



Updated Conference Draft

Combating Food Shortages in Least Developed Countries: Current Development Assistance Approaches*

Alan J. Tomkins, JD, PhD**

* Paper for background and discussion at “Law and Development at the Microlevel: From Microtrade to Current Issues in Law and Development,” Seattle University School of Law, December 10, 2011. Helpful input has been provided by Eric Luftman, Bureau of Economic, Energy and Business Affairs, U.S. Department of State, and Kathryn E. Russell and Caitlin Welsh, Office of Global Food Security, U.S. Department of State. Do not cite, quote, or disseminate without prior permission. The perspectives and information contained here will be integrated into a more complete analysis and discussion of combating food insecurity in the world’s least developed countries. Comments and suggestions welcomed – please direct to atomkins@nebraska.edu.

** Alan J. Tomkins, J.D., Ph.D. is Director of the University of Nebraska Public Policy Center. He is serving from January 2011–January 2012 as a Franklin Fellow and Senior Advisor in the Office of Global Food Security, U.S. Department of State. The perspectives in this paper are the author’s and do not necessarily reflect the views or positions of the United States Government.

The Law and Development Institute
Seattle Conference
December 10, 2011

This paper identifies and briefly discusses the major policy initiatives that have been developed to combat chronic food shortages in the world's least developed nations. The United States has taken the world's leadership position in trying to address chronic hunger and under-nutrition as part of its Feed the Future initiative, an effort that is linked to the G8's L'Aquila Food Security initiative. Both initiatives focus on activities and outcomes that are intended to reduce food insecurity in the medium and long terms. Both initiatives operate in the context of the immediate food relief policies and practices that most nations subscribe to as part of the United Nations food security initiatives.

In September 2000, United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan announced that “the largest-ever gathering of world leaders,” building on perspectives and information adduced over years of U.N.-sponsored conferences and summits focusing on reducing global poverty and hunger, had agreed to the United Nations Millennium Declaration and the Millennium Development Goals, calling for halving global hunger and poverty by 2015.¹ The Goals reflected the world's concerns that severe food insecurity continued to threaten millions of people in developing nations, despite considerable wealth and prosperity in much of the world.²

¹ General Assembly, United Nations Millennium Declaration, A/RES/55/2 (Sept. 18, 2000), available at <http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.pdf>. See generally, Millennium Summit, retrieved Nov. 15, 2011, from <http://www.un.org/millennium/summit.htm>. Ending hunger is one of eight goals to address persistent and marked poverty. End Poverty 2015 Millennium Campaign, (no date), retrieved Nov. 15, 2011, from <http://endpoverty2015.org/>. The pledge to end poverty and hunger was at the core of the Millennium Development Goals:

End poverty by 2015. This is the historic promise 189 world leaders made at the United Nations Millennium Summit in 2000 when they signed onto the Millennium Declaration and agreed to meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The MDGs are an eight-point road map with measurable targets and clear deadlines for improving the lives of the world's poorest people. World leaders have agreed to achieve the MDGs by 2015.

<http://www.endpoverty2015.org/en/about>. The other seven goals, in addition to ending hunger, are: Universal Education; Gender Equity; Child Health; Maternal Health; Combat HIV/AIDS; Environmental Sustainability; and Global Partnership.

² See, e.g., Ray Kiely, The Crisis of Development, in GLOBALISATION AND THE THIRD WORLD 24, 25-26 (Ray Kiely & Phil Marfleet eds., 1998):

Great optimism fueled the perspective that “this time will be different,” and it was felt it was achievable to make a significant difference into the problem of poverty and hunger.³

By the beginning of the 1990s, most people in sub-Saharan Africa were poorer than they had been thirty years before. With a population of about 500 million, nearly 300 million are living in absolute poverty [citation omitted]. In developing countries as a whole, nearly 800 million people do not get enough food, and about 500 million are chronically malnourished. Almost one-third of the population of developing countries - about 1.3 billion - lives below the poverty line. The infant mortality rate, at about 350 per 100,000 live births, is about nine times higher than that in ‘advanced’ industrial countries [citation omitted].

³ See What’s Different this Time?:

[I]t’s important to understand why the Millennium Development Goals are unique in many powerful ways:

- They represent a compact between all the world’s major economic players. Poorer countries pledged to improve policies and governance and increase accountability to their own citizens; wealthy countries pledged to provide the resources. Since the commitment to achieve the goals comes from the highest political levels, for the first time, entire governments are committed to their achievement—including the trade and finance ministers who hold the world’s purse strings. And major international financial institutions—the World Bank, the IMF, the regional development banks, and increasingly, the membership of the World Trade Organization—have made explicit that they will be accountable for achieving the Goals too.
- The world has never before seen so much prosperity. The hundreds of billions that are being spent in Iraq have put things in perspective. We might not need more than about \$50 billion of additional aid per year to meet the Goals. About \$900 billion was invested in arms by governments in 2003 alone; and rich countries grant large support to their domestic agricultural producers, totaling \$300 billion each year. Financially, in the grand scheme of things, we’re talking about relatively small change.
- Performance against the goals is being monitored. These are not just lofty statements of intent; precise monitoring mechanisms have been put in place, in the form of national Millennium Goals reports and the Secretary General’s reports to the General Assembly. Civil society organizations around the world are creating their own set of reports as well, to ensure that governments are held to the highest possible standards of performance. Over 60 country reports have already been produced at the national level.
- The Goals are clearly achievable. Some have even argued that they are not in fact millennium, but ‘minimum’ development goals. We believe that to set the bar any lower than this would be morally unacceptable. Individual Goals have already been achieved by many countries in the space of only 10-15 years.

End Poverty 2015 Millennium Campaign, *supra* note 2, at <http://endpoverty2015.org/en/goals>.

Some, such as William Easterly, a New York University economics professor, are skeptical that foreign aid policies, like those espoused in the End Poverty Millennium Campaign, will fulfill the aspirations of ending poverty and hunger. *E.g.*, WILLIAM EASTERLY, *THE ELUSIVE QUEST FOR GROWTH: ECONOMISTS’ ADVENTURES AND MISADVENTURES IN THE TROPICS* (2001); WILLIAM EASTERLY, *THE WHITE MAN’S BURDEN: WHY THE WEST’S EFFORTS TO AID THE REST HAVE DONE SO MUCH ILL AND SO LITTLE GOOD* (2006); William Easterly, *Are Aid Agencies Improving?*, 22 *ECON. POL’Y* 633 (2007); William Easterly, *Was Development Assistance a Mistake?*, 97 *AM. ECON. REV.* 328 (2007).

