



a U.S. Government initiative

SEE ^{THE} FUTURE
FEED
CHANGE

FEED THE FUTURE GUIDE

May 2010

The *Feed the Future Guide* describes the strategic approach and implementation structures of Feed the Future (FTF), the U.S. global hunger and food security initiative. It is intended to inform partners and stakeholders about the development of FTF and how we translate our principles into actions on the ground. This guide is a living document. As we continue to consult with partners and learn lessons, we will update this guide to reflect the evolution of Feed the Future.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS	i
KEY TERMS	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
I. THE GLOBAL CONTEXT	I
1.1 A New Approach to Global Hunger and Food Security	1
1.2 The Global Challenge and Opportunity	2
2. PARTNERSHIPS AND COORDINATION	4
2.1 Partner Countries	4
2.2 Multilateral Institutions	4
2.3 Key Stakeholders	6
2.4 U.S. Government	6
3. A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH	8
3.1 Our Collective Impact	8
3.2 FTF Goal and Key Objectives	9
3.3 Potential FTF Investments	9
4. FOCUS COUNTRY INVESTMENTS	15
4.1 Selection Factors	15
4.2 Investment Overview	16
4.3 Guidance on Stakeholder Consultation	18
4.4 Phase I Investments	18
4.5 Criteria for Moving from Phase I to Phase II	19
4.6 Phase II Investments	20
4.7 Periodic Reviews	20
5. COMPLEMENTARY INVESTMENTS	21
5.1 Regional Programs	21
5.2 The Global Agriculture and Food Security Program	23
5.3 Strategic Partnerships	24
5.4 Global Research and Innovation	24
6. CROSS-CUTTING PRIORITIES	27
6.1 Guidance on Gender	27
6.2 Guidance on Environment and Climate Change	29
7. RESULTS FRAMEWORK	33
TABLES & FIGURES	
Table 1 Potential FTF Focus Countries	15
Table 2 Illustrative Examples of Foundational and Core Investments	17
Table 3 Illustrative Evidence of Stakeholder Consultation	18
Figure 1 FTF Results Framework	34

ACRONYMS

CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program
CDF	Community Development Fund
CFS	Committee on World Food Security
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIP	Country Investment Plan
CMAM	Community Management of Acute Malnutrition
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CSIS	Center for Strategic and International Studies
DAC	OECD Development Assistance Committee
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FTF	<i>Feed the Future</i> , the U.S. government's global hunger and food security initiative
GAFFSP	Global Agriculture and Food Security Program, a World Bank-administered, multi-donor trust fund
GAO	U.S. Government Accountability Office
GHI	Global Health Initiative, the U.S. government's initiative to improve global health
IDLO	International Development Law Organization
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFC	International Finance Corporation
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IUU	Illegal, unregulated and unreported
MCC	Millennium Challenge Corporation
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
RF	Results Framework
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
UN	United Nations
UNHLCF	United Nations High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government
WB	World Bank
WFP	United Nations World Food Program

KEY TERMS

Agriculture – The science and practice of activity related to food, feed, and fiber production, processing, marketing, distribution, utilization, and trade, including family and consumer sciences, nutrition, food science and engineering, agricultural economics and other social sciences, forestry, wildlife, fisheries, aquaculture, floriculture, veterinary medicine, and other environmental and natural resources science.

CAADP – The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) is the agricultural program of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), a program of the African Union (AU). Established by the AU assembly in 2003, CAADP focuses on improving food security, nutrition, and increasing incomes in Africa's largely farming based economies. It aims to do this by raising agricultural productivity by at least 6 percent per year and increasing public investment in agriculture to 10 percent of national budgets per year.

Climate Change Adaptation – Adjustment in natural or human systems in response to natural or expected climatic stimuli or their effects, which moderates harm or exploits beneficial opportunities.

Climate Change Resilience – The capacity of a system to absorb disturbance and still retain its basic functions and structure, thereby encompassing a range of states such that a resilient system may not return to its original state but to a state that allows for the same broad functions and structure.

Complementary Investments – The four categories of FTF investment that will complement bilateral FTF investments in Focus Countries, consisting of investments in regional programs, the multi-donor trust fund for global agriculture and food security, strategic partnerships, and global research and innovation.

Core Investments – FTF investments in inclusive agriculture sector growth and improved nutritional status, especially for women and girls.

Country Investment Plan (CIP) – The multi-year investment plan for food security developed by a country government in consultation with development partners and stakeholders.

Extreme Poverty – For the purposes of FTF monitoring and evaluation and in the context of the poverty-related MDG, extreme poverty is defined as living on less than US\$1.25 per day, as calculated by the World Bank in 2008 using 2005 purchasing power parity exchange rates.

Food Security – Food security is defined as having four main components: availability, access, utilization, and stability. Families and individuals require a reliable and consistent source of quality food, as well as sufficient resources to purchase it. People must also have the knowledge and basic sanitary conditions to choose, prepare, and distribute food in a way that results in good nutrition for all family members. Finally, the ability to access and utilize food must remain stable and sustained over time.

Foundational Investments – FTF investments that consist of the technical, political and financial support to a Focus Country to develop its food security strategy and investment plan, support policy reforms and build capacity for successful implementation of a Country Investment Plan.

FTF – Feed the Future, the U.S. government's global hunger and food security initiative, through which the United States works with host governments, development partners, and other stakeholders to sustainably tackle the root causes of global poverty and hunger.

FTF Country Coordinator – The person designated by the U.S. Ambassador in each Focus Country to lead the whole-of-government implementation of FTF at the country level.

FTF Focus Countries (or Focus Countries) – The countries in which FTF concentrates its investments.

FTF Results Framework – The conceptual and analytic framework that depicts, in graphical form, the types of program components that are expected to lead to benefits at household, community and national levels based on evidence regarding the key drivers of agricultural-led growth and improved nutrition. The general FTF Results Framework outlines our goal of sustainably reducing poverty and hunger; our key objectives of inclusive agricultural sector growth and improved nutritional status, and our program objectives at the next level below.

GHFS Coordinator – The Global Hunger and Food Security (GHFS) Coordinator will provide strategic policy and budget direction that spans the U.S. government resources of Feed the Future. The GHFS Coordinator will also coordinate FTF implementation across federal agencies and sectors to align and integrate FTF with complementary efforts in agriculture, trade, health, climate change, and economic policy in service of a common strategy.

Investment Portfolio – The mix of FTF programs, including core and foundational investments and bilateral and complementary investments, that are managed by the FTF Country Coordinator at the country level and the GHFS Coordinator at the global level.

MCC Compact – The agreement signed between a country government and the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), pursuant to which the MCC provides funds from the Millennium Challenge Account to help countries reduce poverty and stimulate economic growth.

MDGs – The Millennium Development Goals, which include reducing by half the proportion of people living in extreme poverty and the proportion of people suffering from hunger by 2015 based on the 1990 baseline.

Natural Resources Management – The integrated management of natural resources, such as water, soil, biodiversity, forests, rangelands and fisheries, to provide multiple benefits, including social and economic benefits, economic development, and conservation or enhancement of ecosystem goods and services for present and future generations.

Phase I – The first phase of investment in a Focus Country during which FTF investments consist of foundational investments that assist a country in developing its CIP, conducting policy reform, and building capacity for successful implementation of the CIP. Phase I also includes core investments that directly contribute to accelerating inclusive agriculture sector growth and improving nutritional status.

Phase II – The second phase of investment in a Focus Country, during which a country is eligible for larger-scale FTF investments in priority areas that are aligned with the CIP. In Phase II, FTF invests in a greater proportion of core investments that result in scaled-up development impacts at the country and regional level, while continuing to build the foundation for sustainable and inclusive market-led growth through investments in capacity building and policy reform.

Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) – A strategy prepared by a country, through a participatory process involving domestic shareholders and external development partners, that describes a country's macroeconomic, structural, and social policies and programs to promote broad-based growth and poverty reduction, along with external financing needs and major funding sources.

Stakeholders – The broad range of local, national, regional, and international actors affected by and/or interested in food security, including but not limited to affected populations, donor and host governments, NGOs, cooperatives, foundations, universities, research organizations, multilateral institutions, local civic actors, legislative or local government bodies, private sector entities, professional organizations, technical experts, labor unions, business associations, religious groups, women-focused organizations, environmental and social NGOs, and loosely organized citizen groups. Key stakeholders will vary, depending on the specific consultation, program and context.

Undernutrition – The outcome of insufficient food intake, inadequate care and infectious diseases. It includes being underweight for one's age, too short for one's age (stunting), dangerously thin for one's height (wasting), and deficient in vitamin and minerals (micronutrient deficiencies).

Value chain – The full sequence of activities or functions required to bring a product or service from conception, through the intermediary steps of production, transformation, marketing, and delivery to the final consumers.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the G8 Summit in L'Aquila, Italy in July 2009, global leaders committed to “act with the scale and urgency needed to achieve sustainable global food security.”¹ They recognized that the combined effect of longstanding underinvestment in agriculture and food security, historically high and volatile food prices, and the economic and financial crisis was increasing dramatically the number of poor and hungry and jeopardizing global progress toward meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). By robbing people of a healthy and productive life and stunting the development of the next generation, hunger leads to devastating consequences for individuals, families, communities, and nations. At L'Aquila, leaders called for increased investment in agriculture and rural development as a proven lever for combating food insecurity and as an engine for broader economic growth, prosperity, and stability.

Feed the Future (FTF), the U.S. government's global hunger and food security initiative, renews our commitment to invest in sustainably reducing hunger and poverty. At L'Aquila, President Obama's pledge of at least \$3.5 billion for agricultural development and food security over three years helped to leverage and align more than \$18.5 billion from other donors in support of a common approach. The 2009 G8 and G20 Summits established a framework for coordinated and comprehensive action among host governments, donors, civil society, the private sector, and other stakeholders. The five principles of a common approach, first articulated at L'Aquila, embrace the *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness* and the *Accra Agenda for Action*, and were endorsed unanimously as the *Rome Principles for Sustainable Food Security* by 193 countries at the 2009 World Summit on Food Security.

We are guided by the *Rome Principles* as we work alongside development partners to support processes through which countries develop and implement food security strategies and investment plans that reflect their needs, priorities, and development strategies. The country-owned plans, referred to in this document as Country Investment Plans (CIPs), serve as the foundation for countries to mobilize resources and coordinate with development partners to accelerate their progress toward the Millennium Development Goal of halving the proportion of people suffering from hunger and poverty by 2015. As described in the *Rome Principles*, we commit to work in partnership to:

- » **Invest in country-owned plans that support results-based programs and partnerships**, so that assistance is tailored to the needs of individual countries through consultative processes and plans that are developed and led by country governments
- » **Strengthen strategic coordination** to mobilize and align the resources of the diverse partners and stakeholders – including the private sector and civil society – that are needed to achieve our common objectives
- » **Ensure a comprehensive approach** that accelerates inclusive agricultural-led growth and improves nutrition, while also bridging humanitarian relief and sustainable development efforts
- » **Leverage the benefits of multilateral institutions** so that priorities and approaches are aligned, investments are coordinated, and financial and technical assistance gaps are filled
- » **Deliver on sustained and accountable commitments**, phasing-in investments responsibly to ensure returns, using benchmarks and targets to measure progress toward shared goals, and holding ourselves and other stakeholders publicly accountable for achieving results.

A family is considered food secure when its members do not live in hunger or fear of hunger. Food security is defined as having four main components: availability, access, utilization, and stability. Families and individuals require a reliable and consistent source of quality food, as well as sufficient resources to purchase it. People must also have the knowledge and basic sanitary conditions to choose, prepare, and distribute food in a way that results in good nutrition for all family members. Finally, the ability to access and utilize food must remain stable and sustained over time.

Sustainably reducing hunger and poverty begins with vulnerable countries. Host governments must decide on their own needs, priorities, and development strategies for addressing the causes and consequences of food insecurity. They should do so based on evidence and experience and in consultation with their development partners, including donors, civil society, and the private sector. At the country level, partners can engage in meaningful dialogue on a common framework for action, identify how resources align against strategic priorities, and determine how to address gaps and make adjustments. To increase harmonization of plans and strategies, we work with and build upon existing country-owned processes such as those supported by the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) approach and the African Union's Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP).

Multilateral institutions are actively engaged in improving food security and supporting country-owned processes and plans. FTF builds on the Administration's strong commitment to multilateral engagement by seeking to leverage the strengths of multilateral organizations to sustain political momentum, improve accountability and coordination, and provide technical and financial support. We will play an active role in strengthening and promoting multilateral institutions that contribute to food security efforts, including the United Nations (UN) Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and its Committee on World Food Security (CFS), the UN International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the multi-donor trust fund for global agriculture and food security (the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program, or GAFSP), and regional organizations that promote peer review, cross-border programs, and regional integration.

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the private sector are particularly important for building momentum for combating food insecurity and increasing the sustainability of our efforts. NGOs often have close ties to local communities and are critical to robust consultation and sustainable implementation. The private sector can bring financial and technical resources, market access, cutting-edge business practices, in-country networks, and other expertise related to food security. We seek to leverage and coordinate our resources and efforts with NGOs, the private sector, and the full range of stakeholders interested in food security and agricultural-led growth.

