

---

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT  
GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY STRATEGY  
IMPLEMENTATION REPORT  
FOR 2019

---

---

FEED THE FUTURE

# **Report on the Implementation of the *Global Food-Security Strategy* (GFSS) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2019**

## **Table of Contents**

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

**Report on Implementation of the *Global Food-Security Strategy***

**The Journey to Self-Reliance (J2SR)**

**Mobilizing the Private Sector**

**Win with Women**

**Evidence and Research Pave the Way**

### **Appendices**

1. Executive Summary of the GFSS
2. Updates from the Interagency Working Group
3. Updates from Individual Departments and Agencies
4. Spending Report
5. Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Indicators
6. Performance Data
7. Glossary of Key Terms

## **Message from the USAID Administrator**

As the Global Coordinator for Feed the Future, the U.S. Government's global hunger and food security initiative, it is my pleasure to report on the implementation of the U.S. Government *Global Food-Security Strategy* (GFSS) for Fiscal Year 2019—the third annual review of the Administration's commitments, achievements, and lessons-learned in reducing global hunger, poverty, and malnutrition.

This past year, with the reauthorization of the bi-partisan *Global Food-Security Act of 2016*, we saw the powerful reaffirmation of the commitment of the United States to empower smallholder farmers and strengthen communities and economies to protect and accelerate their progress on the Journey to Self-Reliance.

Feed the Future continues to reduce poverty and stunting in the areas in which we work and has helped millions of women realize greater economic potential. Amid this progress, we also face increasing challenges. Hunger has risen, primarily because of conflict, climate variability, and economic downturns. Against this global backdrop, our focused determination to work with other governments, civil society, and the private sector to address the root causes of hunger and poverty in our partner countries so they can advance on the Journey to Self-Reliance also benefits us at home in the United States. Feed the Future's work opens new markets for U.S. businesses, improves the policy environment for responsible private investment and trade, and creates demand for U.S. innovations and expertise. Smart, effective investments and policies will create a more peaceful and stable world that is resilient to shocks, stresses, and recurrent humanitarian crises, which in the long run should end the need for sustained foreign assistance.

The GFSS continues to align our efforts from Washington to the field to advance catalytic partnerships and scalable innovations. We look forward to working closely with Congress, national governments, the private sector, universities, beneficiaries, and other stakeholders on our collective vision. Ending hunger is possible. Together, we can continue to turn scarcity into abundance, desperation into hope, and hardship into opportunity.

Sincerely,

Mark Green  
USAID Administrator

## **Report on the Implementation of the U.S. Government’s *Global Food-Security Strategy* during Fiscal Year (FY) 2019**

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

In the third year of implementing the GFSS, Feed the Future made significant progress in accelerating women’s empowerment and entrepreneurship; strategically aligning resilience, food safety, and research investments for impact; and making progress toward the interagency’s Target Country graduation process to advance the Journey to Self-Reliance. Congress highlighted food security as a national-security priority within the 2018 National Defense Authorization; moreover, the 2019 Congressional Report on *Global Food-Systems Vulnerability* published by the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) highlighted Feed the Future for its role in preserving and protecting food systems, reducing instability, and successfully creating secure markets for regional and global trade. Feed the Future advances the Administration’s priorities of sustainably reducing global humanitarian needs that give rise to U.S. Government international humanitarian spending and holding governments, civil society, and the private sector in partner nations accountable to design, manage, and fund their own solutions to their development challenges. Feed the Future’s agricultural research also has a global impact and reduces the vulnerability of the United States and worldwide food systems to drought, pests, and other diseases.

Feed the Future is making an impact. Based on our measured results between baseline and interim findings, we estimate that, between 2010 and 2017, 23.4 million more people are living above the poverty line, 3.4 million more children are living free from stunting, and 5.2 million more families have escaped hunger since the initiative began. We estimate that, over this period, poverty has dropped an average of 23 percent, and childhood stunting has dropped by 32 percent across the areas where we work.<sup>1</sup> In 2018, Feed the Future programs helped more than 175,000 women and their businesses. For example, the results from Feed the Future’s Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) show women have more access to finance and a greater opportunity to influence household decision-making and leadership within the community. Feed the Future continues to elevate resilience and nutrition and encourage investments from host governments and the private sector across our programming to ensure

---

<sup>1</sup> Feed the Future Progress Snapshot (2018).

communities navigate dynamic challenges to food security successfully on their Journeys to Self-Reliance.

The Administration continues to seek the most efficient use of foreign-assistance resources, including those that support food security. In the President’s Budget Request for FY 2019, the Administration proposed to reduce or eliminate funding for several partner Agencies and programs within Feed the Future identified as duplicative, ineffective, and/or inefficient.<sup>2</sup>

### **The Journey to Self-Reliance**

National leadership, political will, the mobilization of domestic resources, private-sector investment, transparency, and a commitment to results and accountability are critical to the long-term sustainability and success of our investments and partnerships to support smallholder producers. Feed the Future supports national policy reform and implementation and urges governments to set their own policy and funding priorities for food security and nutrition. Host-government commitment to, and investment in, food security were two of the criteria by which the U.S. Government selected Target Countries for Feed the Future. To publicly affirm our mutual expectations and actions to reduce hunger, poverty, and malnutrition, Feed the Future has memorialized commitments to food security in Target Countries through a series of signed “Declarations of Partnership” with seven partner governments in the Federal Democratic Republics of Nepal and Ethiopia; the Federal Republic of Nigeria; and the Republics of Uganda, Sénégal, Niger, and Ghana. This was an optional step governments in Target Countries could take after completing their Feed the Future Country Plans.

Feed the Future is forming Country Support Teams for all 12 Target Countries and an additional 15 Aligned Countries that have significant and complementary programming in agriculture, resilience, nutrition, and water, sanitation, and hygiene. Specifically, the initiative established Country Support Teams for Kenya, Sénégal, and Nepal as pilots, and the remaining will be fully stood up between October 2019 and January 2020. Each Country Support Team welcomes interagency contributions from Washington and at post, and their objective is to support progress toward each of the Target Country Plans (see Appendix 3); create synergies across programming and other U.S. Government initiatives; crowd-in private-sector investment; and leverage all whole-of-Government tools to meet the GFSS’ goal to sustainably reduce poverty, hunger, and malnutrition. All Feed the Future Target Countries will receive a graduation score (explanation follows), with a scorecard that outlines their progress along the Journey to Self-Reliance. The Feed the Future Graduation Scorecard is a tool to assist each Feed the Future Country

---

<sup>2</sup> These agencies and programs include the U.S. African Development Foundation (USADF), Inter-American Foundation (IAF), the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), USDA’s McGovern-Dole Food for Education and Food for Progress programs, and USAID’s P.L. 480 Title II food aid program.

Coordinator and interagency team to identify short- and long-term areas of success, opportunities, and course corrections, if any.

### *Graduation of Target Countries*

The Feed the Future interagency established a transparent, data-driven policy and review process to determine a country's readiness to graduate from the status of a Target Country to a new relationship with the U.S. Government. This past year, the interagency worked to put in place the *Feed the Future Target-Country Graduation Policy and Review Process*. A pilot review process for graduation, which started in 2019, tests our approaches to measure a Target Country's readiness to move on. Next year will be the first year Feed the Future could identify a country as a candidate for graduation, by evaluating quantitative and qualitative data on the following three high-level analytical dimensions:

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

### **Mobilizing the Private Sector**

The private sector is the most important factor in advancing and sustaining inclusive, agriculture-led economic growth and nourishing populations. In some areas in Feed the Future Target and Aligned Countries, private-sector businesses can play critical roles to help smallholders and other producers enter global commodity supply-chains and are increasingly important to expanding consumer markets.

Feed the Future has worked with the private sector to modernize and transform food systems in Target and Aligned Countries; realign them to better serve low-income consumers, producers, and processors; make them more resilient against economic and environmental shocks; and increase their abilities to deliver safe, nutritious food year-round and over the long term. The Alliance for Inclusive and Nutritious Food-Processing, for example, is a Feed the Future partnership with Partners in Food Solutions, a consortium of six leading global food companies: General Mills, Cargill, Royal DSM, Bühler, the Hershey Company, and Ardent Mills. By drawing on the world-class expertise and global capabilities of these companies, this partnership creates a stronger food-processing sector in four African countries—which, in turn, generates

economic growth; increases the production of safer, more nutritious foods; and makes those products more available to “base-of-the-pyramid” and low-income consumer segments.

Feed the Future has played a key role in developing private-sector partnerships that advance Feed the Future’s goals, achieve business objectives, and support the U.S. Government’s broader policy priorities and initiatives. It also contributes to the Women’s Global Development and Prosperity Initiative (W-GDP) and Prosper Africa, an interagency effort that unlocks opportunities to promote trade between Africa and the United States and investment in the United States by African countries and vice versa. For example, in November 2018, USAID and Corteva Agriscience signed a Memorandum of Understanding that will help open new markets for U.S. technologies and advance science that potentially will benefit both U.S. farmers and smallholder farmers abroad.

Feed the Future aims to strategically deploy the U.S. Government’s investments to mobilize private capital sustainably at scale. For example, the Feed the Future Kenya Investment Mechanism (KIM) aims to unlock as much as \$400 million in private finance and investment into four key value-chains— dairy, livestock, horticulture, and clean energy. KIM works with local financial institutions to help them develop the know-how and financial products to serve small and medium-sized enterprises, provides financial incentives to unlock local private capital, and supports the development of local providers of business-advisory services.

The GFSS also incentivizes and nurtures market-based solutions to the constraints that perpetuate hunger, poverty, and malnutrition. For example, the Feed the Future Innovation and Entrepreneurship for Food Safety project, which began in June 2019, examines the social, economic, and commercial barriers that deter the adoption of food-safety practices. The project also supports a range of private-sector partners to incorporate them into their business models to normalize behavioral changes around food safety across the food system.

### **Win with Women**

Women are essential to ensuring self-reliance, prosperity, nutrition, and resilience in the countries in which Feed the Future works. When women are economically empowered, they re-invest in their families and communities and create a multiplier effect that provides global benefits and stability. Feed the Future breaks down barriers that hold women back to unleash their economic potential as full participants in society.

The GFSS promotes women’s empowerment and equality between women and men in its programming, policies, and research. Feed the Future continues to prioritize the collection and use of sex-disaggregated data and has funded the development of the Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) and the project-level WEAI, which programs can use to identify key

areas of women’s (and men’s) disempowerment, design appropriate strategies to address deficiencies, and monitor outcomes related to women’s empowerment. The new Feed the Future Advancing Women’s Empowerment project will enhance the capacity of the U.S. Government and partners to design, implement, and learn from gender-responsive programming.

Feed the Future invests in women entrepreneurs who have a significant and growing presence throughout agriculture and food systems, yet are disproportionately underserved and often face less-favorable terms to gain access to financing and other essential resources to grow their businesses. Between 2011 and 2018, Feed the Future unlocked more than \$630 million in loans for women farmers and women-owned businesses.

In 2018 alone, Feed the Future helped more than 2.9 million women producers apply improved agricultural technologies and practices on over 1.17 million hectares of land. Additionally, the analysis of WEAI mid-term results shows that the key constraints to empowerment in the areas where Feed the Future concentrates its programming have improved from 2011, when the initiative was launched, through 2015—2.6 million more women have had access to credit and are able to make decisions on its use, 3.3 million more women have had reasonable workloads, and 3.7 million more women have had input into productive decisions in these areas.

Despite this progress, women still face barriers to reaching their full economic potential, and women farmers apply new technologies and practices in a lower proportion than their male counterparts. To ensure investments in technology and training have full impact now and for years to come, Feed the Future is building the capacity of in-country public- and private-extension actors to strengthen women’s empowerment in agriculture by applying tools developed in partnership with U.S. university experts, such as *Assessing How Agricultural Technologies Can Change Gender Dynamics and Food Security Outcomes*, and the *Competency Framework for Integrating Gender and Nutrition Within Agricultural Extension Services*.<sup>3</sup> In addition, Feed the Future is exploring effective digital platforms to improve women’s agricultural practices through the *Feed the Future Developing Local Extension Capacity Activity*.<sup>4</sup>

Feed the Future will continue to build partnerships with the private sector and with the recently launched W-GDP Initiative to advance gender equality and women’s empowerment through agriculture and food systems.

### **Evidence and Research Pave the Way**

---

<sup>3</sup> Assessing how Agricultural Technologies Can Change Gender Dynamics and Food Security Outcomes <https://ingenaes.illinois.edu/technology-assessment-toolkit/>; Competency Framework for Integrating Gender and Nutrition within Agricultural Extension Services [https://ingenaes.illinois.edu/wp-content/uploads/INGENAES-2017\\_08-Nutrition-and-Gender-in-Extension-Competency-Framework.pdf](https://ingenaes.illinois.edu/wp-content/uploads/INGENAES-2017_08-Nutrition-and-Gender-in-Extension-Competency-Framework.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> Feed the Future Developing Local Extension Capacity <https://www.agrilinks.org/activities/feed-future-developing-local-extension-capacity-project>

Feed the Future strengthens national data systems in Target Countries to improve their policy-making and build local capacity and accountability, while maintaining the highest levels of accountability for results, even as we reduce the long-term costs of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) to the U.S. Government. In 2018, the U.S. Government and other donors coordinated with the World Bank, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, and the International Fund for Agricultural Development to prioritize the design and start up the “50 X 2030” Initiative, which builds capacity and commitment in 50 countries to collect, analyze, and use agricultural data.<sup>5</sup>

### *Leading with the Data*

Building on the strong culture of learning established under the first phase of Feed the Future, we use M&E findings to continuously improve programming. This culture of learning greatly influenced the development of the GFSS itself. In September 2018, Feed the Future launched a new Learning Agenda for public comment to provide a framework for addressing the biggest evidence gaps and to better target our learning efforts. Each year, U.S. Government Departments and Agencies review their Feed the Future investments to increase and scale impact in high-performing programs and correct or terminate low-performing ones to maximize the effectiveness of taxpayer resources. For example, new analysis of our population-based survey data for nutrition helped identify statistically significant improvements in underweight and women’s dietary diversity, but not in other important indicators. This shifted our focus from production and households to a more comprehensive food-systems approach.

