
U.S. GOVERNMENT GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY STRATEGY

FY 2017-2021

September 2016

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	iii
Acronyms	v
Glossary of Key Terms	vii
1. The Global Context	1
2. Goal and Objectives of the Strategy: The Results Framework	7
Objective 1: Inclusive and Sustainable Agricultural-Led Economic Growth.....	12
Objective 2: Strengthened Resilience Among People and Systems	17
Objective 3: A Well-Nourished Population, Especially Women and Children	19
Cross-Cutting Intermediate Results	23
Complementary Results	32
3. Targeting Approach	35
4. U.S. Approach	38
Whole-of-Government Coordination	38
Country and Local Ownership	41
Sustainability.....	42
Partnerships.....	43
Science, Technology, and Innovation	46
5. Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning	49
6. References	53
Annex 1. Agency-specific Implementation Plans	57
U.S. Agency for International Development	58
U.S. Department of Agriculture	63
U.S. Department of Commerce.....	68
U.S. Department of State	72
U.S. Department of the Treasury	76
The Millennium Challenge Corporation	80
Overseas Private Investment Corporation.....	85
Peace Corps.....	89
Office of the United States Trade Representative.....	93
U.S. African Development Foundation.....	97
U.S. Geological Survey.....	101
Annex 2. Index of Global Food Security Act Strategy Requirements	104
Annex 3. Leveraging Other U.S. Government Strategies and Investments	108

Executive Summary

This Global Food Security Strategy presents an integrated whole-of-government strategy and agency-specific implementation plans as required by the Global Food Security Act of 2016 (GFSA).¹ This strategy reflects the unique skills, resources, and lessons learned from U.S. federal departments and agencies that contribute to global food security, as well as input from partners throughout the private sector, academic institutions, and civil society. It charts a course for the U.S. Government to contribute to the achievement of global food security and the range of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), together with partners across the globe.

Right now, the world is closer than ever before to ending global hunger, undernutrition, and extreme poverty, but significant challenges and opportunities remain, including urbanization, gender inequality, instability and conflict, the effects of a changing climate, and environmental degradation. Despite our collective progress in global food security and nutrition over recent years, a projected 702 million people still live in extreme poverty,² nearly 800 million people around the world are chronically undernourished,³ and 159 million children under five are stunted.⁴ Food security is not just an economic and humanitarian issue; it is also a matter of security, as growing concentrations of poverty and hunger leave countries and communities vulnerable to increased instability, conflict, and violence.

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

- **Inclusive and sustainable agricultural-led economic growth**, as growth in the agriculture sector has been shown in some areas to be more effective than growth in other sectors at helping men and women lift themselves out of extreme poverty and hunger.⁵ It does this by increasing availability of food, generating income from production, creating employment and entrepreneurship opportunities throughout value chains, and spurring growth in rural and urban economies.
- **Strengthened resilience among people and systems**, as increasingly frequent and intense shocks and stresses threaten the ability of men, women, and families to sustainably emerge from poverty.
- **A well-nourished population**, especially among women and children, as undernutrition, particularly during the 1,000 days from pregnancy to a child's second birthday, leads to lower levels of educational attainment, productivity, lifetime earnings, and economic growth rates.

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

Several key elements of our approach strengthen our ability to achieve these objectives. The first is **targeting our investments** in countries and geographic areas where we have the greatest potential to sustainably improve food security and nutrition and **strategically focusing our resources** on those

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

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

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

Inspired by the global agenda laid out in the SDGs and the objectives of the GFSA:

Our vision is a world free from hunger, malnutrition, and extreme poverty, where thriving local economies generate increased income for all people; where people consume balanced and nutritious diets, and children grow up healthy and reach their full potential; and where resilient households and communities face fewer and less severe shocks, have less vulnerability to the shocks they do face, and are helping to accelerate inclusive, sustainable economic growth.

This strategy builds on the U.S. Government's strong foundation of global food security and nutrition investments and aims to break silos, integrating programming across sectors and agencies for maximum impact and effective stewardship of United States taxpayer dollars. By implementing this whole-of-government strategy over the next five years, we believe that, together with our many partners across the globe, we can achieve this vision within our lifetimes.

