U.S. GOVERNMENT GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION REPORT FOR 2018

FEED THE FUTURE

Table of Contents

Letter from the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)

1.) Global Food Security Strategy Implementation Report

2.) Country-Driven, Country-Managed, Increasingly Country-Financed

3.) Whole of Government Guidance

4.) Partnering to Meet the Challenge

Appendix 1: GFSS Executive Summary

Appendix 2: Spending Report

Appendix 3: Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Indicators

Appendix 4: GFSS Performance Data

Appendix 5: Graduation Approach

Appendix 6: Interagency Working Group Updates

Appendix 7: Individual Department and Agency Updates

Appendix 8: Target Country Plans

Appendix 9: Glossary of Key Terms

Letter from the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)

It is my pleasure to submit the Report on the Implementation of the Global Food Security Strategy during Fiscal Year 2018 —the second annual review of activities to carry out the provisions of the bipartisan *Global Food Security Act of 2016,* which reinforces the Administration's commitment to improving the human conditions around the world.

As the Global Coordinator for Feed the Future, I am proud of the results we have achieved, as well as the ongoing progress of our initiatives to strengthen accountability and improve interagency coordination within the Federal Government.

Under the U.S. Government's Global Food Security Strategy, which aligns our efforts from Washington to the field, and across interagency partners, we can already claim some notable successes:

- In the areas where Feed the Future invests, an estimated 23.4 million more people are living above the poverty line, 3.4 million more children live free of stunting, and 5.2 million more families no longer go hungry;
- In places where Feed the Future has worked over the past seven years, we estimate that poverty has dropped by 23 percent, and stunting in children by 32 percent; and
- Our partner countries in Africa have increased their domestic investments in agriculture four times more than the continent as a whole.

While we celebrate this progress, we also face increasing challenges. Hunger remains on the rise, primarily because of military conflict. When we lean into fragile areas and focus on building resilience in areas of recurrent crises, we must also better connect humanitarian assistance and broader development for sustainable progress. As the President's National Security Strategy pledges, "we will support food security and health programs that save lives and address the root causes of hunger and disease."

Improving global food security benefits America as well, by helping us identify emerging threats to our domestic supply systems, reducing the pressure of migratory populations, and creating opportunities for U.S. businesses. Smart, effective investments help create a more peaceful and stable world, and support our partners' progress on the Journey to Self-Reliance.

We look forward to working closely with the Congress, external stakeholders, national governments, the private sector, and beneficiaries as we continue the important work of ensuring this program remains effective and at the forefront of good development practice

1. Report on the Implementation of the U.S. Government's Global Food Security Strategy during Fiscal Year 2018

More than 800 million people suffer from chronic hunger and malnutrition today.[1] Feed the Future has brought partners together to change this, by helping 23.4 million more people live above the poverty line, 3.4 million more children live free from stunting, and 5.2 million more families escape hunger. We estimate that, since 2011, poverty has dropped an average of 23 percent, and childhood stunting by 32 percent across the areas where we work. Our programs build resilience and invest in long-term food security, all while reducing the need for food aid and helping countries move beyond dependency on the Journey to Self-Reliance.

Led by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), Feed the Future draws on the agricultural, trade, investment, development, and policy resources and expertise of a number of U.S. Government Departments and Agencies. In response to the Global Food Security Act (GFSA) of 2016, the U.S. Government developed the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS), a five-year integrated strategy that builds on the first phase of Feed the Future's experience and responds to changes in the global context. This Report summarizes our efforts and results to date as required by Section 8(a) of the GFSA.

In the second year of implementing the GFSS, Feed the Future made significant progress: completion of 12 Feed the Future Target Country Plans; the issuance of guidance on "graduation" and 18 technical topics; definition and selection of Feed the Future "aligned" countries; and standardization of interagency approaches to monitoring, evaluation, and learning. Feed the Future contributes to the President's National Security Strategy through programs that target communities affected by conflict, and by empowering women and youth. This programming supports the Administration's priorities of reducing U.S. Government international humanitarian spending and holding partner nations accountable to design, manage, and fund their own solutions to their development challenges.

However, food insecurity is increasing globally because of conflict, the first such observed increase in over a decade. Building the resilience of households, communities, institutions, and systems is key to breaking the cycle of crises among chronically vulnerable populations and, ultimately, reducing their dependence on humanitarian assistance. The GFSS elevated resilience, in the recognition that long-term food security depends upon the capacity to anticipate and prepare for recurring shocks and stresses in the food and agriculture sector. The Strategy has also challenged us to work in fragile and crisis-prone areas. Investments in agriculture and food

[1] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2018). The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2018: Building climate resilience for food security and nutrition [EN/AR/RU]. Rome, Italy. http://www.fao.org/state-of-food-security-nutrition/en/

security can build resilience to recurrent humanitarian crises, which can help drive sustainable reductions in poverty, hunger, and malnutrition among the most vulnerable.

2. Country-Driven, Country-Managed, Increasingly Country-Financed

Country leadership, political will, domestic resource-mobilization, and commitment to results and accountability are critical to the long-term sustainability and success of our investments and partnerships. Feed the Future supports country-led policy reform and implementation, and urges countries to set their own policy and funding priorities for food security and nutrition. Host-government commitment to, and investment in, food security were two of the criteria by which the U.S. Government selected target countries. Feed the Future memorializes Target Countries' commitments to food security through a "Declaration of Partnership" agreement with each partner government, which publicly affirms our mutual expectations and actions for reducing hunger, poverty, and malnutrition.

Declarations of Partnership should include commitments by the host government to do the following:

- Review and/or develop national agriculture, food security, and nutrition investment plans;
- Catalyze responsible private-sector investment and a trade-enabling policy environment for the food and agriculture sector;
- Communicate political and financial cross-Ministerial intentions to achieve results and accelerate progress against poverty, hunger, and malnutrition;
- Report to publicly on investments, programs, and impact;
- Strengthen and use national data and analysis systems; and
- Account for lessons learned and implement them.

This year, Feed the Future prioritized a collaborative, data-driven interagency effort to complete Feed the Future Target Country Plans for all 12 Target Countries. Each country plan describes Feed the Future programs within a country, and lays the foundation for measuring progress against the GFSS goal of reducing poverty, hunger, and malnutrition. These interagency country plans cover five years of implementation (Fiscal Year [FY] 2018 to FY 2022)[2] and, where applicable, have replaced the Feed the Future Multi-Year Strategies created in FY 2011. The country plans include all relevant contributions from the U.S. Government Agencies and Departments named in the GFSA and external stakeholder input. All 12 country plans build on

[2] Target country plans are available at https://www.feedthefuture.gov/. Budget assumptions for interagency contributions to these plans reflect the Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Estimate, President's Budget Request for FY 2018, based on information publicly available at the time the documents were prepared. Out-year budget assumptions reflect a straight-line to the FY 2018 President's Budget Request. Any funding beyond FY 2017 is subject to the availability of funds, as determined by the President's Budget and a Congressional appropriation. Out-year budget assumptions could require revision based on future Presidents' Budget Requests.

and support each country's food security priorities and reflect lessons learned, evidence, and local context.

3. Whole of Government Guidance

Technical Guidance

The interagency developed a suite of technical guidance on the GFSS for overseas and domestic-based staff and partners. The 18 documents guide the planning design of Feed the Future programming in Target Countries to achieve the GFSS' objectives, and reinforce best practices among the different technical areas involved in implementation of the Strategy.

Aligned Countries

Beyond Target Countries, the U.S. budget designated 35 nations as Feed the Future Aligned Countries that support and are accountable for GFSS objectives. All U.S. Embassies in Feed the Future Target and Aligned Countries must meet three basic requirements:

- Designate a single interagency point of contact (from any Feed the Future Department or Agency) at Post for coordination;
- Align country-level Feed the Future programs with the GFSS; where applicable, Feed the Future Aligned Countries will focus on building resilience in areas of recurrent humanitarian crises; and
- Submit annual reports, including by entering results and out-year targets for applicable activity-level GFSS indicators (both outcomes and outputs; see Annex 4), and the submission of performance narratives in the Feed the Future Monitoring System as determined through consultation with the interagency Feed the Future Coordinator at each Embassy.

The list of Feed the Future Target Countries can change over the life of the GFSS (FY 2017 to FY 2021), though there is no assumption that countries designated as "aligned" will become target countries, or a commitment of future out-year funding. Nor is there a commitment that target countries that are not performing, or are otherwise not meeting expectations, will receive funding.

Graduation

The Feed the Future interagency established a transparent, data-driven policy and review process to determine when Feed the Future Target Countries can transition from Target-Country status. As USAID Administrator Mark Green has consistently stated, "The purpose of foreign aid is to end the need for its existence." The *Feed the Future Target Country Graduation Policy and Review Process,* developed with external input, aligns with Administrator Green's vision of the Journey to Self-Reliance and the President's National Security Strategy. The basic premise of graduation is to identify the point at which countries demonstrate the capacity and commitment

to sustain and fund development advancements and successes in inclusive agricultural growth, resilience, and nutrition that can allow them to create a new food-security relationship with the United States. The annual review process for graduation, starting in 2019, will measure a Target Country's readiness to move from Target-Country status and make recommendations by evaluating quantitative and qualitative data aligned to the following three high-level analytical dimensions:

1. **Development Achievement:** Progress in reducing poverty, hunger, and malnutrition across the Feed the Future Zones of Influence;[3]
2. **Country Commitment:** Commitment by host country governments to investing in food security and nutrition and policy reform through public-sector spending in food security and the implementation of sound policies and regulations; and
3. **Country Capacity:** Capacity by host countries to sustain advancements by analyzing the capacity of the private sector, civil society, the effectiveness of key government institutions, and the growth of the country's agricultural Gross Domestic Product.

4. Partnering to Meet the Challenge

Feed the Future has an increased focus on strengthening national data systems in Target Countries to improve their policymaking and build local capacity and accountability, while maintaining the highest levels of accountability for results even as we reduce long-term monitoring-and-evaluation (M&E) costs to the U.S. Government. In the past year, we have supported the collection of national household and agriculture surveys in several Target Countries to build the capacity of host-country governments to collect, assess, and build on these data themselves in the future.

Leading with the Data

Building on the strong culture of learning established under the first phase of Feed the Future, we use M&E findings to improve programming constantly. This culture of learning greatly influenced the development of the GFSS itself. Since the release of the strategy, new impact-level data for our Target Countries informed the design of new projects, the management of ongoing performance by partners, and the strategic direction reflected in Target Country plans. In Senegal, for example, the data did not show any statistically significant changes in poverty and stunting. In response, the country plan outlined a smaller, more-concentrated geographic area of focus to allow for greater density of programming, and thus, development impact. Most recently, in September 2018, Feed the Future launched a new Learning Agenda for public comment to provide a framework for addressing the biggest evidence gaps, which is essential for increasing our effectiveness and efficiency. Each year, U.S. Government Departments and Agencies review their Feed the Future investments, to increase and scale impact in high-

[3] Targeted geographic areas where U.S. Government global food security and nutrition programs work.

performing programs and correct or terminate low-performing ones to maximize the effectiveness of taxpayer resources.