### *Catalyzing Research Investments*

The interagency 2017 *Global Food Security Research Strategy* guides the prioritization of Feed the Future’s research investments in Feed the Future Innovation Labs, other U.S. university-based programs, and the centers of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). Feed the Future aligns its research activities with this *Strategy*, and refines and amplifies them in partnership with the presidentially appointed Board for International Food and Agricultural Development attached to USAID and other activities sponsored by U.S. Government Departments and Agencies beyond Feed the Future.

To ensure the effective use of resources for research to address the highest priorities of the GFSS, USAID and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) have agreed to co-lead a new Feed the Future Interagency Working Group on Research, which will inform research investments and coordinate the U.S. Government’s resources in support of the *Global Food Security Research Strategy* to address emerging pests and disease threats.

---

<sup>5</sup>Data to End Hunger: The 50 X 2030 Initiative <http://www.data4sdgs.org/50by2030>

Feed the Future continues to work with partners to further refine, test, and commercialize innovative solutions. A 2017 study on innovations developed by Feed the Future Innovation Labs found that 81 percent of the technologies reported as ready for uptake were actually handed off to technology-scaling entities.

One such innovation, developed by the Feed the Future Innovation Lab for the Reduction of Post-Harvest Loss (PHL IL) scientists, is the GrainMate moisture-meter. This innovation builds on foundational work previously supported through USDA's Food for Progress Program to enable farmers and the purchasers of grain to accurately measure the moisture content of grains and animal feed before storage. Proper drying of grain is critical to prevent the growth of fungi that produce toxins harmful to humans and animals. Several hundred farmers and crop aggregators in Ghana, the German Development Agency (GIZ), the Ghana Grains Council, and others use the meter to reduce post-harvest loss and ensure safe food and feed. Paul Armstrong, a scientist with USDA's Agricultural Research Service, invented GrainMate, and Isaac Sesi, an African engineer and entrepreneur supported by the PHL IL, commercialized it. Sesi has received several awards for his work on this important technology, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology named him one of its "35 Innovators Under 35" in 2019.

To further advance such research, USAID designed four new Innovation Labs in 2018 and 2019 that align with the themes laid out in the *Global Food Security Research Strategy*.<sup>6</sup> These investments collectively will address challenges associated with markets, risk, and resilience; food security policy, capacity, and influence; food safety; and crop improvement. These innovations coupled with strong private-sector engagement and host-country partnership will pave the way to reduce global hunger, poverty, and malnutrition and help countries achieve greater self-reliance.

---

<sup>6</sup> Feed the Future Innovation Labs <https://www.feedthefuture.gov/feed-the-future-innovation-labs/>

## Appendix 1: Executive Summary of the *Global Food-Security Strategy (GFSS)*

Our vision remains a world free from hunger, malnutrition, and extreme poverty; where thriving local economies generate increased income for all people; where people consume balanced and nutritious diets, and children grow up healthy and reach their full potential; and where resilient households and communities face fewer and less-severe shocks, have less vulnerability to the crises that do occur, and help to accelerate inclusive, sustainable economic growth. We have built a strategy and are now implementing guidance and programming that builds on the U.S. Government's strong foundation of investments in global food security and nutrition to break down silos, integrate programming across sectors, and deploy Departments and Agencies for maximum impact and the effective stewardship of U.S. taxpayer dollars.

Despite our collective progress in global food security and nutrition over recent years, an estimated 702 million people still live in extreme poverty, nearly 800 million people around the world are chronically undernourished, and 159 million children under five are stunted. The U.S. Government, in partnership with other governments, civil society, multilateral development institutions, research institutes, universities, and the private sector, will build on experience to date to address these challenges, take advantage of opportunities, and advance food security and nutrition by focusing efforts around three interrelated and interdependent objectives:

- **Inclusive, sustainable, agriculture-led economic growth**, which is more effective than growth in other sectors at helping men and women lift themselves out of extreme poverty and hunger because it increases the availability of food, generates income from production, creates employment and entrepreneurship opportunities throughout value-chains, and spurs growth in rural and urban economies;
- **Strengthened resilience among people and systems**, as increasingly frequent and intense shocks and stresses threaten the ability of men, women, and families to emerge from poverty sustainably; and
- **A well-nourished population, especially women and children**, as undernutrition, particularly during the first 1,000 days between pregnancy and a child's second birthday, leads to lower levels of educational attainment, productivity, lifetime earnings, and economic growth rates.

Through this approach, we will strengthen the capacity of all participants throughout the food and agriculture system by paying special attention to women, the extreme poor, small-scale producers, youth, marginalized communities, and small and medium-sized enterprises. Several key elements of our approach strengthen our ability to achieve these objectives. These key elements include:

- Targeting our investments in countries and geographic areas where we have the greatest potential to improve food security and nutrition sustainably, and strategically focusing

our resources on those approaches and interventions that evidence shows will reduce extreme poverty, hunger, and malnutrition at scale;

- Implementing a comprehensive, multifaceted, whole-of-Government approach rooted in lessons-learned and evidence-to-date that reflects emerging trends;
- Country leadership, recognizing that developing countries, above all others, must own, lead, guide, manage, and invest in these efforts to drive progress;
- Establishing partnerships with a wide range of development actors and groups, which will improve the reach, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of our efforts. This includes using foreign aid strategically to catalyze the mobilization of domestic resources for self-reliance and private sector-driven trade and economic development;
- Harnessing the power of science, technology, and innovation to dramatically improve food and agricultural practices, as well as to increase local capacity to address these issues; and
- Focusing on the sustainability of our programs as we work to create the conditions under which our assistance is no longer needed. We will do this by reducing susceptibility to recurrent food crises as well as large international expenditures on humanitarian assistance, and ensuring a sustainable food and agriculture system with adequate and appropriate finance available to key actors, especially from local sources.

To measure progress and remain accountable to the public, U.S. Government Agencies and Departments further commit to strengthening our rigorous approach to monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL), which includes the following:

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

## **Appendix 2: Interagency Working Group Updates under the *Global Food-Security Strategy (GFSS)***

Feed the Future has seven Interagency Working Groups, most co-chaired by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and one of the 11 other partner Federal Departments and Agencies. Each Working Group leverages the expertise of the U.S. Government (USG) Agencies and Departments to advance its issue-specific agenda, guide the broader interagency general group, and support governments, civil society, and the private sector in each of the Feed the Future countries as they implement their Feed the Future Country Strategies.

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

The interagency MEL Working Group, formed in 2016, played a large role in the revision of the GFSS indicators in 2017. This past year, the group reviewed edits to these indicators for the upcoming 2019 reporting season and published a revised version of the handbook in September 2019, available here: <https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook>. This revised version corrects errors, adds points of clarification, and makes adjustments to a few of the indicators to improve our measures of performance. Members include different Bureaus from USAID; the U.S. Departments of State, Agriculture (USDA), Commerce, and the Treasury; the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC); the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), now the U.S. International Development Finance Corporation (DFC); Peace Corps; and the U.S. African Development Foundation (USADF).

### *Task Force on Fall Armyworm (FAW)*

The outbreak of FAW threatens the current and future progress of agricultural success in Africa and Asia. FAW is resistant to many conventional pesticides, and its voracious appetite particularly targets maize, a vital staple crop in Africa. This crop pest has the potential to cause billions of dollars in damage and put hundreds of millions at risk of hunger. Since first reported in Africa in 2016, FAW has spread to more than 52 countries in Africa and Asia, and potentially affects an estimated 20-50 percent of maize yields, as well as other crops.<sup>7</sup> In 2017, the USG issued a call to action to partners, and USAID launched a Fall Armyworm Task Force to help combat this pest and build the capacity of people and systems to manage future threats. In November 2018, the Task Force announced the winners of the Fall Armyworm Tech Prize, an innovation incentive competition that rewarded digital solutions that can help identify and provide actionable information on how to treat FAW in Africa, considering countries' policies and laws, as well as cultural context. The FAW Task Force has leveraged the technical knowledge, research capacity, and activities of USG Departments and Agencies and external

---

<sup>7</sup> Centre for Agriculture and Bioscience International (September 2017). Fall armyworm: impacts and implications for Africa. <https://www.cabi.org/ISC/abstract/20183058906>

partners to strengthen their pest-management capacities and facilitate a rapid response. Building on decades of experience in controlling FAW in the Americas, African, Asian, and global experts have coordinated to accomplish the following:

- Recommend best pest-management science
- Identify safe, effective innovations for control;
- Elevate and advance opportunities to strengthen the policy and enabling environment to facilitate technology access; and
- Transfer pest-management knowledge/technology to key actors in agriculture systems in Feed the Future Target Countries.

Finally, the Task Force has completed its objectives and has been dissolved. Future work on FAW will be part of the newly formed interagency Research Working Group, which the next version of this report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 will discuss.

#### *Working Group on Policy*

Transformational policy, embraced by host-country governments, key stakeholders, and partners, is critical to the success of Feed the Future, and particularly important is enabling policy for private-sector investment. Countries become more self-reliant when their governments are committed to making food security a priority, build the framework and allocate budget to deliver on inclusive plans that recognize the role of the private sector and civil society. The interagency Working Group on Policy identifies best practices and approaches and disseminates them across the USG to inform the design and implementation of projects and programs. Key achievements of the working group in FY 2019 include the following:

- The completion of revised policy matrices in Feed the Future Target Countries to reflect new Country Plans and their respective policy priorities, as well as new GFSS Policy Technical Guidance, and to improve the reporting process, with preliminary first reports due at the end of FY 2019;
- Revised and completed two offerings of the USAID University course, “Policy to Advance Food Security and Inclusive Agricultural Growth” in Washington, D.C. and Pretoria, South Africa, with important interagency representation in each offering; and
- Increased engagement with, and support for, U.S. Embassies and USAID Missions that are developing policy activities that target resilience and food security, including in the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, the United Republic of Tanzania, and the Republic of Sénégal, among others.

#### *Working Group on Private-Sector Engagement*

The private sector is a key stakeholder and partner for Feed the Future, as private resources along with good policy are the engines that propel development and transformation. The USG interagency is taking a market-systems approach to facilitate private-sector engagement and partnerships under the GFSS, including with U.S. companies and agri-businesses, to ensure the success and sustainability of these investments. In 2019, the Working Group held regular meetings to ensure coordination on several topics, including the agriculture technical track of the Global Entrepreneurship Summit and the new DFC. To that end, USAID and OPIC developed case studies on companies that received graduated financing from the two Agencies. The Working Group also developed an interagency Fact Sheet on international development finance and contributed to an agriculture finance primer oriented toward USG field staff and partners.

#### *Working Group on Nutrition*

Under the USG's *Global Nutrition Coordination Plan*, the interagency is accountable for coordinated actions that provide the backbone for collaborative nutrition programming, including the creation of a permanent, Government-wide GFSS Sub-Technical Working Group (GFSSSTWG) to serve as a leader and convener for action and information-sharing. The GFSSSTWG builds on the shared goals of the Federal Departments and Agencies that lead global nutrition efforts on behalf of the USG and will restart its efforts in Fall 2019.

#### *Working Group on Food Safety*

In 2016, a group of subject-matter experts from USAID, USDA, and the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) established a USG Interagency Working Group on Food Safety (FSWG) to further the global effort to address food safety, within the scope of USAID's *Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy* and the USG's *Global Nutrition Coordination Plan (GNCP)*. Safe food supplies support national economies, trade and tourism, contribute to food and nutrition security, and underpin sustainable development. The FSWG promotes nutrition, food security, and trade via a platform for the interagency exchange of food-safety information and experiences and by exploring opportunities for collaboration with U.S. Embassies and USAID Missions abroad. This year, the FSWG has strengthened coordination and communication among several USG Departments and Agencies including USAID, HHS/FDA, USDA (Food Safety and Inspection Service, Foreign Agriculture Service, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service) and the U.S. Codex Office, which has improved their common understanding of food safety-related programming, increased collaboration and greater effectiveness of food safety-related activities and investments, and leveraged existing interagency resources to better support USG posts globally.