To increase the effectiveness of our investments, we will prioritize and concentrate our efforts and resources on core Focus Countries where the *Rome Principles* can best be realized. We will support the implementation of country-owned plans through investments that draw on our areas of comparative advantage, such as research and innovation and private sector-led growth, and have been demonstrated to be key drivers of agricultural-led growth and improved nutrition. Building on our experience and on the priorities of partner countries, our investments will address the key determinants of food insecurity – *availability and access*, through investments in agricultural productivity, agribusiness and market development, and equitable distribution of and control over productive resources; *utilization* of food, through a multifaceted approach to nutrition; and *stability*, through ensuring that effective mechanisms are in place to address chronic food insecurity.

We intend to invest in Focus Countries in two phases to help ensure the sustainability and impact of our investments. In Phase I, significant effort is devoted to *foundational investments* – technical, political and financial support to assist a country in developing its Country Investment Plan, and conducting policy reform and capacity-building for its successful implementation. Phase I investments also include *core investments* – investments in our two key objectives of **accelerating inclusive agriculture sector growth** and **improving nutritional status**. Our foundational investments in Phase I are designed to lay the groundwork for an expansion of core investments in Phase II, helping to provide both donors and recipients with the assurance that investments will be efficient, well-targeted, and mutually reinforcing.

The determination for a country to move from Phase I to Phase II is based on three criteria: (1) a multi-stakeholder review of the technical quality and soundness of the CIP, (2) evidence of coordination and consultation with key stakeholders, and (3) Focus Country commitment and capacity as indicated by follow-through on the country's own financial and policy commitments. In addition, Phase II determinations may take into account considerations of resource availability. When a

country enters Phase II, it is eligible for larger-scale FTF investments in priority areas that are aligned with the CIP. In Phase II, we will invest in a greater proportion of core investments that result in scaled-up development impacts at the country and regional level, while continuing to build the foundation for sustainable and inclusive market-led growth.

In addition to our bilateral investments in Focus Countries, we will also engage in complementary investments that are designed to support our efforts to combat hunger and poverty in Focus Countries. These include:

- » Investments in **regional programs** where Focus Countries are located, when significant challenges to food security require cooperation across national borders
- » Investments in multilateral mechanisms such as the new World Bank (WB)-administered, multi-donor trust fund – **the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program** – an important means to leverage the comparative advantage of multilateral development agencies in large-scale investments, such as infrastructure
- » Investments in countries that are **strategic partners**, where FTF investments will benefit Focus Countries through technical, policy, and other cooperation
- » Investments in **global research and innovation** that build on new breakthroughs in science and technology, reverse the decline in investment in agricultural productivity, respond to key challenges such as global climate change and water scarcity, and strengthen institutions that deliver technologies to small-scale agricultural producers.

We recognize that creating significant new economic opportunities for women and addressing environmental challenges are critical levers for accelerating growth and achieving a food secure world. Therefore, in all of our investments and activities, we will promote and foster a shared commitment to the goals and fundamental principles set forth in our guidance on gender, environment, and climate change. We will do so through early, consistent, and constructive engagement with country counterparts and other stakeholders and through support for food security programs that help partner countries address our mutual environmental, social, and development priorities.

As reflected in the *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness*, the *Accra Agenda for Action* and the *Rome Principles*, a robust system to measure progress and enhance accountability is necessary to improve aid effectiveness. Donors and partner countries should set benchmarks and targets for investments – and be held publicly accountable to them. In addition to monitoring and evaluating FTF investments, we support the development of common monitoring and evaluation systems at country, regional, and multilateral levels to track the progress of our collective efforts. Our evaluation strategy will focus our resources on informing future program design so that we learn from our experiences and develop results that we can share with partner countries, stakeholders, and other development partners.

Feed the Future pursues two paths: (1) addressing the root causes of hunger that limit the potential of millions of people and (2) establishing a lasting foundation for change by aligning our resources with country-owned processes and sustained, multi-stakeholder partnerships. Through our leadership in this initiative, we advance global stability and prosperity by improving the most basic of human conditions – the need that families and individuals have for a reliable source of quality food and sufficient resources to access and purchase it. FTF and other USG priorities – including global health and climate change – allow us to confront the growing challenges of global poverty, disease, water scarcity, climate change, and diminishing natural resources. By addressing these complex challenges and promoting our values, we protect our own security and lay the foundation for a more peaceful and prosperous future for all.

I. THE GLOBAL CONTEXT

I.1 A New Approach to Global Hunger and Food Security

Today, the number of people suffering from hunger and poverty exceeds one billion.² The steep rise in global food prices in 2007 and 2008 served as an alarm bell to developed and developing countries alike about the state of the global food system and the growing problem of hunger. The economic and financial crisis added tens of millions more people to the ranks of the poor and hungry and further shook developing countries' confidence in the global economy.³ The international community responded to these shocks with increases in humanitarian assistance. At the same time, momentum began to build for renewed attention to addressing persistent poverty – the root cause of hunger and economic fragility.

At the G8 Summit in L'Aquila, Italy in July 2009, global leaders committed to “act with the scale and urgency needed to achieve sustainable global food security.”⁴ This begins with an increase in funding for long-term approaches to combating the fundamental causes of hunger and poverty. The share of official development assistance devoted to agriculture was as much as 17 percent in the late 1980s, but fell to 6 percent in recent years.⁵ At the G8 and subsequent G20 Summit, global leaders called for increased investment in agriculture and rural development as a proven lever for combating food insecurity and as an engine for broader economic growth, prosperity, and stability.

At L'Aquila, President Obama's pledge of at least \$3.5 billion for agricultural development and food security over three years helped to leverage and align more than \$18.5 billion from other donors in support of a common approach. The 2009 G8 and G20 Summits were important for establishing a framework for coordinated and comprehensive action among host governments, donors, civil society, the private sector, and other stakeholders. The five principles of our common approach, first articulated at L'Aquila, embrace the *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness* and the *Accra Agenda for Action* and were endorsed unanimously as the *Rome Principles of Sustainable Food Security* by 193 countries at the 2009 World Summit on Food Security.

We will be guided by the *Rome Principles* as we work alongside host governments and development partners to accelerate progress toward the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) of halving the proportion of people living in extreme poverty and hunger by 2015. To achieve this goal, we will work in partnership to:

- » ***Invest in country-owned plans that support results-based programs and partnerships***, so that assistance is tailored to the needs of individual countries through consultative processes and plans that are developed and led by country governments
- » ***Strengthen strategic coordination*** to mobilize and align the resources of the diverse partners and stakeholders – including the private sector and civil society – that are needed to achieve our objectives
- » ***Ensure a comprehensive approach*** that accelerates inclusive agricultural-led growth and improves nutrition, while also bridging humanitarian relief and sustainable development efforts
- » ***Leverage the benefits of multilateral institutions*** so that priorities and approaches are aligned, investments are coordinated, and financial and technical assistance gaps are filled
- » ***Deliver on sustained and accountable commitments***, phasing-in investments responsibly to ensure returns, using benchmarks and targets to measure progress toward shared goals, and holding ourselves and other stakeholders publicly accountable.

FTF harnesses a range of diplomatic and development resources from across the U.S. government (USG). Through diplomacy, we will work with partner countries and other stakeholders to sustain the political commitment to food security over the long term. Food security must remain high on the agenda of global, regional, and national fora to catalyze the equitable poverty reduction necessary for sustained impact. Through development assistance, we will build on our areas of comparative advantage such as research and innovation and private sector-led growth for the benefit of developing countries. In addition, we will strengthen host government capacity to make sound and strategic choices about their own investments and provide a roadmap for donors. Through our efforts, FTF will support policy reforms that create an enabling environment for private sector investment that drives gains and sustainability over the long-term. In all of our partnerships, we will work with others to ensure transparency and accountability to civil society, both at home and abroad.

Feed the Future (FTF) builds on the U.S. government's continued and robust commitment to humanitarian assistance that helps alleviate the immediate impact of acute hunger. FTF complements the USG's existing programs in agriculture and food security and the related work by international and financial institutions receiving funds from the USG. We will elevate coordination within the U.S. government to align our diverse resources and effectively partner with other stakeholders to leverage and harmonize our investments for the greatest collective impact. We see our role and that of other donors as catalyzing pro-poor economic growth through providing political, financial, and technical assistance. We envision a world where private investment drives sustainable growth, and where country and market-led development supplants foreign assistance.

1.2 The Global Challenge and Opportunity

More than one billion people – nearly one-sixth of the world's population – suffer from chronic hunger. This crisis has devastating and far-reaching effects. Each year, more than 3.5 million children die from undernutrition.⁶ Hunger robs the poor of a healthy and productive life and stunts the mental and physical development of the next generation. According to the World Bank (WB), undernutrition costs developing countries up to 3 percent of their annual gross domestic product and places individuals at risk of losing more than 10 percent of their lifetime earning potential.⁷ Reducing chronic hunger is essential to building a foundation for development investments in health, education, and economic growth. It is essential to the sustainable development of individuals, communities, and nations.

In the future, ensuring food security will only become more challenging. Globally, food demand is projected to increase by 50 percent over the next 20 years.⁸ In developing countries, where need is already the greatest, improvements in agricultural productivity have lagged behind. For example, since the early 1960s, grain yield – a commonly used indicator for agricultural productivity – has increased in the rest of the world by almost 2.5 percent annually, while the annual increase in Sub-Saharan Africa has reached only 1 percent.⁹ Moreover, food supplies face increasing threats from climate change, water scarcity, environmental degradation, and competition for scarce energy resources.

Meeting this demand in a sustainable way will require doing more with less – less water and other natural resources, less energy, and a less certain climate. If potential declines in crop yields due to climate change are not addressed, the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) projects that by 2050, the number of children suffering from undernutrition could increase by as much as 20 percent.¹⁰ The food price crisis of 2007 – 2008 illustrates the types of disruptions we could experience more often in the future. The steep rise in food prices affected families everywhere, including in the United States, but it was most devastating for developing countries where millions more fell into extreme poverty and hunger.

While the challenges are significant, so are the tools for success. The global commitment among a broad range of stakeholders provides the political momentum and resources needed to address the challenge. Within the global

development community, we have solutions that have demonstrated impact. Evidence consistently shows that agricultural growth is highly effective in reducing poverty. Recent studies suggest that every 1 percent increase in agricultural income per capita reduces the number of people living in extreme poverty by between 0.6 and 1.8 percent.¹¹

We have seen new market-oriented approaches to small-scale agriculture deliver results on a large scale – from the rapid rise of smallholder dairy industries in India¹² to applications of modern science that led to annual maize yield increases in African countries that are comparable with those in the United States.¹³ We have seen the greening of the Sahel through community-based agroforestry that enhances management of water and soil fertility.¹⁴ In Latin America, the diversification to higher value export commodities has been an effective means to pull small-scale producers out of poverty. Unleashing the proven potential of small-scale agricultural producers, while encouraging the sustainable and equitable management of natural resources, will reduce hunger and create a more resilient global food supply for everyone.

Women will be a pivotal force behind achieving a food secure world. In most developing countries, they produce between 60 and 80 percent of the food.¹⁵ Analysis by IFPRI shows that equalizing women's access to agricultural inputs can increase output by more than 10 percent.¹⁶ Studies show that when gains in income are controlled by women, they are more likely to be spent on food and children's needs.¹⁷ By investing more in women, we amplify benefits across families and generations.

2. PARTNERSHIPS AND COORDINATION

Success will require leveraging the combined efforts of many. We are committed to engaging in partnerships and coordination at all levels – global, regional, national, and local – and with all stakeholders – public and private. In addition to promoting country ownership and investing in the capacity of host governments to meaningfully engage key stakeholders, we will work to enhance regional coordinating mechanisms that facilitate peer review and regional integration. At the global level, we will focus on coordination related to advocacy, resource mobilization, sharing information and best practices, tracking investments and results, and supporting country-owned processes. We also embrace the need for greater coordination within the U.S. government to engage our partners more effectively.

2.1 Partner Countries

Partner countries should decide their needs, priorities, and development strategies. As embodied in the *Paris Declaration*, the *Accra Agenda for Action* and the *Rome Principles*, country ownership provides the most effective means to coordinate development efforts and achieve sustainability. At the country level, partners can engage in meaningful dialogue on a common framework for action, identify how resources align against strategic priorities, and determine how to address gaps and make adjustments. We recognize the ongoing leadership of other governments and development partners in promoting country-led processes and donor coordination. Within the USG, the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) has been a leader in operationalizing the principle of country ownership through its poverty reduction programs. Through Feed the Future, we are expanding our government's commitment to aligning our investments with partner country priorities and increasing our own transparency and accountability.

In 2003, African leaders made a historic pledge to develop rigorous agricultural development strategies and to increase their own investments in agricultural-led growth through the African Union's Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP). Since then, countries in Africa and beyond have been developing strategies and investment plans that address the fundamental constraints to agricultural-led growth and food security. Even as we continue to work with our partners to develop a common approach to country-owned processes, we will remain flexible in recognition of the diversity of country contexts and the range of planning that already exists in many countries.