Catalyzing Research Investments

The 2017 Global Food Security Research Strategy lays out a vision for coordinated U.S. Government investment in food and agriculture. It guides the prioritization Feed the Future's research investments, including into the Feed the Future Innovation Labs, other U.S. university-based programs, and the centers of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). The Strategy's themes are the following:

- Technologies and practices can advance productivity, drive income growth, improve diets, and promote the conservation of natural resources;
- Technologies and practices can reduce, manage, and mitigate risk to build resilient, prosperous, well-nourished individuals, households, and communities;
- Research provides key insights about partner countries to maximize the effect and efficiency of U.S. Government investments; and
- Programs must deploy evidence to sustainably and equitably improve economic opportunity, nutrition, and resilience.

Feed the Future aligns its research activities with this Strategy and are refined, updated, and amplified in partnership with the Presidentially appointed Board for International Food and Agricultural Development, interagency working groups, and additional activities by U.S. Government Agencies and Departments beyond Feed the Future. For example, we have funded 900 innovations, and a pipeline of 50,000 more are in development as we work with partners to further develop, test, and commercialize these solutions.

Looking ahead, investments in food, agriculture, and nutrition systems and institutions will remain one of the most-effective investments to alleviate poverty. Protecting and accelerating this progress in an increasingly complex world is our challenge. Over the last year, as a result of conflict, we have seen unprecedented humanitarian need across the world. As the specter of hunger looms again, Feed the Future is adjusting to help those who have escaped poverty avoid falling back into it.

Against this backdrop, we continue to see reductions in poverty and stunting. Please find included in this report's appendices the updates from: individual Departments and Agencies on their efforts to support global food-security programming; information on collaboration through interagency working groups; Feed the Future's whole-of-Government indicators monitoring, evaluation, and learning; and data and reporting for Fiscal Year 2017. We look forward to continuing this work, in close consultation with our Congressional stakeholders, to reduce global hunger, poverty, and malnutrition sustainably.

Appendix 1: Executive Summary of the GFSS

Our vision remains 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. We have built a strategy and are now implementing guidance and programming that builds on the U.S. Government's strong foundation of investments in global food security and nutrition to break silos, integrate programming across sectors, and deploy Departments and Agencies for maximum impact and the effective stewardship of United States taxpayer dollars.

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. The U.S. Government, 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, shown to be more effective than growth in other sectors at helping men and women lift themselves out of extreme poverty and hunger because it increases the availability of food, generates income from production, creates employment and entrepreneurship opportunities throughout value chains, and spurs 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 emerge from poverty sustainably; and
- 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 improve food security and nutrition sustainably 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, multifaceted 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, manage, 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 agricultural 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 under which 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, U.S. Government Agencies and Departments further commit to strengthening our rigorous approach to monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL), which includes the following:

- a whole-of-Government Results Framework;
- a performance-monitoring process and whole-of-Government performance indicators;
- an evaluation approach that uses impact and performance evaluations;
- a learning agenda that prioritizes key evidence gaps; and
- a focus on strengthening data systems in Target Countries.

Appendix 2: GFSS Spending Report

This Section and Appendix 4 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 GFSS, 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 to the relevant Federal Agencies and Departments, and Appendix 4 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 Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 to FY 2018, 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 Enacted ($000s)	FY 2018 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	1,431,978	1,492,875
Development Assistance	826,700	843,422	866,250	901,260	823,855	762,139	841,400
Economic Support Fund	343,206	275,013	228,306	185,834	122,025	150,587	146,700
Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia	30,520	0	0	0	11,000	12,500	12,500
Public Law (P.L.) 480 Title II- Non-Emergency[b]	425,000	300,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
Global Health Programs	128,952	128,621	149,731	149,955	161,381	156,752	142,275
U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)	420,501	417,501	322,126	329,626	386,626	376,611	382,611
Cochran Fellowship Program[c]	N/A	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	N/A

(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 Enacted ($000s)	FY 2018 Estimate ($000s)
McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program[d]	174,501	174,501	185,126	191,626	201,626	201,626	207,626
Food for Progress Program	246,000	243,000	137,000	138,000	185,000	174,985	174,985
U.S. Department of Commerce[e]	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
U.S. Department of State	500	500	5,500	10,500	500	500	500
Contributions to International Organizations	[f]	[f]	[f]	[f]	[f]	[f]	[f]
Diplomatic and Consular Programs[g]	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Economic Support Fund	0	0	5,000	10,000	0	0	0
U.S. Department of the Treasury	165,000	156,646	163,000	30,000	74,930	53,000	30,000
International Fund for Agricultural Development	30,000	28,481	30,000	30,000	31,930	30,000	30,000
Global Agriculture and Food Security Program	135,000	128,165	133,000	0	43,000	23,000	0
Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC)	[h]	[h]	[h]	[h]	[h]	[h]	[h]
Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC)[i]	878	4,372	1,162	6,925	0	1,018	1,342
Peace Corps[j]	23,000	23,850	27,120	28,270	26,290	22,949	23,081
Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR)[k]	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
U.S. African Development Foundation (USADF)	[l]	[l]	[l]	[l]	[l]	[l]	[l]
U.S. Department of the Interior Geological Survey (USGS)[m]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Inter-American Foundation (IAF)	[n]	[n]	[n]	[n]	[n]	[n]	[n]
Subtotal	2,364,257	2,149,925	2,113,195	1,992,370	1,956,607	1,886,056	1,930,409

Footnotes:

N/A = Not Available

*Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 reported levels are post-sequestration.

[a] The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) figures reflect enacted levels that fund the 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). USAID levels from the Global Health account (GH-P) include funding for nutrition and household-level water, sanitation, hygiene, and environment programs. In general, over this period, USAID's Congressional Budget Justification (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 for FY 2012-FY 2017 appropriations that should be used for development food-assistance programs authorized by Title II of P.L. 83-480, as amended. Appropriations to the Title II account do not specify the level of funding that USAID should be directed to emergency versus non-emergency programming.

[c] The Cochran Fellowship Program and Borlaug Fellowship Program do not appear in the President's Budget Request for the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). 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 total include $5 million to execute local and regional food-procurement projects under Section 1726 (c) of Title Seven of the United States Code, as provided in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of FY 2016 and Consolidated Appropriations Act of FY 2017, respectively. In FY 2018, the Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY 2018 (Omnibus) provided $10 million.

[e] The International Trade Administration (ITA), a bureau within the U.S. Department of Commerce, conducts food-security activities as part of its overall trade-promotion and trade-development efforts. ITA does not directly assign funding to the implementation of global food-security activities, 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 or to fund 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's 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] The Department of State's assessed contributions for two United Nations (UN) agencies, the UN Food and Agriculture Organization and the UN World Health Organization, and an international organization that supports food security, the World Organization of Animal Health, totaled approximately $1.3 billion from FY 2012 to FY 2018. The proportion of the funding that directly supports U.S. international food security efforts is not known.

[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 governments to adopt transparent and science-based regulations and practices to improve food safety.

[h] Although the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) has obligated approximately $1.169 billion for food security from FY 2012 through FY 2018, MCC's enacted budget is planned at a country level, and excludes sector-level detail.

[i] The Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) loan subsidy plus negative-subsidy projects (as defined in Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-11, Section 185.3 (v)) of $1,018,000 for FY 2017 supported $217,681,000 of financing commitments and $11,670,000 of insurance commitments in FY 2017 for food-security projects. In FY 2018, OPIC's subsidy of $1,342,000 will support an estimated $83,856,000 of OPIC financing and insurance commitments combined for food security projects.

[j] Represents funding estimates for Peace Corps Volunteers who are working in agriculture, environment, health (nutrition and water/sanitation), community economic development, youth development, and education programs. 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] The United States Trade Representative (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 the implementation of global food security activities, nor is the level of effort available, such as number of hours per employee devoted to food-security activities.

[l] Although the U.S. African Development Foundation (USADF) has obligated over $86 million in grants that support food security from FY 2012 through FY 2018, USADF's enacted budget is planned and applied at a country level and excludes sector-level detail.

[m] No U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) appropriations support global food-security activities such as the USAID-funded Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET), satellite remote sensing, modeling, and geospatial methods to characterize climate variability and climate change in countries with sparse surface instrument networks, and agro-climatological analysis of anomalous climatic events that have potential impacts on food security, as described in the USGS GFSS implementation plan, for the period covered in this table.

[n] Although the Inter-American Foundation (IAF) has obligated over $25 million in grants that support food security from FY 2012 through FY 2017, IAF's enacted budget is planned at a country level and excludes sector-level detail. At the time IAF collected these data, final FY 2018 obligations were not yet available. IAF will provide FY 2018 information in next year's report.

Appendix 3: Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Indicators for the Global Food Security Strategy

Full indicator definitions and details are available in the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook online here:
https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook

Indicator #	Indicator TITLE and Link to Definition Sheet
EG-c	Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.90/day 2011 Purchasing Power Party (PPP) [ZOI-level]
EG-d *	Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.90/day 2011 PPP [National-level]
EG-e	Prevalence of moderate and severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) [ZOI-level]
EG-f *	Prevalence of moderate or severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) [National-level]
EG-g	Percentage of Households below the Comparative Threshold for the Poorest Quintile of the Asset-Based Comparative Wealth Index [ZOI-level]
EG-h	Depth of Poverty of the Poor: Mean percent shortfall of the poor relative to the $1.90/day 2011 PPP poverty line [ZOI-level]
EG.3-2	Number of individuals participating in USG food security programs [IM-level]
EG.3-10, -11, -12	Yield of targeted agricultural commodities among program participants with USG assistance [IM-level]
EG.3-e	Percent change in value-added in the agri-food system ("Ag GDP+") [National-level]
EG.3-f	Abbreviated Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index [ZOI-level]
EG.3-g	Employment in the agri-food system [National-level]
EG.3-h	Yield of targeted agricultural commodities within target areas [ZOI-level]
EG.3.1-1	Kilometers of roads improved or constructed as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]
EG.3.1-14	Value of new U.S. Government commitments and private sector investment leveraged by the USG to support food security and nutrition [IM-level]
EG.3.1-c	Value of targeted agricultural commodities exported at a national level [National-level]
EG.3.1-d	Number of milestones in improved institutional architecture for food security policy achieved with USG support [Multi-level]
EG.3.2-2	Number of individuals who have received USG-supported degree-granting non-nutrition-related food security training [IM-level]

Indicator #	Indicator TITLE and Link to Definition Sheet
EG.3.2-7	Number of technologies, practices, and approaches under various phases of research, development, and uptake as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]
EG.3.2-24	Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USG assistance [IM-level]
EG.3.2-25	Number of hectares under improved management practices or technologies with USG assistance [IM-level]
EG.3.2-26	Value of annual sales of farms and firms receiving USG assistance [IM-level]
EG.3.2-27	Value of agriculture-related financing accessed as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]
EG.3.2-28	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]
EG.3.2-29	Number of organizations with increased performance improvement with USG assistance [IM-level]
EG.3.2-a	Proportion of producers who have applied targeted improved management practices or technologies [ZOI-level]
EG.3.3-10	Percentage of female participants of USG nutrition-sensitive agriculture activities consuming a diet of minimum diversity [IM-level]
EG.4.2-7	Number of individuals participating in group-based savings, micro-finance or lending programs with USG assistance [IM-level]
EG.4.2-a	Proportion of households participating in group-based savings, micro-finance or lending programs [ZOI-level]
EG.10.4-7	Number of adults with legally recognized and documented tenure rights to land or marine areas, as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]
EG.10.4-8	Number of people who perceive their tenure rights to land or marine areas as secure as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]
ES.5-1	Number of USG social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets [IM-level]
HL.8.2-2	Number of people gaining access to a basic sanitation service as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]
HL.8.2-5	Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members [IM-level]
HL.8.2-a	Percentage of households with access to a basic sanitation service [ZOI-level]
HL.8.2-b	Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members [ZOI-level]
HL.9-1	Number of children under five (0-59 months) reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USG-supported programs [IM-level]