### *Working Group on Global Engagement*

The interagency Working Group on Global Engagement shares information and improves the consistency of U.S. positions in global policy fora and discussions on food security. By improving coordination across global processes, such as Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Forum, the Group of Seven (G-7), the Group of 20 (G-20), and the Committee on World Food Security (CFS), the working group contributes to the coherence and amplification of the USG's priorities and messages, a unified and effective interagency effort, and consistency and stability for long-term and strategic development gains. Accomplishments of the Working Group this past year include the following:

- Coordinated interagency consultations with the Chair of the United Nations (UN) Committee on World Food Security and planning for the North America CFS Regional Consultations for October 2019;
- Shared documents and outcomes from APEC, the G-7, the G-20, CFS and the Informal North American Regional Conference of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization; and
- Support for the public- and private-sector windows of the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) for 2019 and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).

### *Working Group on Communications and Outreach*

The interagency Working Group on Communications and Outreach brings together communicators from the USG Agencies and Departments that comprise Feed the Future. The Working Group promotes consistent messaging and contributes interagency accomplishments and stories to Feed the Future's platforms for amplification. Bi-weekly updates circulated among the Working Group and quarterly roundtables with external communicators keep the USG interagency connected on current priorities, projects, and events. Accomplishments this past year include the following:

- **Feed the Future newsletter:** The Feed the Future newsletter engages the broader stakeholder community with stories on the USG's efforts and progress to combat global poverty, hunger, and malnutrition. From October 2018-2019, USG interagency partners contributed to a total of seven newsletters on themes such as women's empowerment, resilience, and nutrition, which were distributed to a list of more than 6,000 readers; and
- **Strategic planning:** The Working Group met quarterly to share updates, events, and campaigns, and met to plan for the 2019 Progress Snapshot and Feed the Future Week 2019. At each planning session, the members brainstormed ways to draw on the strengths and priorities of each Agency and Department to amplify global food security messaging most effectively.



## **Appendix 3: Updates from Individual U.S. Government Departments and Agencies on Their Implementation of the *Global Food Security Strategy* (GFSS) 2017-2021**

This annex provides the third annual update of the U.S. Government (USG) Federal Department- and Agency-specific progress in carrying out the GFSS and the implementation plans provided in Annex 1 of the *Strategy*.

### **U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)**

On behalf of the American people, USAID's work advances U.S. national security and economic prosperity, demonstrates American generosity, and promotes a path to recipient self-reliance and resilience. USAID leads the implementation and coordination of the GFSS across multiple Federal Departments and Agencies and contributes to this *Strategy* by overseeing critical food-security investments. In the last year, Congress approved USAID's proposal to establish a new Bureau for Resilience and Food Security as part of the Agency's Transformation. This new Bureau will work strategically across the Agency to scale up investments in resilience, agriculture-led growth, nutrition, water security, sanitation, and hygiene, with a focus on improving support to the field.

#### ***Progress***

USAID drove the development of 12 Feed the Future Target Country plans, which outline each country's national approach to promoting food security, nutrition, and resilience and reflect the technical, diplomatic, and programmatic contributions of USG Departments and Agencies. This effort galvanized support from governments, civil society, and the private sector to take on food-security challenges and facilitated greater stewardship of taxpayer resources.

In the past year, USAID helped the governments and other stakeholders in more than 20 African countries develop new, stronger national agriculture investment plans that account for core elements of the Global Food Security Act and GFSS, including resilience to recurrent crises, nutrition, policy, trade, and private-sector investment. USAID's financial and technical support has also helped African regional institutions deliver the inaugural report for a ground-breaking mutual-accountability initiative wherein the governments of more than 46 African countries report biennially against 43 indicators that measure their nations' respective progress toward achieving Africa-wide commitments related to the mobilization of domestic resources, agriculture-led growth, food security, nutrition, and regional trade.

USAID selected six concepts under the new Resilience Challenge Fund to amplify field-led efforts to reduce the future need for humanitarian assistance in areas of recurrent crises. The

USAID Missions selected to implement programs with this funding were in the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia; the Federal Republic of Somalia; and the Republics of Kenya, Malawi, Uganda, and Zimbabwe. Applications had to demonstrate innovative and effective approaches to building resilience to recurrent crises and the ability to influence or leverage resources from other donors, national governments, and the private sector to scale these approaches and reduce future emergency humanitarian deliveries of food.

USAID also elevated nutrition in our Transformation by initiating a new Nutrition Leadership Council and a coordination and oversight body at the level of Deputy Assistant Administrator across multiple Bureaus, and announced our intention to launch a Center for Nutrition in the new Resilience and Food Security Bureau to coordinate with nutrition teams in the Bureaus for Global Health and Humanitarian Assistance. USAID also started several new projects, including its flagship multi-sector nutrition activity, USAID Advancing Nutrition; two operational research projects on nutrition in more fragile contexts in East Africa; and a portfolio of research and implementation projects on safe food systems. Finally, USAID hired our first-ever Chief Nutritionist, Shawn Baker, who will chair the Nutrition Leadership Council.

Finally, USAID coordinated the USG interagency to develop the Feed the Future Target Country Graduation Policy and Review Process. Helping communities progress beyond assistance on the Journey to Self-Reliance is a key foreign-policy objective. Feed the Future supports this by building host-country commitment and capacity through catalytic assistance so that the governments, civil society, and the private sector in Target Countries can assume full responsibility for managing and financing solutions to their own food-security challenges.

### ***Lessons Learned***

During FY 2019, USAID funded multiple actions to facilitate learning and analysis across the global Feed the Future portfolio. USAID financed 22 online events that had 2,494 combined participants from more than 100 countries. In addition, USAID reviewed and analyzed results achieved since the beginning of the initiative. The analysis revealed that farmers supported by Feed the Future outpaced national yields and maintained progress, even in the face of stresses; that women's empowerment is going up in areas we work; and that Feed the Future is reaching similar numbers of men and women. Based on results measured in the first interim surveys conducted since the baselines, the analysis also projected that Feed the Future would exceed our stunting-reduction targets in five years and poverty targets in seven years. Furthermore, investments in building resilience in areas of recurrent humanitarian crisis in places like Ethiopia, Kenya, and Malawi enabled communities to sustain themselves in the face of severe droughts and reduced their need for humanitarian assistance.

### ***Partners***

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

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

### ***Targeted Beneficiaries***

USAID's assistance through the GFSS benefits rural and urban people who are hungry or malnourished, and the extreme poor, with a focus on small-scale food producers, women, and youth. For example, women's empowerment and equality between men and women remain critical to achieving inclusive, sustainable, agriculture-led growth, resilience, and nutrition.

### **U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)**

In FY 2019, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) continued to participate fully in all aspects of implementation of the GFSS, at both headquarters and through participation in overseas, interagency teams. Highlights of this engagement include helping update the Feed the Future Learning Agenda, coordinating U.S. Government participation in a critical African food-safety conference, aligning USDA's international food-assistance programs with GFSS, joining the Prosper Africa initiative as an interagency partner, and participating in an interagency review of new plans and strategies. Finally, USDA and USAID leadership continued dialogue to strengthen collaboration on issues of mutual interest, specifically on agricultural trade and research.

### ***Progress***

Consistent with past years, USDA released its annual International Food Security Assessment, drawing on Departmental technical expertise to provide data-based projections of food-security indicators to stakeholders and the public.

In FY 2019, USDA achieved a new milestone—publishing third-party evaluations of its international food-assistance projects on USAID’s Development Experience Clearinghouse website, which will help improve transparency and enhance learning about food security for all stakeholders.

USDA continued to invest in rigorous evaluation of its international food-assistance projects using diverse mechanisms and is centrally managing a contract to do mid-term evaluations and data-quality assessments of two Food for Progress poultry projects in Ghana. Both projects underwent an external data-quality assessment for the first time, which revealed areas of strength and areas for improvement in both projects, with time to implement improved data practices for the second half of the projects’ lifespans.

USDA efforts in FY 2019 also addressed the enabling environment for animal health and food safety. USDA’s African Veterinary Science Faculty Exchange Program continued to train cohorts of African fellows on these issues and is intended to help facilitate regional cooperation and knowledge sharing in Africa. In Spring 2019, USDA also coordinated U.S. Government engagement in a crucial, high-level regional meeting on African food safety.

USDA completed its resource commitment to the Global Open Data for Agriculture and Nutrition (GODAN) initiative. USDA intends to continue its support of the GODAN initiative through a joint collaboration with the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development (DFID) through 2021, subject to the availability of funds.

### ***Lessons Learned***

USDA finalized the incorporation of certain Feed the Future standard indicators into its monitoring and evaluation system for food assistance at the beginning of FY 2019 and is working with implementers to help transition from the old set of indicators to the new ones. Because some of the new indicators require significantly more disaggregated data than the previous ones, USDA has had some challenges implementing the new measures and will continue to work with implementers individually to raise the quality of the food-assistance data.

### ***Partners***

USDA continues to partner with U.S. Land Grant institutions in implementing trade and scientific-exchange programs, some of which directly or indirectly support GFSS.

### ***Targeted Beneficiaries***

USDA's efforts are intended to benefit U.S. farmers, ranchers, foresters, and exporters and their overseas partners and to contribute to an enabling environment for global food security in middle- and low-income, food-deficit countries. USDA does this through programs aimed at:

- Supporting school feeding, maternal and child nutrition, and literacy;
- Modernizing and strengthening agricultural sectors;
- Providing training to agricultural professionals and researchers; and
- Supporting international-research collaborations.

### **U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC)**

In FY 2019, two Bureaus within the U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC)—the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the International Trade Administration (ITA)—continued to support efforts to address global food insecurity. Specifically, NOAA offered assistance through sharing data to improve weather forecasting, drought early warning systems, and climate resilience and adaptation, among other areas of expertise. ITA continued to bolster the creation of open and fair markets, support supply chains that allow for the free flow of U.S. goods and services to maintain global food security and expand international customer base for U.S. exports in food-insecure countries.

#### ***Progress***

NOAA:

- NOAA's National Weather Service (NWS) continued to provide global capacity-building to enhance partners' abilities to meet or improve needs for weather forecasting, hydrologic modeling and prediction, and drought early warning systems, to foster the application of this knowledge in risk management against impacts of a changing climate on food supplies (crops, livestock, and fisheries). The NWS Climate Prediction Center continued to provide technical decision support, including forecast production and risk assessments, to the USAID Food for Peace Famine Early Warning System Network (FEWS NET). The NWS cooperated with USDA in World Meteorological Organization's (WMO) Commission for Agricultural Meteorology activities such as the World Agricultural Meteorology Information System (WAMIS);
- NOAA's National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service (NESDIS) continued to facilitate domestic and international access to NOAA satellite data in support of weather forecasting and science. NESDIS provided data to the Global Drought Information System (in collaboration with the National Integrated Drought Information System), the Global Historical Climate Network (GHCN), the global Climate Data Record (CDR), and the International Comprehensive Ocean-Atmosphere Dataset (ICOADS);

- NOAA's Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR) conducted research to enable better forecasts, earlier warnings for natural disasters, and a greater understanding of earth systems. The OAR Climate Program Office (CPO) managed competitive research programs in which NOAA funded high-priority climate science, assessments, decision-support research, outreach, education, and capacity-building activities;
- NOAA's OAR Earth System Research Laboratory (ESRL) continued to advance the scientific basis for drought and flood early warning systems, and for water and weather services development with the WMO, USDA, National Integrated Drought Information System, and other national and international agencies engaged in assessing the predictability of extreme events for anticipating potential water, crop, and food-security outcomes;
- NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) continued to foster the increase of sustainable marine aquaculture production through streamlined permitting, science-based management, and technology development and transfer; and
- NMFS and the NOAA Office of General Counsel continued to participate in capacity-building training sessions and workshops in Southeast Asia, Africa, South America, and the Caribbean. The workshops covered topics such as: U.S. food safety; ecosystem approaches to fisheries management; fisheries enforcement; fisheries law development; combating illegal unreported and unregulated fishing; and marine spatial planning. These capacity-building activities supported increased profitability, market access, and employment for export partners, as well as helped to strengthen resilience by improving sustainability and sharing state-of-the-art fisheries management and science to ensure long-term availability of global fisheries resources.

ITA:

- ITA continued Business-to-Business matching between U.S. companies and overseas local businesses. ITA's Commercial Service offices in GFSA countries continued to provide local assistance to U.S. companies to increase trade with those markets. Other mechanisms included international trade missions, international trade shows, and government-to-government advocacy;
- ITA's U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service continued to support Feed the Future by assisting GFSA Target Countries with creating country-specific implementation plans. Resultant plans can provide valuable information to clarify Target Countries' upcoming agricultural capacity-building strategies and possible market access opportunities for the U.S. private sector;
- ITA continued to contribute to general understanding of global market landscapes, including those in the United States and in food-insecure countries, with publicly available publications housed at [www.export.gov](http://www.export.gov). Examples included Country Commercial Guides and Top Market Reports. These publications facilitate U.S.

companies doing business in food-insecure countries, which helps those countries integrate into the global economy;

- ITA continued to solicit, and convey to Feed the Future, input from U.S. private-sector companies on market expansion priorities; and
- ITA continued to facilitate awareness in foreign markets of U.S. disruptive technologies, focusing on financial inclusion that will help empower vulnerable populations in food-insecure countries to enable their entry into the global commercial supply chain and strengthen their purchasing power for U.S. export goods.