Investing in strengthening partner country capacity to engage in results-based planning and robust stakeholder consultation is a key component of our approach. We will also encourage and participate in multi-stakeholder technical reviews of country-owned food security investment plans to provide common feedback on the steps needed to strengthen them. This coordination will provide broader opportunities to learn from the experiences of others and improve inclusivity, transparency, and accountability of stakeholders, including donors who participate in country-led processes.

2.2 Multilateral Institutions

Building on the Administration's commitment to multilateral engagement, we seek to leverage the strengths of multilateral organizations to build political momentum for sustained efforts to achieve food security. Robust multilateralism improves coordination among development partners and reduces the management burden on host governments. For example, in response to the 2007-2008 food price crisis, the United Nations (UN) High-Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis (UNHLCF) was created to harness the combined strength of a number of UN agencies, funds, and programs, as well as international financial institutions, to promote a unified and comprehensive response to food security challenges. Through our diplomatic and development efforts, we will play an active role in strengthening and promoting the multilateral system as a key component of our support for the global response to food insecurity.

With their convening authority and technical expertise, multilateral institutions play a central role in efforts to enhance food security by providing emergency assistance, undertaking analysis and research, offering a platform for sector-wide

investments in agriculture, and providing a significant portion of the external financing for investment projects and programs in developing countries. In line with the commitments of bilateral partners at L'Aquila, many multilateral institutions are increasing their financial and technical support at the country level to boost agricultural productivity, reduce vulnerability, increase access to safe and sound financial services, and improve nutrition for vulnerable populations.

The United Nations Rome-based institutions have expertise and experience that can be leveraged to help implement a multi-stakeholder strategy. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) can provide technical expertise in the development of country-owned investment plans and advise countries during the implementation phase. The United Nations World Food Program (WFP), while not a development agency, can share its experience in partnering with the private sector and academic community to improve the nutritional value of its emergency assistance. The International Development Law Organization (IDLO) can guide Focus Countries in creating an enabling policy environment, especially with respect to land rights for women. The Committee on World Food Security (CFS) of the FAO can serve as an effective platform to convene stakeholders to strengthen collaborative action, promote greater policy convergence through sharing best practices, and advise and support countries and regions in the development, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of their own food security plans. The UNHLTF continues to play an important coordination role at the global level.

Multilateral institutions are not only important to mobilizing and coordinating donor country commitments, but to promoting global mutual accountability among donors, host governments, and other stakeholders. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) can provide support to coordinate member country contributions and promote a unified approach to tracking resources. The OECD, working with the UNHLTF and the CFS, has developed a tool to map and track the pledges committed at the 2009 G8 Summit in L'Aquila. We anticipate that similar tools can be enhanced to incorporate a broader range of commitments, including those from civil society and the private sector; and we support a leading role for the reformed CFS in tracking and monitoring international commitments and results.

Multilateral development banks and funds, such as the World Bank, the regional development banks, and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), have important advantages that complement bilateral programs. These institutions can leverage significant financial and technical resources, including in support of country-owned plans; make multi-year commitments of funding to provide host governments with certainty in their budget and planning processes; and undertake complex regional projects that require high levels of intergovernmental coordination such as intra-regional transportation corridors that boost trade flows and reduce the costs and time to ship inputs and agricultural products.

To harness these advantages, G20 leaders at the 2009 Summit in Pittsburgh called for a new, flexible multi-donor trust fund, the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP), to be administered by the World Bank and implemented by a number of multilateral institutions (see Section 5.2). An important objective of GAFSP is to consolidate donor resources where a multilateral approach holds a comparative advantage either because of economies of scale or donor capacity. This fund will leverage the existing resources of multilateral institutions, their expertise and experience, and their presence in low-income countries to meet needs that donors and country partners often find difficult to address in a timely or efficient manner on their own. GAFSP will also finance private sector activities to help catalyze investment along the agricultural value chain.

Through regional coordination, countries can share experiences, provide peer support, address cross-border issues, and benefit from trade flows. As recognized at L'Aquila, coordination at the regional level is therefore an important means to strengthening local ownership. Through CAADP, we will work closely with the regional economic communities – Southern African Development Community (SADC), Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), and Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) – to promote cross-border programs, regional integration,

and the peer review of country-owned plans. In other regions, we will work with organizations such as Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture and the Asian Development Bank to encourage technical and political support for the development of regional strategies that link to country-level planning and implementation around food security.

2.3 Key Stakeholders

While a country-led planning process is the central mechanism for coordination in our approach, country-led does not mean “government only.” Meaningful consultation with multiple stakeholders is critical to ensuring equitable growth and poverty reduction. Robust engagement helps strengthen the commitment of key actors, builds the foundation for long-term sustainability, promotes mutual accountability, and balances our support for country-led processes with our need to ensure sound and strategic use of U.S. resources in promoting equitable and sustainable development.

Stakeholders comprise a broad range of local, national, regional, and international actors affected by or interested in food security, including affected populations, host governments (including local and legislative bodies), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), cooperatives, foundations, universities, donors and multilateral institutions, local civic and religious actors, private sector entities, labor unions, and women-focused organizations. We seek to leverage our resources and efforts with a wide range of stakeholders and will promote the participation of key stakeholders in planning and implementation.

NGOs and the private sector are particularly important for combating food insecurity and increasing the sustainability of our efforts. Given their close ties to local communities, NGOs are often effective at ensuring that people who are very poor and vulnerable are consulted about and benefit from agricultural and nutrition programs. They are also critical to efforts promoting robust consultation and sustainable implementation. We will continue to partner and consult with NGOs as we move forward and refine our approach, embracing and deploying their expertise and seeking their technical assistance.

Public sector investments alone, while important, are not sufficient to reduce poverty and food insecurity. Our investments will help create enabling policy environments and physical infrastructure that facilitates private sector investment by individual agricultural producers, small and medium enterprises (SMEs), and larger businesses. By coordinating with the private sector and sharing risks in pursuit of food security, we will increase our collective effectiveness and impact. The private sector brings necessary financial resources, human capital, technological resources and intellectual property, market access, cutting-edge business practices, in-country networks, and other expertise related to food security. We will explore public-private partnerships and a wide range of other mechanisms for engaging the private sector, including financing mechanisms that USG programs may support and complement, such as political risk insurance, lending facilities and investment funds for SMEs.

2.4 U.S. Government

To improve the effectiveness of our contributions to global food security, the United States must improve coordination within our own government. USG agencies that have food security-related activities will participate in the planning and implementation of Feed the Future to coordinate and align USG activities in Washington and in the field.¹⁸ Better coordination increases the U.S. government’s capacity to harness each agency’s comparative advantages and makes it easier for our partners to coordinate their programs with ours, a critical component of our commitment at L’Aquila. We will also prioritize coordination and integration with other U.S. initiatives that affect food security, including those focused on improving global health and climate change.

Coordination will be improved among USG agencies through the strategy described in this document, adopted by USG agencies with food security-related activities and led by the U.S. Global Hunger and Food Security (GHFS) Coordinator. The Coordinator will provide strategic policy and budget direction that spans the U.S. government resources of Feed the Future. The GHFS Coordinator will also coordinate FTF implementation across federal agencies and sectors to align and integrate FTF with complementary efforts in agriculture, trade, health, climate change, and economic policy in service of a common strategy. Beyond promoting broader alignment within the U.S. government, the Coordinator will strengthen collaboration with the international community, including other bilateral donors, multilateral development banks, and other international organizations.

The GHFS Coordinator will have two deputies: the Deputy Coordinator for Development and the Deputy Coordinator for Diplomacy. The Deputy Coordinators are responsible for implementing FTF, including ensuring that all relevant USG agencies and departments are consulted and engaged as necessary for purposes of aligning and coordinating FTF with other food security-related programs and policies across the U.S. government.

To facilitate coordination of USG activities at the country level, the U.S. Ambassador in our Focus Countries will designate an FTF Country Coordinator. The FTF Country Coordinator will lead the implementation of FTF at the country level and will be responsible for maximizing the impact of USG resources by aligning, coordinating, and integrating FTF and other USG resources, as well as the resources of the host government and development partners.

3. A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH

In 2000, the global community articulated a collective vision for food security embodied in the Millennium Development Goal of eradicating extreme poverty and hunger. It also set the concrete and ambitious targets of halving the proportion of people living in extreme poverty and suffering from hunger between 1990 and 2015. With Feed the Future, the United States is redoubling its efforts to accelerate progress towards the MDGs to overcome the setbacks resulting from the food price and financial crises and to achieve long-term gains.

One of the key elements of our approach is our strong commitment to coordinate and partner with other developing countries, other donors, international institutions, and other development partners to achieve much greater results.

3.1 Our Collective Impact

At the 2009 G8 and G20 Summits, donors committed to increase investment in agricultural development and to allocate resources for agricultural development and food security using a common set of principles, including strategic coordination. If the \$22 billion pledged under this global initiative is invested in country-led, evidence-based strategies consistent with the *Rome Principles*, we can collectively raise incomes, improve nutrition, and enhance food security in at least four different ways.

First, based on our preliminary analysis, the combined investments of this global effort focused directly on agricultural production – in, for example, extension services, training, roads, and irrigation – can increase the incomes of at least 40 million people, including 28 million people who are currently living on incomes of less than \$2 per day, and 13 million people living in extreme poverty on less than \$1.25 per day. These investments will increase their incomes for many years beyond the life of specific projects as people continue to use the infrastructure, technologies, and new sustainable practices that are introduced as part of the program. Assuming the funds pledged at L'Aquila are invested in strong, evidence-based programs, they can increase the incomes of these people by an average of at least 10 percent per person sustained for at least 10 years – a gain in income equivalent in real terms to an extra year's worth of today's income over 10 years.

Each year, this extra income would allow a typical household of five people to purchase a basket of goods similar to the following: an additional 100 kilograms of rice or other staple food, together with fish, poultry, fruit, and vegetables sufficient to add 150 calories per person per day; keep a child in school for an additional semester; and increase the household's annual spending on clothing, fuel, household goods, telecommunications, and services by about 30 percent. While actual spending patterns will vary from household to household, reflecting individual priorities and needs, the additional income will strengthen local economies and provide an important buffer for vulnerable populations in times of stress and enhance their food security on a daily basis. As women are more likely to reinvest income in the welfare of their children, our targeted investments in women will yield benefits across generations.

Second, in addition to direct producer level investments, this global effort will include significant increases in investments in research and development and its dissemination at the global, regional, and country levels. Numerous studies have shown that research has a high rate of return and that agricultural productivity improvements are closely linked to investment in research.¹⁹ This research on production systems, development of new crop varieties, post-harvest value chains, risk and vulnerability reduction, and other areas (described in more detail in Section 5.4) will significantly increase productivity gains and farm income above and beyond the amounts described above. The returns from new research in agriculture are potentially quite large, especially when applied in conjunction with the direct investments in producer level production, markets, and nutrition.

Third, beyond those individuals and families whose incomes will grow directly, millions more will benefit indirectly from the producer level investments, increased market access, and new research as food supplies increase and prices to all consumers are lowered. These effects and a range of other indirect but measurable benefits – including increased technical and institutional capacity, favorable policy environments, and the expansion of recipient countries' own public and private investments – will accelerate a process of sustainable, country-driven development, poverty reduction, and improved nutrition.

Fourth, working with our partners, we will invest directly in nutrition programs that have been proven to work. Based on our preliminary analysis, our combined investments can reach 25 million children with a package of nutrition interventions that has been demonstrated to reduce child mortality, improve nutrition outcomes, and protect human capital. The package includes interventions in the development window of opportunity (starting from the nine months of pregnancy through two years of age, including maternal nutrition, promotion of breastfeeding, and infant and young child feeding practices); diet quality and diversification (food fortification, consumption of nutrient-rich foods); community management of acute malnutrition; and targeted micronutrient supplementation. These interventions are projected to reduce the number of stunted children by nearly 10 million, and the number of underweight children by more than 4 million, and increase the lifetime productivity of people in developing countries.

3.2 FTF Goal and Key Objectives

Our overarching goal is to **sustainably reduce global hunger and poverty by tackling their root causes and employing proven strategies for achieving large scale and lasting impact.** We will measure success toward this goal at the highest levels – the prevalence of poverty and underweight children – alongside other key measures of progress that contribute to this goal.

In order to achieve progress toward our goal, we have identified two key objectives that address the principal determinants of food insecurity: accelerating inclusive agriculture sector growth and improving nutritional status. These objectives have direct causal linkages to sustainably reducing hunger and poverty.

- » **Accelerate inclusive agriculture sector growth:** There is broad consensus that achieving the collective goal of sustainably reducing global poverty and hunger will require accelerating inclusive agriculture sector growth.²⁰ We will measure progress through change in agricultural production, agriculture value added per person (i.e. the income derived from agricultural production), and in the incomes of both men and women in rural areas, including men and women who are very poor.
- » **Improve nutritional status** (especially of women and children): Evidence shows that alleviating poverty will reduce undernutrition, but alone will not resolve the problem.²¹ We will coordinate and integrate our agriculture and nutrition investments to maximize impact and measure the success of our efforts toward achieving this objective through change in the prevalence of stunted and wasted children and the prevalence of underweight women.²²

Our measures of impact at the national level will represent the combined efforts of many partners, most importantly the countries themselves. For further details on how we will measure our success, please see Section 7.0.