Even with the UN's commitment to fixing the problem, global poverty and hunger persisted as the end of the first decade of the new millennium was approaching.⁴ At the 2009 G8 meeting in L'Aquila, Italy, the latest approach to food security was outlined as part of the L'Aquila Food Security Initiative (AFSI),⁵ with a focus on mid-term, long-term, and sustainable strategies.⁶ The initiative represented a 22 billion dollar commitment, led by a pledge from the United States contributing \$3.5 billion to the effort, to meet the MDG of halving hunger by 2015.⁷ Under the L'Aquila Initiative, it was agreed there would be a focus on sustainably reducing global hunger and poverty by targeting agriculture growth at the smallholder farmer level, along with myriad other features that would address the root causes and perpetuation of hunger and poverty.

AFSI confronted anew a continuing challenge of immense proportions. Currently, it is estimated that nearly one-sixth of the world's population is food insecure and suffers from chronic malnutrition and undernutrition. That means there are almost one billion people

⁴ See, e.g., United Nations General Assembly, Keeping the Promise: United to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals (September 17, 2010), at para. 20, available at <http://www.un.org/en/mdg/summit2010/pdf/mdg%20outcome%20document.pdf>.

⁵ "L'Aquila" Joint Statement on Global Food Security, L'Aquila Food Security Initiative (AFSI) (July 10, 2009), retrieved Nov. 15, 2011, from http://www.g8italia2009.it/static/G8_Allegato/LAquila_Joint_Statement_on_Global_Food_Security%5B1%5D,0.pdf (hereinafter AFSI). The statement was endorsed, in addition to the G8 countries, by:

Algeria, Angola, Australia, Brazil, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Libya (Presidency of the African Union), Mexico, The Netherlands, Nigeria, People's Republic of China, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Spain, South Africa, Turkey, Commission of the African Union, FAO, IEA, IFAD, ILO, IMF, OECD, The Secretary General's UN High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis, WFP, The World Bank, WTO who attended the food security session at the G8 Summit in L'Aquila on 10 July 2009 and by the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA), Bioversity/Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), Global Donor Platform for Rural Development, Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR).

Id. at 6.

⁶ *Id.* at para. 4, para. 5, para. 10, and para. 12.

⁷ "President Obama's pledge of at least \$3.5 billion for agricultural development and food security over three years helped to leverage and align more than \$18.5 billion from other donors in support of a common approach" to achieve food security. FEED THE FUTURE GUIDE 1 (2010, May), available at http://www.usaid.gov/feedthefuture/FTF_Guide.pdf.

impacted, and millions of children die annually.⁸ Without successful, long-term, and sustainable interventions, it is expected that hunger and nutritional problems will dramatically increase as the world's population expands to more than 9 billion (nearly a 40% increase) by 2050 and food requirements increase by 70% worldwide and by 100% in developing countries.⁹ Food insecurity will be exacerbated by global warming and connected issues such as decreased water supplies, as well as by rising food prices and increased demands for food.¹⁰

The U.S. program that is implementing the L'Aquila initiative is the *Feed the Future* (FtF) initiative, a whole of government effort led by the U.S. Agency for International Development.¹¹ FtF is targeted to some of the world's poorest countries and regions.¹² FtF has become the Obama Administration's primary program for assuring food security in the world's least developed nations. This paper will discuss some of the key features of the L'Aquila and FtF initiatives and argues that these two initiatives are promising policy approaches for eradicating poverty and hunger.

Development Approaches

⁸ "More than one billion people – nearly one-sixth of the world's population – suffer from chronic hunger. This crisis has devastating and far-reaching effects. Each year, more than 3.5 million children die from undernutrition." FEED THE FUTURE GUIDE, *supra* note 7, at 2 (citation omitted). See also FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS, THE STATE OF FOOD INSECURITY IN THE WORLD 2009, at 10-11 (estimating over a billion food insecure and undernourished people for 2009, the highest levels since 1970), available at <http://www.fao.org/docrep/012/i0876e/i0876e00.htm>.

⁹ E.g., FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS, THE STATE OF FOOD INSECURITY IN THE WORLD 2011, at 42, available at <http://www.fao.org/docrep/014/i2330e/i2330e.pdf>.

¹⁰ E.g., David B. Lobell & Christopher B. Field, *Global Scale Climate–Crop Yield Relationships and the Impacts of Recent Warming*, 2 ENVIRON. RES. LETT. 1 (2007); Raj Nallari & Rwitwika Bhattacharya, *Triple Crisis: Rising Food Prices, Global Financial Crisis, and Climate Change Issues*, in FRONTIERS IN DEVELOPMENT POLICY: A PRIMER ON EMERGING ISSUES 277 (Raj Nallari et al. eds., 2011).

¹¹ See U.S. Commitment to Feed the Future, *supra* note 6.

¹² Twelve focus countries are in Africa (Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia), four are in Asia (Bangladesh, Cambodia, Nepal, Tajikistan), and four are in Latin America and the Caribbean (Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, and Nicaragua). FEED THE FUTURE GUIDE, *supra* note 7, at 15. In addition, there are five regional entities participating in the Feed the Future initiative: Asia Regional, Central America and Mexico Regional, East Africa Regional, Southern Africa Regional, and West Africa Regional. Feed the Future Countries, retrieved November 15, 2011, from <http://www.feedthefuture.gov/countries>. For current information on countries and regions, see links at *id*.

The L'Aquila Food Security Initiative (AFSI) and the Feed the Future (FtF) program stem from a new – or at least renewed – conception of economic development.¹³ After several decades that saw a decrease in investments in food security as evidenced by declines in aid focused on agriculture,¹⁴ the trend is now to view food security as a critical component of overall economic development.¹⁵ Although a case can be made that concept of development is hundreds of years old, its modern guise can be traced to the post-World War II era.¹⁶ It was in 1949 that the policy of development was articulated by President Harry Truman in his inaugural address, drawing explicit attention to the interrelated issues of hunger, economic stability, and long-term peace.¹⁷ Over the next 60+ years, development approaches evolved, evolving from foci on trade and credit issues central to import-substitution industrialization designed to spur economic

¹³ For an overview of traditional developmental economics, see DEBRAJ RAY, DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS (1998).