Indicator #	Indicator TITLE and Link to Definition Sheet
HL.9-2	Number of children under two (0-23 months) reached with community-level nutrition interventions through USG-supported programs [IM-level]
HL.9-3	Number of pregnant women reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USG-supported programs [IM-level]
HL.9-4	Number of individuals receiving nutrition-related professional training through USG-supported programs [IM-level]
HL.9-15	Percent of participants of community-level nutrition interventions who practice promoted infant and young child feeding behaviors [IM-level]
HL.9-a	Prevalence of stunted (HAZ < -2) children under five (0-59 months) [ZOI-level]
HL.9-b	Prevalence of wasted (WHZ < -2) children under five (0-59 months) [ZOI-level]
HL.9-d	Prevalence of underweight (BMI < 18.5) women of reproductive age [ZOI-level]
HL.9-h *	Prevalence of stunted (HAZ < -2) children under five (0-59 months) [National-level]
HL.9-i	Prevalence of healthy weight (WHZ ≤ 2 and ≥-2) among children under five (0-59 months) [ZOI-level]
HL.9.1-a	Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet [ZOI-level]
HL.9.1-b	Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age [ZOI-level]
HL.9.1-d	Prevalence of women of reproductive age consuming a diet of minimum diversity [ZOI-level]
GNDR-2	Percentage of female participants in USG-assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources [IM-level]
RESIL-1	Number of host government or community-derived risk management plans formally proposed, adopted, implemented or institutionalized with USG assistance [IM-level]
RESIL-a	Ability to recover from shocks and stresses index [ZOI-level]
RESIL-b	Index of social capital at the household level [ZOI-level]
RESIL-c	Proportion of households that believe local government will respond effectively to future shocks and stresses [ZOI-level]
YOUTH-3	Percentage of participants in USG-assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources who are youth (15-29) [IM-level]
FTF Context-1	Percentage of Households below the Comparative Threshold for the Poorest Quintile of the Asset-Based Comparative Wealth Index [National-level]
FTF Context-2 *	Average income of small-scale food producers, by sex and indigenous status (SDG indicator #2.3.2) [National-level]
FTF Context-3 *	Volume of production per labor unit by classes of farming/pastoral/forestry enterprise size (SDG indicator #2.3.1) [National-level]

Indicator #	Indicator TITLE and Link to Definition Sheet
FTF Context-4 *	Percentage of 15-29 year olds who are Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) (SDG indicator #8.8.6) - [National-level]
FTF Context-5	Prevalence of wasted (WHZ < -2) children under five (0-59 months) [National-level]
FTF Context-6	Depth of Poverty of the poor: Mean percent shortfall relative to the $1.90/day 2011 PPP poverty line [National-level]
FTF Context-7	U.S. government humanitarian assistance spending in areas/populations subject to recurrent crises [Recurrent crisis areas (if data not available, National)]
FTF Context-8	Number of people in need of humanitarian food assistance in areas/populations subject to recurrent crises [Recurrent crisis areas (if data not available, National)]
FTF Context-9	Prevalence of people who are 'Near-Poor', living on 100 percent to less than 125 percent of the $1.90 2011 PPP poverty line [ZOI-level]
FTF Context-10	Risk to well-being as a percent of GDP [National-level]
FTF Context-11	Yield of targeted agricultural commodities [National-level]
FTF Context-12	Average Standard Precipitation Index score during the main growing season [ZOI-level]
FTF Context-13	Average deviation from 10-year average NDVI during the main growing season [ZOI-level]
FTF Context-14	Total number of heat stress days above 30 °C during the main growing season [ZOI-level]
FTF Context-15 *	Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture (SDG indicator #2.4.1) [National-level]
FTF Context-16	Prevalence of healthy weight (WHZ ≤ 2 and ≥-2) among children under five (0-59 months) [National-level]
FTF Context-17	Prevalence of underweight (BMI < 18.5) women of reproductive age [National-level]
FTF Context-18 *	Prevalence of undernourishment (SDG indicator #2.1.1) [National-level]
FTF Context-19	Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet [National-level]
FTF Context-20	Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age [National-level]
FTF Context-21	Prevalence of women of reproductive age consuming a diet of minimum diversity [National-level]
FTF Context-22	Food security and nutrition funding as reported to the OECD DAC [Global-level]
FTF Context-23	Share of agriculture in total government expenditure (%) [National-level]
FTF Context-24	Proportion of total adult rural population with secure tenure rights to land, (a) with legally recognized documentation and (b) who perceive their rights to land as secure [National-level]

Indicator #	Indicator TITLE and Link to Definition Sheet
FTF Context-25	**Average percentage of women achieving adequacy across the six indicators of the Abbreviated Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index [ZOI-level]**

**Marks those that are also a Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) indicator – see details in Handbook*

Appendix 4: Performance Data for the Implementation of the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS)

Select Feed the Future Annual Global Results
Fiscal Years (FY) 2011 to 2017

INDICATOR [a]	FY2011 [b]	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017
Improved Agricultural Productivity							
Farmers and others who have applied improved technologies or management practices with U.S. Government assistance	1,738,216	7,437,913	6,633,882	6,757,148	9,072,040	11,566,190	11,399,494
% Male	59%	72%	70%	63%	63%	63%	60%
% Female	41%	28%	30%	37%	37%	37%	40%
Hectares of land under improved technologies or management practices with U.S. Government assistance	2,368,369	3,802,307	3,996,299	3,177,418	5,342,827	6,625,970	7,510,305
% Male	85%	73%	84%	70%	68%	67%	69%
% Female	15%	27%	16%	30%	32%	33%	31%
Individuals who have received degree-granting agricultural productivity or food security training supported by the U.S. Government	935	932	928	1,298	1,304	1,397	1,518

INDICATOR [a]	FY2011 [b]	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017
% Male	60%	59%	56%	55%	56%	59%	59%
% Female	40%	41%	44%	45%	44%	41%	41%
Improved Use of Nutrition Services							
Children under five reached by U.S. Government-supported nutrition programs [c]	8,814,584	12,038,528	12,699,186	12,343,776	18,006,457	27,677,460	22,657,081
% Male	n/a	50%	50%	56%	49%	48%	48%
% Female	n/a	50%	50%	44%	51%	52%	52%
Health facilities with established capacity to manage acute undernutrition [d]	85	1,141	848	2,029	2,959	2,887	1,351
People trained in child health and nutrition, supported by the U.S. Government [e]	14,265	699,938	1,145,903	1,441,042	2,681,398	3,601,441	1,806,910
% Male	41%	42%	22%	19%	24%	20%	26%
% Female	59%	58%	78%	81%	76%	80%	74%
Expanded Markets and Trade							
Value of total annual sales generated as a result of U.S. Government assistance [f]	$53,465,273	$352,962,159	$1,241,077,894	$1,533,876,241	$2,278,995,489	$2,407,247,622	$2,658,888,723

INDICATOR [a]	FY2011 [b]	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017
Micro-, small-, and medium-sized enterprises, including farmers, who have received agricultural-related credit as a result of U.S. Government assistance	15,163	275,587	340,563	881,248	1,227,391	701,835	836,861
% Male-owned	92%	54%	65%	51%	56%	31%	40%
% Female-owned	8%	46%	35%	49%	44%	69%	60%
Value of agricultural and rural loans resulting from U.S. Government assistance (USD) [g]	$213,796,353	$127,365,952	$188,805,217	$671,555,635	$877,871,314	$656,598,716	$658,493,985
% Male Recipients	70%	89%	64%	72%	52%	52%	61%
% Female Recipients	30%	11%	36%	28%	48%	48%	39%
Value of new private-sector capital investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by Feed the Future implementation (USD)	$27,908,031	$251,650,254	$163,581,946	$150,345,228	$154,007,901	$230,137,354	$243,232,261

Results Chart Notes

U.S. Government (USG) Departments and Agencies that have reported into the Feed the Future Monitoring System (FTFMS) include USAID, the U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Treasury, the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), Peace Corps and the U.S. African Development Foundation. Feed the Future began tracking results in FY 2011, when the initiative developed multi-year strategies, defined its zones of influence, and implemented its system for monitoring and evaluation.

Some results from FY 2011 to FY 2016 have been revised based on additional information provided after publication for previous years. Indicators have been reported annually for Feed the Future Focus and Aligned countries.[4]

For a list of Feed the Future's original Focus Countries, visit www.feedthefuture.gov. Participating U.S. Government Departments and Agencies do not necessarily report on all countries in which they have programs, and might only report on certain common indicators. As part of implementing the GFSS, the interagency selected a new list of 12 Feed the Future Target Countries.

Additionally, the USAID Office of Food for Peace has reported on Feed the Future indicators in non-aligned as well as non-focus countries where it has development programs, as have some other U.S. Government Departments and Agencies involved in Feed the Future.

Feed the Future does not report disaggregates – including by sex – for all activities, and therefore percentages often represent only a subset of activities.

The data for output and outcome indicators above are directly attributable to USG funding. For the purposes of this report, a result is attributable to the USG, or the USG can claim credit for a result even when other partners are involved in achieving the result, if the USG can claim that without USG intervention and funding the outcome would not have taken place.

(a) In October 2017, Feed the Future published an updated list of indicators as part of the *Report on the Implementation of the Global Food Security Strategy.* These performance-management indicators are designed to measure progress against each result in the Feed the Future Results Framework under the GFSS. The full definitions of indicators are available in the updated *Feed the Future Indicator Handbook* at https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook.

(b) Reporting was incomplete in 2011, the first year of the Feed the Future Monitoring System (FTFMS). Figures do not reflect the full impact of Feed the Future programs in that year.

(c) 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

[4] 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. These results represent aggregate statistics observed in 17 of the original 19 Feed the Future focus countries. US Agency for International Development. (2017) The Global Food Security Strategy Implementation Report. https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1867/GFSS_ImplementationReport_2017.pdf

interventions delivered through Feed the Future, Food for Peace Development, and Global Health nutrition programs at USAID 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 partners' information systems are only able to track contacts, not individual children. Starting in FY 2017, this revised indicator captured nutrition-specific interventions only. The previous version of this indicator captured both nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive efforts. Moving forward, USAID will only report nutrition-specific interventions.[5]

(d), **(e)** Because USAID and Feed the Future archived these two indicators in FY 2016, projects have stopped reporting on them, which resulted in a decrease in total results. Starting next year, Feed the Future will capture and report elements of these results under new indicators.

(f) This indicator reflects a change from previous progress reports, which featured incremental sales (the increase in sales year on year, compared to an adjusted baseline). This and future progress products will include total annual sales instead, which gives a clearer picture of what producers (and, starting in FY 2018, firms too) are making every year.

(g) In a few cases, the percentages between male and female disaggregates will not add up to 100 percent of the total because another disaggregate (*e.g.*, "joint" or "not applicable") not reported here is an option.

Appendix 5: Approach to Graduation under Feed the Future:

https://feedthefuture.gov/graduation

Appendix 6: Updates on Interagency Working Group under the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS)

To continue the close collaboration under the GFSS, the interagency established two additional groups, the Working Groups on Fall Armyworm and Global Engagement, to join a suite of others that leverage the expertise of the U.S. Government Agencies and Departments that implement the Strategy through Feed the Future.