3.3 Potential FTF Investments

Guided by the *Rome Principles*, we support the implementation of country-owned plans as a means to increase coordination, effectiveness and sustainability. We will do so through investments that directly support these country plans and draw on USG areas of comparative advantage, such as research and innovation and private sector-led growth, and have been demonstrated to be key drivers of agricultural-led growth and improved nutrition. As described in

the UNHLP's *Comprehensive Framework for Action* and other documents such as the *World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development*, a comprehensive approach includes a wide range of technically sound and results focused actions and investments.²³

Drawing on an international base of research and experience, we have developed a set of potential investments to guide us as we design investments in support of specific country-owned plans. Our investments will vary by country and will depend on the country's highest priorities and the investments of the country itself, as well as the investments of other donors and key actors. They will build on existing successes, our expertise and strengths, and be concentrated in strategic areas based on our comparative advantages. They will be designed in close coordination with governments and other development partners in order to maximize our collective impact. We will also coordinate our monitoring and evaluation system with our partners to facilitate learning and improvement over time and to measure our progress toward the hunger and poverty MDG.

3.3.1 Inclusive Agriculture Sector Growth

Investments in agricultural-led growth will encompass the following areas: improving agricultural productivity, expanding markets and trade, and increasing the economic resilience of vulnerable rural communities. The specific package and focus of investments will vary by country and will depend on the key priorities articulated in the country's strategy.

Improving agricultural productivity

Gains in productivity can be driven by a number of factors, including improved access to agricultural inputs and knowledge, more efficient use of land and labor, conducive policy environments, and improved management of natural resources. We will consider supporting investments in productivity, with particular focus on small-scale agricultural producers, that:

- » **Increase access to affordable agricultural inputs and improved techniques and technology**, including agricultural biotechnology, high quality seed, livestock feed, fertilizer, and best management practices. We will work with private sector partners to expand commercially sustainable agro-input industries and dealer networks, including small and medium enterprises; seed company training to improve quality management; smart voucher schemes for smallholder purchases of inputs; and policy reforms that facilitate private sector investment. Increased access to inputs should be coupled with strategies to help ensure their safe and sustainable use. Investments will aim for women to have equal access to affordable inputs and improved techniques and technology.
- » **Develop inputs and technologies that are adapted to local conditions** by supporting national research institutes, funding applied research, and building local research capacity, including training local researchers and technicians.
- » **Expand access to knowledge through agricultural extension**, providing educational services that are tailored to meet local needs, including the needs of women. These should be demand-driven, scientifically-based, cost-effective, and build on local and indigenous knowledge. We will invest in strengthening the effectiveness and coverage of a range of public and private extension service delivery systems, including those for delivery of new informational products for short-, medium-, and long-term forecasts and other climate information in a form that producers can use. If gender inequalities inhibit demand, then these inequalities should be addressed. Approaches tailored to the different roles that men and women play within the household can be more effective than approaches that focus on just the head of household.
- » **Strengthen property rights to land and other productive assets** to promote investment and sustainable resource use, including clarifying and harmonizing statutory and customary land tenure systems. Land systems that ensure strong and clear rights will create incentives to increase productivity, lease underutilized resources, and better manage natural assets to optimize economic opportunities.

- » **Enhance sustainability and resilience of production** through a large-scale systems approach to environmental and natural resource management. Climate change impacts will be most severe on hydrological cycles and rainfall patterns. Sound management of natural assets – including land, water, forests, and fisheries – provides multiple benefits in terms of food production, environmental health, and nutrition. Watershed and landscape approaches can help maintain critical environmental services and goods, mitigate floods and droughts, and replenish aquifers. We will support integrated resource management approaches, which are the best method to balance demands for resources for agriculture, people, and ecosystems.
- » **Increase access to sound and affordable financial and risk management services**, such as insurance instruments, savings accounts, loans, and other financial tools that assist male and female small-scale producers, laborers and SME owners. To increase access to these services, we will work with partner countries to support policy reform in the financial and insurance sectors to expand the reach of microfinance and other financial institutions. We will also support reform and implementation of policy and regulations that promote private sector entrepreneurship, and investments in competitive agribusinesses of all sizes.
- » **Strengthen agricultural producer organizations** that can better represent the interests of men and women producers and entrepreneurs in government policymaking; help them engage in bulk purchases of farming and aquaculture inputs at lower prices, and tap potential economies of scale in storage and distribution; serve as an efficient conduit for disseminating training, market, and management information; and assist in cooperatively meeting regulatory and market standards.
- » **Strengthen regional harmonization and coordination** that will add value to activities at the country level. This includes harmonization of laws and regulations governing the release of varieties and trade in seeds, more efficient supply chains for fertilizers and other inputs, efficient exchange of best practices and knowledge for similar agroecological conditions, and shared approaches to help producers adapt to the effects of global climate change.

Expanding markets and trade

Increasing the efficiency of agricultural producers will not result in higher incomes and reduced hunger unless surplus harvest and products can be sold in well-functioning local, national, regional or international markets.²⁴ Agribusinesses, including SMEs, are a pivotal link between small-scale producers and markets to purchase inputs and to sell products. Lack of transparent regulations, inconsistent and unpredictable public policies, and few mechanisms to enforce contracts between businesses deter private investment and limit the ability of agricultural producers and businesses to access capital. This situation reduces the incentives for agricultural producers to increase the quantity, quality, and value of their agricultural production.

Trade also plays a critical role in food security. With rising population growth and urbanization, international and regional trade is essential to achieve broad-based economic development and food security. Development of strong, integrated regional agriculture and food markets will increase the availability of safe and nutritious food, decrease local prices, and expand economic growth.

Our potential investments to expand markets and trade include those that:

- » **Expand market information** for producers and enterprise owners, including through programs that focus on equitable access for women. Greater access to market information will increase the ability of small-scale agricultural producers to participate in formal and higher-value markets. Information-sharing tools, such as sending market information via mobile phones and the internet, enable agricultural producers to negotiate better prices with buyers, match producers with new and distant markets, and help farmers and fishers in planning their production and harvests. Producer organizations and commercial commodity exchanges can serve as conduits of market information, increasing price transparency between remote buyers and sellers.

- » **Improve post-harvest market infrastructure** to make markets work better for women and men agricultural producers and extend the reach of nutritious foods. Post-harvest losses such as spoilage in storage and transit reduce the economic and nutritive value of fruits, vegetables, fish, and other products that are critical for quality diets. Post-harvest market infrastructure investments include public and private facilities that are used for grading, storage, and processing; improved technology for food storage and safety; energy and telecommunication systems; and roads that can deliver rural services and connect producers to markets.
- » **Improve access to business development and financial services** to improve the productivity, value-added and competitiveness of agribusinesses of all sizes.
- » **Enhance animal, plant, and food safety** by improving standards and creating strong regulatory frameworks to expand trade.
- » **Reduce the time and cost of moving goods across borders**, including through the harmonization of policies and regulations and tariff reductions, to open up reliable access to regional markets and encourage staple foods to move from areas of surplus to areas of deficit.
- » **Create an enabling policy environment for agribusiness growth** by improving the ability of partner governments to collect and analyze market information; training private sector trade associations in how to engage local and national governments; providing opportunities for the private sector to engage with governments and regional organizations; seeking reductions in government controls on commodity prices; protecting intellectual property; and supporting reform and implementation of policy and regulations that promote private sector entrepreneurship, innovation, and investment in competitive agribusinesses of all sizes.

Increasing economic resilience in vulnerable rural communities

Efforts to include families and communities that are vulnerable and very poor are critical to ensuring that growth is broad-based and sustainable. These efforts should begin at the community level. We will design and implement programs that enable the rural poor to participate in and contribute to food security. We will strive to promote inclusive rural growth by integrating humanitarian and development resources and bridging the gap between these two types of assistance.

The Community Development Fund (CDF) is a new resource provided through FTF that will target investments to community-based interventions aimed at increasing the resilience of the rural poor and accelerating their participation in agricultural development and food security programs. USG resources to support community-level development activities are often generated by the sale of USG food assistance, or monetization. Through CDF, we will pilot the use of cash to fund community-level development activities directly when the process of monetization is not contributing to country-level development objectives. While the value of non-emergency resources provided for community-based development will remain the same, an increasing amount of these resources will be provided directly in cash – freeing up food assistance that is needed for emergency programs.

Our investments to increase economic resilience through CDF and other FTF funds may include those that:

- » **Promote an enabling policy environment** that ensures secure and efficient access to and management of land and natural resources; encourages reasonable regulation of migration and employment that enables labor mobility and flexibility of livelihood strategies; and promotes small enterprise development.
- » **Support effective delivery and implementation of programs aimed at building household and community assets, diversifying rural livelihoods, and improving nutritional status.** “Productive safety nets,” for example, provide resources (food or cash) to households engaged in public works, training programs, or other activities as a way of assisting households to meet nutritional and other basic needs while increasing their economic potential.

- » **Build in-country capacity to manage risk** through early warning systems and markets for micro-insurance, including health, life, and other products tailored to the needs of vulnerable households and communities. These products serve dual purposes: (1) they help anticipate and even reduce humanitarian requirements by providing governments, local communities, and households with the tools that they need to reduce risk, and (2) they help rural households and communities protect their assets in the face of unexpected, catastrophic events. We will work to integrate U.S. humanitarian resources with development resources in support of public and private sector capacity for risk management.
- » **Increase the benefits of local and regional food assistance procurement to smallholder farmers** through procurement programs like the World Food Program's "Purchase for Progress," which not only provides guaranteed markets for smallholder production, but helps build their capacity to participate robustly in those markets.
- » **Adapt and deliver extension and financial services and improved technologies to very poor communities.** Distance, illiteracy, gender, opportunity costs, social exclusion, and other factors may marginalize communities and households, reducing their access to mainstream development interventions. In addition to promoting policies that address systemic constraints, we will tackle these constraints through community-based interventions that are designed to reach the vulnerable and very poor.

3.3.2 Improved Nutritional Status

We aim to strengthen the links between agriculture and improved nutrition outcomes. We seek to address some of the most significant challenges to preventing and treating undernutrition by working with partner countries to raise the importance of nutrition on the national agenda; encouraging them to implement evidence-based interventions at a national scale to reach the most vulnerable (including women, adolescent girls, and young children); and using data to make sound decisions about our program investments to reduce undernutrition. We will also assist countries in building the technical capacity to implement, monitor, and evaluate their nutrition programs over the long term.

In addition to coordinating closely with host governments and other development partners, we will work with the Global Health Initiative (GHI) to ensure that USG nutrition investments have maximum impact on our target populations.²⁵ Through both initiatives, we will implement a nutrition strategy based on country-specific needs and opportunities. We will build capacity of health systems to screen and treat undernutrition and use local food products to do so. We will leverage existing community workers – both health workers and agricultural extension workers – to deliver nutrition education at a local level. We will also empower women in both initiatives by increasing access to new farming skills, agricultural inputs, health knowledge, and quality health services as a way of reducing poverty and improving the health and wellbeing of themselves and their children.

We will consider investments that:

- » **Prevent undernutrition through community-based programs** that increase household resilience and are built on the proven effectiveness of community workers, who are often the best change agents to deliver nutrition education. These programs should be based on an analysis of the specific social and behavioral context in each location and promote nutrition messages aimed at improving key evidence-based practices including proper maternal nutrition, exclusive breastfeeding of infants under six months, appropriate introduction of complementary foods, and promotion of adequate water, sanitation, and hygiene practices.
- » **Improve diet quality and diversity** to prevent nutritional deficiencies and vulnerability to disease caused by low-quality diets. This can be achieved by strengthening agriculture and nutrition linkages through multiple approaches, such as increasing household production of nutritious foods, empowering women with access to income, and

educating women about food utilization and nutrition as a means to improving the health and wellbeing of children in the household. We will invest in improving nutrition throughout the value chain, including research to improve the nutrient value of staple food sources and post-harvest preservation and processing techniques that increase the nutrient content of processed staple foods.

- » ***Improve delivery of nutrition services by health systems linked to community-based programs.*** Key nutrition services include community management of acute malnutrition (CMAM) and micronutrient supplementation. The CMAM approach ensures timely detection and referral of cases of severe acute undernutrition in the community to medical treatment by making services available at decentralized treatment points and through community outreach and mobilization. To save lives and reduce morbidity in the short- and medium-term, food-based approaches and prevention programs should be coupled with targeted micronutrient supplementation programs, including vitamin A supplementation for young children and iron folic acid supplementation for pregnant women. Our investments will include strengthening and integrating national and decentralized health and social systems responsible for planning, budgeting, and cost analysis of nutrition service delivery.