¹⁴ In the OECD countries, official developmental assistance shrank, in general, and agriculture investments reduced by 43%. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Measuring Aid to Agriculture (2010, April), *retrieved* November 15, 2011, from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/54/38/44116307.pdf>. *See also* FEED THE FUTURE GUIDE, *supra* note 7, at 1 (“The share of official development assistance devoted to agriculture was as much as 17 percent in the late 1980s, but fell to 6 percent in recent years.”). *See generally* OECD, CREDITOR REPORTING SYSTEM 2009: AID ACTIVITIES IN SUPPORT OF AGRICULTURE (2009), and compare to OECD, 50 Years of Official Development Assistance, *retrieved* November 15, 2011 from http://www.oecd.org/document/41/0,3746,en_2649_34447_46195625_1_1_1_1,00.html.

¹⁵ *See, e.g.*, Breda Griffith, *What is Development?*, in FRONTIERS IN DEVELOPMENT POLICY: A PRIMER ON EMERGING ISSUES 9 (Raj Nallari et al. eds., 2011). *See generally* Ruth E. Gordon & Jon H. Sylvester, *Deconstructing Development*, 22 WIS. INT’L L.J. 1, 4-5 (2004). Food security also is viewed as more than simply developmental assistance: It also is viewed as having national security implications. *See, e.g.*, INDEPENDENT LEADERS GROUP ON GLOBAL AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT, RENEWING AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IN THE FIGHT AGAINST GLOBAL HUNGER AND POVERTY: THE CHICAGO INITIATIVE ON GLOBAL AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT (2009), *available at* http://www.thechicagocouncil.org/UserFiles/File/GlobalAgDevelopment/Report/gadp_final_report.pdf; J. STEPHEN MORRISON & JOHANNA NESSETH TUTTLE, A CALL FOR A STRATEGIC U.S. APPROACH TO THE GLOBAL FOOD CRISIS: A REPORT OF THE CSIS TASK FORCE ON THE GLOBAL FOOD CRISIS, CORE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (2008, July), *available at* http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/080728_food_security.pdf. From the Center for Strategic and International Studies, *see also* CENTER FOR STRATEGIC & INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, CULTIVATING GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY A STRATEGY FOR U.S. LEADERSHIP ON PRODUCTIVITY, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, AND TRADE 4 (Report of the CSIS Task Force on Global Food Security) (2010, May), *available at* http://csis.org/files/publication/100422_Food_%20Security_WEB.pdf; Johanna Nesseth Tuttle, INSTABILITY AND GLOBAL FOOD SUPPLIES, IN GLOBAL FORECAST 2011: INTERNATIONAL SECURITY IN A TIME OF UNCERTAINTY 53 (Craig Cohen & Josiane Gabel eds., 2011, June), *available at* http://csis.org/files/publication/110610_Cohen_GlobalForecast2011.pdf.

¹⁶ Kiely, *supra* note 2.

¹⁷ *Id.* at 26-27.

growth, to a focus, by the 1970s, on enhanced agricultural productivity to combat chronic rural poverty.¹⁸

Despite the focus on agriculture as a key to development, the approach did not yield the desired outcomes. As already discussed, by the turn of the 21st century poverty and hunger were still major problems across the globe, and the need for a new approach to combat poverty and hunger became apparent even before the price increases in 2007-2008 resulted in millions of new people falling into poverty and hunger crises.

By mid-decade, new approaches to create the necessary infrastructure for food security in developing nations were being agreed to in multinational contexts. Specifically, the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness¹⁹ and the Accra Agenda for Action,²⁰ taken together, provide:

for aid recipients to forge their own national development strategies with their parliaments and electorates (**ownership**); for donors to support these strategies (**alignment**) and work to streamline their efforts in-country (**harmonisation**); for development policies to be directed to achieving [sic] clear goals and for progress towards these goals to be monitored (**results**); and for donors and recipients alike to be jointly responsible for achieving [sic] these goals (**mutual accountability**).²¹

L'Aquila Food Security Initiative (AFSI)

¹⁸ *Id.* at 27-32. See also FRANZ HEIDHUES ET AL., DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES AND FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY IN AFRICA: AN ASSESSMENT Chap. 2 (IFPRI, 2020 Discussion Paper 38, 2004), available at <http://www.ifpri.org/publication/development-strategies-and-food-and-nutrition-security-africa>. See generally, LAW AND DEVELOPMENT PERSPECTIVE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE LAW (Yong-Shik Lee et al., eds., 2011); Lily Endean Nierenberg, *Reconciling the Right to Food and Trade Liberalization: Developing Country Opportunities*, 20 MINN. J. INT'L L. 619 (2011).

¹⁹ The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005), in THE PARIS DECLARATION ON AID EFFECTIVENESS AND THE ACCRA AGENDA FOR ACTION (2005/2008), available at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/41/34428351.pdf>.

²⁰ The Accra Agenda for Action (2008), in THE PARIS DECLARATION ON AID EFFECTIVENESS AND THE ACCRA AGENDA FOR ACTION (2005/2008), available at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/41/34428351.pdf>.

²¹ OECD, Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action, retrieved November 15, 2011, from http://www.oecd.org/document/18/0,3746,en_2649_3236398_35401554_1_1_1_1,00.html.

AFSI represented a logical next step, incorporating the principles identified in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action. Specifically, the AFSI Statement outlined these types of principles as the foundation of a new developmental approach to be adopted to address long-term food security. In order to:

achieve sustainable global food security[, it will be necessary to] partner with vulnerable countries and regions to help them develop and implement their own food security strategies, and together substantially increase sustained commitments of financial and technical assistance to invest in those strategies. Our action will be characterized by a comprehensive approach to food security, effective coordination, support for country-owned processes and plans as well as by the use of multilateral institutions whenever appropriate. Delivering on our commitments in a timely and reliable manner, mutual accountability and a sound policy environment are key to this effort. We see a comprehensive approach as including: increased agriculture productivity, stimulus to pre and post-harvest interventions, emphasis on private sector growth, smallholders, women and families, preservation of the natural resource base, expansion of employment and decent work opportunities, knowledge and training, increased trade flows, and support for good governance and policy reform.²²

The AFSI Statement went even further. Noting that there is “an urgent need for decisive action to free humankind from hunger and poverty,”²³ and such action must be at the level of

²² AFSI, *supra* note 5, at para. 3. Key features of the AFSI approach thus include commitment to transparency and accountability among donors, as well as Managing for Results. Of course, these elements will be difficult to actualize. For example, the commitment to donor coordination, . See, e.g., Marian Leonardo Lawson, Foreign Aid: International Donor Coordination of Development Assistance (Congressional Research Service Report for Congress, 2010, Apr. 15), available at <http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/142758.pdf>.