Working Group on Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL)

[5] Nutrition-specific interventions address the immediate causes of undernutrition, such as a poor or inadequate diet, disease, and related underlying factors such as lack of access to food, sub-optimal feeding practices, inadequate health care, and an unhealthy environment. Nutrition-sensitive interventions address the basic underlying causes of undernutrition, incorporating nutrition goals and activities into efforts in other areas such as agriculture, education, water supply, and sanitation and hygiene. These efforts can even serve as delivery platforms for nutrition-specific interventions, such as introducing agricultural as well as nutrition best practices at farmer trainings.

The Working Group on Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) achieved a number of milestones in advancing Feed the Future's upgraded Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning. First, the Working Group released the revised set of Feed the Future indicators to measure progress against the GFSS Results Framework. Target-setting and reporting on this upgraded set of indicators will start in FY 2019. In addition, the Working Group developed a Memorandum of Understanding to outline each Department and Agency's commitments to increase accountability and effectiveness of Feed the Future through MEL. Last, Feed the Future released a revised Learning Agenda that will improve the initiative's effectiveness.

Working Group on Fall Armyworm

The outbreak of Fall Armyworm (FAW) threatens current and future progress of agricultural success in Africa. FAW is resistant to many conventional pesticides, and has a voracious appetite that particularly targets maize, a vital staple crop in Africa. This crop pest has the potential to cause billions of dollars in damage and put hundreds of millions at risk for hunger. Its presence is now confirmed in more than 40 African countries today. The U.S. Government issued a call to action to partners in 2017, and launched an emergency Fall Armyworm Task Force to help Africa combat this pest and build resilience to future threats of this nature. The Task Force worked together to accomplish the following:

- Support a FAW Study Tour to Brazil with 24 African policy-makers in March 2018 to showcase lessons learned and best practices to combat the pest through public-and-private sector efforts;
- Announce the Feed the Future FAW Tech Prize, a public-private partnership with Land O'Lakes, Inc., and the Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research, to support innovations to inform, identify, and combat FAW; and
- Provide input and technical review on the first integrated pest-management guide on combating FAW specifically tailored for Africa, published in January 2018.

Working Group on Policy

No country has improved the well-being of its people, including food security, without a deliberate approach to policy and service-delivery and infrastructure. Transformational policy, embraced by host country governments, key stakeholder and partners, is critical to the success of Feed the Future, particularly where regional and cross-border trade-facilitation is necessary for agricultural-led growth. Countries become more self-reliant when their governments are committed to making food security a priority agenda and put in place the framework and budgetary allocations to deliver on their plans and make progress on them. Recognizing the important contribution of policy engagement to the success of Feed the Future, the interagency launched a Policy Working Group with a mandate to identify best practices and approaches and disseminate them across the U.S. Government to inform the design and implementation of

projects and programs. Key achievements of the working group in FY 2018 include the following:

- The revision of policy matrices in Feed the Future Focus Countries to reflect new GFSS Country Plans and their respective policy priorities, and new GFSS Policy Technical Guidance;
- The creation and dissemination of "Declaration of Partnership" guidance to serve as a mutual accountability tool for implementing Feed the Future in Target and Aligned Countries; and
- Produced the FY 2017 policy matrix report, which identified two-thirds of policy actions for the Fiscal Year as completed or on-track in each of the Target Countries.

Working Group on Private Sector Engagement

The private sector is a key stakeholder and partner for Feed the Future, as private resources are the engine that propels agricultural development and transformation. The interagency is taking a market-systems approach to facilitate 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. The Overseas Private Investment Corporation (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 coordinate various resources, tools, and authorities to effectively engage and leverage commercial expertise and investment to achieve the objectives of the GFSS. In 2018, the Working Group held a joint meeting with McCormick, Inc., at its plant outside of Baltimore, Maryland to understand the spice sector and identify opportunities for the U.S. Government to collaborate on new value chains and geographies. A two-day Inclusive Market Systems Development training was open to all members of the Working Group to promote interagency collaboration and learning. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and USAID are also collaborating on a Food Safety Network to promote the goals of the GSS through short-term capacity-building, including training, assessments and actionable recommendations, and support for regional sanitary and phytosanitary advisory services. Finally, members of the Working Group built on previous work by facilitating meetings between businesses based in Malawi- and North Carolina s in the sweet-potato-processing industry, which inspired an American food-processing-equipment company, Sinovatek, to go to Southern and East Africa for the first time to explore business opportunities.

Working Group on Nutrition

Under the U.S. Government's Global Nutrition Coordination Plan (GNCP), the interagency is accountable for coordinated actions that provide the backbone for collaborative nutrition programming, including the creation of a permanent, Government-wide Global Nutrition

Technical Working Group (GNTWG) to serve as a leader and convener for action and information-sharing. As part of the GNTWG, the GFSS Nutrition Sub-Working Group builds upon the shared goals of the Agencies and Departments that are leading global nutrition efforts on behalf of the U.S. Government. Co-led by USAID and USDA, the group serves as a platform to collaborate at the headquarters and country levels, build consensus on priority actions to demonstrate results toward the nutrition objective of the GFSS through Feed the Future, and document U.S. Government progress and results - including updates from USDA (*i.e.* McGovern Dole and national nutrition policies); and input on surveillance and monitoring from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention within HHS.

Accomplishments this past year include the following:

- HHS/CDC best practices on filling critical gaps in nutrition data: The International Micronutrient Malnutrition Prevention and Control (IMMPaCt) project managed by HHS/CDC is a multi-disciplinary group that focuses on key micronutrients that are usually insufficient in the human diet by providing technical assistance to countries to plan and develop nutrition interventions, assessments, surveillance and, monitoring systems, and evaluations. The data provided lessons learned from Guatemala and Uganda to develop high-quality, timely, low-cost systems that provide indicators of the coverage of nutrition programs and status biomarkers for Rwanda, Burkina Faso, and Nigeria, and USAID is already integrating them into national comprehensive surveys on nutrition in Nepal and Malawi. Planning is currently underway with USAID for national micronutrient assessments/surveillance systems in Rwanda, Burkina Faso, and Nigeria; and
- Produced the U.S. Government's Report on Year One of the Global Nutrition Coordination Plan.

Working Group on Global Engagement

The Working Group on Global Engagement shares information and improves the consistency of U.S. positions in global policy discussions on food security. By improving coordination across global processes, such as APEC, the G7, the G20, and the Committee on World Food Security (CFS), the Working Group is contributing to the coherence and amplification of U.S. priorities and messages, a unified and effective interagency effort, and consistency and stability for long-term and strategic development gains. Accomplishments this past year include the following:

- Coordinated inter-agency consultations with the Chair of the United Nations (UN) Committee on World Food Security; and
- Shared documents and outcomes from APEC, the G7, the G20, CFS, the Informal North American Regional Conference of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization, Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP), and Global Open Data for Agriculture and Nutrition (GODAN).

Working Group on Communications and Outreach

The Working Group on Interagency Communications and Outreach brings together communicators from the U.S. Government Agencies and Departments that comprise Feed the Future. The Working Group promotes consistent Feed the Future messaging and contributes interagency accomplishments and stories to Feed the Future's platforms for amplification. Bi-weekly updates circulated among the Working Group and quarterly roundtables with external communicators keep the interagency connected on current priorities, projects and events. The group collaborates on strategic planning to better tell the interagency story of Feed the Future and expand the initiative's network of champions and partners. Accomplishments this past year include the following:

- **Interagency "taglines":** Each interagency partner developed a two-to-three sentence description of how it contributes to Feed the Future. The Working Group circulated the final "taglines" among the group for common use and highlighted them in the 2018 Feed the Future Progress Snapshot. As a result, each interagency partner is now able to speak with authority and consistency about what it and others are contributing to the initiative.
- **Strategic planning:** The Working Group met to plan amplification ideas for the 2018 Progress Snapshot, and for Feed the Future Week 2018. At each planning session, the Working Group brainstormed ways to draw upon the strengths and priorities of each Agency and Department to amplify Feed the Future's story most effectively. As a result, multiple interagency partners participated in amplifying Feed the Future's progress, expanding the initiative's reach and raising visibility of its accomplishments, including a blog post by the new Peace Corps Director. Feed the Future added 4,200 followers on Twitter and generated 14,000 engagements (likes, retweets, clicks and comments) from 1,400 posts in the past year. Feed the Future also gained 2,200 likes on its Facebook page.

Appendix 7: Updated from U.S. Government Agencies and Departments on the Implementation of the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) 2017-2021

This annex provides the second annual update of the USG Federal Department and Agency-specific progress in implementing the U.S. Government Global Food Security Strategy 2017-2021 (GFSS), and the implementation plans provided in Annex 1 of the GFSS.

U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)

On behalf of the American people, USAID promotes and demonstrates democratic values abroad, and advances a free, peaceful, and prosperous world. USAID leads the implementation and coordination across multiple Federal Departments and Agencies to implement the GFSS; and contributes to this Strategy by overseeing critical food-security investments in the field and

centrally managed programs. In the last year, USAID proposed the establishment of a new Bureau for Resilience and Food Security as part of the Agency's Transformation. In this proposal, the Bureau would continue to invest in agricultural-led growth and food-security programming while strategically working across the Agency to scale up activities in resilience, climate-smart agriculture, nutrition, water security, sanitation, and hygiene.

Progress

After leading efforts among the USG interagency to select the 12 Feed the Future (FTF) Target Countries, USAID coordinated the development of five-year (Fiscal Year (FY) 2018-2022) country plans. In addition, USAID drove the development of guidance for Feed the Future Aligned Countries and regional programs, and guidance documents for 18 technical areas. Additionally, for FY 2018, USAID is launching a Resilience Challenge Fund to scale resilience programming and reduce the need for humanitarian assistance by allowing USAID Missions to apply for additional FTF resources for programs that a) demonstrate innovative and effective approaches to building resilience to recurrent crises; and b) influence and leverage significant resources from other donors, national governments, and the private sector to scale those approaches.

USAID continued efforts to address new and emerging threats to global food security by launching a Call to Action for donors, companies and other partners to help African countries combat Fall Armyworm, an invasive crop pest. Now found in over 40 African countries, Fall Armyworm poses a significant threat to food security and livelihoods. USAID set up a Fall Armyworm Task Force, launched a prize for digital solutions with private-sector partners, and worked with research institutions to produce a field manual for comprehensive, integrated pest-management and related resources to help farmers tackle the pest.

USAID facilitated the revision of the whole-of-Government Feed the Future indicators to gauge progress toward the goals, objectives and intermediate results of the GFSS. Formalized in an interagency Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), USAID organized the Departments and Agencies that implement Feed the Future under one shared commitment for a Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Framework, including rigorous and transparent monitoring, reporting and evaluation of performance, and the sharing of evidence and data. Additionally, USAID led the development of a revised Feed the Future Learning Agenda, which will help prioritize filling critical evidence gaps in global food security.

Ongoing USAID Feed the Future investments in FY 2017[6]advanced the following:

- Leveraged $243 million in new private sector capital investment;
- Disbursed $306 million in agricultural and rural loans;
- Helped 10.7 million farmers and others apply improved technologies or practices;
- Created 78,000 full-time jobs;
- Provided 837,000 farmers and small or medium sized enterprises with agricultural credit;
- Reached 22.6 million children with nutrition-specific interventions; and

[6]This report was assembled during the fourth quarter of FY 2018 so full-year results were not yet available. FY 2017 results reported here became available in the Spring of 2018.

- Disseminated 700 technologies or management practices supported through research funded by the USG for transfer to public or private organizations.