4. FOCUS COUNTRY INVESTMENTS

We will prioritize and concentrate our efforts and resources on Focus Countries where the *Rome Principles* can best be realized in practice. We will continue to provide assistance for agricultural development to some other countries where the overall political and investment environment may not be conducive for a major scale-up in investments, or where other donors are playing a major role in food security. In these countries, we commit to align our programs with our objectives and to invest according to the *Rome Principles* to the extent possible.

The list of the 20 potential Focus Countries is set forth below, although this list may change based on annual and multi-year reviews that assess our overall portfolio in terms of both country performance and our overall resource constraints (see Section 4.7):

TABLE I – POTENTIAL FTF FOCUS COUNTRIES

Region	Countries
Africa	Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia
Asia	Bangladesh, Cambodia, Nepal, Tajikistan
Latin America and the Caribbean	Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua

4.1 Selection Factors

Focus Countries will be selected based on five factors related to the needs and opportunities for reducing food insecurity:

- » **Level of Need:** We assess the level of need based on income levels, poverty rates, the Global Hunger Index compiled by IFPRI in conjunction with Deutsche Welthungerhilfe and Concern Worldwide,²⁶ and the IFPRI categorization of level of food security,²⁷ among other factors. The Global Hunger Index uses three equally weighted indicators to represent a multidimensional measure of global hunger – the proportion of undernourished as a percentage of national population, prevalence of underweight children under the age of five, and mortality in children under five.
- » **Opportunity for Partnership:** We seek to work in countries that place a high priority on food security for all of their citizens and that are committed to working in partnership with, among others, donors, civil society, international organizations, and the private sector. Our assessment is based on a range of factors, including basic political stability and the absence of conflict, the quality of governance, the overall economic policy environment, and the commitment to design and implement a high-quality strategy to enhance food security.
- » **Potential for Agricultural-led Growth:** Within our strategy, the principle mechanism for reducing extreme hunger and poverty is agricultural-led growth. Thus, we will prioritize countries where poverty is still predominantly rural and where there is significant potential for improvements in agricultural productivity and market development.
- » **Opportunity for Regional Synergies:** We will work with countries that present strong opportunities to strengthen regional trade and development corridors, integrate markets and accelerate regional growth, and play a major role in regional trade.
- » **Resource availability:** A central tenet of our strategy is that creating lasting progress in food security will require deep investments in agricultural, economic, and social systems. To achieve this, our resources will be concentrated in a set of countries that have committed a substantial proportion of their own resources to provide the level of

support necessary to catalyze growth and significantly contribute to accelerating progress toward the MDGs. We are committed to coordinating with development partners to leverage additional resources, but recognize that prioritization and strategic choices are still required due to resource constraints.

4.2 Investment Overview

In cooperation with host governments and development partners, we will assist Focus Countries in developing Country Investment Plans (CIPs) for increasing agricultural-led growth and enhancing food security and in attracting financial and technical support to implement these plans. While the process for technical review of CIPs may vary by country or region, we are working with experts from CAADP, FAO, IFPRI, WB, and the regional development banks to help ensure that CIPs are based on rigorous analysis. Supporting country-led plans increases the long-term sustainability of donor investments in food security and strengthens coordination among stakeholders so that investments can be better leveraged. Because meaningful engagement with key stakeholders increases the likelihood that the country's food security strategy will be effective, equitable, and sustainable, consultation is critical from the outset. As such, we will support the participation of civil society and the private sector in the development, review, and implementation of CIPs.

Many countries have created strategies and plans for agricultural development, poverty reduction, and other sectors that relate to reducing hunger and poverty. These may include, among others, the government's CAADP Country Compact, Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS), or MCC Compact. To avoid duplication of effort and increase harmonization of plans and strategies, the CIP process will include a stocktaking of past and current efforts related to food security and should build on that work. At the same time, the CIPs will go to the next level of detail in establishing priorities and strategies for enhancing food security. They should include an analysis of key constraints to accelerating agricultural-led growth and improving nutrition and a set of prioritized policy changes and programs that address these key constraints.

We intend to invest in Focus Countries in two phases to help ensure the sustainability and impact of our investments. In Phase I, significant effort is devoted to *foundational investments* – technical, political, and financial support to assist a country in developing its CIP, conducting policy reform, and building the capacity for successful implementation of its CIP. This includes assistance to countries to help them address cross-cutting environmental and social issues, such as gender, climate change, and environmental degradation, in their strategic plans. Phase I investments also include *core investments* – investments in our two key objectives of inclusive agriculture sector growth and improved nutritional status (see Table 2 for illustrative examples). Our foundational investments in Phase I are designed to lay the groundwork for an expansion of core investments in Phase II, helping to provide both donors and recipients with the assurance that investments will be efficient, well-targeted, and mutually reinforcing.

The decision for a country to move from Phase I to Phase II is based on three criteria: (1) a multi-stakeholder review of the technical quality and soundness of the CIP, (2) evidence of coordination and consultation with key stakeholders, and (3) Focus Country commitment and capacity as indicated by follow-through on the country's own financial and policy commitments. When a country enters Phase II, it is eligible for larger-scale FTF investments in priority areas that are aligned with the CIP. In Phase II, we will invest in a greater proportion of core investments that result in scaled-up development impacts at the country and regional level, while continuing to build the foundation for sustainable and inclusive market-led growth.

TABLE 2 – ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES OF FOUNDATIONAL AND CORE INVESTMENTS

	Type	Illustrative Examples*
FOUNDATIONAL INVESTMENTS	Plan development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data systems that help target investments and monitor progress • Public expenditure review and analysis • Natural resources and environmental assessments that underpin a sustainable and climate resilient strategy • Gender assessments, including assessment of baseline sex-disaggregated data
	Policy reform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programs to increase women's control over land and other assets • Support for policy reforms, such as modern seed laws, land tenure reform, fisheries access and management reform, greater transparency, reduced tariff barriers, gender equality, and integrated community-based resource management policies
	Capacity building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills training of key government officials working on food security • Expansion of agricultural extension and research systems • Institution strengthening for modern fisheries management • Strengthening capacity for agricultural sector policy analysis, investment planning and performance monitoring
CORE INVESTMENTS	Inclusive agriculture sector growth and improved nutritional status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market information systems • Access to high-quality inputs (e.g., seeds, fertilizer) • Post-harvest infrastructure • Agribusiness development • Rural feeder roads and irrigation • Access to financial services • Adaptive research • Diet quality and diversification • Community-based, prevention-focused nutrition programs • Early warning systems and forecasting services • Productive safety nets • Women's empowerment • Natural resources management

*See Section 3.3 for more examples of potential FTF investments.

4.3 Guidance on Stakeholder Consultation

For Country Investment Plans to be successful, a sustainable mechanism for effective consultation and engagement with public and private stakeholders and other development partners is necessary to increase the effectiveness and inclusiveness of the CIP and leverage additional resources.

We will partner with and support other donors, the private sector, civil society, and NGOs during the development and implementation of the CIP. In particular, we will provide financial and technical support to stakeholders to increase their influence and participation in the planning process and to carry out the development activities envisioned in the CIP. For our investments, we will work with a broad range of implementing partners with a focus on impact, sustainability, and cost-effectiveness.

Because we place significant emphasis on the quality of host country government consultation to ensure transparency and accountability, stakeholder consultation and coordination is one of the criteria for determining whether a country is ready for Phase II. Quality consultation should reflect analytical work on gender and other social differences so that the full range of potential beneficiaries is represented in the consultation process and their needs are considered. To determine whether a Focus Country is ready to move to Phase II, FTF will look for evidence of consultation and coordination with the following key stakeholders:

TABLE 3 – ILLUSTRATIVE EVIDENCE OF STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

Stakeholders	As evidenced by, for example,
Affected communities	Feedback incorporated into the CIP
Private sector	Policy reforms to create enabling environment; increased private sector investment in agriculture and food security
Civil society	Feedback incorporated into CIP; durable mechanisms for transparency
Donor community	Alignment of funding through country-led coordination mechanism

Once the Focus Country enters Phase II, we will continue to support public consultation as a means of communication and transparency to:

- » Provide intended beneficiaries with the information needed to encourage and enable them to participate in projects that are funded in alignment with the CIP
- » Gather information from beneficiaries and stakeholders about the impact and effectiveness of these projects, with the goal of correcting problems and scaling up positive outcomes
- » Provide interested stakeholders and the general public with information about the progress and impact of the CIP as it is implemented.

4.4 Phase I Investments

During Phase I, our Focus Country investments will consist of a greater proportion of foundational investments. These foundational investments include technical, financial, and political support to the Focus Country to develop a CIP that includes:

- » Clear linkages to overall objectives and goals, including the poverty and hunger MDGs
- » Analysis of main constraints to achieving food security, including policy and institutional issues

- » Prioritized policy changes and investments based on potential impact
- » Clear government commitments to key policy changes and contributions to funding projects and programs
- » Assessment of technical feasibility reflecting best practices and sustainability
- » Sound economic, financial and beneficiary analysis
- » Integration of cross-cutting issues, including gender and the environment
- » Comprehensive results framework (RF) and monitoring and evaluation plan
- » Description of coordination between the CIP and other programs (e.g., infrastructure)
- » Strategies to build the country's institutional and professional capacity to fight hunger and poverty and sustain investments over time

Foundational investments also support countries in building the capacity and seeking policy reforms critical for the successful implementation of the CIP. Based on prior analysis, we will fund core investments in Phase I to increase agricultural-led growth and reduce undernutrition. These investments may be phased out, realigned or scaled up in accordance with the priorities that emerge as the CIP is developed.

4.5 Criteria for Moving from Phase I to Phase II

On an annual basis, the GHFS Coordinator, in consultation with the Deputy Coordinators and FTF Country Coordinators, will determine whether a country is ready to move from Phase I to Phase II. This determination will be based on recommendations that take into account assessments in the following areas:

Technically-sound Country Investment Plan: A review of the technical rigor of the CIP will be conducted by a multi-stakeholder team comprised of technical experts, development partners, and other stakeholders from civil society and the private sector. The purpose of the review is to identify gaps or weaknesses in the CIP and create a clearly defined action plan for addressing them.

Coordination and consultation with key stakeholders: The Focus Country government should provide documentation that illustrates the level and kind of consultation and coordination that has occurred with key stakeholders around the development of the CIP, as described in Section 4.3. In addition, coordination mechanisms, such as donor working groups, will be assessed for their capacity to align resources in the future.

Focus Country commitment and capacity: Focus Country government commitment to the CIP, including the creation of a policy environment conducive for investment, is essential for sustainability and success. Therefore, the GHFS Coordinator will evaluate country commitment and capacity in the following areas:

- » Adherence to basic principles of good governance and an overall policy environment conducive to achieving substantial results for the investments made
- » Progress made in a policy reform agenda linked to the CIP
- » Progress made in an implementation capacity building plan linked to the CIP
- » Level of government budget allocation in national food security.

Assessing progress in these four areas will be based on a set of indicators that measure both the progress toward reforms that a country has committed to and a set of objective, cross-country policy indicators. In addition, determinations on a Focus Country moving from Phase I to Phase II may take into account considerations of resource availability.

Further guidance on the Phase II criteria will be provided on the FTF website (www.feedthefuture.gov).

4.6 Phase II Investments

In preparing for Phase II, the FTF Country Coordinator will conduct an assessment of the comparative advantages of the USG relative to the activities and expertise of the country government and other development partners. This assessment should consider existing USG activities at the country and regional levels, as well as potential USG contributions. Based on this assessment, we will select our portfolio of Phase II investments, which must be consistent with the country's priority areas as set forth in the CIP and complementary to investments planned by the country and other donors. These investments may include new projects and/or scaling up existing projects that are effective.

When a Focus Country reaches Phase II, it can expect a higher overall level of FTF investment, with a greater proportion of core investments relative to foundational investments. The CIP describes investments at the plan and program level, rather than at the detailed project level. Therefore, we will conduct the analysis and preparatory work required for the development of specific projects, including project-level gender and environmental assessments.

4.7 Periodic Reviews

The overarching purpose of periodic reviews is to assess the overall FTF portfolio and guide our efforts such that we maximize impact within our resource constraints. Each year, the GHFS Coordinator will review the status of each Focus Country and decide when and whether a country is ready to move from Phase I to Phase II. Under certain circumstances, such as a major political event or natural disaster, deterioration in the investment environment, or a failure to reach milestones, the GHFS Coordinator may determine that a country should no longer be in Phase II or no longer be a Focus Country. In the long run, a country may improve its poverty and undernutrition levels such that we can begin to phase out and shift our investments to other countries with greater need and/or opportunity.

On the other hand, based on the opportunity for high impact, the GHFS Coordinator may determine that a Focus Country should receive increased support, or that a new country should become a Focus Country. In order to respond in a timely and effective way to unique and evolving country contexts, and in particular to unanticipated advances on an individual country's investment plans and policy environments, we plan to employ a strategic reserve – a budget mechanism that facilitates the concentration of resources in countries in which there are immediate opportunities for rapid development progress.