²³ *Id.* at para. 2.

“scale and urgency [required] to achieve sustainable global food security,”²⁴ the AFSI Statement recognized the critical link between food security and long-term economic stability. But it was not just a relationship between these two factors: The Statement also recognized the complicated and interconnected system that would bolster food security. It would require, for example:

[d]elivering food, cash and vouchers through effective emergency assistance as well as through national safety-nets and nutrition schemes, such as food and cash for work, unconditional cash transfer programs, school feeding and mother-and-child nutrition programs, is an imperative goal. In the long-term, government led, cash based social protection systems and targeted nutrition interventions are needed to support the poorest and excluded populations. We call upon all nations to support these aims by providing sufficient, more predictable and flexible resources. We also call upon all countries to remove food export restrictions or extraordinary taxes, especially for food purchased for humanitarian purposes, and to consult and notify in advance before imposing any new restriction.²⁵

Thus, as previously mentioned, AFSI attended to the importance of social and political factors as diverse as the role of women to the advantages of public-private partnerships to the key role of civil society.²⁶ Finally, AFSI pointed to a success in Africa, the Comprehensive

²⁴ *Id.* at para. 3. The dire problem, but simply, is that:

The combined effect of longstanding underinvestment in agriculture and food security, price trends and the economic crisis have led to increased hunger and poverty in developing countries, plunging more than a further 100 million people into extreme poverty and jeopardising the progress achieved so far in meeting the Millennium Development Goals.

Id. at para. 1.

²⁵ *Id.* at para. 6. Trade and markets received specific attention as positive mechanisms that could facilitate food security, or inhibit it if not properly structured. *Id.* at 7.

²⁶ *Id.* at para. 4, para. 9, & para. 10. The Statement also notes the importance of

coherent policies to foster economy-wide growth, which is inclusive and environmentally sustainable, are to be pursued in conjunction with social protection mechanisms such as safety nets and social policies for

Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP), that encompassed these and other elements, including targeting assistance “to a country’s plans and priorities [reflecting] the national political will to develop and implement comprehensive food security strategies, based on sound scientific evidence, inclusive consultation, domestic investment and clear directions.”²⁷

Thus, AFSI adopted key factors from the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action, integrated policies of social safety nets and environmental attentiveness with trade policies of open borders and transparency, and recipient accountability.²⁸ Given the strong leadership exercised in the AFSI Statement by the United States, it should be no surprise that similar concepts are embodied in the United States’ international food security program, the Feed the Future initiative.

Feed the Future (FtF)

The United States provided leadership resulting in the creation of the L’Aquila Food Security Initiative (AFSI). A few months prior to the G8 meetings, President Obama announced the U.S would lead an “effort to reach out to people around the world who are suffering, to provide them immediate assistance and to extend support for food security that will help them lift themselves out of poverty.”²⁹ Within the U.S., this food security effort would be implemented via the FtF program.

the most vulnerable. Our attention to promoting access to health care and education in rural areas will substantially contribute to productivity and economic growth and, as importantly, improve nutrition and food security. It is necessary to improve access to food through more equitable income generation and distribution, employment creation and income prospects in developing countries.

Id. at para. 4.

²⁷ *Id.* at para. 11.

²⁸ International donor coordination, however, promises to be challenging. *See, e.g.*, MARIAN LEONARDO LAWSON, FOREIGN AID: INTERNATIONAL DONOR COORDINATION OF DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE (Cong. Res. Svc. 2010), available at <http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/142758.pdf>.

²⁹ Remarks by President Barak Obama at Strasbourg [France] Town Hall (2009, Apr. 3), retrieved November 15, 2011, from http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-by-President-Obama-at-Strasbourg-Town-Hall/. President Obama noted that this food security effort needed to be multilateral:

Historically, food development and related assistance programs have been more stove-piped within agencies, with strategic coordination across agencies not necessarily being the rule of thumb. The Department of Agriculture (USDA) has operated virtually independently from the Department of State (State), which has operated independently from the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR), which has operated independently from the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), which has operated independently from the Peace Corps, which has operated independently from the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), which has operated independently from the Agency for International Development (USAID, the main implementing agency for U.S. foreign food aid and lead agency for FtF), and so on.³⁰ FtF was intended to be a departure from silos of the past. FtF was planned as a whole of government effort, integrating the work of each governmental agency in order to maximize the program's effectiveness.³¹

All of us must join together in this effort, not just because it is right, but because by providing assistance to those countries most in need, we will provide new markets, we will drive the growth of the future that lifts all of us up. So it's not just charity; it's a matter of understanding that our fates are tied together – not just the fate of Europe and America, but the fate of the entire world.

Id.

³⁰ Indeed, in previous years, there was even a lack of effective coordination between the Department of State and USAID, e.g., GAO, FOREIGN AID REFORM: COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY, INTERAGENCY COORDINATION, AND OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS WOULD BOLSTER CURRENT EFFORTS (2009, Apr.), available from <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09192.pdf>, much less across independent United States government agencies, *id.* at 23, 31-32. See also MARIAN LEONARDO LAWSON & SUSAN B. EPSTEIN, FOREIGN AID REFORM: AGENCY COORDINATION (Cong. Res. Svc. 2009). See generally GAO, MANAGING FOR RESULTS: BARRIERS TO INTERAGENCY COORDINATION (2000, Mar.), available at <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/gg00106.pdf>.