Lessons Learned

Findings from monitoring, evaluation, and other analyses have informed significant lessons learned that, in turn, have informed strategic, design, and budgetary decisions. Data show resilience programs can reduce the need for humanitarian assistance in regions subject to recurrent humanitarian crises and better equip communities and countries to manage shocks, such as drought, when they do occur. For example, a recent analysis in Kenya that compared the severe droughts in 2011 and 2017 showed that the need for humanitarian assistance was far lower in 2017 than expected, given the historical relationship between drought severity and humanitarian need, thanks in part to forward-learning investments in resilience and drought-cycle management in projects implemented by USAID and the Kenyan Government's own Ending Drought Emergencies initiative. USAID is now working with national governments to scale up these approaches elsewhere. More broadly, USAID is elevating resilience as an Agency priority and centralizing technical expertise to create a better link between emergency assistance and long-term investments in resilience, food security and water security.

Partners and Targeted Beneficiaries

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 jump-start their economies and create new opportunities for people at every level of their societies. USAID does this through 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 and combat emerging threats;
- Connecting **American companies, universities, farmers, ranchers, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs)** to global networks to share our American legacy of agricultural ingenuity; and
- Leveraging the contributions of **other bilateral donors, multilateral organizations, and private foundations**, and using our influence, experience, and resources to lead the global food-security agenda and influence global actors.

USAID's assistance through the GFSS benefits rural and urban people who are hungry, malnourished, and the extreme poor, with a focus on women, youth, and small-scale food producers. For example, women's empowerment and equality remain between men and women critical to achieving inclusive, sustainable, agriculture-led growth, resilience, and nutrition, and to supporting American companies, global economic growth, and U.S. national-security interests more broadly. In FY 2017, USAID helped nearly 9,000 woman's' groups access organizational

development assistance, and over 450,000 women and women-owned businesses receive $80 million in agricultural and rural loans. USAID is reducing the barriers women face throughout agriculture and food systems in agriculture that are particularly complex, such as workload and time-allocation. The Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI), developed by USAID, transformed the way we create and invest in programs to promote for women's empowerment and equality between men and women by making empowerment measurable.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2018, USDA actively participated in all aspects of Feed the Future, consistent with the USDA Implementation Plan for the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS), 2017-2021.

Among these efforts, notable major contributions for FY18 include: the participation of USDA overseas offices in the USAID-led development and finalization of GFSS Country Plans for the twelve Feed the Future Target Countries; the participation of USDA headquarters staff in all major Feed the Future policy efforts, including the designation of Feed the Future Aligned Countries; the development of the guidance document on Graduation; finalization of the Feed the Future indicators; co-chairing Feed the Future's nutrition working group; and leveraging USDA research and other expertise in key Feed the Futures initiatives (*e.g.*, addressing the presence of the invasive crop pest, the fall armyworm, in Africa, and its potential impacts on African food security and resilience).

Consistent with past years, USDA released its annual International Food Security Assessment, drawing on Departmental technical expertise to provide data-based projections of food security indicators to stakeholders and the public. As in FY 2017, USDA also hosted the World Food Prize laureate announcement ceremony.

In FY18, Feed the Future experienced a major shift in implementation from headquarters to the field, following the identification of the Target Countries, and the need to develop, Post-led, interagency GFSS Country Plans. USDA ensured continuity of its engagement in Feed the Future during this shift by providing its overseas offices with background and support during the process. USDA's overseas offices spearheaded USDA input into the GFSS Country Plans, ensuring the GFSS Country Plans were consistent with U.S. agricultural trade policy objectives and took into account, where appropriate, the alignment of USDA programs in GFSS Country Plan considerations.

USDA's efforts in Feed the Future aim to benefit U.S. farmers, ranchers, foresters, and exporters and their overseas partners; 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 middle and low-income food-deficit countries. In FY18, USDA also continued to solicit, plan, and

finalize its new awards for international food assistance and fellowship programs, including new opportunities to engagements with partners in Feed the Future countries.

An area of progress for USDA in FY18 Feed the Future implementation was the policy and strategy dialogue that took place at USAID Missions to develop the GFSS Country Plans. These conversations facilitated improved interagency awareness of how trade and international markets can serve as tools for food security, which should help contribute to a strengthened, whole-of-government approach to Feed the Future, and increase the potential for Feed the Future Target Countries to attract private sector investment, integrate into the global marketplace, and generate income as a means for helping alleviate hunger and poverty.

A second major area of progress, key results, and lessons learned in FY18, took place through USDA's engagement in the Feed the Future monitoring, evaluation, and learning working group, and aligned monitoring and evaluation efforts regarding USDA's food assistance programs. Since the Feed the Future indicators were finalized in November, 2017, USDA has incorporated relevant output and outcome Feed the Future indicators into its list of standard indicators used by implementing partners for its food assistance programs (McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition, Food for Progress, and Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement), which allows USDA to report annually on our programs' contributions to Feed the Future.

USDA continued to invest in generating an evidence base for its food assistance programs centering on the theme of sustainability, specifically what factors affect whether a project's benefits continue after the termination of food assistance. In FY18, USDA undertook a study focusing on evidence of sustainability from closed Food for Progress projects. The results of the study, and associated learning agendas, will be applied directly to future program design with the aim of investing in interventions that have lasting positive effect.

U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC)

In Fiscal Year 2018 two Bureaus within the U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC) – the National Ocean and Atmospheric Agency (NOAA) and the International Trade Administration (ITA) – continued to support efforts to address global food insecurity. Specifically, NOAA offered assistance through sharing data to address food insecurity through improved weather forecasting, drought early warning systems, and climate change resilience and adaptation, among other expertise; 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 to maintain global food security, and expand international customer base for U.S. exports in food insecure countries.

Fiscal Year 2018 Progress

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA):

- NOAA's National Weather Service (NWS) continued to provide global capacity building to enhance partners' abilities to meet or improve needs for weather forecasting, hydrologic modeling and prediction, and drought early warning, to foster the application of this knowledge in risk management against impacts of changing climate on food supplies (crops, livestock, and fisheries). Further, the NWS and the U.S. Department of Agriculture participated in a meeting of the World Meteorological Organization's (WMO) Commission for Agricultural Meteorology in April 2018, providing input to the Commission's programs such as the World Agricultural Meteorology Information System.
- NOAA's National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service (NESDIS) continued to facilitate domestic and international access to NOAA satellite data in support of weather forecasting and science. NESDIS provided data to the Global Drought Information System (in collaboration with the National Integrated Drought Information System), the Global Historical Climate Network (GHCN), the global Climate Data Record (CDR), and the International Comprehensive Ocean-Atmosphere Dataset (ICOADS).
- NOAA's Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR), conducted research to enable better forecasts, earlier warnings for natural disasters, and a greater understanding of earth systems. The OAR Climate Program Office (CPO) managed competitive research programs in which NOAA funded high-priority climate science, assessments, decision support research, outreach, education, and capacity-building activities.
- NOAA's OAR Earth System Research Laboratory (ESRL) provided technical decision support, including forecast production and risk assessments, to the USAID Food for Peace Famine Early Warning System Network (FEWSNet). ESRL also advanced the scientific basis for drought and flood early warning systems, and for water and weather services development with the WMO, USDA, National Integrated Drought Information System, and other national and international agencies engaged in assessing the predictability of extreme event for anticipating potential water, crop and food security outcomes.
- NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) continued to foster the increase of sustainable marine aquaculture production through streamlined permitting, science-based management, and technology development and transfer.
- NMFS and the NOAA Office of General Counsel continued to participate in capacity building trainings and workshops in Southeast Asia, Africa, South America and the Caribbean. The workshops covered topics such as: U.S. food safety; ecosystem approaches to fisheries management; fisheries enforcement; fisheries law development; combating illegal unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing; and marine spatial planning.

These capacity-building activities supported increased profitability, market access, and employment for export partners, as well as helped to strengthen resilience 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):

- ITA continued Business-to-Business matching between U.S. companies and overseas local businesses. Notably, in June of 2018, the Secretary and Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade, accompanied by a delegation of members of the President's Advisory Council on Doing Business in Africa (PAC-DBIA), led a fact-finding trip in FY 2018 to Ethiopia, Kenya, Côte D'Ivoire, and Ghana in which both opportunities and obstacles facing U.S. agribusiness companies in these markets were a central focus. The trip resulted in the signing of Memoranda of Understanding with Ethiopia, Kenya, and Ghana to deepen cooperation to facilitate more bilateral commercial partnerships. The PAC-DBIA members will use the collected information and first-hand experiences in the PAC-DBIA development of reliable and actionable recommendations for the President to strengthen commercial engagement between the United States and African countries.
- ITA's U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service continued to support Feed the Future by assisting target countries to create country specific implementation plans. Resultant plans can provide valuable information to clarify target countries' coming agricultural capacity building strategies and possible market access opportunities for U.S. private sector.
- 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 which helps those countries integrate into the global economy.
- ITA continued to solicit, and convey to Feed the Future, input from U.S. private sector companies on market expansion priorities.
- ITA continued to facilitate awareness in foreign markets 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.

Lessons Learned

The collective DOC activities described above were not specifically designed nor funded to promote global food security, but were ongoing, standing workstreams to carry out individual Bureaus' mandates. For example, NOAA's core mission is to provide its partners access to

comprehensive oceanic, atmospheric, and geophysical data, and ITA's mission is to facilitate U.S. exports, including all U.S. products that address global food insecurity. The activities nevertheless contributed to Feed the Future. The impact of these activities relative to the GFSS, however, cannot be quantified because the indicators that the Bureaus use to monitor, measure, and evaluate performance are not designed to address food security. NOAA and ITA will continue to support global food security, albeit indirectly, through their core missions.

Partners & Targeted Beneficiaries

NOAA's partners and targeted beneficiaries included fishermen and fishing groups, weather and fisheries researchers, U.S. and foreign government policy makers, and NGOs. ITA's partners and targeted beneficiaries included U.S. and international contributors to international processed food supply chains including private sector and entrepreneurs.

U.S. Department of State

The U.S. Department of State leads America's foreign policy through diplomacy, advocacy, and assistance by advancing the interests of the American people, their safety and economic prosperity. 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 in ways that concurrently promote U.S. economic prosperity and U.S. national security. 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. S/GFS goals support Pillar IV of the National Security Strategy, "Advance American Influence," particularly to "support food security and health programs that save lives and address the root cause of hunger and disease." Food security work across the Department of State is highlighted below.

Progress

S/GFS leads U.S. government engagement on global food security and nutrition in multilateral, regional, and bilateral fora. S/GFS engages with ambassadors and economic officers at Post and

desk officers in each regional bureau to identify and monitor food security and nutrition issues related to the stability and development of the countries in which they serve. S/GFS monitors and identifies emerging food security issues, such as food crises in Venezuela or the fall armyworm outbreak in Africa. S/GFS works 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. S/GFS coordinated State participation in GFSS Washington-based support groups for the 12 Feed the Future target countries to develop and provide policy guidance for each of the country plans. S/GFS also engages 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.

S/GFS and the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, Office of Agricultural Policy (EB/AGP) worked closely with interagency coordinators to develop monitoring, evaluation, and learning processes for GFSS. Both offices also helped develop GFSS Aligned Countries and the Graduation guidance.

EB/AGP promotes trade and investment policy and linkages that improve global food security and open foreign markets for U.S. firms. EB/AGP works with U.S. Trade Representative (USTR), United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), USAID, and other U.S. agencies to promote global food safety standards and to remove barriers to trade for agricultural and food products. Its policy and regulatory outreach includes promoting agricultural biotechnology as a tool to increase long-term agricultural productivity, improve food security and nutrition, and raise farmer incomes.