### ***Lessons Learned***

The collective DOC activities described above were not specifically designed nor funded to promote global food security, but were ongoing, standing workstreams to carry out individual Bureaus' mandates. For example, NOAA's core mission is to provide its partners access to comprehensive oceanic, atmospheric, and geophysical data, and ITA's mission is to facilitate U.S. exports, including all U.S. products that address global food insecurity. The activities nevertheless contributed to Feed the Future. The impact of these activities relative to the GFSS, however, cannot be quantified because the indicators that the Bureaus use to monitor, measure, and evaluate performance are not designed to address food security. NOAA and ITA will continue to support global food security, albeit indirectly, through their core missions.

### ***Partners and Targeted Beneficiaries***

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

### **U.S. Department of State (State)**

The U.S. Department of State leads U.S. foreign policy through diplomacy, advocacy, and assistance by advancing the interests of the American people, their safety, and economic prosperity. State prioritizes food security as an issue of national security and economic prosperity, and State's Washington-based officials, as well as those based at our Embassies and Missions worldwide, engage with foreign governments and in international fora to promote policies to improve global food security and nutrition. The Secretary of State is responsible for the continuous supervision and general direction of assistance programs under 22 U.S.C. § 2382 and has the lead role coordinating U.S. assistance under 22 USC § 6593.

In the context of the GFSS 2017-2022, State, working with USAID, USTR, USDA, and other agencies, promotes global, regional, national, and sub-national policies that foster sustainable

reductions in hunger and malnutrition, and sustainable increases in agricultural development in ways that concurrently promote U.S. economic prosperity and national security. The Secretary's Office of Global Food Security (S/GFS) coordinates the Department's global food-security efforts under GFSS. S/GFS collaborates closely within the Department, and with other Agencies and Departments, to promote long-term global food-security, nutrition, and sustainable agricultural development. Department goals support Pillar IV of the 2017 *National Security Strategy*, "Advance American Influence," particularly to "support food security and health programs that save lives and address the root causes of hunger and disease." Food-security work across the Department of State is highlighted below.

### ***Progress***

S/GFS promotes U.S. Government interests on global food security and nutrition in multilateral, regional, and bilateral fora. S/GFS engages with ambassadors and economic officers at post and desk officers in each regional Bureau to identify and monitor food-security and nutrition issues related to the stability and development of the countries in which they serve. S/GFS monitors and identifies emerging food-security issues, such as conflict-driven food insecurity. S/GFS works with other Agencies and Departments, such as USAID and USDA, to develop and support USG efforts to address these threats. S/GFS coordinated State participation in GFSS Washington-based support groups for the 12 Feed the Future Target Countries to develop and provide policy guidance for each of the country plans along with the two regional country plans, as well as the graduation policy for GFSS. S/GFS engages in multiple multilateral fora including the G-7 Food Security Working Group, the APEC Policy Partnership on Food Security, the UN Committee on World Food Security, the Scaling Up Nutrition Movement, and Nutrition for Growth Initiative. These multilateral engagements, where State often represents the USG and presents the approved interagency positions, result in new policies and increased political attention to food security and nutrition. S/GFS also engages with civil society, research institutions, and other stakeholders to promote awareness of, and access to, new technologies and practices to improve resilience in agriculture, fisheries, and aquaculture.

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

The Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Office of Economic and Development Affairs (IO/EDA) advances U.S. policies on food security within the context of the United Nations (UN) system, including managing U.S. Government interactions with the Rome-based food-security

agencies and at the UN General Assembly in New York. IO/EDA also serves as the desk for our Mission to the UN Agencies in Rome (USUN Rome) and works with multilateral partners, such as the World Food Programme, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the World Organization for Animal Health, and other international organizations. Through these international fora, the Department has worked to advance U.S. national interests in food security and national security, promote trade, and protect the health of Americans.

The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, Office of Global Change (OES/EGC) works on the planning and obligation of resilient agriculture activities. The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, Office of International Health and Biodefense (OES/IHB) works to raise awareness of the linkages between food security and other global issues, such as zoonotic or drug-resistant disease, and biodefense.

### ***Lessons Learned***

In FY 2019, State advanced U.S. food-security interests in multiple multilateral fora such as the Committee on World Food Security and the G-7, including the G-7's development of a Framework on Decent Jobs for Rural Youth in the Sahel. In addition, the Secretary hosted the World Food Prize Laureate Announcement Ceremony, where he highlighted the importance of innovation in solving global hunger. The Secretary also highlighted the importance of innovation in achieving global food security at the 2019 Global Entrepreneurship Summit in the Netherlands, which featured food and agriculture as a focus area. We continue to improve communication around food-security issues throughout the leadership of the Department, including with outgoing Ambassadors and senior officials, as well as improving coordination and communication among the interagency, Posts, and other stakeholders.

### ***Partners***

State typically does not work directly with implementing partners, but rather works bilaterally, multilaterally, and through international organizations to develop policy and align foreign-policy priorities. Along with other Agencies, the Department engages with civil society, the private sector, international organizations, research institutions, and other stakeholders to promote awareness of, and access to, new technologies and practices that improve resilience in agriculture, nutrition, fisheries, and aquaculture.

### ***Targeted Beneficiaries***

The Department works with other Agencies to recommend policy that affects smallholder farmers, scientists, agricultural researchers, policy-makers, *etc.*

## **U.S. Department of the Treasury (Treasury)**

The Department of the Treasury oversees and contributes to the Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs), which includes their large agricultural portfolios. In addition, Treasury is a member of the International Fund for Agricultural Development's (IFAD) Executive Board and its largest historical donor. The Department is also involved in the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program's (GAFSP) decision-making bodies and continues to work with other stakeholders to refine GAFSP's model and examine its place in the food-security financing architecture. Treasury further augments its support of food security in developing economies through dialogue with Ministries of Finance at high-level forums.

### ***Progress***

Treasury efforts have led to progress in the MDBs' improved focus on food security. Both the African Development Fund and Asian Development Fund have made efforts to improve nutrition and agricultural production after food security's inclusion as a thematic priority during replenishment discussions. Treasury works with IFAD to improve its efficiency and impact, and with GAFSP.

### ***Lessons Learned***

Treasury plans to work with GAFSP Management to further define its discrete role in the food-security finance architecture and seek to avoid any overlap with other institutions.

### ***Partners***

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

### ***Targeted Beneficiaries***

The MDBs' evidence-based and country-owned programs are several billion dollars per year and continue to play an integral role in improving food security in developing countries. The MDBs support agriculture and agriculture infrastructure investments including through the water and transport sectors as well as programs that target global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty. IFAD has specialized in supporting people in remote rural areas with projects for smallholder farmers, small and medium enterprises, and agribusinesses that are intended to reduce poverty, increase food security, improve nutrition, and strengthen resilience. GAFSP supports projects that are intended to scale up agricultural and food-security assistance in low-income countries.

### **The Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC)**

MCC's mission is to reduce poverty through economic growth. Since its first compact in 2005, MCC has invested more than \$5 billion in partner countries to address the many sources of food insecurity. MCC was a member of the interagency effort to develop the GFSS in 2016. In FY 2019, MCC continued its commitment to Feed the Future through significant progress in food-security-related investments in Niger, Morocco, and Sierra Leone; closure of the program in Zambia; and signature of the program in Togo.

## *Progress*

### **Niger**

Niger is the only MCC partner that is also a Feed the Future Target Country. In FY 2019, MCC and the Government of Niger made significant progress in implementing the \$437 million Sustainable Water and Agriculture Compact (2018–2023). The agricultural sector in Niger employs more than 80 percent of the population and represents the second-largest export sector. However, due to frequent droughts and floods that decimate crops, many poor households struggle for subsistence. The MCC compact will improve water availability, infrastructure, and market access, and will benefit more than 3.9 million people. Under the **\$257.2 million Irrigation and Market Access Project**, MCA-Niger, the legal entity in charge of implementing the compact, is finalizing critical feasibility and design studies for irrigation systems and plans to start rehabilitating the Konni perimeter later this year. In FY 2019, the program also advanced key interventions to improve land rights for farmers and long-term land governance, provide technical assistance for water-user associations, and provide farmer training to ensure reliable, inclusive, and long-term management and access to land, water, and productive assets. In addition, MCC is co-financing with the World Bank a **\$93.8 million Climate-Resilient Communities Project** aimed at increasing productivity and resilience in the agriculture and livestock sectors through improved access and management of natural resources. Under the Animal Health component, MCC supported the Government of Niger in a 2018-2019 vaccination campaign to cover 11 million cattle (88 percent of national bovine herd) and 16 million sheep and goats (representing 76 percent of national small ruminant herd), which will reduce the prevalence of debilitating diseases and improve herd productivity for livestock-dependent families.

### **Morocco**

The agriculture sector employs nearly 40 percent of Morocco's workforce. Yet, agriculture contributes only around 12 percent of Morocco's gross domestic product (GDP), due in part to low agricultural productivity linked to the lack of land ownership. MCC's Morocco Land and Employability Compact (2017-2022) includes the **\$33 million Rural Land Activity** and the **\$10.4 million Land Governance Activity**. With MCC support, the Government of Morocco has developed a faster, more inclusive process to provide farmers and their families with individual titles to land they have been farming for generations. In June 2019, the Government of Morocco launched an improved titling process that covers about 67,000 hectares in the Gharb and Haouz regions. Post-compact, the Government of Morocco intends to refine and apply the improved

titling process across other irrigated, collective lands—an area that covers about 300,000 hectares in Morocco. Land titles will provide rural families with the freedom and security to invest in their land, improve agricultural output, and develop sustainable farming practices. The Land Governance Activity will support legal, policy, and institutional reforms that will improve the environment for investment in agriculture and food security. In FY 2019, the Government of Morocco, with MCC support, is continuing the participatory, national land-dialogue process and various studies that will provide critical inputs to the eventual adoption of a national land-governance strategy.

### **Sierra Leone**

Limited or poor access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) is one of the key drivers of malnutrition. In FY 2019, MCC continued supporting WASH improvements and coverage through ongoing implementation of the Sierra Leone Threshold program's **\$16 million Water Sector Reform Project** (2016-2020). The project focuses on improving access to WASH services through water-sector reform and improved utility management and efficiency. Recently completed field-asset assessments and mapping are already helping the Guma Valley Water Company (GVWC) to manage flows in the system. The project creates the institutional conditions for sustainable operation of water-supply services in Freetown and supports the GVWC with hydraulically isolating two service areas in Freetown to serve as learning laboratories to test and improve systems-management and customer-service-provision approaches. Based on this project, GVWC will be better positioned to improve access to clean water for the estimated 1.5 million residents of Freetown, and to manage anticipated large-scale improvements to its antiquated infrastructure.

### **Zambia**

In November 2018, MCC successfully closed the **\$292.6 million Lusaka Water Supply, Sanitation, and Drainage Project**. The Infrastructure Activity helped to reduce the incidence and prevalence of water-related disease and resulting malnutrition through increased access to clean water and decreased incidence of flooding. This activity has constructed or rehabilitated 23.4 km of drains and achieved a metering ratio of 66 percent against a target of 90 percent. The project's Institutional Strengthening Activity made targeted improvements to the financial sustainability, operations and maintenance, environmental management, and social inclusion of the Lusaka Water Supply and Sewerage Company. The project issued grants totaling more than \$5.8 million to implement innovative projects in water supply, sanitation, and drainage.

### **Togo**

Customary land-tenure systems dominate rural Togo, and smallholder farmers often lack any kind of official documentation. In February 2019, MCC and the Government of Togo signed the \$35 million MCC Togo Threshold Program. The program includes an **\$8 million Land Reform to Accelerate Agricultural Production Project** that will support the establishment of a regulatory framework to implement the new Land Code and will field-test cost effective

procedures and technologies for land formalization to provide Togolese farmers with the security necessary to make long-term investments in their land.

### ***Lessons Learned***

The close of the Zambia compact provided important lessons for the sustainability of MCC's future investments that target improved access to clean and safe drinking water, which is critical to improving nutritional status and thus food security. In particular, future water supply, sanitation, and drainage infrastructure investments should be paired with greater emphasis on the capacity and incentives of partner governments and key institutions to maintain infrastructure assets and implement policy reforms to ensure the sustainability of MCC's investments. Additionally, MCC recognizes that setting appropriate conditions on its investments are an essential tool to support the sustainability of key institutions and ensure buy-in among partner governments. At the same time, the use of conditions must be flexible enough to allow MCC and its MCA counterparts to adjust to changing conditions on the ground. The satisfaction of key conditions should also be evaluated regularly to ensure they are still relevant and appropriate in relation to project objectives.

### ***Partners***

MCC works with partner-country governments and other implementing partners that represent both the public and private sectors to promote growth, help people lift themselves out of poverty, and invest in future generations. In Niger, MCC is collaborating with the International Fertilizer Development Center to support the Government of Niger to open up the market to private-sector competition and to establish a regulatory system for fertilizer quality and a better targeted subsidy program for vulnerable populations during crisis.

### ***Targeted Beneficiaries***

MCC food-security investments target smallholder farmers, herders, and their families, and citizens that rely on safe and reliable access to urban water-supply systems.

## **Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC)**

OPIC is committed to mobilizing private investment to support the agriculture sector, increase food security throughout the developing world, and empower smallholder farmers, many of whom are women.

As the U.S. Government's development finance institution, OPIC provides financing and political-risk insurance to projects in developing countries in Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East. OPIC's support of these projects helps mobilize additional private capital. OPIC's agriculture work empowers smallholder farmers by improving access to

mechanization and important skills training to increase yields. OPIC also invests throughout the agriculture value chain to improve efficiencies and minimize crop loss.