³¹ In FtF, a concerted effort would be undertaken to aggressively and affirmatively coordinate agency activities. FEED THE FUTURE GUIDE, *supra* note 7, at 6-7. See also Statement of the Honorable Patricia Haslach, House Oversight Committee of Feed the Future Initiative 14-15, 17-18, 26 (July 20, 2010) (Joint Hearing Before the Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight and the Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health of the Committee On Foreign Affairs) (One Hundred Eleventh Congress, Second Session); Statement of the Honorable William Garvelink, House Oversight Committee of Feed the Future Initiative 27, 34 (July 20, 2010) (Joint Hearing Before the Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight and the Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health of the Committee On Foreign Affairs) (One Hundred Eleventh Congress, Second Session). United States government agencies involved include the African Development Foundation (USADF), Agency for International Development, Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce (Commerce), Department of Defense (DoD), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Department of Labor (Labor), Department of State, Department of the Treasury (Treasury), Export-Import Bank (EXIM), Institute of Peace (USIP), Millennium Challenge Corporation, National Security Council (NSC), Overseas

FtF is guided by key principles for advancing global food security, based on the Rome principles: (1) Impact the underlying causes of hunger and under-nutrition; (2) Invest in country-led plans that are developed in consultation with diverse partners and stakeholders; (3) Leverage the benefits of multilateral institutions; and (4) Implement mechanisms for accountability and measurement.³² The overarching goals of FtF are “to sustainably reduce global hunger and

Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), and the Trade and Development Agency (USTDA). FEED THE FUTURE GUIDE at n.18.

³² These principles are based on the principles that were agreed upon as part of the L’Aquila Food Security Initiative, *supra* notes 22-27. At the 2009 World Summit on Food Security, the AFSI principles were unanimously endorsed by 193 countries and are now referred to as the *Rome Principles*. FEED THE FUTURE GUIDE, *supra* note 7, at 1. The Rome Principles include:

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

Rome Principles, <http://www.feedthefuture.gov/about#Rome%20Principles>.

The wording of the Rome Principles are not set in stone, but rather are interpreted – or at least articulated – slightly different in different contexts. *See, e.g.*, Mitsuhiro Yokoyama, World Food Security – Global Challenges And FAO’s Activities (Annexure 5.2.4), in AFRO-ASIAN RURAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION (AARDO), FOOD SECURITY – GLOBAL TRENDS AND PERSPECTIVE 113 (Report of the Research and Education Centre of AARDO seminar at the Institute for the Development of Agricultural Cooperation in Asia, Tokyo, Japan, July 12-25, 2010), *retrieved* Nov. 15, 2011, from <http://www.aardo.org/reca.pdf>:

- Principle 1 : Invest in country-owned plans, aimed at channeling resources to well designed and results-based programmes and partnerships.
- Principle 2 : Foster strategic coordination at national, regional and global level to improve governance, promote better allocation of resources, avoid duplication of efforts and identify response-gaps.
- Principle 3 : Strive for a comprehensive twin-track approach to food security that consists of: 1) direct action to immediately tackle hunger for the most vulnerable and 2) medium and long-term sustainable agricultural, food security, nutrition and rural development programmes to eliminate the root causes of hunger and poverty, including through the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.
- Principle 4 : Ensure a strong role for the multilateral system by sustained improvements in efficiency, responsiveness, coordination and effectiveness of multilateral institutions.

poverty by tackling their root causes and employing proven strategies for achieving large scale and lasting impact,”³³ in order not only to address food security but also to enhance national security and political stability in developing nations.³⁴ The key objectives are to “accelerate inclusive agriculture sector growth” and to “improve nutritional status (especially of women and children).”³⁵

Impact the Underlying Causes of Hunger and Undernutrition. Hunger and lack of adequate nutrition are “among the most urgent challenges facing the international community” and “have an acute negative impact on economic development by slowing growth and perpetuating the cycle of poverty through three principal routes: direct losses in productivity from poor physical status; indirect losses from poor cognitive function and deficits in schooling; and losses caused by increased health care costs.”³⁶

-
- Principle 5 : Ensure sustained and substantial commitment by all partners to investment in agriculture and food security and nutrition, with provision of necessary resources in a timely and reliable fashion, aimed at multi-year plans and programmes.

Id. at 115.

³³ *Id.* at 9.

³⁴ *E.g.*, Joe Biden, Remarks by Vice President Biden at the World Food Program USA Leadership Award Ceremony (October 24, 2011) (“[F]ood security [is] a priority because it enhances our national security and the stability of the international system. As Pope Paul VI once said, ‘development is the new word for peace.’ And the reality is that, in many countries, food security and political stability are closely linked. Investments made to ward off food insecurity and prevent its recurrence can prevent the vicious cycles of rising extremism, armed conflict and state failure than can require far larger commitments of resources down the road.”), *retrieved* November 15, 2011, from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/10/24/remarks-vice-president-biden-world-food-program-usa-leadership-award-cer>.

³⁵ FEED THE FUTURE GUIDE, *supra* note 7, at 9.

³⁶ WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME, GLOBAL FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION: SUMMARY NOTE para. 4 & 8 (Informal Consultation on the Ending Child Hunger and Undernutrition [ECHUI], Ending Childhood Hunger and Undernutrition Initiative, Oct. 9, 2006), *available at* <http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/resources/wfp111813.pdf>. The critical problem of undernutrition was examined in-depth in a five-part series published in THE LANCET, *Maternal and Child Undernutrition* (2008), and became the basis for a related nutrition initiative, *Scaling Up Nutrition*. *See, e.g.*, SCALING UP NUTRITION: A FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION (Sept. 2010), *retrieved* Nov. 15, 2011, from http://www.unscn.org/files/Annual_Sessions/2009_Brussels/SUNframework_sept2010.pdf. *See also* David Nabarro, *Introducing the Policy Brief, Scaling Up Nutrition: A Framework for Action* (Apr. 2010), *retrieved* Nov. 15, 2011, from http://www.unscn.org/en/scaling_up_nutrition_sun/sun_purpose.php. *See generally* United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition, *Scale Up Nutrition*, *available at* http://www.unscn.org/en/scaling_up_nutrition_sun/.

Rural poverty and hunger in developing nations represents a lion's share of the problem. Data from the International Food Policy Research Institute suggest that the vast majority of the world's poorest people reside in rural areas.³⁷ The bulk of these poor people live in Sub-Saharan Africa.³⁸ The failure of agriculture in Africa and other developing nations is one of the root causes of hunger and poverty.