The Bureau of International Organization 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), manages our relationship with the UN food security agencies and works with multilateral partners, such as the World Food Program, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), OIE, and other international organizations. 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.

The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, Office of Global Change, and S/GFS work together on the planning and obligation of resilient agriculture activities, including in Central America, and S/GFS provides policy guidance on resilient agriculture projects. The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, Office of International Health and Biodefense (OES/IHB) works to raise awareness of

the linkages between food security and other global issues, such as zoonotic or drug-resistant disease, and biodefense.

Lessons Learned

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2018, the State Department addressed growing chronic food insecurity with respect to issues such as the rise in conflict-related food insecurity and the fall armyworm outbreaks in Africa. We are working on better communicating food security issues throughout the leadership of the Department as well as improving coordination and communication between the interagency in DC, Posts, and other stakeholders.

Partners & Targeted Beneficiaries

The Department of State typically does not work directly with implementing partners, but rather works bilaterally and multilaterally in developing policy and aligning foreign policy priorities that will then guide the work other agencies do with implementing partners. 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. 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

The Department of the Treasury works with the Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) to improve their focus on food security and is a member of the International Fund for Agricultural Development's (IFAD) Executive Board and its largest historical donor. The Department has collaborating with the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP)'s decision making bodies and is working with other stakeholders to either refine GAFSP's model and increase the program's effectiveness or to allow it to reach its natural conclusion. Treasury further augments its support of food security in developing economies through dialogues with Ministries of Finance at high-level forums.

Progress

With respect to MDBs, both the African Development Fund and Asian Development Fund have made efforts to improve nutrition and agricultural production, after food security's inclusion as a thematic priority during replenishments discussions, which Treasury negotiated in 2016. IFAD concluded its eleventh replenishment negotiations in 2017 and the United States was pivotal in

securing commitments to reform, including focusing 90 percent of IFAD's core resources to Low Income and Lower Middle Income Countries, 50 percent of core resources to Africa and 25-30 percent of core resources to the most fragile situations. In 2017, IFAD approved a grant and loan program of $1.3 billion, which is 57 percent higher than the $829.2 million approved the previous year.[7] In 2017, the GAFSP allocated $160 million in new grant funding to Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Haiti, Myanmar, Nepal, Rwanda, and Tanzania to help increase food security and reduce poverty.[8]

Lessons Learned

Throughout the IFAD replenishment discussions, Treasury was able to push IFAD to further efficiency gains and to target its work at the neediest and most at-risk populations. IFAD Management took these suggestions on board and are making adjustments in line with U.S. priorities.

Partners and Targeted Beneficiaries

Treasury supports multilateral development partners that carry out projects and interventions in agricultural development and food security. These partners include the World Bank, African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, IFAD and GAFSP.

These multilateral efforts further reduce rural poverty, increase food security, and improve nutrition. The MDBs' evidence-based and country-owned programs continue to play an integral role in improving food security in developing countries. The MDBs support agriculture and agriculture infrastructure investments including through the water and transport sectors as well as programs targeting global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty.

For 40 years, IFAD has specialized in supporting people in remote rural areas. IFAD projects support smallholder farmers, small and medium enterprises, and agribusinesses by reducing poverty, increasing food security, improving nutrition and strengthening resilience. GAFSP supports projects that scale up agricultural and food security assistance in low-income countries.

The Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC)

MCC has been at the forefront of addressing food security priorities since its first compact in 2005, with more than $5 billion invested in partner countries to date to address the many sources of food insecurity. In 2016, MCC was a member of the interagency effort to develop the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS). GFSS-related programming, as described in MCC's

[7] Annual Report. 2017. International Fund for Agricultural Development.
[8] Global Agriculture and Food Security Program Announces New Round of Grants to Fight Hunger and Poverty. 2017. The World Bank. Press Release.

Implementation Plan, has continued in Fiscal Year (FY) 2018. These include the entry into force of the compact in Niger, the only MCC partner country that is also a GFSS target country, the closure of the Indonesia compact, and significant progress in MCC's food security related investments in Morocco, Zambia, and Sierra Leone.

Progress through June 2018

In January 2018, MCC and the Government of Niger celebrated the start of the $437 million five-year Sustainable Water and Agriculture Compact. The agricultural sector employs more than 80 percent of the population and represents the second-largest export sector. However, due to frequent droughts and floods that decimate crops, many poor households struggle to maintain even a subsistence existence. The MCC compact will improve water availability, infrastructure, and market access, and benefit more than 3.9 million people. In FY18, the Government of Niger adopted a fertilizer reform plan to encourage private sector investment in fertilizer. The reform will enable farmers to have greater access to more competitively-priced and a wider mix of fertilizers, in turn promoting increased yields of staple and cash crops. Under the **$257.2 million Irrigation and Market Access Project**, MCA-Niger, the legal entity in charge of implementing the compact, is carrying out critical feasibility and design studies for the irrigation systems. In addition, MCA-Niger is rolling out key land tenure interventions, technical assistance for water user associations, and farmer training aimed at ensuring reliable, inclusive and long-term management and access to land, water and productive assets. In addition, MCC is partnering with the World Bank on the **$93.8 million Climate-Resilient Communities Project** to improve productivity and resilience in the agriculture and livestock sector through improved access and management of natural resources.

The five-year Indonesia compact officially closed in April 2018. The **$120.1 million Community-Based Health and Nutrition to Reduce Stunting Project** integrated sanitation, maternal and child health, and nutrition interventions with the goal of reducing stunting. By compact close, the project had trained more than 30,000 health service providers on proper feeding for pregnant mothers and infants, growth monitoring, micronutrient quality assurance, and/or sanitation, and provided grants for 5,400 villages to execute 181,912 health and education promoting community activities. The National Communications Campaign aired 4,155 television spots and engaged 8,455 stakeholders and policymakers in stunting prevention. The Nutrition Project formed a cornerstone for a larger movement to increase awareness of stunting in Indonesia and channel resources to address the problem—evidenced by the introduction of the word "stunting" into the Indonesian vocabulary and advertising products to reduce stunting. During the compact term, Indonesia also played a pivotal role in the global Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement. MCC was the first donor to fund an explicitly anti-stunting project in Indonesia, instead of one focused on malnutrition or sanitation alone. Since then, other donors have made or are planning similar investments in a multi-sectoral approach to fight stunting.

Also in Indonesia, the **$228 million Green Prosperity Project** (GP) funded 66 grants in the areas of sustainable agriculture (cocoa, oil palm, rubber, and coffee), on- and off-grid renewable energy, peatland restoration, and improved natural resource management. GP leveraged $28

million in co-financing and enabled piloting of innovative alternatives to rural economic growth models that have historically contributed to environmental degradation. Results include training of 78,844 cocoa farmers, of which 30% were women, and sustainable certification of independent smallholder cocoa and oil palm producers with significant private sector co-financing. GP also completed 12.75 MW of new renewable energy generation and piloted models in community-developer partnerships for off-grid mini-grids, promoting critical access to affordable, reliable electricity to increase rural productivity. GP also supported interventions focused on improved land management for sustainable rural production including peatland restoration to combat forest fires, community land use planning, and securing community rights to communal forest lands.

The Morocco Land and Employability Compact (2017-2022) includes the **$33 million Rural Land Activity** and the **$10.4 million Land Governance Activity**. The Rural Land Activity will increase rural productivity by streamlining the process for converting collective, irrigated lands in the country to private ownership by smallholder farmers, including women. In FY18, MCA-Morocco and key Ministry partners have developed an improved procedure for land privatization that will be piloted under the activity. The Land Governance Activity will support legal, policy, and institutional reforms that will improve the environment for investment in agriculture and food security. The Government of Morocco kicked off the activity this year with a participatory, national land dialogue process.

In Zambia the **$309.6 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. This activity has constructed or rehabilitated almost 30 km of drains and achieved a metering ratio of 63 percent, against a target of 90 percent. The Project's Institutional Strengthening Activity is on track to improve the financial sustainability, operations and maintenance, environmental management and social inclusion of the Lusaka Water Supply and Sewage Company. To date, 174 (83 percent) of a targeted 210 people have been trained in social and gender integration and social inclusion and 316 (102 percent) of a targeted 310 people have been trained in hygiene and sanitary best practices. The project has issued grants totaling over $5.3 million to implement innovative projects in water supply, sanitation and drainage.

The **$16 million Water Sector Reform Project** (2016 – 2020) in the Sierra Leone Threshold program is improving access to reliable and safe water and sanitation (WASH) services through water sector reform and improved utility management and efficiency. The project is creating the institutional conditions for sustainable operation of water supply services in Freetown and working with the Guma Valley Water Company (GVWC) to hydraulically isolate two service areas in Freetown to serve as learning laboratories to test systems management and service

provision approaches. Based on this project, Guma will be better positioned to improve access to clean water for the estimated 1.5 million residents of Freetown.

Lessons Learned

The close of the Indonesia compact provided lessons for the sustainability of MCC's future food security interventions, reiterating the importance of MCC's tenets of country ownership and leveraging private sector resources to achieve sustainability and maximize the impact of U.S. Government funding.

The Community Based Health & Nutrition Program demonstrated the importance of multi-level country ownership. Provincial and District Health Offices proved critical for effecting policy changes due to their incentive to deliver results in the fight against malnutrition. The Project also highlighted that for results to be sustained, partner countries need to be willing to take on bureaucratic restructuring to reflect multi-sectoral needs. In Indonesia, the Ministry of Health structure was adapted to take a more comprehensive approach to nutrition, including establishing a clear link between sanitation and nutrition by combining the respective directorates.

The GP Grants Facility successfully crowded in private sector resources to meet food security objectives by identifying and targeting projects on a demand-driven basis that were ripe for implementation and/or scaling up in an evolving and dynamic market. At the same time, it was the most technically and geographically broad facility that MCC has supported. The project demonstrated that for facilities to be successful in attracting private sector and government counterparts who can sustain gains, it is important to clearly identify objectives, scope, size, and strategy. MCC has already begun applying this lesson to subsequent facilities such as the Off-Grid Clean Energy Facility in Benin II which targets one sector. A forthcoming comprehensive report on Indonesia's Compact will offer a full accounting of MCC's results and learning from these two projects. MCC is also updating the MCC Grants Facilities Guidance.

Partners and Targeted Beneficiaries

MCC works with a wide range of implementing partners, representing both the public and private sector. Partners in GP in Indonesia providing significant co-financing to projects targeting independent smallholder producers included Cargill, Mars, and Unilever, as well numerous Indonesian firms and NGOs. In fact, partnerships in the sustainable agriculture portfolio of projects under the Indonesia compact will have leveraged almost $20 million. In Niger, MCC is collaborating with the International Fertilizer Development Center to transform the fertilizer market. 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)

The Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) is committed to mobilizing private investment to support the agriculture sector, empower smallholder farmers and increase food security throughout the developing world.

As the U.S. Government's development finance institution, OPIC provides financing and political risk insurance to projects in more than 100 developing countries in Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, Latin America and the Middle East. OPIC's support in these projects helps to mobilize additional private capital. OPIC's projects in agriculture empower smallholder farmers by helping them access equipment and training to increase their yields; and invests in agriculture value chains to improve efficiencies.