### ***Progress***

In 2018, OPIC committed almost \$588 million in financing and \$22 million of insurance for food-security projects.

### ***Partners***

OPIC's partners in advancing global food security include companies, private equity firms, and social investment funds. Recent and ongoing investments in the sector include:

- **Proximity Finance.** In 2019, OPIC committed \$8 million to Proximity Finance to support expanded microlending to rural borrowers, primarily smallholder farmers, in Myanmar. Agriculture employs 60 percent of the labor force in Myanmar, but limited access to credit, particularly in rural communities, has restricted the sector's growth;
- **Twiga Foods Ltd.** An OPIC loan helps Twiga Foods Ltd. supply fresh produce from Kenyan farmers and deliver it to urban vendors, most of whom are women, which helps them increase their sales and profits;
- **Global Partnerships.** OPIC financing helps Global Partnerships' *Social Investment Fund 5.0* support local social enterprises that provide financing and other services such as education and training to rural communities, many working in the agriculture sector; and
- **One Acre Fund.** OPIC has provided multiple loans to One Acre Fund, a social enterprise that supports Africa's smallest farmers—many of whom work on just a single acre of land—by helping them increase the volume and quality of their yields so they can increase their income.

### ***Targeted Beneficiaries***

Many of OPIC's investments empower the world's female farmers, who produce a large share of the world's food, but often lack access to financing. OPIC recognizes that a large gender credit gap limits the potential of women in agriculture. In 2017, it launched the 2X Women's Initiative, through which it committed to mobilize \$1 billion dollars in capital to empower women across multiple sectors, including agriculture.

### **Peace Corps**

Peace Corps contributes to the mitigation of food and nutrition insecurity, reduction of poverty, and increase in resilience by building local capacity at the individual, group, and community levels. These efforts help to increase agricultural productivity, diversity, and related income sustainably; improve nutrition outcomes for mothers and children; and adapt to, and mitigate the

impact of, climate variability. The agency continues to invest in, support, and extend these activities in more than 40 countries worldwide, with emphasis on the Feed the Future Target and Aligned Countries in which Peace Corps Volunteers (PCVs) currently serve.

### ***Progress***

**Note:** *The results of PCV activities are only extracted for reporting by Peace Corps headquarters at the end of each Fiscal Year. The following results are from FY 2018.*

Peace Corps finalized a new project review and design process centered on Reference Logical Project Frameworks (LPF) for each sector in which PCVs work: Agriculture, Community Economic Development, Education, Environment, Health, and Youth in Development. Peace Corps selected nine relevant GFSS indicators, six output indicators and three outcome indicators, which it incorporated into the Reference LPFs so that Peace Corps will be able to better monitor its contributions to the GFSS and incorporate these into the Feed the Future Monitoring System (FTFMS). To date, the agency has conducted project reviews and re-designs using the new process in five Feed the Future Target Countries—Ghana (Agriculture, Health), Sénégal (Agriculture, Health, Environment, Community Economic Development), Uganda (Agriculture, Health), Guatemala (Agriculture, Health), and Nepal (Agriculture)—and in eight Feed the Future Aligned Countries—Benin (Agriculture, Health), Madagascar (Agriculture), Malawi (Environment), Morocco (Youth), Mozambique (Health), Rwanda (Health), Tanzania (Agriculture), and Zambia (Agriculture, Health, Environment).

In 43 countries, 1,083 PCVs focused their collective efforts on promoting and disseminating food and nutrition security and poverty-reduction innovations and interventions. More than 500 PCVs trained over 44,000 individuals, 55 percent of whom were women, on food-security-related topics, and a similar number of PCVs trained nearly 49,000 individuals, about 70 percent of whom were women and girls, on improved health and nutrition. The following results were obtained in FY 2018:

- **Objective 1: Inclusive and sustainable agricultural-led economic growth**

In 33 countries, 500 Agriculture, Environment, and Community Economic Development PCVs assisted nearly 20,000 smallholder farmers, 45 percent of whom were women, to apply at least one improved management practice or technology to increase agricultural productivity and profits. Additionally, 141 PCVs trained almost 3,000 individuals in 24 countries in agriculture-related income generation and business development. As a result, 32 PCVs reported that more than 80 firms or civil-society organizations in 13 countries have increased profits or become financially self-sufficient.

- **Objective 2: Strengthened resilience among people and systems**

In 25 countries, 160 Agriculture and Environment Volunteers assisted more than 7,000 smallholder farmers to use climate information or implement risk-reducing actions to improve climate-related resilience. In five countries, 86 Volunteers worked, specifically, to assist more than 800 individuals, nearly half of whom were women, to employ new soil- and water-conservation and -management practices. These practices include adding boomerang berms and rock lines to capture soil during heavy rain events and increasing organic matter on top of (mulch) and within (compost) soil to retain moisture.

- **Objective 3: A well-nourished population, especially among women and children**  
In 26 countries, 176 Agriculture, Environment, and Health Volunteers taught or trained individuals and groups, with a particular focus on women of reproductive age, to produce, diversify, and consume nutrient-rich foods and, as a direct result, reached nearly 14,000 children under five years of age. Two-hundred and three Volunteers worked with more than 4,000 individuals, 61 percent of whom were women, to increase their knowledge and skills in bio-intensive gardening. As a direct result, the population created 634 new household gardens for the express production of diverse, nutrient-rich vegetables and fruits, as well as 149 new school gardens.

### ***Lessons Learned***

Improving harvesting and post-harvest management practices and techniques successfully increases and prolongs availability of food, and also increases income-generating opportunities. In FY 2018, 26 Agriculture PCVs trained 1,578 smallholder farmers in five countries, including 823 women (52 percent), in post-harvest management and techniques including the use of plastic tarps and solar dryers to improve drying and Purdue Improved Crop Storage (PICS) bags to improve storage, as well as the use of value-adding techniques such as making jams, jellies, and juices. As a direct result, 860 smallholder farmers, including 428 women (50 percent), adopted one or more new post-harvest technology.

With a continued, strong interest in home gardening, all 15 Peace Corps agriculture projects have now incorporated an associated nutrition objective into their project designs. To achieve the desired behavior change—improved nutrition—agriculture PCV activities have expanded to include nutrition education, including social and behavior-change communication as well as use of the Essential Nutrition Actions’ framework, and cooking demonstrations.

### ***Partners***

Peace Corps food-security projects typically partner with the relevant Ministry, for example the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Environment or Forestry, or the Ministry of Health. For agriculture, the environment, and community economic-development projects, the partners at the community level are often community-based development organizations, formal or informal farmer groups, small businesses or, quite often, the individual target beneficiaries.

### ***Targeted Beneficiaries***

The ultimate beneficiaries of Peace Corps projects are the individuals, groups, and communities where PCVs are assigned to serve. In most cases, these are relatively small, rural, or peri-urban communities with a large percentage of people living in poverty with few services and few opportunities to improve their lives. In general, agriculture and food-security projects target smallholder farmers and their household members.

### **Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR)**

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

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

### ***Progress***

In FY 2019, the USTR worked to develop and maintain open markets—not just agricultural markets—globally through its trade initiatives and participation in international organizations. USTR participates extensively throughout the year at the WTO, including the Committees on Agriculture, Import Licensing, Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS), and Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) to raise questions with other countries regarding domestic support, market access, export competition, technical regulations, import licensing, and food, plant, and animal health measures. USTR also utilizes the Trade Policy Review Body of the WTO, which regularly analyzes country implementation of these WTO commitments and raises questions of members on any perceived lapses of implementation. USTR actively engages in the WTO

accession negotiations of candidate countries that seek WTO membership, and ensures that such countries fully implement domestic reforms that support open and rules-based trade in agricultural goods. These WTO meetings provide opportunities to promote transparency and communication among all WTO Members regarding implementation of commitments under the WTO agreements.

USTR promotes trade facilitation through its activities and work on multiple trade initiatives and programs each year. In FY 2019, USTR held trade talks with multiple countries, including Nepal and Bangladesh, to promote expanded bilateral trade and investment in goods and services. U.S. preference programs aim to support sustainable growth and economic development through trade, and in so doing, contribute to the alleviation of poverty and hunger in the beneficiary countries. These programs are of crucial importance to a number of least-developed countries (LDCs) which do not as of yet have the capacity to negotiate and implement comprehensive Free Trade Agreements (FTAs). In 2017, the four major U.S. preference programs—the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (CBERA), the Nepal Trade Preference Act, and the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA)—provided duty-free treatment to roughly \$34.5 billion in imports from 126 beneficiary countries and territories. In 2018, the GSP program alone accounted for \$23.5 billion worth of imports from 121 beneficiary countries and territories—44 of which are LDCs.<sup>8</sup> By encouraging countries to develop transparent, rules-, and science-based trade and investment policies consistent with their international obligations, U.S. imports from sub-Saharan Africa under AGOA (including its GSP provisions) totaled \$12 billion in 2018. The top five AGOA beneficiary countries were Nigeria, South Africa, Angola, Chad, and Kenya. Other countries that benefit greatly from AGOA include Ghana, Lesotho, Republic of the Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Madagascar, Ethiopia, Mauritius, and Gabon.

### ***Lessons Learned***

Integrating developing economies, economies in transition, and emerging economies into the international trading system can bring tremendous benefits. By encouraging countries to develop transparent, rules- and science-based trade and investment policies consistent with their international obligations, trading partners can realize the full benefits of trade liberalization. That liberalization in turn benefits U.S. producers by creating and maintaining reliable trading partners abroad.

### ***Partners***

Although USTR is not an implementing agency for GFSS, it participates and collaborates in the Washington-based Interagency Working Groups. USTR often collaborates with other U.S. Government Agencies, such as USDA and USAID, in their trade-capacity-building initiatives to help partner countries develop harmonized, science-based standards for animal and plant health

---

<sup>8</sup> <https://ustr.gov/issue-areas/trade-development/preference-programs/generalized-system-preference-gsp>

and food safety. In addition to direct bilateral engagement with other country governments through free-trade agreements, trade preference programs, and trade and investment framework agreements (TIFAs), USTR works closely with other U.S. Agencies as well as other countries in the WTO Committees on Agriculture, SPS, and TBT.

### ***Targeted Beneficiaries***

By encouraging countries to develop transparent, rules-, and science-based trade and investment policies consistent with their international obligations, USTR aims to integrate developing economies, economies in transition, and emerging economies into the global trading system.

### **U.S. African Development Foundation (USADF)**

The U.S. African Development Foundation (USADF) provides grants of up to \$250,000 directly to African small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and cooperatives so they can become a part of Africa's growth story. USADF contributes to Feed the Future by providing seed capital and technical assistance to agricultural enterprises, resulting in improved food security and economic livelihoods. USADF's core mission closely aligns with GFSA objectives in three specific areas:

- **Accelerate inclusive, agricultural-led economic growth that reduces global poverty and hunger.** Approximately 70 percent of USADF grants focus on supporting agriculture-led economic growth for smallholder farmers in Africa. In FY 2019, USADF grants assisted 57 organizations and 103,745 farmers to develop better enterprise-management skills and improve production and marketing capabilities.
- **Increase the productivity, incomes, and livelihoods of small-scale producers.** USADF, through its local partners in 20 African countries, prepares agriculture producer groups and SMEs for sustainable growth and increased incomes by helping them acquire training, technical assistance, better inputs, crop storage facilities, irrigation technology, equipment, access to larger markets, and operating capital.
- **Ensure the effective use of taxpayer dollars in achieving these objectives.** USADF leverages the appropriations it receives from Congress by entering into strategic partnership agreements with African governments in a one-to-one match to encourage ownership in the development of their countries. USADF also has strategic partnership agreements with private-sector partners such as Hello Tractor, Mastercard, Root Capital, and Blue Marble to give farmers access to farm equipment, financing, and crop insurance.

### ***Progress***

In FY 2019, USADF obligated \$9.4 million in grants to 57 groups benefiting 103,745 farmers, of which 57,301 are women. In the spirit of interagency collaboration and reflecting its expertise in

small-grant programming, USADF leveraged \$9 million from MCC to implement the climate-resilient agriculture small-grant facility of the MCC Niger Compact. USADF is programming \$2 million in grants under this interagency agreement to accelerate inclusive, agriculture-led economic growth and increase the productivity and incomes of smallholder farmers in Niger.

In FY 2019, USADF received a \$3.7 million Power Africa interagency transfer from USAID for its off-grid energy program to invest in energy systems such as mini-grids, solar pumps, and biogas digesters to power agriculture growth.

USADF funding contributes to GFSS intermediate results 1, 2, 3, and 4: Its work:

- (1) Strengthens inclusive agriculture systems that are productive and profitable;
- (2) Strengthens and expands access to market and trade for farmers;
- (3) Increases employment and entrepreneurship; and
- (4) Increases sustainable productivity through climate-smart approaches.

Through USADF grant funding, members of the Monze District Women Association (DWA), located in Zambia’s Southern Province, gained access to resources and training that teaches them how to diversify their income. Two years ago, the farmers of Monze DWA began expanding the diversity of crops they produced from maize to sunflower, given its revenue potential.