One solution to rural poverty and hunger is to improve food productivity and nutritional value at the source, that is, at the small (smallholder) farmer level. A body of recent research points to the benefit of increasing agricultural productivity in developing nations: “[S]udies suggest that every 1 percent increase in agricultural income per capita reduces the number of people living in extreme poverty by between 0.6 and 1.8 percent.”³⁹ The objective, therefore, is to increase agricultural productivity and income for the poorest populations.⁴⁰ These increases “can be driven by a number of factors, including improved access to agricultural inputs and knowledge, more efficient use of land and labor, conducive policy environments, and improved management of natural resources.”⁴¹ Ultimately, FtF anticipates that by:

focus[ing] directly on agricultural production – in, for example, extension services, training, roads, and irrigation – [the FtF initiative] can increase the

³⁷ E.g., AKHTER U. AHMED ET AL., THE WORLD'S MOST DEPRIVED: CHARACTERISTICS AND CAUSES OF EXTREME POVERTY AND HUNGER (IFPRI Research Report, 2007), available at <http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/publications/vp43.pdf>.

³⁸ *Id.*

³⁹ FEED THE FUTURE GUIDE, *supra* note 7, at 3, citing XINSHEN DIAO ET AL., THE ROLE OF AGRICULTURE IN DEVELOPMENT – IMPLICATIONS FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA (IFPRI Research Report 153, 2007), available at <http://www.fanrpan.org/documents/d00369/>; LUC CHRISTIANENSEN ET AL., THE ROLE OF AGRICULTURE IN POVERTY REDUCTION – AN EMPIRICAL PERSPECTIVE (World Bank Policy Research Working Paper no. 4013, 2006), available at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=931990; Colin Thirtle et al., *The Impact of Research-Led Agricultural Productivity Growth on Poverty Reduction in Africa, Asia and Latin America*, 31 WORLD DEV. 1959 (2003). Additionally, there needs to be improvements in basic health services, education, sanitation and safe water supply. See, e.g., AHMED ET AL., *supra* note 37, at 27-29.

⁴⁰ E.g., DALILA CERVANTES-GODOY & JOE DEWBRE, ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE OF AGRICULTURE FOR POVERTY REDUCTION (OECD Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Working Papers, No. 23, 2010), available at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/32/50/44804637.pdf>.

⁴¹ FEED THE FUTURE GUIDE, *supra* note 7, at 10.

incomes of at least 40 million people, including 28 million people who are currently living on incomes of less than \$2 per day, and 13 million people living in extreme poverty on less than \$1.25 per day. These investments will increase their incomes for many years beyond the life of specific projects as people continue to use the infrastructure, technologies, and new sustainable practices that are introduced as part of the program. [T]hey can increase the incomes of these people by an average of at least 10 percent per person sustained for at least 10 years – a gain in income equivalent in real terms to an extra year’s worth of today’s income over 10 years.

Each year, this extra income would allow a typical household of five people to purchase a basket of goods similar to the following: an additional 100 kilograms of rice or other staple food, together with fish, poultry, fruit, and vegetables sufficient to add 150 calories per person per day; keep a child in school for an additional semester; and increase the household’s annual spending on clothing, fuel, household goods, telecommunications, and services by about 30 percent. While actual spending patterns will vary from household to household, reflecting individual priorities and needs, the additional income will strengthen local economies and provide an important buffer for vulnerable populations in times of stress and enhance their food security on a daily basis. As women are more likely to reinvest income in the welfare of their children, our targeted investments in women will yield benefits across generations.⁴²

⁴² *Id.* at 8.

In other words, FtF will make a marked impact on global hunger and poverty through agricultural improvements in some of the world's least developed countries. Although improved agricultural productivity will not obviate the need for crisis, humanitarian assistance, humanitarian assistance needs should reduce and can be intertwined with the mid-term to long-term impacts on food production.⁴³

However, the goal is not simply to improve agricultural productivity. The FtF initiative focuses on the entire *value chain*, starting with agriculture *per se* but also including adding value, including nutritional value, to agricultural products as well as marketing, on to final consumption of produced goods.⁴⁴ Nutritional improvements are critical, and FtF is committed to “improving nutrition throughout the value chain, including research to improve the nutrient value of staple food sources and post-harvest preservation and processing techniques that increase the nutrient content of processed staple foods.”⁴⁵

Invest in Country-Led Plans Developed in Consultation with Stakeholders. After decades of developmental assistance to the world's least developed countries, it became clearer that assistance was not effective without buy-in from focus nations. By the turn of the century, with impetus from the World Bank and International Monetary Fund,⁴⁶ it became more common to ask the focus country to determine the kinds of assistance that would help them combat hunger

⁴³ *E.g., id.* at 2, 12-13.

⁴⁴ Value chain implicates “[t]he full sequence of activities or functions required to bring a product or service from conception, through the intermediary steps of production, transformation, marketing, and delivery to the final consumers.” *Id.* at *iii*.

⁴⁵ *Id.* at 14.

⁴⁶ The World Bank and IMF's Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers were intended to provide debt relief for developing nations in consideration for recipient nations bringing together stakeholders – including civil society and other non-governmental actors – for the purpose of creating a national strategy, including necessary policies and activities, for taking the developing nation out of poverty and on to the next level of economic prosperity. *See, e.g.,* John Mackinnon & Ritva Reinikka, *Lessons from Uganda on Strategies to Fight Poverty* (World Bank, Policy Research Working Paper 2440, 2000), *retrieved* Nov. 15, 2011, from http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2000/10/07/000094946_00092705331313/Rendred/PDF/multi_page.pdf.

and poverty.⁴⁷ Consultative processes that included civil society became increasingly common, even while the particular elements of consultation were not well defined or consistently (or effectively) implemented.⁴⁸

The FtF initiative embraced the critical component of country-led plans (Country Investment Plans, or CIPs),⁴⁹ informed by consultative/strategic planning processes bringing key and diverse stakeholders into the discussions regarding how to move from food insecurity to food security.⁵⁰ The “[h]ost governments must decide on their own needs, priorities, and development strategies for addressing the causes and consequences of food insecurity.”⁵¹

Civil society and private sector partners represent a key target for strengthening consultative input in order to achieve sustainability of the food security infrastructure systems.⁵² Civil society enhances public involvement, governmental accountability, and democratic

⁴⁷ The notion of stakeholder consultation and buy-in was already something that had long-been promoted and used in the environmental context, as a way to develop plans and fashion agreements that would endure over time and address local as well as national and multinational needs. *See, e.g.*, BARRY DALAL-CLAYTON ET AL., NATIONAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES: EXPERIENCE AND DILEMMAS (1994), available at <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/7753IIED.pdf>. It became one of the key features of the World Bank’s and IMF’s development strategies. *E.g.*, Mackinnon & Reinikka, *supra* note 42. *See also* HEIDHUES ET AL., *supra* note x, at 5, 13-15.