Much of this investment is focused on empowering the world's female farmers, who produce a large share of the world's food, but are often particularly challenged to access the financing needed to invest in equipment needed to increase outputs. OPIC recognizes that a large gender credit gap limits the potential of women in agriculture and other sectors and in 2017 the agency launched the 2X Women's initiative to empower the world's women.

Partners and targeted beneficiaries

OPIC's partners in advancing global food security include businesses, private equity firms, as well as social investment funds

Recent and ongoing investments in the sector include

- **Twiga Foods Ltd.** OPIC agreed to provide up to $5 million to ***Twiga Foods Ltd***., the first company in Kenya to aggregate demand for and supply of produce onto a single technology platform, guaranteeing offtake for small farmers and providing better visibility of expected earnings before harvest.
- **Global Partnerships.** OPIC agreed to provide $20 million to Global Partnerships ***Social Investment Fund 5.0,*** which lends to local social enterprises that provide financing and other services such as education and training to rural communities, many working in the agriculture sector.
- **Phatisa Food Fund 2** In 2017, OPIC committed up to $75 million to the Phatisa Food Fund 2, which invests in mid-size food and agriculture businesses that will modernize and grow Africa's domestic food production. OPIC previously supported Phatisa's first

fund, the Africa Agriculture Fund, which invested in eight agriculture businesses including a fertilizer and seed business in Malawi. With the help of the Fund's technical assistance facility, these businesses conducted soil tests and developed customized fertilizer blends to help smallholder farmers increase their yields.

Progress

In 2017, OPIC committed almost $230 million to projects in the agriculture sector that will advance global food security.

Lessons learned

There are global trends reflecting a significant need for increased food production and increased efficiency across agriculture value chains, therefore OPIC's financial tools and ability to mobilize private investment will be an effective and critical resource to address the growing food security challenge.

Peace Corps

Peace Corps contributes to the mitigation of food and nutrition insecurity, reduction of poverty and increase in resilience by building local capacity at the individual, group and community level to sustainably increase agricultural productivity, diversity and related income; improve nutrition outcomes for mothers and children; and adapt to and mitigate the impact of climate change. The agency continues to invest in, support, and extend these activities in nearly 40 countries worldwide, with emphasis on the GFSS 'target' and 'aligned' countries in which Peace Corps volunteers currently serve.

Progress

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 Peace Corps finalized a new project design approach centered on Reference Logical Project Frameworks (LPF), for each sector in which Peace Corps Volunteers work: Agriculture, Community Economic Development, Education, Environment, Health, and Youth in Development. Nine (9) relevant GFSS indicators, six (6) output indicators and three (3) outcome indicators, were selected and incorporated into the Reference LPFs so that Peace Corps will be able to better monitor its contributions to the GFSS and incorporate these into the Feed the Future Monitoring System (FTFMS). Project reviews and re-designs using the new LPFs were conducted in eight (8) GFSS target or aligned countries: Ghana (Agriculture, Health), Senegal (Agriculture, Environment, Community Economic Development), Tanzania (Agriculture), Uganda (Agriculture, Health), Zambia (Agriculture, Environment), Nepal (Agriculture), Guatemala (Agriculture, Health), Malawi (Environment).

In FY 2017, nearly 1,000 Volunteers focused their collective efforts on promoting and disseminating food and nutrition security and poverty reduction innovations and interventions, training nearly 14,000 individuals, with just over half of these (56 percent) women. Similar results are expected in FY18. The following results were obtained in FY 2017:

- **Objective 1: Inclusive and sustainable agricultural-led economic growth** Over 1,000 Agriculture, Environment and Community Economic Development Volunteers working with 23 projects in 17 countries assisted over 7,000 smallholder farmers, 57 percent of whom were female, to apply at least one improved management practice or technology to increase agricultural productivity and profits. Additionally, over 2,300 individuals were trained in agriculture-related income generation and business development and over 300 individuals, 73 percent of whom were female, started a new, individual or group agriculture-related business.
- **Objective 2: Strengthened resilience among people and systems** Over 1,000 Agriculture and Environment Volunteers working with 21 projects in 17 countries assisted over 7,000 smallholder farmers to employ 'climate smart' agricultural practices to intensify production, adapt to less predictable weather conditions and sequester carbon (mitigation) in the soil. Over 100 Volunteers worked, specifically, to assist over 2,500 individuals, nearly half women, to employ new soil and water conservation and management practices such as adding boomerang berms and rock lines to capture soil during heavy rain events and increasing organic matter on top of (mulch) and within soil (compost) as a means to retain moisture.
- **Objective 3: A well-nourished population, especially among women and children** Just over 2,000 Agriculture, Environment and Health Volunteers working with 22 projects in 42 countries assisted individuals and groups, with a particular focus on women of reproductive age, to produce, diversify and consume nutrient-rich foods. Nearly 6,000 individuals, 52 percent female, improved their knowledge and skills in bio-intensive gardening and almost 2,500 individuals, 48 percent female, improved their knowledge and skills in small animal husbandry including poultry, fish and bees. Over 2,800 individuals, 77 percent women, were trained in child health and nutrition employing the 'Essential Nutrition Actions' framework, with over 700 children under 5 reached directly through these efforts.

Lessons Learned

Home gardening, using climate smart, organic and bio-intensive gardening practices and techniques, is the most common agricultural production technology promoted by agriculture, environment and other Volunteers to address food security. In FY 2017, nearly 6,000 individuals, 52% of whom are female, now use their garden to produce diverse, nutrient-dense horticulture crops such as green leafy vegetables, orange-fleshed fruits and vegetables including Vitamin A-fortified orange-fleshed sweet potato, beans and pulses.

With interest in home gardening comes the opportunity to focus on improving nutrition. Thirteen (13) out of 19 agriculture and food security projects have now incorporated a nutrition objective into their project design. To achieve the desired behavior change, improved nutrition, volunteers' activities have expanded to include nutrition education, including use of the Essential Nutrition Actions' framework, and cooking demonstrations.

Partners & Targeted Beneficiaries

Peace Corps food security projects typically partner with the relevant Ministry, for example the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Environment or Forestry, or the Ministry of Health. For agriculture, environment and community economic development projects, the partners at the community level are often community-based development organizations, formal or informal farmer groups, small businesses or, quite often, the individual target beneficiaries. The ultimate beneficiaries of Peace Corps projects are the individuals, groups and communities where Volunteers are assigned to serve. In most cases, these are relatively small, rural or peri-urban communities with a large percentage of people living in poverty with few services and few opportunities to improve their lives. Agriculture and food security projects, in general, target smallholder farmers, those with two (2) hectares or less of land, and their household.

Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR)

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2018, the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) worked to develop and maintain open markets globally through its trade initiatives and participation in international organizations. USTR participates extensively throughout the year at the World Trade Organization (WTO) Committees on Agriculture, Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS), and Technical Barriers to Trade (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 2018, 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 2018 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, 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 GSP, the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (CBERA), the Nepal Trade Preference Act, and the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) – provided duty-free treatment to roughly $34.5 billion in imports from 126 beneficiary countries and territories in 2017. In 2017, the GSP program alone accounted for $21.3 billion worth of imports from 121 beneficiary countries and territories – 44 of which are LDCs.[9] U.S. imports from sub-Saharan Africa under AGOA totaled $13.8 billion in 2017.[10] The top five AGOA beneficiary countries were Nigeria, South Africa, Angola, Chad, and Kenya. Other countries that benefit greatly from AGOA include Lesotho, Mauritius and Ethiopia.

Supported Activities

Consistent with the President's Trade Agenda, USTR supports the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) through policies 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 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.

[9] See https://ustr.gov/issue-areas/trade-development/preference-programs/generalized-system-preference-gsp.
[10] USITC Trade Data Reports for Sub-Saharan Africa found at: https://dataweb.usitc.gov/

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, Trade Preference Programs, and Trade and Investment Framework Agreements (TIFAs), 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)

The U.S. African Development Foundation (USADF) is the U.S. government's African enterprise agency. We invest in small and medium growing businesses, promote local economic development, and create pathways to prosperity for underserved communities. We contribute to Feed the Future by providing seed capital and technical assistance to small and growing agricultural enterprises, resulting in improved food security and economic livelihoods for over 2 million people a year. USADF's core mission closely aligns GFSA objectives in 3 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.

Coordinates 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 African Growth and Opportunities Act (AGOA), to link technology and trade to GFSA agricultural-led economic growth objectives.

Progress

Since the submission of the GFSS Implementation Report last October 2017, USADF is in the process of awarding $20 million of new grants to support GFSA activities to more than 150 new enterprise organizations that help grow smallholder producer group revenues and incomes and support local partner organizations that manage the GFSA portion of USADF's active portfolio. Based on historical performance over the average 3-year grant implementation life cycle, USADF projects the grant activities for this $20 million will combine to generate more than $100 million of new local economic activity impacting 2 million people across hundreds of vulnerable communities in Africa. In the past 10 years, USADF has leveraged approximately $25 million dollars in donated funds to expand transformational programs in Africa and deployed an additional $5 million of interagency funds from other U.S. Government agencies.

USADF investments in youth-led enterprise and off-grid energy benefit investments made in the agricultural sector. Over 70% of the 200 youth-led enterprise grants are in the agricultural sector. Through the Electrify Africa Act, USADF has funded over 75 energy entrepreneurs that bolster the agriculture sector by providing alternative energy solutions that support on-farm and off-farm growth and development for productive purposes.

Lessons Learned

Key lessons learned in Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 include:

- New selection and design processes were applied to better focus interventions ag-based smallholder cooperative on business and enterprise growth models;
- Better metrics were introduced to track impact at the household income level and at the organizational capacity level;
- Greater impact is expected as renewable off-grid energy solutions are integrated with standard project designs that address increased production, productivity, incomes;
- Increased efforts to scale impact were applied to leverage outside funding to increase resource availability. This resulted in:
    - Expanded the number of new and renewed strategic co-funding partnership agreements with more host-country governments;
    - Improved program evaluation reporting helped increase contribution increases in countries where there are ongoing agreements, e.g. Government of Benin doubled their co-funding contribution from USD $5 million to $10 million;
    - New partnerships with banks and private sector funding

In addition, USADF's business approach in the Turkana region of Kenya enhanced beneficiary level knowledge, promoted ownership and sustainability of food security solutions, and led to some of the first Turkana owned and managed enterprises in Turkana counties; e.g. first and largest egg production enterprise; owned and managed wholly by Turkana women.

Findings from monitoring and evaluation of our programs encouraged the agency to take a more enterprise approach to our business model and target larger enterprises and apex organizations that can reach more people.

Implementing Partners & Targeted Beneficiaries

An important aspect of the USADF implementation model is the use of in-country management and technical partners to support and overcome implementation challenges faced by early-stage grassroots enterprises and African entrepreneurs grant recipients. In FY 2018, USADF supported the growth of African development institutions in 20 countries that support development efforts initiated by the communities themselves. Establishing in-country development experts help host country governments become more self-sufficient in providing for their own development needs.

Through enterprise creation and development, USADF focuses on improving lives and livelihoods for smallholder farmers and their families, by working directly with the smallholder producer organizations with whom they are associated. USADF grants assist hundreds of agricultural cooperatives develop better enterprise management skills, improve production, and access larger markets. The growth of those organizations in turn improve the income levels of the member farmers.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)

In support of 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 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.

In support of resilience studies, USGS maps and monitors land use; tree cover density; and soil, water, and vegetation conservation practices across focus zones in Africa; this evidence base

helps guide decision-making on where to make investments in improved soil and water conservation practices.