In FY 2019, members were not only selling their crops, but they also processed more than 100 tons of sunflower into oil to sell—a nearly seven-fold increase from their first year in the program when they processed 15 tons of sunflower oil. The women are using their increase in incomes to make improvements to their homes and pay their children’s school fees.

### ***Lessons Learned***

Sustainable success is a long-term process. A shea butter production grant USADF funded almost ten years ago in Ghana has now evolved into a skin-care company with two finished product lines, one of which launched in more than 700 Target stores in the United States in July 2019. It is a long road from a grassroots enterprise to the shelves of Target, and the grantee has credited USADF’s market access, technical support, and training, or “mini-MBA” as she describes it, for her success.

It is typically difficult to attain quick growth from investments in more nascent organizations whose management-capacity deficits are often deeper and whose growth trajectories are generally longer than that of more established organizations that are better positioned for sustainable growth.

While the agency still supports grassroots cooperatives, USADF also targets organizations with larger production potential and larger numbers of people to maximize return on the U.S. taxpayer's investment and help Africans engaged in self-development succeed.

USADF routinely uses data from monitoring and evaluation to make decisions, such as shifting the Agency's project selection criteria to better target organizations that are more primed for sustainable growth and impact.

### ***Implementing Partners***

In FY 2019, USADF supported the growth of African development organizations in 20 countries. Working with African organizations as partners is one of the foundational pillars of the USADF Act, which "encourages the establishment and growth of development institutions which are indigenous to particular countries in Africa and which can respond to the requirements of the poor in those countries." USADF relies on its African implementing partners to use their local knowledge to co-develop projects along with grantees using a participatory development process and provide technical assistance, implementation, and monitoring support to grantees.

### ***Targeted Beneficiaries***

The main beneficiaries of USADF's work are smallholder farmers, SMEs that integrate large numbers of farmers into their supply chain, youth entrepreneurs who start agribusinesses and provide opportunities for unemployed youth, and energy entrepreneurs who use off-grid energy to help power the smallholder agriculture sector. Cross-cutting through all of these is an emphasis on working with women—up to 65 percent of USADF's beneficiaries in the agriculture sector are women.

### **U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)**

USGS food-security efforts are funded by USAID's Office of Food for Peace (see Appendix 4). In support of the USAID-funded Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET), USGS applies its expertise with satellite remote sensing, modeling, and geospatial methods to characterize climate variability in countries with sparse surface-instrument networks.

USGS assists FEWS NET food-security analysts in the interpretation of the agro-climatological significance of anomalous climatic events so that potential impacts can be factored into food-security assessments and scenario development.

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

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

### ***Progress***

FEWS NET (which includes USGS, University of California, Santa Barbara [UCSB], and NASA) has developed new forecasting tools that include: early estimates of the start-of-season outlook that are made using weather forecasts and seasonal-scale soil moisture forecasts, and have allowed identification of the 2018-2019 drought in Southern Africa as early as mid-December of 2018. To provide context to this early warning, the food-aid relief request from the Southern African Development Community (SADC) during the 2015-2016 drought was not released until June 2016.

USGS continued to provide extensive support to monitoring the 2018-2019 agricultural season in Afghanistan through monthly “Seasonal Monitor” reports (from November 2018 through May 2019). These reports and supplemental monitoring materials, including analysis and presentation of streamflow time series for select basins (*e.g.*, streamflow peaks that may induce local flooding), advised FEWS NET on aspects of agro-climatology that had the potential to affect production and flooding. FEWS NET routinely conveyed information to various National Ministries, USAID, and the Afghanistan Food Security Cluster to provide actionable information to reduce hunger.

Using FEWS NET remote sensing agro-climatic products and new forecasting tools, USGS and collaborators at UCSB provided support to the Group on Earth Observations Global Agricultural Monitoring (GEOGLAM) “Special Report on Southern Africa 2018/19 Summer Crops.” The report highlights a long delay in the start of the season, limited rainfall and/or extended dry spells throughout the season, and some areas that experienced their worst drought since 1981 (*e.g.*, southern Zambia and areas of Zimbabwe).

USGS and FEWS NET supported a GEOGLAM “Special Report on the East Africa Main Season Crops (Mar-May).” The report notes that the March-May season throughout East Africa was characterized by severe dryness and above-average temperatures, resulting in expectations that crop production will be 40-50 percent below normal. Despite late season rainfall enhancement in some areas, the dryness was largely irreversible across eastern Kenya and southern Somalia, resulting in the second consecutive season with below-average crop production. In this case, FEWS NET mid-season monitoring and forecasting systems rapidly identified the East Africa drought and food-security crisis beginning in late March 2019.

USGS and UCSB have initiated a webinar series with SADC with the goal of building its capacity to monitor and forecast drought. The second webinar in the series included presentations from USGS on “Combining satellite rainfall observations with weather model

predictions to produce integrated monitoring products” and from SADC on “Information needs of Disaster Risk Reduction Agencies related to extreme precipitation and potential flooding.”

USGS completed an analysis and mapping of on-farm tree density across cropland in Malawi; results show that farmers have adopted an important natural-resource-enhancement practice (farmer-managed natural regeneration) on more than one million hectares of farmland. This practice contributes to increased soil fertility, increased crop yields, more firewood and fodder, and a variety of tree products, all of which contribute to building resilience to drought and unpredictable crop yields. A comparison of on-farm tree cover between 2009 and 2017 shows only a slight increase in some areas.

In general, USGS and UCSB partners continue to provide key cross-governmental leadership, developing and implementing cutting-edge drought monitoring systems that draw from contributions provided by FEWS NET science partners (*e.g.*, NOAA and NASA) as well as from USGS. A journal article on FEWS NET drought early warning support to USAID will be featured in the June issue of the *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*.

### ***Lessons Learned***

Decades of USAID/USGS efforts have improved our understanding of the impacts of the phases of El Niño Southern Oscillation (*i.e.*, El Niño and La Niña), the Indian Ocean Dipole (IOD), and the gradient of sea surface temperatures between the central and eastern portions of the tropical Pacific Ocean. This understanding, combined with state-of-the-art monitoring and modeling systems, has allowed higher confidence in the prediction of potentially devastating water deficits for crops and pasture, *e.g.*, for southern Africa during the 2018-2019 growing season and the East Africa long rains season (March-May), as noted above.

### ***Implementing Partners***

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

### ***Targeted Beneficiaries***

A wide range of stakeholders use USGS data and analyses (see footnote on Appendix 4 table), including the U.S. Government and partner-government policy-makers, National Meteorological and Hydrological Services, the global food-security community (including international and national institutions, U.S. universities, and non-governmental organizations [NGOs]), and GEOGLAM. USGS primarily supports activities in sub-Saharan Africa, Central America, Central Asia (Afghanistan and Tajikistan), Haïti, and, peripherally, other areas of the world that

do, or will potentially, experience food insecurity (*e.g.*, areas of South America, the Middle East, North Africa, and the rest of Asia).

### **Inter-American Foundation (IAF)**

The Inter-American Foundation (IAF) contributes to Feed the Future by providing grants to local grassroots and NGOs in Latin America and the Caribbean to address food insecurity and improve resilience in rural communities. The IAF's mission and grant-making work closely align with each of the GFSS objectives:

- **Reduce poverty and hunger and build resilience among vulnerable populations.** The IAF supports training for small-scale farmers in sustainable agricultural practices to improve yields, generate greater income for their families, and bolster communities' abilities to withstand economic downturns, natural disasters, violent conflict, instability, and other challenges. It also provides for training at the organizational level (associations, cooperatives, and agricultural savings and loans groups) to improve their management of crises or challenges;
- **Promote inclusive, sustainable, agriculture-led growth.** The IAF supports community-led projects that are intended to improve farm management practices, create value chains; process and add value to crops; expand access to markets; and diversify crops to lower the exposure to single-crop crises. To improve the long-term sustainability of these farm- and agriculture-related initiatives, the IAF requires its grantee partners to mobilize or contribute counterpart resources to the grant; and
- **Achieve food security and improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children.** The IAF supports community-led projects to improve access to water, increase the production of staple crops, create safe storage for seeds and grains, and diversify crops in the local diet, including by providing nontraditional crops to school lunch programs. It encourages its grantee partners to diversify their membership to include entrepreneurial women and youth, including putting them in leadership roles.

The IAF began formally participating in Feed the Future interagency coordination in FY 2018.

### ***Progress***

Across the region, the IAF's active sustainable agriculture (including food security and natural-resource management) portfolio totals \$33 million. In FY 2019, the IAF is providing an additional \$5.4 million to local organizations. Investments in small-scale agricultural infrastructure are contributing to drought resilience, improvements in food availability, and increased farmer/household incomes. Improvements in the organizational capacity of cooperatives and rural savings and loan organizations are expanding markets and increasing

access to affordable credit. And, the introduction and adoption of organic inputs is contributing to the consumption of healthy products, protection of long-term soil fertility, and increased revenue for small farmers.

### ***Lessons Learned***

IAF partner organizations are engaging youth in agriculture by incorporating greater use of technology in their enterprises, embracing market-based agriculture (versus only subsistence farming), expanding into agricultural enterprises, and providing young farmers access to credit. The IAF's exchanges and farmer-to-farmer knowledge-sharing opportunities help transfer information and encourage the adoption of successful sustainable agricultural practices. Specific examples include the construction and use of greywater recycling systems, covered production agriculture, and the production and sale of organic fertilizers and other inputs.

### ***Implementing Partners***

The IAF partners directly with more than 100 local organizations to support community-led food-security-related initiatives intended to improve production, launch enterprises, reach new markets, utilize environmentally friendly technologies, and increase incomes for producers. Partner efforts are supported by the IAF's small in-country teams that provide management and technical expertise. Partners also engage the public and private sectors to unlock the additional resources (monetary and non-monetary) needed to expand and sustain the impact of their food-security investments.

### ***Targeted Beneficiaries***

The IAF provides direct funding to local organizations, whose activities in FY 2019 directly benefited 160,000 people engaged in sustainable agriculture to strengthen local economies, improve food security, and especially incent the participation of women and youth in agriculture. Organizations include farmer groups, associations, small businesses, NGOs, community savings and loan organizations, and other grassroots organizations. These groups range in size and level of market insertion from subsistence-level farmers in remote areas to larger associations that produce for regional and foreign markets.

## **Appendix 4: *Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) Spending Report***

This Section responds to Section 8(a)(7) of the Global Food Security Act for “a transparent, open, and detailed accounting of spending by relevant Federal departments and agencies to implement the GFSS, including, for each Federal department and agency, the statutory source of spending, amounts spent, implementing partners, targeted beneficiaries, and activities supported to the extent practicable and appropriate.” The following table includes a detailed accounting of budget authority appropriated for food security to the relevant Federal Departments and Agencies. Appendix 4 also includes a review by Department and Agency of implementing partners, targeted beneficiaries, and activities as part of each Agency’s GFSS implementation-plan update.

**Table 1. Assistance for Global Food Security Activities from Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 to FY 2019, including Feed the Future (Budget Authority)**

<i>(Budget Authority in thousands)</i>	FY12 Enacted (\$000s)	FY13 Enacted* (\$000s)	FY14 Enacted (\$000s)	FY15 Enacted (\$000s)	FY16 Enacted (\$000s)	FY17 Enacted (\$000s)	FY18 Enacted (\$000s)	FY19 Estimate (\$000s)
U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) (a)	1,754,378	1,547,056	1,594,287	1,587,049	1,468,261	1,431,978	1,492,875	1,531,345
Development Assistance	826,700	843,422	866,250	901,260	823,855	762,139	841,400	810,416
Economic Support Fund	343,206	275,013	228,306	185,834	122,025	150,587	146,700	175,084
Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia	30,520	0	0	0	11,000	12,500	12,500	15,100
Title II Non-Emergency (b)	425,000	300,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	365,000
Global Health Programs	128,952	128,621	149,731	149,955	161,381	156,752	142,275	165,745
U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)	420,501	417,501	322,126	329,626	386,626	376,611	362,670	365,963
Cochran Fellowship Program (c)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Borlaug Fellowship Program (c)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program (d)	174,501	174,501	185,126	191,626	201,626	201,626	207,626	210,255
Food for Progress Program	246,000	243,000	137,000	138,000	185,000	174,985	155,044	155,708
U.S. Department of Commerce (e)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
U.S. Department of State	500	500	5,500	10,500	500	500	500	500
Contributions to International Organizations	(f)	(f)	(f)	(f)	(f)	(f)	(f)	(f)
Diplomatic and Consular Programs (g)	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Economic Support Funds	0	0	5,000	10,000	0	0	0	0
U.S. Department	165,000	156,646	163,000	30,000	74,930	53,000	30,000	30,000

of the Treasury								
International Fund for Agricultural Development	30,000	28,481	30,000	30,000	31,930	30,000	30,000	30,000
Global Agriculture and Food Security Program	135,000	128,165	133,000	0	43,000	23,000	0	0
Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC)	(h)							
Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) (i)	878	4,372	1,162	6,925	0	1,018	3,598	9,666
Peace Corps (j)	23,000	23,850	27,120	28,270	26,290	22,949	18,116	17,509
Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) (k)	N/A							
U.S. African Development Foundation (USADF)	(l)							
U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) (m)	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
Inter-American Foundation (IAF)	(n)							
Subtotal	2,364,257	2,149,925	2,113,195	1,992,370	1,956,607	1,886,056	1,907,759	1,954,983