⁴⁸ *E.g.*, DIALOGUE IN PURSUIT OF DEVELOPMENT (Jan Olsson & Lennart Wohlgemuth, eds., 2003), available at http://portals.wi.wur.nl/files/docs/msp/study2003_2.pdf.

⁴⁹ The Country Investment Plan, or CIP, is “[t]he multi-year investment plan for food security developed by a country government in consultation with development partners and stakeholders.” FEED THE FUTURE GUIDE, *supra* note 7, at *ii*.

⁵⁰ Stakeholders are:

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

Id. at *iii*. *See also id.* at 6.

⁵¹ *Id.* at *v*.

⁵² *Id.* “Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the private sector are particularly important for building momentum for combating food insecurity and increasing the sustainability of our efforts.... We seek to leverage and coordinate our resources and efforts with NGOs, the private sector, and the full range of stakeholders interested in food security and agricultural-led growth.” *Id.*

objectives. The *FtF Guide* notes, “NGOs often have close ties to local communities and are critical to robust consultation and sustainable implementation.”⁵³ The private sector not only has needed capital for commerce, it is a leading edge on local, regional, and international trade opportunities.⁵⁴

The FtF’s Guidance on Stakeholder Consultation,⁵⁵ however, does not specify how these consultations should take place, which sectors of society should be included,⁵⁶ the level of consultation that should occur, and so on.⁵⁷ Nonetheless, it is a required component of each country’s CIP, and each of the FtF focus countries have engaged in consultation processes, varying as to the numbers and extent of consultation by non-governmental participants.⁵⁸

⁵³ *Id.*

⁵⁴ *Id.* (“The private sector can bring financial and technical resources, market access, cutting-edge business practices, in-country networks, and other expertise related to food security.”).

⁵⁵ *Id.* at 18.

⁵⁶ “As mentioned previously, *supra* note 50, a range of stakeholders is to be included. In addition to NGOs, the private sector, and others, women are a key target group. “We are committed to working with partner countries to promote gender-sensitive consultative processes that ensure organizations with a mandate to represent gender concerns and interests will be included amongst those consulted,” *id.* at 27, as a “tool” for ensuring “gender integration,” *id.* at 28.

An important question, though, is how extensively should the public itself be engaged? The public is a crucial target group, but civil society and NGOs may not directly include the impacted groups whose voice also could contribute to strategic and sustainable CIPs. Is such inclusion necessary? Or is that simply a country-decision to be made?

⁵⁷ This has led to some criticisms, such as the one levied by the international NGO, Bread for the World, recommending clarity regarding what a country-led process entails and how has civil society been consulted. BREAD FOR THE WORLD, OUR COMMON INTEREST: ENDING HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION Chap. 2 (Hunger Report 2011), available at <http://hungerreport.org/2011/report/chapters/two>.

In the past, assessments of the success of the consultative process also have noted that there are frequently few outside government who have been given the opportunity to provide meaningful input. *E.g.*, HEIDHUES ET AL, *supra* note x, at 18 (“Consultations have too often been confined to the ministerial level; parliaments, local governments, civil society, and private sector organizations have regularly been bypassed and those who lack an organized voice, such as women, the landless, and minorities have been left out entirely.”). Whether this is also an apt criticism for FtF is still to be determined.

⁵⁸ “The Focus Country government should provide documentation that illustrates the level and kind of consultation and coordination that has occurred with key stakeholders around the development of the CIP.” FEED THE FUTURE GUIDE, *supra* note 7, at 19. The actual consultative processes that have taken place are described, *inter alia*, for each of the FtF country strategies, which can be accessed from the Feed the Future website, <http://www.feedthefuture.gov/countries>. As a general matter, the consultations are supposed to allow “meaningful dialogue on a common framework for action, identify how resources align against strategic priorities, and determine how to address gaps and make adjustments.” FEED THE FUTURE GUIDE, at v.

Leverage the Benefits of Multilateral Institutions. The lack of donor “policy coordination (general development policy and sectoral policies), operational coordination (implementation on the ground) and coordination among international organizations”⁵⁹ has been lamented for decades, both in the U.S. and across the globe.⁶⁰ In addition to key United Nations (UN) organizations such as the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and its Committee on World Food Security (CFS), UN International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), UN High-Level Task Force on the Global Food Security (UNHLTF), and World Food Program (WFP), there are numerous important organizations that have a role in combating hunger and poverty, including the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, International Fund for Agricultural Development, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture.⁶¹ There are also country-based donors that provide funds as well as other development assistance, including the regional European Development Fund (European Union), Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA), Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), and United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), just to name a few of the prominent European development assistance organizations. In the wake of AFSI, a multi-donor trust fund for global agriculture and food security was formed, the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP).⁶² Additionally, there are “regional

⁵⁹ Terhi Lehtinen, *The Coordination of European Development Cooperation in the Field: Myth or Reality?* 8 (European Centre for Development Policy Management Discussion Paper 43, 2003), retrieved Nov. 15, 2011, from [http://www.ecdpm.org/Web_ECDPM/Web/Content/Download.nsf/0/390658E71EAB77BDC1256CF700453A97/\\$FILE/02-43e-thl.pdf](http://www.ecdpm.org/Web_ECDPM/Web/Content/Download.nsf/0/390658E71EAB77BDC1256CF700453A97/$FILE/02-43e-thl.pdf).

⁶⁰ *Id.*

⁶¹ FEED THE FUTURE GUIDE, *supra* note 7, at v & 4-6.

⁶² See generally GAFSP, Global Agriculture and Food Security Program, retrieved Nov. 15, 2011, at <http://www.gafspfund.org/gafsp/>; see also GLOBAL AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SECURITY PROGRAM (GAFSP), ANNUAL REPORT 2011, available at http://www.gafspfund.org/gafsp/sites/gafspfund.org/files/Documents/GAFSP%20AR2011_Layout-Finalpxp.pdf.

organizations that promote peer review, cross-border programs, and regional integration.”⁶³

Thus, there are a lot of important organizations to coordinate.