The GHFS Coordinator will also conduct multi-year performance reviews of investments across the FTF investment portfolio, including Focus Countries and complementary investments. The purpose of the multi-year reviews is to assess our cumulative activities and progress, to evaluate the effectiveness of specific investments and strategies, and to guide strategic and programmatic shifts moving forward. On the basis of the annual and multi-year reviews, the GHFS Coordinator will submit reports to Congress, which will be made publicly available on the FTF website (www.feedthefuture.gov).

5. COMPLEMENTARY INVESTMENTS

We will also engage in a set of complementary investments – in regional programs, the multi-donor trust fund for global agriculture and food security (the GAFSP), strategic partnerships, and global research and innovation – that are guided by the goal of sustainably reducing hunger and poverty in Focus Countries. Our complementary investments will be monitored through the Results Framework to help ensure that they have significant impact and contribute to our goal and objectives (see Section 7.0).

5.1 Regional Programs

Some significant challenges to food security are regional in nature. The small size, economic and geographic isolation, and poor infrastructure of many developing countries present challenges to food security that are not easily surmounted by investing within countries alone. Our regional program investments are guided by three main objectives: expanding access to regional markets; mitigating risks associated with drought, disaster, and disease; and building long-term capacity of regional organizations to address regional challenges.

5.1.1 Expanding Access to Regional Markets

We will prioritize investments that expand access to larger and better functioning regional markets. In regional markets, food can flow from countries that have surplus food to countries with deficit areas, increasing food availability and reducing the volatility of food prices.

In addition, market access for agricultural outputs and inputs will increase producers' incentives to make sustained investment in agricultural technologies.

In Africa and elsewhere, regional organizations have identified transport corridors that facilitate the movement of people, goods, and services across national borders. Developing these corridors involves improving regional infrastructure; encouraging consistent, transparent regulations along regional routes to reduce the time and cost at borders; and expanding trade and spurring market growth in agriculture and other sectors.

To generate broad-based economic development and alleviate poverty, transport corridors must be transformed into development corridors. This can be done through investments that identify and address the needs of local communities, increase national and regional capacity to manage cross-border natural resources, and improve the access of small-scale agricultural producers and enterprises to information about regional markets.

We will support regional development corridors through activities such as:

- » Developing common regulatory standards that are consistent with global standards, including in the areas of food safety and plant and animal health, and building country capacity to implement these standards
- » Building technical capacity to implement multilaterally agreed upon trade facilitation measures
- » Reducing tariffs and other formal trade restrictions
- » Reducing unnecessary or cumbersome customs procedures
- » Improving banking laws related to savings accounts, distribution channels, and payment systems to reduce barriers to cross-border capital flows

- » Strengthening information-sharing systems, including systems for regional commodity associations
- » Investing in infrastructure that connects communities and countries
- » Linking urban and rural food systems in ways that strengthen local and regional markets
- » Improving management of natural resources, including cross-boundary water resources.

5.1.2 Mitigating risks associated with drought, natural disasters, and disease

Our regional program investments also seek to mitigate regional food security risks from drought, flood, disease, and natural disaster, which have long contributed to food insecurity. Particularly in tropical environments, climate change poses increasing threats to food security in the form of more frequent droughts and floods, more violent weather events, rising sea level and sea surface temperatures, increased incidence and severity of pests and disease, and changes in the distribution and ecology of agricultural pests and pathogens.

Our regional program investments to mitigate these risks may be made in the following areas:

- » Research into regional disease, drought, and heat resistance crop varieties or technologies
- » Improved weather and climate forecasting, monitoring, and modeling systems
- » Insurance-based solutions for areas using good farming practices
- » Disaster early warning systems and response planning
- » Integrated land, watershed, and coastal management

5.1.3 Building Long-Term Capacity of Regional Organizations

To increase the sustainability of our investments, we will build government capacity to create and implement policies that will improve trade, investment, and the business environment through effective regional economic institutions. Building capacity can often be accomplished by investing in regional and sub-regional organizations, thereby leveraging existing regional and multilateral commitments to harmonize national policies and integrate regional markets. In addition to investing in regional economic organizations, we will invest in other regional organizations and plans that play a key role in agricultural development. Regional research organizations can contribute to developing improved technologies that can be used throughout a region. Investing in regional private sector organizations will help provide the coordination required to upgrade the value chain – including private sector investors, traders, transporters, warehouse operators, banks, and other lending institutions – and empower advocates for better regional policies and more stable investment environments.

Our regional programs to build long-term government capacity will include three key areas:

- » Accelerating existing regional plans for infrastructure improvements along key development corridors
- » Building the capacities of regional organizations to develop effective emergency planning, improve access to regional markets, undertake agricultural research on regional diseases, develop and disseminate actionable climate science information, and address food security issues that arise within national programs
- » Working with partners to develop and implement regional standards that harmonize food safety requirements and are consistent with international rules in key tradable staples such as rice and maize seed varieties

5.2 The Global Agriculture and Food Security Program

As part of our efforts to coordinate our bilateral assistance with other development partners, we intend to channel a portion of our FTF investments through eligible multilateral institutions such as the new World Bank-administered, multi-donor trust fund, the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program.²⁸ The GAFSP provides a transparent, additional, and flexible source of medium and long-term financing for public and private projects designed to improve food security in low-income countries. Through the GAFSP, we can leverage the financial resources of other GAFSP contributors and the substantial capacity and comparative advantages of the multilateral institutions that will implement its programs. Canada, Spain, South Korea and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation are, along with the USG, the initial contributors to GAFSP.

5.2.1 Eligible Countries and Institutions

The GAFSP has both public sector and private sector windows. On the public sector side, GAFSP financing is country-driven. The GAFSP will invest in countries that are classified as low income by the World Bank,²⁹ have high levels of food insecurity, and have demonstrated their commitment to a comprehensive approach for durably improving the food security of their people. While GAFSP financing is likely to benefit the FTF Focus Countries because of its similar eligibility criteria, we believe it can also assist other countries and finance projects that cross national borders. We expect that the GAFSP will also accept financing requests from regional economic communities. Finally, we expect that private firms and financial institutions doing business in eligible countries will be able to apply for financing through the GAFSP's private sector window, administered by the International Finance Corporation (IFC) – the private sector investment arm of the World Bank.

5.2.2 Eligible Investments

While we expect that the GAFSP's investments will be concentrated in critical rural infrastructure such as roads and irrigation that are not easily financed by bilateral donors, we expect that other GAFSP investments may include:

- » **Raising Agricultural Productivity** – Focusing on adoption of higher yielding technologies, technology generation, water management, and land rights and land use
- » **Linking Farmers to Markets** – Focusing on reducing transfer and transaction costs, supporting mobilization of rural finance, and other value-adding innovations
- » **Reducing Risk and Vulnerability** – Focusing on managing price and weather risk, strengthening food-related social protection in rural and urban areas, and improving nutrition of vulnerable groups
- » **Improving Non-Farm Rural Livelihoods** – Focusing on improving the investment climate and promoting non-farm rural entrepreneurship
- » **Technical Assistance, Institution-Building, and Capacity Development** – Focusing on capacity-building for sector strategy development and implementation; program design, monitoring and evaluation; knowledge development and dissemination; and private sector advisory services.

As appropriate, we will seek to ensure that GAFSP investment projects feed into the FTF Results Framework (see Section 7.0) and conform to the principles and objectives of FTF's gender and environment guidelines (see Section 6.0).

5.3 Strategic Partnerships

We seek to leverage the expertise, resources and leadership of strategic partner countries for the benefit of Focus Countries. Countries may be selected as strategic partners because of their influence on neighboring Focus Countries, their role as a regional anchor for food security, and/or their potential to contribute to the development of Focus Countries outside their region. We see our strategic partnerships as means of deepening important relationships as we combine our efforts to produce lasting change in the Focus Countries. The potential strategic partners are Brazil, India, Nigeria, and South Africa.

Through strategic partnerships, we seek to foster trilateral cooperation in the following areas:

- » Joint research and dissemination of technical assistance related to agriculture, nutrition, and poverty reduction that builds on the technical expertise in strategic partner countries
- » Promotion of regional or bilateral economic reforms based on the strategic partner's participation in regional economic organizations or trade relationships
- » Development of a strategic partner's role as a regional anchor through projects and policies that increase its stabilizing influence on Focus Countries
- » Political leadership to advance action in the Focus Countries
- » Mobilization of the private sector to participate in private-public partnerships and to invest in Focus Countries

5.4 Global Research and Innovation

Investment in agricultural research today drives the growth and resilience of the food supply for tomorrow. When combined with other investments in agricultural development and nutrition, research-based innovations can address some of the fundamental constraints that give rise to food insecurity by reducing production risks associated with pests, diseases, and weather patterns; increasing agricultural productivity and resource-use efficiency; contributing to market development; and enhancing food quality to assure a sufficient supply of macro and micro-nutrients to meet people's basic needs.

Public investment in agriculture by both developing countries and donors has declined over the past two decades despite new threats to food production, including new crop and livestock diseases, the decline in soil fertility and fisheries resources, and the challenges of climate change. At the same time, the agenda for agricultural research has expanded beyond improving agricultural yields to include the environmental, social, gender, and health dimensions of our global food supply. Because undernutrition is a major dimension of food security, agricultural and nutrition research that improves diet quality and diversity is also critical.

Investment in new agricultural technologies and practices will take place globally, regionally, and at the country level. Working beyond the country level allows the development and delivery of results that are applicable across countries. Global research will draw upon the multilateral Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) as well as harness the advancements and capacity of research institutions in the U.S. and elsewhere. At the same time, we recognize the central role that national systems in developing countries – universities, research institutions, and extension systems – play in informing the global research agenda of the needs of small-scale agricultural producers and adapting technologies to the needs of their agricultural producers and local consumers.

5.4.1 Investment in Priority Problems

Going forward, our research will be organized around solving specific high priority problems of productivity and nutrition alongside long-term investments in staple food systems. Research will also emphasize *systems solutions* – recognizing there are no silver bullets and that research must be applied in combination with other development interventions, such as extension, training, and market information systems, that promote growth, reduce risk, increase resource efficiency, add value, and increase environmental sustainability and resilience.

Based on a consultative and analytical process, we have identified several priority areas for research. We will continue to refine the specific priority problems under these areas to guide the realignment of existing research and to launch new global programs.

- » **Systems Research:** Transformation of major production systems requires building an integrated approach that combines component technologies and practices with cross-cutting natural resources and social and policy contexts. To link investments to the broader production, marketing, and social context, and to predict the future context for climate change adaptation efforts, we will launch several new systems-focused agendas to sustainably intensify specific agricultural production regions. These will integrate research on soil fertility, water and natural resources management, technologies with equitable impacts for women, risk management tools, improved nutritional content, climate change adaptation, policy, and assessment of pathways to enhance the uptake and impact of technology.
- » **Enhancing Staple Food Production:** This will include long-term investments in breeding and enhancement of productivity gains in livestock, fish and crops – including nutrient-dense crop varieties – that also reduce risk and enhance resilience and nutritional outcomes.
- » **Local-Regional Value Chains and Market Access:** Investments will emphasize post-harvest and market research aimed at increased access and efficiency of markets for small-scale producers – both men and women, as well as the role of policies and investment strategies in fostering greater participation and transparency of markets.
- » **Dietary quality and improved nutrition:** Investments will identify constraints to achieving dietary quality at the household and community level, including assessments of household-level food security; food and nutrient intake, particularly for the most vulnerable women and young children; barriers to sustainable production of diverse crops, fish and livestock; food marketing practices; food processing and fortification at national and community levels; and ways to reduce post-harvest losses focusing on perishable but highly nutritious items like fruits and vegetables. Based on assessments of cost, feasibility, and appropriateness, investments will be made to manufacture nutrient-dense new foods using local products, such as lipid-based nutrient supplements. In close coordination with the Global Health Initiative, we will conduct research to optimize delivery platforms for effective nutrition interventions.
- » **Public Policy Research:** Sound public policies and a robust enabling environment are essential to achieving global food security. Many governments may have limited capacity to conduct public policy analysis. We will provide support to governments and stakeholders to develop the capacity to analyze public policy choices and to build information systems to enable fact and science-based decision making.

5.4.2 Investments in Institutions and Capacity Building

A key component of our research support will be to strengthen the human, institutional, and policy framework for agricultural science and technology, including nutrition. At the global level, we will focus on catalyzing change by increasing attention to research within CIPs and providing platforms for country-level investments in training

and agricultural education, strengthening sustainable organizations that address national needs, and promoting the development of policies and regulations that facilitate the use of agricultural sciences. We will place particular emphasis on strengthening the linkages between global and national research and between research and adoption of technology. Our goal is to see developing countries increase their own investments alongside those of the development community.