**Footnotes:**

N/A = Not Available

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

- a) USAID levels reflect enacted levels supporting implementation of global food-security activities, including agriculture, nutrition, and household-level water, sanitation, hygiene, and environment programs, as defined by the U.S. Foreign Assistance Standardized Program Structure and Definitions (<http://www.state.gov/f/c24132.htm>). GH-P USAID levels include funding for nutrition and household-level water, sanitation, hygiene, and environment programs. In general, over this period, USAID Congressional Budget Justification (CBJ) tables and descriptions of global food-security funding provided the amounts for agriculture, which is the principal component of this funding.
- b) USAID Title II - Non-Emergency enacted levels represent the minimum amount of Title II resources for FY 2012-FY 2019 appropriations that should be used for development-food-assistance programs authorized by Title II of the Food for Peace Act, as amended. Appropriations to the Title II account do not specify the level of funding that USAID should direct to emergency versus non-emergency programming.
- c) The Cochran Fellowship Program and Borlaug Fellowship Program are not included in the Department of Agriculture's budget request. Program funds are from the USDA Foreign Agricultural Service Salaries and Expenses account. The topic of a fellowship is determined at the time it is awarded. These programs are at the discretion of FAS and are intended to facilitate trade capacity-building efforts that promote and support U.S. agricultural exports. FAS obligated \$1.7 million and \$1.3 million respectively for these programs in FY 2018.
- d) Both the FY 2016 and FY 2017 total include \$5 million to carry out local and regional food procurement (LRP) projects under 7 USC 1726 (c), as provided in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of FY 2016 and Consolidated Appropriations Act of FY 2017, respectively. In FY 2018, \$10 million was provided under the Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY 2018 (Omnibus). FY 2019 provided \$15 million to carry out LRP projects.
- e) The U.S. International Trade Administration (ITA) conducts food-security activities as part of its overall trade promotion and trade development efforts. Funding is not directly assigned to global food-security activities' implementation, nor is the level of effort—such as number of hours per employee devoted to the strategy—readily available. ITA's appropriation is subdivided into an administrative program unit and three business units (Global Markets, Industry and Analysis, and Enforcement and Compliance). Activities related to the U.S. Government *Global Food Security Strategy* (GFSS) primarily take place within the Industry and Analysis unit. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) conducts activities identified in the Department of Commerce GFSS implementation plan as part of its overall capacity-building efforts. While these activities contribute to the GFSS, funding is not directly assigned to GFSS implementation. These activities are primarily funded through NOAA's Operations, Research, and Facilities appropriation, which is subdivided into NOAA's seven Line Office units. Each Line Office supports activities that contribute to the GFSS, such as capacity-building for drought warnings and science-based aquaculture production. Funding, however, is not specified for that particular purpose.
- f) The Department of State's assessed contributions for two United Nations (UN) agencies and another international organization, all which support food security, totaled approximately \$1.3 billion from FY 2012 to FY 2018, and U.S. contributions in 2019 toward assessments totaled about \$195 million. The three agencies include the UN Food and Agriculture Organization, UN World Health Organization, and the World Organization of Animal Health. This funding supports the agencies overall. The proportion of the funding that directly supports U.S. international food-security efforts is not known.
- g) Funding supports the promotion of agricultural biotechnology as a tool to increase long-term agricultural productivity and improve food security and nutrition and encourages countries to adopt transparent and science-based regulations and practices to improve food safety.
- h) Although MCC has obligated approximately \$1.06 billion in food security from FY 2012 through FY 2019, MCC's enacted budget is planned at a country level and excludes sector-level detail.
- i) The OPIC loan subsidy (as defined in OMB Circular A-11, Section 185.3 (v)) of \$3,598,350 for FY 2018 plus negative subsidy projects supported \$588,042,729 of financing commitments and \$22,110,000 of insurance commitments in FY 2018. In FY 2019, it is estimated that OPIC subsidy of \$9,666,473 will support \$112,999,500 of OPIC financing commitments for food-security projects.
- j) Represents funding estimates for Peace Corps Volunteers working in agriculture, environment, health (nutrition and water/sanitation), community economic development, youth development, and education programs. Funding is attributed to Volunteer activities in all sectors related to food-security programming indicators, which are reported on at the end of the Fiscal Year.
- k) USTR leads U.S. trade negotiations and oversees the development and coordination of U.S. international trade, commodity, and direct investment policy. Because trade can play a role in stimulating economic growth and strengthening food security, USTR works with trading partners, as part of its overall trade-policy agenda, to reduce barriers to trade and therefore increase the availability of food. Funding is not directly assigned to global food-security activities implementation, nor is the level of effort available, such as number of hours per employee devoted to food-security activities.
- l) Although USADF has obligated more than \$30 million in grants that support food security from FY 2012 through FY 2018, USADF's enacted budget is planned at a country level and excludes sector-level detail. At the time data were

collected, final FY 2019 obligation information was not yet available. FY 2019 information will be provided in next year's report.

- m) No USGS-appropriated funds support global food-security activities. Activities are supported by interagency transfers from USAID, as described in the USGS GFSS implementation plan, for the period covered in this table.
- n) Although IAF has obligated more than \$30 million in grants that support food security from FY 2012 through FY 2018, IAF's enacted budget is planned at a country level and excludes sector-level detail. At the time data were collected, final FY 2019 obligation information was not yet available. FY 2019 information will be provided in next year's report.

## Appendix 5: Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Indicators for the *Global Food Security Strategy* (GFSS)

Full indicator definitions and details are available in the *Feed the Future Indicator Handbook* online here: <https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook>. Note that the indicator titles and definitions used in Fiscal Year (FY) 2018, and therefore included in this report, are from the March 2018 version of the *Feed the Future Indicator Handbook* (direct link to the file is here: <https://www.agrilinks.org/sites/default/files/ftf-indicator-handbook-march-2018-508.pdf>).

<b>Performance Indicators addressing the Goal, Objectives, or IRs of the GFSS Results Framework</b>
Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than \$1.90/day 2011 Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) [ZOI-level]
Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than \$1.90/day 2011 PPP [National-level]*
Prevalence of moderate and severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) [ZOI-level]
Prevalence of moderate or severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) [National-level]*
Percentage of Households below the Comparative Threshold for the Poorest Quintile of the Asset-Based Comparative Wealth Index [ZOI-level]
Depth of Poverty of the Poor: Mean percent shortfall of the poor relative to the \$1.90/day 2011 PPP poverty line [ZOI-level]
Number of individuals participating in U.S. Government (USG) food-security programs [IM-level]
Yield of targeted agricultural commodities among program participants with USG assistance [IM-level]
Percent change in value-added in the agri-food system (“Ag GDP+”) [National-level]
Abbreviated Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index [ZOI-level]
Employment in the agri-food system [National-level]
Yield of targeted agricultural commodities within target areas [ZOI-level]
Kilometers of roads improved or constructed as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]
Value of new U.S. Government commitments and private-sector investment leveraged by the USG to support food security and nutrition [IM-level]
Value of targeted agricultural commodities exported at a national level [National-level]
Number of milestones in improved institutional architecture for food-security policy achieved with USG support [Multi-level]

<b>Number of individuals who have received USG-supported degree-granting non-nutrition-related food-security training [IM-level]</b>
<b>Number of technologies, practices, and approaches under various phases of research, development, and uptake as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]</b>
<b>Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USG assistance [IM-level]</b>
<b>Number of hectares under improved management practices or technologies with USG assistance [IM-level]</b>
<b>Value of annual sales of farms and firms that receive USG assistance [IM-level]</b>
<b>Value of agriculture-related financing accessed as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]</b>
<b>Number of hectares under improved management practices or technologies that promote improved climate risk reduction and/or natural-resources management with USG assistance [IM-level]</b>
<b>Number of organizations with increased performance improvement with USG assistance [IM-level]</b>
<b>Proportion of producers who have applied targeted improved management practices or technologies [ZOI-level]</b>
<b>Percentage of female participants of USG nutrition-sensitive agriculture activities who consume a diet of minimum diversity [IM-level]</b>
<b>Number of individuals who participate in group-based savings, micro-finance, or lending programs with USG assistance [IM-level]</b>
<b>Proportion of households that participate in group-based savings, micro-finance, or lending programs [ZOI-level]</b>
<b>Number of adults with legally recognized and documented tenure rights to land or marine areas, as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]</b>
<b>Number of people who perceive their tenure rights to land or marine areas as secure as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]</b>
<b>Number of USG social-assistance beneficiaries who participate in productive safety nets [IM-level]</b>
<b>Number of people who gain access to a basic sanitation service as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]</b>
<b>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members [IM-level]</b>
<b>Percentage of households with access to a basic sanitation service [ZOI-level]</b>
<b>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members [ZOI-level]</b>
<b>Number of children under the age of five (0-59 months) reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USG-supported programs [IM-level]</b>
<b>Number of children under the age of two (0-23 months) reached with community-level nutrition interventions through USG-supported programs [IM-level]</b>

Number of pregnant women reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USG-supported programs [IM-level]
Number of individuals who receive nutrition-related professional training through USG-supported programs [IM-level]
Percent of participants of community-level nutrition interventions who practice promoted infant and young child feeding behaviors [IM-level]
Prevalence of stunted (HAZ < -2) children under the age of five (0-59 months) [ZOI-level]
Prevalence of wasted (WHZ < -2) children under the age of five (0-59 months) [ZOI-level]
Prevalence of underweight (BMI < 18.5) women of reproductive age [ZOI-level]
Prevalence of stunted (HAZ < -2) children under the age of five (0-59 months) [National-level]*
Prevalence of healthy weight (WHZ $\leq 2$ and $\geq -2$ ) among children under the age of five (0-59 months) [ZOI-level]
Prevalence of children six to 23 months old who receive a minimum acceptable diet [ZOI-level]
Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age [ZOI-level]
Prevalence of women of reproductive age who consume a diet of minimum diversity [ZOI-level]
<b>Cross-cutting Indicators</b>
Percentage of female participants in USG-assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources [IM-level]
Number of host-government or community-derived risk-management plans formally proposed, adopted, implemented, or institutionalized with USG assistance [IM-level]
Ability to recover from shocks and stresses index [ZOI-level]
Index of social capital at the household level [ZOI-level]
Proportion of households that believe local government will respond effectively to future shocks and stresses [ZOI-level]
Percentage of participants in USG-assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources who are youth (15-29 years old) [IM-level]
<b>Context Indicators</b>
Percentage of Households below the Comparative Threshold for the Poorest Quintile of the Asset-Based Comparative Wealth Index [National-level]
Average income of small-scale food producers, by sex and indigenous status (SDG indicator #2.3.2) [National-level]*

<b>Volume of production per labor unit by classes of farming/pastoral/forestry enterprise size (SDG indicator #2.3.1) [National-level]*</b>
<b>Percentage of youth (15 to 29 years old) who are Not in Education, Employment, or Training (NEET) (SDG indicator #8.8.6) - [National-level]*</b>
<b>Prevalence of wasted (WHZ &lt; -2) children under the age of five (0-59 months) [National-level]</b>
<b>Depth of Poverty of the Poor: Mean percent shortfall relative to the \$1.90/day 2011 PPP poverty line [National-level]</b>
<b>USG humanitarian assistance spending in areas/populations subject to recurrent crises [Recurrent crisis areas (if data not available, National)]</b>
<b>Number of people in need of humanitarian food assistance in areas/populations subject to recurrent crises [Recurrent crisis areas (if data not available, National)]</b>
<b>Prevalence of people who are “Near-Poor,” living on 100 percent to less than 125 percent of the \$1.90/day 2011 PPP poverty line [ZOI-level]</b>
<b>Risk to well-being as a percent of GDP [National-level]</b>
<b>Yield of targeted agricultural commodities [National-level]</b>
<b>Average Standard Precipitation Index score during the main growing season [ZOI-level]</b>
<b>Average deviation from ten-year average Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) during the main growing season [ZOI-level]</b>
<b>Total number of heat stress days above 30 °C during the main growing season [ZOI-level]</b>
<b>Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture (SDG indicator #2.4.1) [National-level]*</b>
<b>Prevalence of healthy weight (WHZ ≤ 2 and ≥ -2) among children under the age of five (0-59 months) [National-level]</b>
<b>Prevalence of underweight (BMI &lt; 18.5) among women of reproductive age [National-level]</b>
<b>Prevalence of undernourishment (SDG indicator #2.1.1) [National-level]*</b>
<b>Prevalence of children six to 23 months old who receive a minimum acceptable diet [National-level]</b>
<b>Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age [National-level]</b>
<b>Prevalence of women of reproductive age consuming a diet of minimum diversity [National-level]</b>
<b>Food security and nutrition funding as reported to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) [Global-level]</b>
<b>Percent share of agriculture in total government expenditure [National-level]</b>
<b>Proportion of total adult rural population with secure tenure rights to land, (a) with legally recognized documentation and (b) who perceive their rights to land as secure [National-level]</b>

**Average percentage of women who achieve adequacy across the six indicators of the Abbreviated Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index [ZOI-level]**

\*Marks those that are also a Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) indicator – see details in the *Feed the Future Indicator Handbook*

Indicators are color coded as follows: blue are regular performance indicators, purple are cross-cutting indicators (including resilience), and orange are context indicators.