For FtF, GAFSP is the primary means of coordinated financial investment, leveraging the U.S.’s own \$3.5 billion commitment. A key objective of GAFSP is to “consolidate donor resources where a multilateral approach holds a comparative advantage either because of economies of scale or donor capacity.”⁶⁴ GAFSP has both governmental and non-governmental contributors,⁶⁵ and the nearly billion dollar fund (these are pledges, a little more than half has been donated) is administered by the World Bank.⁶⁶ GAFSP funds supplement FtF (and other donor) funds, as well as allow developing nations not part of the FtF initiative to receive needed

⁶³ FEED THE FUTURE GUIDE, *supra* note 7, at v. In Africa, regional economic entities include “Southern African Development Community (SADC), Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), and Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA).” *Id.* at 5.

⁶⁴ *Id.*

⁶⁵ Initial GAFSP contributions came from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Canada, South Korea, Spain, and the U.S. *Id.* at 23.

⁶⁶ The actual amount pledged as of June 2011 is \$972 million, and \$581 has been received. GLOBAL AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SECURITY PROGRAM, *supra* note 62, at 8-9, 17. There are two types of funds in GASPF:

GAFSP operates through two windows: the Public Sector Window and the Private Sector Window. The Public Sector Window of GAFSP provides a new and additional pool of grant funds that are not pre-allocated by country. These funds finance the medium- to long-term investments needed to improve the income and food security of poor people in developing countries as countries require, and are prepared to use such funds effectively. It emphasizes the scaling-up of good practice through support to strategic, inclusive, and evidenced-based agricultural investment plans led by the countries themselves under existing aid effectiveness initiatives, such as the CAADP process in Africa. Resources from the Private Sector Window of GAFSP will be used to support and demonstrate new and innovative financing aimed at increasing the commercial potential of small and medium sized agri-businesses and farmers by bringing them into local, national and global value chains. The Private Sector Window will make investments (including equity investments, first loss cover, loans and credit guarantees, and weather insurance products) and provide advisory services (including grants), consistent with relevant IFC guidelines and policies.

Id. at 8. The funds are divided into the two windows as follows:

Seven donors have pledged USD 972 million to GAFSP as a whole, with USD 897 million of this earmarked for the Public Sector Window (from Australia, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Canada, Ireland, Korea, Spain, and the United States), and 75 million earmarked for the Private Sector Window (from Canada and the United States). Of the total amount, USD 581 million has been received, USD 531 million for the Public Sector Window and USD 50 million for the Private Sector Window.

Id.

assistance.⁶⁷ As of June 2011, \$481 million had been allocated for food security-related development activities in a dozen countries.⁶⁸

In addition to the GAFSP fund, three other nations have so far committed to working in concert with the U.S. in FtF: Brazil, India, and South Africa.⁶⁹ For example, Brazil has implemented a project together with United States in Mozambique, working with the host country and the U.S. to provide, among other aid, school-aged children nutritious, locally-grown food.

Implement Mechanisms for Accountability and Measurement. An important feature of any governmental program today is evaluating effectiveness in order to both improve the program as well as to ensure accountability. Over the past decades, developmental activities have increasingly been subject to more rigorous assessment, and attention to how to evaluate FtF's effectiveness and impacts were one of the core dimensions of the FtF initiative.⁷⁰ "The FtF "results framework" identifies the expected impacts and outcomes of FtF:⁷¹ "The FTF Results Framework reflects the types of program components that are expected to lead to benefits at household, community, and national levels based on evidence around the key drivers of agricultural-led growth and food security."⁷² There are eight, high level outcomes that will be used to measure the FtF program's goal of "sustainably reducing poverty and hunger" and the

⁶⁷ FEED THE FUTURE GUIDE, *supra* note 7, at 23.

⁶⁸ The recipient nations were: Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Haiti, Liberia, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Tajikistan, and Togo. GLOBAL AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SECURITY PROGRAM, *supra* note 62. Funding went not only to FtF focus countries, but also to other nations in need. All funds were allocated in the public sector window. There were 25 submissions in total. *Id.* at 8, 20. The private sector window deadline was August 2011. *Id.* at 25.

⁶⁹ FEED THE FUTURE GUIDE, *supra* note 7, at 24.

⁷⁰ *Id.* at 5 ("Our evaluation strategy will focus our resources on informing future program design so that we learn from our experiences and develop results that we can share with partner countries, stakeholders, and other development partners.").

⁷¹ *Id.* at 33-34.

⁷² *Id.* at 33.

key objectives of “inclusive agricultural sector growth and improved nutritional status.”⁷³ These include:

(1) Improved agriculture productivity; (2) Improved markets; (3) Increased private sector investment in agriculture and nutrition related activities; (4) Increased agriculture value chain on-and off farm jobs; (5) Increased resilience of vulnerable communities and households; (6) Improved access to diverse and quality foods; (7) Improved nutrition related behaviors; and (8) Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services.⁷⁴

In addition to the overall goals of FtF, each focus country, as part of its CIP, must indicate what the country’s goals and objectives are, and how these will be measured and assessed.⁷⁵ Because the FtF program is in its initial phases, there are not yet outcome data to report.⁷⁶

Conclusion

Although the foundations for the multinational L’Aquila Food Security Initiative and the U.S.’s comprehensive Feed the Future program predate either policy, AFSI and FtF represent important next steps in combating chronic hunger and pervasive undernutrition. These are efforts that target mid-term and long-term changes, rather than relying on short-term, humanitarian based interventions. There is a gratifying integration with other existing development initiatives, although probably not as well integrated as it needs to be given the enormity of the problem. The Results Framework of FtF gives some reassurance that there will be transparent information that will allow objective assessments of the efficacy of this policy approach.

⁷³ *Id.*

⁷⁴ *Id.* at 34. The Feed the Future website details the measurement and evaluation strategies, <http://www.feedthefuture.gov/progress>.

⁷⁵ The specific, country-level evaluation plans and measurement strategies can be accessed from the Feed the Future website, <http://www.feedthefuture.gov/countries>.

⁷⁶ See <http://www.feedthefuture.gov/progress> (“Reports on indicators of progress toward Feed the Future goals and objectives will be available beginning Spring 2012.”).