To strengthen country agricultural research institutions, including universities and extension services, we may invest in the following:

- » Development of scalable and cost-effective programs for training the next generation of agricultural researchers and research administrators within host countries and elsewhere
- » Advancing women's leadership in science and technology through proactive recruitment, mentoring, and targeted research support
- » Formulating approaches to improving agricultural education and extension that is relevant to agricultural producers, their needs, and the local environment
- » Creating platforms for improving national capacity to collect, develop, analyze, and disseminate agricultural and market data
- » Developing measures to hold research institutions more accountable for delivering technologies to agricultural producers, beginning with purpose-driven research through stronger linkages to the private sector and extension systems

6. CROSS-CUTTING PRIORITIES

In all of our investments and activities, we will promote and foster a shared commitment to the goals and the fundamental principles set forth in our guidance on gender, environment, and climate change. This will be accomplished through early, consistent, and constructive engagement with country counterparts and other stakeholders and through support for food security programs that help partner countries address our mutual environmental, social, and development priorities.

6.1 Guidance on Gender

Women's contributions to agricultural production often go unrecognized. Therefore, it is less likely that policies and decisions consider women's roles and address gender inequalities. As a result, women's access to land and other key productive resources, including tools, technology, and inputs, can be limited, preventing them from moving from low productivity subsistence production to profitable farming. Despite their significant role as agricultural producers, women rarely have legal control over the land they farm. And because women are underrepresented in political and administrative structures, they often have a limited voice in decision-making organizations and cannot participate equally in agricultural training programs and producer organizations. For all of these reasons, women have fewer opportunities to invest in productivity increases and have less control over the returns from their labor. The result is that women are less able to provide food and care for themselves and their children.

Reducing gender inequality and recognizing the contribution of women to agricultural productivity is critical to achieving global food security. There is consistent and compelling evidence that when the status of women is improved, agricultural productivity increases, poverty is reduced, and nutrition improves (see Section 1.2). We will integrate gender concerns into all of our investments and help partner countries and implementing partners strengthen their capacity to consider and address the negative impacts of unequal access to and control over assets that affect women involved in all stages of the agricultural value chain.

6.1.1 Guiding Principles

Given the fundamental role that women play in achieving food security, three key principles will be mainstreamed through the design and implementation of FTF.

- » *We are committed to working with partner countries to promote gender-sensitive consultative processes* that ensure organizations with a mandate to represent gender concerns and interests will be included amongst those consulted.
- » *In all stages of planning and implementation of FTF investments, we will strive for gender equality*, especially in policies and programs related to market access.
- » *We recognize the importance of considering the gender impact of all FTF investments* on access to and control over assets: social, economic, and human capital.

6.1.2 Key Objectives

In all of our investments and partnerships, including those with host country governments and multilateral organizations, we seek to:

- » **Ensure that women, as agricultural producers, have equal access to assets, inputs, and technologies**, including land and other productive natural assets, extension services, financial services, agricultural inputs, and the knowledge to enable them to participate in and obtain appropriate returns from the agricultural system. Legal reforms, especially related to land rights, are often important to ensuring equal access.
- » **Expand the involvement and participation of women in decision-making** at all levels and in all institutions (community, national, regional, and global) related to policy, investment allocation, program development, and implementation. This effort will help ensure that women have a voice so their contributions can be recognized and their needs better met. Men need to be engaged in these change processes to achieve sustainable outcomes for the entire community.
- » **Ensure the interests of women and men are reflected in all FTF policies and programs and those of the host country's CIP**, including efforts to help ensure the participation of women, establish reasonable targets for participation of women, and monitor and evaluate program impact on both men and women.

6.1.3 Implementing the Gender Guidance for FTF Investments

To operationalize our principles and make progress toward our objectives, and be consistent with country strategies, we will make investments to:

- » **Support the incorporation of gender best practices** in the development and implementation of Country Investment Plans. We will provide technical assistance, where necessary, and up-to-date information on best practices through promotion and dissemination of resources, including documents such as the Agriculture and Gender Sourcebook,³⁰ and other resources such as websites and communities of practice.
- » **Implement consultation as a tool for gender integration**, including increased access for organizations representing women's food security and agriculture interests in consultations at all levels. When reviewing the quality and content of a Focus Country's consultative process as one criteria for Phase II readiness (see Section 4.3), we will assess how the country used social/gender analysis to involve and help ensure meaningful participation of women and men, and how the country will involve organizations representing their respective interests in the development and implementation of the CIP.
- » **Promote monitoring and evaluation of the gender impacts of our investments** by adopting FTF monitoring and evaluation plans that establish sex-disaggregated targets, track the impacts of our investments on women and men, and measure the progress of women's achievements related to men's. To do this, we will promote the sex-disaggregation of all data in both large-scale country and regional agricultural expenditure and consumption surveys, and project specific monitoring. The latter will include household level data so that the impact on both men and women within the household can be assessed.
- » **Develop approaches to target men and women with agricultural interventions**. This includes investments in sustainable labor-saving technologies so that shifts in the gender division of labor and products do not systematically disadvantage one sex over the other. Where water, fuel, and labor constraints increase the domestic chore burden on women and girls and prevent women from expanding agricultural production, labor-saving technologies such as pest and weed controls, improved tools, irrigation, and post-harvest technologies may be considered. Involving and recognizing both the men and women producers within the household in agricultural programs can be more sustainable than focusing on only the head-of-household.

- » **Improve targeting of financial services to women**, including providing women in farming and agribusiness access to financing at all levels, such as participation in microfinance and commercial loan programs to grow their businesses to small, medium and large enterprises. This should include reducing legal and other barriers to women's access to financing, including creating innovative financing methods to better meet the needs of women. Links between microfinance groups such as village savings and loan groups and other financial services, including insurance, will be supported. Other financial services such as leasing and long-term loans should be made available to women as well as men producers.

6.2 Guidance on Environment and Climate Change

Environmental degradation and climate change are critical cross-cutting issues that can affect the sustainability of investments in agricultural development and food security, impede long-term economic growth, and adversely affect livelihoods and wellbeing. Food security strategies must be designed not only to accelerate agricultural-led growth and reduce undernutrition, but also to encourage sustainable and equitable land, water, fisheries, and resource management practices. Poor land use and agricultural practices are common factors that contribute to environmental degradation and increase the vulnerability of developing countries to global threats, such as climate change, water scarcity, and pandemic disease. Expanding and intensifying agricultural productivity on a large scale can also adversely affect water resources and aquatic ecosystems, fisheries, and forests, reducing the resiliency of people and the environment to climate stresses and natural disasters.

While depleted or polluted resources, especially water, soils, forests, and fisheries affect everyone, they disproportionately affect the lives of the poor who often lack a voice in resource management decisions and typically have fewer options to cope with harmful changes in their environment. Moreover, competition for resources – including land, water, and other key inputs – and economic shocks due to climate change can undermine stability and exacerbate conflict risk.

We will integrate environmental and climate change concerns into our investments and support and build the capacity of partner countries to take advantage of opportunities in effective resource management and proactive adaptation to climate change.

6.2.1 Guiding Principles

We recognize the importance of promoting sound resource management, helping countries cope with the effects of climate change and variability, and ensuring our investments include appropriate environmental and social safeguard measures.

- » **We are committed to working with partner countries to promote climate-resilient and environmentally sustainable agricultural development** by integrating climate change and environmental stewardship into the design and implementation of FTF-funded projects, consistent with internationally recognized practices and procedures, and in accordance with applicable host country and USG regulations and safeguard policies.
- » **Consistent with the principle of country-driven development, we expect partner countries to consider potential environmental threats and opportunities** and manage the environmental implications of the CIP, but recognize that partner countries may require technical and financial assistance to do so effectively.
- » **We recognize that people's livelihoods and wellbeing depend on reliable and equitable access to natural resources** and will help partner countries strengthen their capacity to preserve and enhance natural ecosystems that are vital to achieving long-term agricultural development and food security outcomes and to responding to global environmental challenges such as climate change.

These principles reflect the U.S. government's commitments to address climate change and our acknowledgement that the success of our development efforts will depend upon efforts to foster low-carbon and climate-resilient growth. Environmental and climate change guidelines specific to FTF complement and reflect the effective integration of the U.S. climate change pillars of adaptation, clean energy, and sustainable landscapes.

6.2.2 Key Objectives

There are four distinct but related environmental and climate issues that should be considered throughout the program cycle, including conceptualization, design, implementation, and monitoring of our investments:

- » **Climate change adaptation** – Assess potential climate risks that could undermine the performance and sustainability of a proposed investment and incorporate measures into the project to reduce the vulnerability of the project to these risks.
- » **Natural resource management** – Identify the key natural resources that are critical to the objectives of an investment and incorporate measures into the project to promote sustainable and equitable management of and access to these resources.
- » **Environmental and social safeguards** – Assess the potential adverse effects of the proposed investment on the natural, physical, and social environment and incorporate measures into the project to prevent, control, or minimize these impacts to acceptable levels and in accordance with applicable regulations, standards, and best practices.
- » **Climate change mitigation** – Support low-carbon agricultural development by promoting carbon reducing or carbon sequestering land use practices and facilitating the deployment of improved management practices and technology where it directly supports the underlying goals of the investment program and is technically and economically appropriate to do so.

This guidance focuses on climate change adaptation and natural resource management because these are potential environmental stresses to food security programs. Though both are addressed separately here, in practice, natural resource management and climate change adaptation are integrated. Comprehensive guidelines and tools on environment and climate change will be developed.

6.2.3 Implementing the Guidance: Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience

Climate change poses a particularly troubling threat to global food security, making the challenge of confronting global hunger even harder and creating urgency around managing climate risks to investment in agriculture. Our investments can be directed to enhance the resilience of food security strategies and move towards a new framework that reflects current and future impacts that changes in climate and other environmental conditions will have on global hunger and food security. In the context of adaptation as an emerging science, FTF presents an early opportunity for the USG to integrate climate change into an important foreign policy and development objective. By integrating climate risk into food security efforts, we advance our commitment to helping the most vulnerable countries respond to the growth impact of climate change.

We will support Focus Countries in their efforts to incorporate climate change adaptation and resilience into their Country Investment Plans. In particular, technical and financial assistance may be provided to help partner countries:

- » **Assess Climate Risk and Vulnerability** – Ensuring a sustainable and resilient agricultural development strategy requires countries to understand the potential implications of current and anticipated climate risks and vulnerabilities on the strategic objectives of their food security programs. Assessing climate risk and vulnerability early in the planning phase helps identify where greater resilience and adaptive capacity is needed most and enables more informed

decisions on the composition and prioritization of proposed investments. Understanding risk and vulnerability does not equal perfect information about the future, but rather sufficient knowledge to identify larger trends and consider a range of options in a risk-management framework. The process of understanding vulnerability should be thought of as an iterative one.

- » **Develop, Prioritize, and Implement Adaptation Actions** – Identifying potential adaptive strategies is a process that involves a broad-reaching development phase in which options are brainstormed widely, indigenous knowledge and existing practices are considered, and capacity for local involvement is built. Stakeholders, communities, and partners are at the center of these efforts. Special attention should be given to the most vulnerable groups and investments that take into account the vulnerability, risks, and opportunities for these groups should be prioritized.
- » **Adopt Rigorous Evaluation and Adaptive Learning Techniques** – All investments in addressing climate risk to food security must come with a commitment to dynamic engagement, iterative learning, and rigorous evaluation which feeds into improved implementation in the long term. This process may include cost-benefit analysis of options, outcomes-oriented measures of effectiveness, consideration of time-sequencing issues (including opportunities to take advantage of early benefits), and broad consultations, especially with regard to local perceptions and acceptability of adaptive strategies. With evaluation, reporting, and capturing lessons, programs can be fine-tuned or overhauled as needed in order to maximize the long-term impact of investments in climate change adaptation for food security.

While, given significant predictive uncertainty, current tools cannot fully inform decisions, there are some basic approaches to resource management, such as improved soil, watershed, coastal, and marine resources management, that will likely improve resiliency and adaptation to climate change. By managing ecosystems for resilience to climate impacts, we can increase the value of relevant ecosystem services to agriculture, such as crop pollination, natural control of plant pests, water provision, and soil fertility.

6.2.4 Implementing the Guidance: Natural Resource Management

Sound management of natural assets – including land, water, forests, and fisheries – provides multiple benefits in terms of food production, environmental health, and nutrition. Properly managed watersheds, rangelands, forests, and fisheries enhance ecosystem functions that boost agricultural productivity, increase access to clean water, replenish aquifers, mitigate damage from storms and floods, and reduce negative environmental impacts from agriculture. In some communities, natural resources serve as primary sources of food and income, and can also act as important safety nets for smallholders when crops fail. Sustainable food security must be achieved within existing constraints on freshwater resources, land, marine resources, and other natural assets. Integrated resource management approaches are the best method to balance demands for resources for agriculture, people, and ecosystems.

We will support Focus Countries in their efforts to advance both policy reforms and the development of a range of improved technologies and approaches through research, extension, and other outreach which provide improved management of natural assets. In particular, we will provide assistance to:

- » **Ensure secure and equitable tenure and access** by supporting investments that enhance tenure security and resource rights for land and other natural assets and strengthen the capacity of local communities and institutions to maintain sound resource management. Tenure security increases investments and productivity of natural assets. Emphasis will be placed on reliable and equal access to natural resources for poor and marginalized groups, especially women.