## **Appendix 6: Performance Data for the Implementation of the *Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS)***

### *Select Feed the Future Annual Global Results*

Accountability for results is a hallmark of the Feed the Future approach. All U.S. Government partners report some level of program results that contribute to the U.S. Government GFSS. The U.S. Government has updated its monitoring, evaluation, and learning system to track results more efficiently and continuously learn from, and improve, its efforts. And while it tracks how many people it has reached, it also measures the impact of its work in the communities and areas where it targets its efforts.

Feed the Future took advantage of the transition to phase two of the initiative under the GFSS to revisit its standard performance monitoring indicators in order to make improvements and ensure measures of progress against each result in the GFSS results framework.

A nearly year-long process of ongoing interagency cooperation, two public comment periods, and collaboration with other technical experts within USAID led to compilation of a list of standard indicators best suited to measure the results of our food-security work and to flesh out clear definitions for each, all of which was published in the March 2018 version of the *Feed the Future Indicator Handbook*. Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 was the first year results and targets were reported using this new handbook, and the results table linked below reflects that change.

As FY 2018 was the first year transitioning to the new indicators and implementing mechanisms were permitted to prepare for the shift by setting targets on the new indicators (for continuing activities) while still reporting results under the old indicators, most of the reported results were still under the old indicators, and many of the results reported under the new indicators underestimate impact components of the new indicators. Refer to the more detailed explanations in the footnotes of the separate table linked below.

[Note that a revised version of this new handbook, to correct minor errors and add clarifications, was published in September 2019, and will be used for FY 2019 reporting, so is not addressed in this report.]

What's changing:

- New and updated performance indicators (see table)
- Collecting baseline data for Feed the Future Target Countries

- Incorporating national-level data and analysis
- Increasing emphasis on building country data systems

## Our Global Annual Results: Fiscal Year 2011 – 2018

Indicator	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18
<b>Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with U.S. Government (USG) assistance (a)</b>								<b>9,797,567</b>
<i>-- of which are producers</i>	1,557,166	7,167,613	6,407,782	6,481,229	8,883,703	11,385,359	11,144,904	9,607,746
<i>Female</i>	19%	27%	25%	29%	27%	27%	32%	31%
<i>Male</i>	28%	69%	64%	54%	48%	49%	48%	41%
<i>Disaggregates Not Available (DNA)</i>	53%	4%	11%	17%	25%	24%	19%	28%
<b>Number of hectares under improved management practices or technologies with USG assistance (b)</b>								
<i>-- of which are intensively-managed hectares (b)</i>								<b>8,440,001</b>
<i>-- of which are cropland or cultivated pasture (c)</i>	1,869,164	3,454,997	3,724,299	2,662,477	5,132,792	6,322,506	7,510,305	8,439,960
<i>-- of which are extensively-managed hectares (ex. rangeland, conservation/protected area, freshwater or marine ecosystems) (d)</i>								<b>2,235</b>
<b>Number of individuals who have received USG-supported degree-granting non-nutrition-related food security training</b>	<b>935</b>	<b>932</b>	<b>928</b>	<b>1,298</b>	<b>1,304</b>	<b>1,397</b>	<b>1,518</b>	<b>1,324</b>
<i>Female</i>	39%	40%	43%	42%	44%	41%	41%	42%
<i>Male</i>	60%	59%	56%	51%	56%	59%	59%	58%
<i>DNA</i>	1%	1%	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Number of individuals receiving nutrition-related professional training through USG-supported programs</b>						<b>63,037</b>	<b>384,519</b>	<b>612,855 (e)</b>
<i>Female</i>						91%	52%	69%

## Our Global Annual Results: Fiscal Year 2011 – 2018

Indicator	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18
<i>Male</i>						9%	18%	26%
<i>DNA</i>						0%	31%	5%
<b>Number of children under the age of five (0-59 months) reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USG-supported programs (f)</b>	<b>8,814,584</b>	<b>12,038,528</b>	<b>12,699,186</b>	<b>12,343,776</b>	<b>18,006,457</b>	<b>27,677,460</b>	<b>22,657,081</b>	<b>28,491,767</b>
<i>Female</i>	<i>n/a</i>	50%	50%	44%	51%	34%	36%	37%
<i>Male</i>	<i>n/a</i>	50%	50%	56%	49%	31%	34%	34%
<i>DNA</i>	<i>n/a</i>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	29%	29%
<b>Value of annual sales of farms and firms receiving USG assistance (g)</b>								<b>\$1,683,248,584</b>
<i>-- of which are from smallholder producers (h)</i>	\$53,465,273	\$352,962,159	\$1,241,277,808	\$1,568,791,560	\$2,286,217,102	\$2,408,065,134	\$2,658,952,465	\$1,625,768,960
<i>-- of which are from non-smallholder producers (i)</i>								\$5,280,227
<i>-- of which are from firms (j)</i>								\$52,199,396
<b>Value of agriculture-related financing accessed as a result of USG assistance (k, l)</b>								<b>\$429,134,649</b>
<i>-- of which is cash debt (m)</i>	\$185,066,353	\$127,365,952	\$188,805,217	\$671,555,635	\$710,871,314	\$387,998,716	\$343,555,006	\$428,950,587
<b>Value of new private sector investment leveraged by the USG to support food security and nutrition (n)</b>								<b>\$234,489,309</b>

## Chart Notes:

1. In October 2017, Feed the Future published an updated list of indicators as part of the Implementation Report for the *U.S. Government Global Food Security Strategy*. These performance management indicators are designed to measure progress against each result in the Feed the Future results framework during Phase Two of the initiative. Full definitions of indicators are available in the updated *Feed the Future Indicator Handbook* at <https://www.feedthefuture.gov/results/>.
2. FY 2018 represents a transition year for results, and therefore some values are likely underestimates. Projects have set targets for the new set of indicators but will not fully transition to reporting results for them until FY 2019. Therefore, some projects are reporting on old indicators while others report on updated indicators. This chart combines these data where appropriate. See the footnotes for details.
3. U.S. Government Departments and Agencies that reported into the Feed the Future Monitoring System (FTFMS) include USAID, the U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Treasury, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, Peace Corps, and the U.S. African Development Foundation.
4. Indicators are reported for Feed the Future Target, Focus and Aligned Countries in FY 2018. For a list of current Feed the Future countries, visit [www.feedthefuture.gov](http://www.feedthefuture.gov). Participating Federal Departments and Agencies do not necessarily report on all countries where they have programs and might only report on certain indicators. The USAID Office of Food for Peace has reported on Feed the Future indicators in non-aligned as well as non-focus countries where it has development programs, as have some other USG Feed the Future Departments and Agencies.
5. The data for output and outcome indicators above are directly attributable to USG funding. For the purposes of this report, a result is attributable to the USG or the USG can claim credit for a result, even when other partners are involved in achieving the result, if it can claim that without USG intervention the outcome would not have taken place.

## Footnotes:

- a) This value includes results reported under the old indicator EG.3.2-17 and the new indicator EG.3.2-24. Results could underestimate the number of “non-producers” that applied as the new indicator captures a broader set of actors beyond the farm, and projects are transitioning to the new indicator.
- b) Results could be underestimated, as past reporting did not include aquaculture hectares, and projects are transitioning to the new indicator.
- c) This value includes all hectares reported under the old indicator EG.3.2-18 and results from the “cropland” and “cultivated pasture” disaggregated under the new indicator EG.3.2-25.
- d) This value only reflects results from the new indicator EG.3.2-25.
- e) This result includes some USAID activities beyond those funded by Feed the Future. This number represents the aggregate of country-wide results from nutrition interventions delivered through Feed the Future, USAID Food for Peace development investments, and USAID Global Health nutrition programs as part of a multi-sectoral effort to combat malnutrition.
- f) This result includes some USAID activities beyond those funded by Feed the Future. This number represents the aggregate of country-wide results from nutrition interventions delivered through Feed the Future, USAID Food for Peace development investments, and USAID Global Health nutrition programs as part of a multi-sectoral effort to combat malnutrition. Individual USAID projects are instructed to count children only once even if they are reached several times. Starting in FY 2017, this revised indicator has captured nutrition-specific interventions only.
- g) This value includes reporting-year sales reported under the old indicator EG.3.2-19 and the new indicator EG.3.2-26. Results could be underestimated, as past reporting did not include sales from non-smallholder producers and firms, and projects are transitioning to the new indicator.
- h) These results include reporting-year sales reported under the old indicator EG.3.2-19 and those reported for the “producer: smallholder” disaggregate with the new indicator EG.3.2-26.
- i) The low value of this result reflects a transition to new indicators. Past reporting did not include sales from non-smallholder farmers. This value only reflects results from the new indicator EG.3.2-26.
- j) The low value of this result reflects a transition to a new indicator. Past reporting did not include sales from firms. This value only reflects results from the new indicator EG.3.2-26.
- k) This total includes reporting from the old indicator on agricultural and rural loans EG.3.2-6 and the new indicator EG.3.2-27. Results could be underestimated as past reporting did not include non-cash debt (i.e., in-kind debt) and non-debt financing, and projects are transitioning to the new indicator.
- l) Sex-disaggregation for this indicator will not be available until future reporting years because of a change in the definition of the indicator to remove shared ownership from the female disaggregate.
- m) These results include the value of loans reported under the old indicator EG.3.2-6 and the value of “cash debt” reported under the new indicator EG.3.2-27.
- n) These results include the value of private-sector capital investment reported under the old indicator EG.3.2-22 and private sector investment reported under the new indicator EG.3.1-14. Results could be underestimated because

previous reporting did not include operating capital investment amounts, and projects are transitioning to the new indicator.

## **Appendix 7: Glossary of Key Terms**

### **Aligned Country**

A developing country outside the grouping of Target Countries that implement Feed the Future programs.

### **Agriculture**

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

### **Evaluation**

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

### **Feed the Future Innovation Labs**

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

### **Food Security**

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

### **Fragility**

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

### **Gender**

The socio-culturally defined set of roles, rights, norms, responsibilities, entitlements, and obligations of females and males in societies, based on sex, which vary among cultures, and change over time.

### **Gender Equality**

Fundamental social transformation, working with men and boys, women and girls, to bring about changes in attitudes, behaviors, roles, and responsibilities at home, in the workplace, and in the

community. Genuine equality means expanding freedoms and improving overall quality of life so that equality is achieved without sacrificing gains for males or females.

### **Implementing Mechanism**

A means of implementing a program or project to achieve identified results, generally through the use of a legally binding relationship established between an executing agency (generally a U.S. Government [USG] Department of Agency or a host-government institution) and an implementing entity (contractor, grantee, host-government entity, international organization) to carry out programs with USG funding. Examples of implementing mechanisms include contracts, cooperative agreements, grants, interagency agreements, bilateral project agreements, fixed-amount reimbursement and performance agreements, and cash transfers to host-country governments, public-private partnerships, Development Credit Authority agreements, and Development Innovation Venture awards.

### **Learning Agenda**

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

### **Malnutrition**

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

### **Nutrition-Specific Interventions**

Interventions to address the immediate causes of undernutrition, such as a poor or inadequate diet, disease, and related underlying factors, such as lack of access to food, sub-optimal feeding practices, inadequate health care, and an unhealthy environment. Example: In the Kingdom of Cambodia, Feed the Future provides cooking demonstrations to families to help them increase the variety of nutrient-rich foods they eat.

### **Nutrition-Sensitive Interventions**

Interventions to address the basic underlying causes of undernutrition, by incorporating nutrition goals and activities into efforts in other areas, such as agriculture, education, water supply, and sanitation and hygiene. These efforts can even serve as delivery platforms for nutrition-specific

interventions, such as introducing agricultural as well as nutrition best practices at farmer training sessions. Example: In the People’s Republic of Bangladesh, Feed the Future is introducing low-cost cold rooms that can increase the shelf life and safety of nutritious foods like fish, fruits, and vegetables.

### **Resilience**

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

### **Self-Reliance**

A country’s ability to plan, finance, and implement solutions to solve its own development challenges.

### **Shock(s)**

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

### **Strategic Transition**

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

### **Stress(es)**

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

### **Stunting**

A sign of chronic malnutrition that refers to a condition measured by a height-to-age ratio that is more than two standard deviations below the median of the World Health Organization’s Child Growth Standards. Stunting is a result of suboptimal food and nutrient intakes; insufficient preventive health care and unhygienic environments; poor maternal nutrition; and inappropriate infant and young child feeding and care by mothers and other members of the family and the community during the most critical periods of growth and development in early life. At a population level, stunting is associated with long-term poor health, delayed motor development, impaired cognitive function, and decreased immunity.

**Sustainability**

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

**Target Country**

A developing country selected to participate in agriculture and nutrition programs under the *Global Food Security Strategy* (GFSS) pursuant to the selection criteria described in the “Targeting Approach” section of the *Strategy*. The list of Feed the Future Target Countries can change over the life of the GFSS.

**Youth**

A life stage that starts in adolescence and continues through young adulthood. The specific age range associated with those stages can vary by the socio-cultural context, programmatic context, and the organization funding or implementing the program.

**Zones of Influence**

The targeted sub-national regions/Districts in which the USG intends to achieve the greatest household- and individual-level impacts on poverty, hunger, and malnutrition through Feed the Future.