Progress

As a result of USGS agro-climatic monitoring and seasonal projection activities (and increased briefings from FEWS to USAID), the impact on food insecurity in Kenya of repeated 2016/17 severe droughts that were similar to those occurring in 2010/11 was substantially less than might be expected given historical relationships.

- Both the extent and depth of food insecurity was much smaller in 2017 than in 2011; in 2011 the number of severely hungry Kenyans was ~2.8 million, in 2017 it was ~1.75 million.
- Despite three consecutive droughts, deflated U.S. Government food aid expenditures for Kenya in 2017 were about half (51% and 40%) of the expenditures during the last two severe droughts in 2011 and 2009, respectively.

USGS analyses showed that El Niño alone is not typically sufficient to produce extreme rainfall during the October-December rainy season in East Africa, but that El Niño combined with a positive Indian Ocean Dipole event conspire to produce large increases in onshore moisture transport and uplift, substantially increasing the risk of flooding. Such information provides early warning of potential crop loss, impact on local food security, and potential humanitarian crisis for the 2018 October-December season.

USGS provided extensive support to monitoring the 2017/18 agricultural season in Afghanistan through monthly seasonal monitoring reports. These reports and supplemental monitoring materials advised FEWS NET on aspects of agro-climatology that had the potential to impact production. Specifically, monitoring of below-normal snow accumulation, poor spring rains, and above average spring temperatures, identified those areas most likely to experience below average production and thus food insecurity for the poorest and most vulnerable populations. Information was routinely conveyed to various National Ministries, USAID, and the Afghanistan Food Security Cluster to provide actionable information to reduce hunger.

USGS began mapping on-farm tree density across cropland in Malawi; results show the adoption of hundreds of thousands of hectares of farmer-managed natural regeneration; this practice is contributing to increased soil fertility, increased crop yields, more firewood and fodder, and a variety of tree products, all of which contribute to building resilience to drought and unpredictable crop yields.

Lessons Learned

Decades of USAID/USGS efforts have improved our understanding of drought in East and Southern African. This understanding, combined with state-of-the-art monitoring and modeling systems, has allowed the prediction of potentially devastating water deficits for crops and pasture. At the same time, extensive partnerships have been formed across U.S. government agencies and with international food security institutions, resulting in much more effective early warning and food security outlooks.

In 2015/16, one of the strongest El Nino events on record produced the worst drought in 50 years in Ethiopia and the worst drought in 36 years for Southern Africa. These droughts and their severe impact on crop production and food deficits were effectively predicted using climate, crop, and land surface modeling and monitoring systems.

In 2016/17, La Nina conditions, combined with exceptionally warm west Pacific Ocean conditions, conspired to produce consecutive droughts in Somalia, Kenya, and Southern Ethiopia. These droughts were predicted, and early food aid distributions to Somalia helped prevent a repeat of the 2011 famine.

Implementing Partners

USGS works with other FEWS NET science partners (including NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, NOAA Climate Prediction Center, NOAA Physical Sciences Division, and USDA Foreign Agricultural Service) and associated universities (University of California, Santa Barbara and University of Maryland) to support FEWS NET data and analytic needs.

Targeted Beneficiaries

USGS data and analyses are used by a wide range of stakeholders (see footnote on appendix 2 table), 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.

Inter-American Foundation (IAF)

The Inter-American Foundation (IAF) partners with non-governmental organizations in Latin America and the Caribbean to address food security by working on sustainable smallholder agriculture. Through technical training and organizational strengthening, farmers and their associations generate income for their families, improve nutrition, and build community resilience to withstand future economic downturns, natural disasters, and other challenges. The

IAF began participating in FTF interagency coordination in Fiscal Year (FY) 2018, including in the development of GFSS country plans for Guatemala and Honduras.

Progress

The IAF works across the region to surface grassroots solutions to community development challenges, including food insecurity, and provides financial and technical resources directly to local organizations to advance their priorities. Specifically, to strengthen food security, the IAF supports projects and organizations that improve water availability, crop diversification, farm management practices, access to markets and income generation. This approach promotes local ownership, enhances community resilience, expands economic opportunity, and lays the groundwork for sustainability.

In FY 2018, the IAF provided $5.8 million in grants to groups engaged in smallholder agriculture. Of this amount, $1.8 million went to organizations in Guatemala and Honduras. These investments strengthen the links between citizens and their communities, thereby helping to reduce push factors for migration. Investments in small scale agricultural infrastructure contribute to drought resilience, improvements in food availability and increased farmer/household incomes. Improvements in the organizational capacity of cooperatives and rural savings and loan organizations are expanding markets and increasing access to affordable credit. The introduction and adoption of organic inputs is contributing to the consumption of healthy products, protection of long-term soil fertility and increased revenue for small farmers.

Lessons Learned

IAF grantee exchanges and farmer to farmer knowledge sharing opportunities are key to transferring information and encouraging the adoption of successful practices. Specific examples include construction and use of greywater recycling systems, covered production agriculture and organic agriculture. Furthermore, the use of technology, market-based agriculture, collective initiatives, and access to credit engage youth to participate in the agricultural sector.

Implementing Partners

IAF grantees implement their own food security-related initiatives to improve production, launch enterprises, reach new markets, utilize environmentally-friendly technologies and increase incomes for producers. Their efforts are supported by the IAF's small in country teams that provide management and technical expertise. Grantees also engage the public and private sectors to unlock the additional resources (monetary and non-monetary) needed to expand and sustain the impact of their food security investments.

Targeted Beneficiaries

The IAF provides direct funding to local organizations engaged in sustainable smallholder agriculture (farmer groups, associations, small businesses, NGOs, community savings and loan organizations, and other grassroots organizations) to strengthen local economies, improve food security, and incent the participation of women and youth in agriculture. These groups range in size and level of market insertion from subsistence level farmers in remote areas to larger associations that produce for regional and foreign markets. IAF support to grantees in Honduras and Guatemala, to advance agricultural livelihoods, directly benefits approximately 20,000 persons.

Appendix 8: Target Country Plans

All Target Country plans are available at: https://www.feedthefuture.gov/

Appendix 9: Glossary of Key Terms

Aligned country
A developing country outside the grouping of target countries that implement Feed the Future programs.

Agriculture
The science and practice of activities related to production, processing, packaging, transporting, trade, marketing, consumption, and use of food, feed, and fiber including aquaculture, farming, wild fisheries, forestry, and pastoralism.

Evaluation
The systematic collection and analysis of information about the characteristics and outcomes of strategies, projects, and activities conducted as a basis for judgments to improve effectiveness and cost-effectiveness and timed to inform decisions about current and future programming. Evaluation is distinct from assessment or an informal review of projects.

Feed the Future Innovation Labs
Research partnerships led by United States universities that advance solutions to reduce global hunger, poverty, and malnutrition. Includes the entities formerly known as the Collaborative Research Support Programs (or CRSPs).

Feed the Future Zones of Influence
Targeted geographic areas where U.S. Government global food security and nutrition programs work.

Food security and nutrition

Access to—and availability, utilization, and stability of— sufficient food to meet caloric and nutritional needs for an active and healthy life.

Fragility
Refers to the extent to which state-society relations produce outcomes that are perceived by citizens to be ineffective and illegitimate. Fragility magnifies a population's vulnerability to risks by reducing access to resources, undermines economic growth, and can lead to marginalization of socially excluded groups, market and service delivery failure, as well as violence and displacement.

Gender
The socially defined set of roles, rights, responsibilities, entitlements, and obligations of females and males in societies. The social definitions of what it means to be female or male vary among cultures and change over time.

Gender equality
Concerns fundamental social transformation, working with men and boys, women and girls, to bring about changes in attitudes, behaviors, roles, and responsibilities at home, in the workplace, and in the community. Genuine equality means expanding freedoms and improving overall quality of life so that equality is achieved without sacrificing gains for males or females.

Learning agenda
A set of strategic questions for which Feed the Future produce evidence, findings, and answers to help determine which interventions have the greatest impact in a given context, which interventions are most cost effective, and what combination and or sequence of interventions/investments have the greatest impact on the multiple objectives of improving agricultural-led economic growth, strengthening resilience, and improving nutrition. Through the Learning Agenda, Feed the Future will contribute to the body of knowledge on food security to improve the design and management of interventions in the agriculture and nutrition sectors.

Malnutrition
Poor nutritional status caused by nutritional deficiency or excess. Malnutrition is a condition resulting when a person's diet does not provide adequate nutrients for growth and maintenance or if a person is unable to fully utilize the food eaten due to illness; this consists of both under- (insufficiency) and over- (excess) nutrition.

Nutrition-specific interventions
Address the immediate causes of undernutrition, such as a poor or inadequate diet, disease, and related underlying factors such as lack of access to food, sub-optimal feeding practices, inadequate health care, and an unhealthy environment. Example: In Cambodia, Feed the Future

provides cooking demonstrations to families to help them increase the variety of nutrient-rich foods they eat.

Nutrition-sensitive interventions
Address the basic underlying causes of undernutrition, incorporating nutrition goals and activities into efforts in other areas such as agriculture, education, water supply, and sanitation and hygiene. These efforts can even serve as delivery platforms for nutrition-specific interventions, such as introducing agricultural as well as nutrition best practices at farmer trainings. Example: In Bangladesh, Feed the Future is introducing low-cost cold rooms that can increase the shelf life and safety of nutritious foods like fish, fruits and vegetables.

Resilience
The ability of people, households, communities, countries, and systems to reduce, mitigate, adapt to, and recover from shocks and stresses to food security in a manner that reduces chronic vulnerability and facilitates inclusive growth.

Self-Reliance
A country's ability to plan, finance, and implement solutions to solve its own development challenges.

Shock(s)
An acute, short to medium-term episode or event that has substantial, negative effects on people's current state of well-being, level of assets, livelihoods, or their ability to withstand future shocks. A shock's onset may be slow or rapid and may affect select households (idiosyncratic shocks) or a large number or class of households (covariate shocks) at the same time.

Graduation
The point at which countries have clearly demonstrated they have the capacity to sustain development advancements and sectoral successes in inclusive agricultural growth, resilience, and nutrition and can 'transition' to a new assistance relationship with the United States.

Stress(es)
A longer-term pressure that undermines current or future vulnerability and well-being, including—but not limited to—climate variability and change, population pressure, and environmental degradation.

Stunting
A sign of chronic malnutrition and refers to a condition that is measured by a height-to-age ratio that is more than two standard deviations below the median of the WHO Child Growth

Standards. Stunting is a result of suboptimal food and nutrient intakes; insufficient preventive healthcare and unhygienic environments; poor maternal nutrition; and inappropriate infant and young child feeding and care by mothers and other members of the family and the community during the most critical periods of growth and development in early life. At a population level, stunting is associated with long-term poor health, delayed motor development, impaired cognitive function, and decreased immunity.

Sustainability
The ability of a target country, community, implementing partner, or intended beneficiary to maintain, over time, the programs authorized and outcomes achieved, from an institutional and programmatic perspective without further donor assistance. Sustainability also refers to the maintenance of the factors and practices that contribute to long-term outcomes and productivity, including financial, environmental, and social sustainability.

Target country
A developing country that is selected to participate in agriculture and nutrition programs under the Global Food Security Strategy pursuant to the selection criteria described in the "Targeting Approach" section of the Global Food Security Strategy.

Youth
For the purposes of this document, youth means a life stage that starts in adolescence and continues through young adulthood. The specific age range associated with those stages may vary by the socio-cultural context, programmatic context, and the organization funding or implementing the program.