- » ***Sustain functions of terrestrial, freshwater, and marine ecosystems*** through support for sustainable management of croplands, watersheds, rangelands, forests, fisheries, freshwater, marine, and coastal ecosystems that provide environmental services that contribute to long-term productivity of food systems, environmental health, and nutrition.
- » ***Foster soil conservation practices that improve productivity of degraded soils*** by supporting farming practices that build soil carbon, improve the efficiency of fertilizer and water inputs, increase drought resilience, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and minimize adverse environmental impacts to soil, water, and forest resources.
- » ***Increase water efficiency and sustainability in agriculture*** through promoting water conservation and efficiency measures that can significantly increase the productivity of agricultural water use while helping to ensure sustainable supplies of freshwater for other human and ecosystem uses.
- » ***Improve management of capture fisheries and encourage development and application of sustainable aquaculture practices*** by working to reduce habitat destruction; illegal, unregulated and unreported (IUU) and unsustainable fishing practices; freshwater and marine pollution; and excessive water withdrawals to protect and enhance fishery resources in freshwater, estuarine, coastal, and marine systems. We will promote modern management approaches to increase capture fisheries productivity and sustainability and encourage the use of sustainable aquaculture practices as part of food security strategies.

7. RESULTS FRAMEWORK (RF)

As reflected in the *Paris Declaration*, the *Accra Agenda for Action* and the *Rome Principles*, a robust system to measure progress and ensure accountability is central to improving aid effectiveness. Donors and partner countries must set benchmarks and targets for investments – and be held publicly accountable to them. Collecting, analyzing, and reporting information about program progress and impact facilitates learning from successes and mistakes and sharing of best practices. We will support the development of common monitoring and evaluation systems at country, regional, and multilateral levels to track the progress of our investments and the investments of others.

The FTF Results Framework reflects the types of program components that are expected to lead to benefits at household, community, and national levels based on evidence around the key drivers of agricultural-led growth and food security. The general RF, shown in graphical form in Figure 1, outlines our goal of sustainably reducing poverty and hunger; our key objectives of inclusive agricultural sector growth and improved nutritional status, and our program objectives at the next level below.³¹ It also includes indicators associated with our goal and key objectives. Below the key objectives level, the general RF will be adapted to create a country-specific RF to assist in designing our programs in support of the Country Investment Plans and in measuring our progress.

Our commitment to promote results-driven planning and performance-based management includes efforts to harmonize our RF with the results frameworks used by partner countries, other development partners and regional initiatives such as the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program. A shared results framework at the country level will leverage our investments by facilitating coordinated investment design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. By illustrating the types of program components that contribute to reducing poverty and hunger, and showing the causal linkages between varying levels of objectives and indicators, our general RF may be a resource for Focus Countries in the development of their programs and monitoring and evaluation plan described in their CIPs.


Depending on the country context, objectives and indicators will vary in importance, applicability, and feasibility. We will conduct data inventories to determine where existing data are insufficient or of poor quality. Based on these inventories, we will collect additional data and help build the capacity of responsible government entities to improve data collection, analysis and reporting. We will engage in efforts to disaggregate data by sex and to collect data to monitor the environmental sustainability and climate resilience of our investments.

Our evaluation strategy will focus our resources on answering questions to inform future program design at the national, regional, and global level. We seek to collect and evaluate reliable information so that we learn from our experience and develop results that we can share with partner countries, stakeholders, and other development partners. We recognize that achieving progress, especially toward the goal of sustainably reducing global poverty and hunger, will take time. Monitoring and evaluation is an iterative learning process that operationalizes our principle of a sustained and accountable approach.

We will also conduct national and program level evaluations that are intended to answer questions regarding drivers of change in agriculture sector performance, the welfare of rural households, and nutrition. Using systematic qualitative and quantitative methods, efforts will be made to better understand the contribution of our investments to broader changes and trends. For a subset of innovative programming, investments in rigorous impact evaluation will help ensure efficacy before scale-up and also yield lessons for broader application.

FIGURE I

FEED THE FUTURE RESULTS FRAMEWORK



ENDNOTES

- ¹ G8 Summit Statement on Food Security, "L'Aquila" Joint Statement on Global Food Security – L'Aquila Food Security Initiative (July 10, 2009), found at http://www.g8italia2009.it/static/G8_Allegato/FINAL_DECLARATION%5b1%5d.2.pdf.
- ² Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2009* (2009), found at <http://www.fao.org/docrep/012/i0876e/i0876e00.htm>.
- ³ See Johanna Nesseseth Tuttle, J. Stephen Morrison, Senator Robert P. Casey, Jr., Senator Richard G. Lugar, and Representative Betty McCollum, cochairs, Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) Task Force on Global Food Security, *Cultivating Global Food Security – A Strategy for U.S. Leadership on Productivity, Agricultural Research and Trade* (CSIS): April 27, 2010), found at http://csis.org/files/publication/100422_Food_%20Security_WEB.pdf.
- ⁴ G8 Summit Statement on Food Security, "L'Aquila" Joint Statement on Global Food Security – L'Aquila Food Security Initiative (July 10, 2009), found at http://www.g8italia2009.it/static/G8_Allegato/FINAL_DECLARATION%5b1%5d.2.pdf.
- ⁵ These statistics refer to official development assistance for the agriculture sector, including forestry and fisheries, of the 22 countries that are members of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC). OECD-DAC, *Measuring Aid to Agriculture* (April 2010), found at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/54/38/44116307.pdf>.
- ⁶ United States Agency for International Development, *Global Food Insecurity and Price Increase Update #3* (May 30, 2008), found at http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/humanitarian_assistance/foodcrisis/documents/053008_USAIDFoodInsecurityUpdate03.pdf.
- ⁷ World Bank, *Repositioning Nutrition as Central to Development: A Strategy for Large-Scale Action* (2006), found at: <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/NUTRITION/Resources/281846-1131636806329/NutritionStrategy.pdf>.
- ⁸ John Beddington, Chief Scientific Advisor to HM Government, *Food, Energy, Water and the Climate: A Perfect Storm of Global Events?* (2009) (stating that grain demand is projected to grow by 50%, and that FAO's prediction is that total crop and livestock demand and production will rise around 40% between 2008 and 2030) (citing World Bank, *World Development Report 2008* (October 19, 2008); FAO, *World Agriculture Towards 2030/2050* (2006)).
- ⁹ U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), *International Food Security – Insufficient Efforts by Host Governments and Donors Threaten Progress to Halve Hunger in Sub-Saharan Africa by 2015* (May 2008), found at <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d08680.pdf>. Grain yield, according to GAO, is measured by kilograms of cereal production per acre.
- ¹⁰ Gerald Nelson, Mark Rosegrant, Jawoo Koo, Richard Robertson, Timothy Sulser, Tingju Zhu, Claudia Ringer, Siwa Msangi, Amanda Palazzo, Miroslav Batka, Marilia Magalhaes, Rowena Valmonte-Santos, Mandy Ewing, and David Lee (IFPRI), *Climate Change – Impact on Agriculture and Costs of Adaptation* (updated 2009), available at <http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/publications/pr21.pdf>.
- ¹¹ The reduction in poverty associated with growth in agricultural income depends on the country setting, the commodity focus of the agricultural growth, and the type of improved agricultural technology adopted. Xinshen Diao, Peter Hazell, Danielle Resnick, and James Thurlow, *The Role of Agriculture in Development – Implications for Sub-Saharan Africa*, (IFPRI Research Report 153: 2007), found at <http://www.fanrpan.org/documents/d00369>. See, also, Luc Christiansen, Lionel Demery, and Jesper Kuhl, *The Role of Agriculture in Poverty Reduction – An Empirical Perspective* (World Bank Policy Research Working Paper no. 4013: 2006), found at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=931990; Colin Thirtle, Lin Lin, and Jennifer Piesse, *The Impact of Research-Led Agricultural Productivity Growth on Poverty Reduction in Africa, Asia and Latin America*, 31 *World Development* 1959 (2003).
- ¹² Kenda Cunningham, "Connecting the Milk Grid: Smallholder Dairy in India," in D.J. Spielman and R. Pandya-Lorch, eds., *Millions Fed: Proven Successes in Agricultural Development* (IFPRI: 2009), found at <http://www.ifpri.org/publication/millions-fed>.
- ¹³ Melinda Smale and T.S. Jayne, "Breeding an 'Amazing' Crop: Improved Maize in Kenya, Malawi, Zambia, and Zimbabwe," in D.J. Spielman and R. Pandya-Lorch, eds., *Millions Fed: Proven Successes in Agricultural Development* (IFPRI: 2009), found at <http://www.ifpri.org/publication/millions-fed>.
- ¹⁴ Chris Reij, Gray Tappan, and Malinda Smale, "Re-Greening the Sahel: Farmer-led Innovation in Burkina Faso and Niger," in D.J. Spielman and R. Pandya-Lorch, eds., *Millions Fed: Proven Successes in Agricultural Development* (IFPRI: 2009), found at <http://www.ifpri.org/publication/millions-fed>.
- ¹⁵ FAO, *Women and Food Security*, found at <http://www.fao.org/FOCUS/E/Women/Sustin-e.htm>.
- ¹⁶ IFPRI, IFPRI Issue Brief, *Women: Still the Key to Food and Nutrition Security* (2005), found at [http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/lib.nsf/db900sid/LKAU-6AZJNC/\\$file/Women_Food_2005.pdf?openement](http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/lib.nsf/db900sid/LKAU-6AZJNC/$file/Women_Food_2005.pdf?openement).
- ¹⁷ Martha Walsh, *Women in Food Aid Interventions: Impacts and Issues* (1998) (reviewing academic and program-related literature on the results and effects of women participating in food-related development activities), found at http://one.wfp.org/policies/introduction/background/faad/FAAD_English/aaq1_532e98.html.
- ¹⁸ These USG agencies include, among others, the Export-Import Bank of the United States, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, the Peace Corps, the U.S. African Development Foundation, the U.S. Agency for International Development, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. Department of Defense, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the U.S. Department of Labor, the U.S. Department of State, the U.S. Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the U.S. Trade and Development Agency, and the U.S. Department of the Treasury.
- ¹⁹ International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, *World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development* (October 19, 2007), p. 165.
- ²⁰ See United Nations High-Level Task Force on the Global Food Crisis, *Comprehensive Framework for Action* (July 2008), found at <http://www.un.org/issues/food/taskforce/Documentation/CFA%20Web.pdf>; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, *World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development* (October 19, 2007); D.J. Spielman and R. Pandya-Lorch, eds., *Millions Fed: Proven Successes in Agricultural Development* (IFPRI: 2009), found at <http://www.ifpri.org/publication/millions-fed>. Further information on best practices in food security programming will be made available on the FTF website (www.feedthefuture.gov).
- ²¹ The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, *Repositioning Nutrition as Central to Development* (2006), found at <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/NUTRITION/Resources/281846-1131636806329/NutritionStrategy.pdf>.
- ²² See Results Framework, Section 7.0.
- ²³ See United Nations High-Level Task Force on the Global Food Crisis, *Comprehensive Framework for Action* (July 2008), found at <http://www.un.org/issues/food/taskforce/Documentation/CFA%20Web.pdf>; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, *World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development* (October 19, 2007); D.J. Spielman and R. Pandya-Lorch, eds., *Millions Fed: Proven Successes in Agricultural Development* (IFPRI: 2009), found at <http://www.ifpri.org/publication/millions-fed>. Further information on best practices in food security programming will be made available on the FTF website (www.feedthefuture.gov).
- ²⁴ See Section 5.1 for additional details on FTF investments in regional programs that will further promote inclusive growth of the agricultural sector.
- ²⁵ GHI is a priority USG initiative that seeks to achieve significant health improvements and create an effective, efficient, and country-led platform for the sustainable delivery of essential health care and public health programs.
- ²⁶ Deutsche Welthungerhilfe, International Food Policy Research Institute, and Concern Worldwide, 2009 Global Hunger Index, *The Challenge of Hunger: Focus on Financial Global and Gender inequality* (2009), found at <http://www.ifpri.org/publication/2009-global-hunger-index>.
- ²⁷ Bingxin Yu, Liangzhi You, and Shenggen Fan, IFPRI Discussion Paper 00945, *Towards a Typology of Food Security in Developing Countries* (January 2010), found at <http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/publications/ifripdp00945.pdf>.
- ²⁸ Institutions eligible to implement investment or technical assistance projects under the GAFSP include the World Bank, the IFAD, regional development banks, FAO, and the WFP.
- ²⁹ Currently defined as per capita income of \$1,135/year or less. Countries currently in arrears to the Bank will be ineligible for GAFSP financing.
- ³⁰ World Bank, International Fund for Agricultural Development and FAO, *Gender and Agriculture Sourcebook* (2009), found at <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTGENAGRLIVSOUBOOK/Resources/CompleteBook.pdf>. Also, see the tools referenced in two publications: (1) C. March, I. Smyth, and M. Mukhopadhyay, *A Guide to Gender-Analysis Frameworks* (1999); and (2) Caroline O.N. Moser, *Gender Planning and Development: Theory, Practice, and Training* (1993).
- ³¹ FTF's goal and key objectives are described in detail in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, respectively.