Acronyms

AfDB	African Development Bank
AgMIP	Agricultural Model Intercomparison and Improvement Project
AMR	Antimicrobial Resistance
APHIS	Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (within the U.S. Department of Agriculture)
ARS	Agricultural Research Service (within the U.S. Department of Agriculture)
BFS	Bureau for Food Security (within the U.S. Agency for International Development)
CAFTA-DR	Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CC	Cross-cutting
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
DCA	Development Credit Authority
DRG	Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance
ERS	Economic Research Service (within the U.S. Department of Agriculture)
ESF	Economic Support Fund
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FAS	Foreign Agricultural Service (within the U.S. Department of Agriculture)
FEWS NET	Famine Early Warning Systems Network
FFP	Food for Peace
FY	Fiscal Year
GAFFSP	Global Agricultural and Food Security Program
GBV	Gender-based Violence
GCCI	Global Climate Change Initiative
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GFSA	Global Food Security Act
GFSS	Global Food Security Strategy
GHI	Global Health Initiative
GODAN	Global Open Data for Agriculture and Nutrition
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILAB	International Labor Affairs Bureau (within the U.S. Department of Labor)
IR	Intermediate Result
ITA	International Trade Administration (within the U.S. Department of Commerce)
IUU	Illegal, Unregulated, and Unreported
MCC	Millennium Challenge Corporation
MDB	Multilateral Development Bank
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NIFA	National Institute of Food and Agriculture (within the U.S. Department of Agriculture)

NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (within the U.S. Department of Commerce)
OES/OMC	Oceans, Environment, and Science, Office of Marine Conservation (within the U.S. Department of State)
OIP	Office of Investment Policy (within the Overseas Private Investment Corporation)
OPIC	Overseas Private Investment Corporation
PCV	Peace Corps Volunteer
PEPFAR	President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief
PMI	President’s Malaria Initiative
PREPARED	Planning for Resilience in East Africa through Policy, Adaptation, Research, and Economic Development
RISE	Resilience in the Sahel-Enhanced
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
S/GFS	Secretary’s Office of Global Food Security (within the U.S. Department of State)
SME	Small- and Medium-sized Enterprise
SPS	Sanitary and Phytosanitary
UN	United Nations
USADF	United States African Development Foundation
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USTR	United States Trade Representative
WASH	Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene
WTO	World Trade Organization

Glossary of Key Terms

Agricultural value chain

The set of actors and activities required to bring agricultural products from production to consumption, including processing, storage, transportation, marketing, and retail. As a product moves through an agricultural value chain, each step adds monetary value to the product.

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.

Agriculture and food systems

The intact or whole unit made up of interrelated components of people, behaviors, relationships, and material goods that interact in the production, processing, packaging, transporting, trade, marketing, consumption, and use of food, feed, and fiber through aquaculture, farming, wild fisheries, forestry, and pastoralism. The food and agriculture system operates within and is influenced by social, political, economic, and environmental contexts.

Appropriate congressional committees

Appropriate congressional committees as defined in the GFSA include: the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate; the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives; and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

Basic sanitation service

The technical term for a sanitation facility that hygienically separates human excreta from human contact. This is a Sustainable Development Goal indicator. A safely managed sanitation service also ensures that fecal waste is removed for treatment or safely disposed in-situ.

Climate-smart agriculture

An integrative approach to address the interlinked challenges of food security and climate change that explicitly aims for three objectives: (1) sustainably increasing agricultural productivity, to support equitable increases in farm incomes, food security and development; (2) adapting and building resilience of agricultural and food security systems to climate change at multiple levels; and (3) reducing greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture (including crops, livestock, and fisheries), either in absolute terms or by reducing emissions intensity in the context of Low Emissions Development.

Context indicator

A means to monitor factors outside the control of the activity or program that have the potential to affect the achievement of expected results. Context indicators may be tracked at any level of a Results Framework or logic model. Context indicators may be used to track country/regional context;

programmatic assumptions of strategies, projects, and activities; and operational context. Context indicators do not directly measure the results of activities.

Ecosystem services

The benefits that flow from nature to people; for example, nature's contributions to the production of food and timber; life-support processes, such as water purification and coastal protection; and life-fulfilling benefits, such as places to recreate.

Extreme poverty

The inability to meet basic consumption needs on a sustainable basis. People who live in extreme poverty lack both income and assets and typically suffer from interrelated, chronic deprivations, including hunger and malnutrition, poor health, limited education and marginalization, discrimination, or exclusion. The extreme poor often lack the resilience to cope with economic setbacks, natural disasters, or illnesses. In October 2015, the international poverty line that is used to measure extreme poverty moved from US\$1.25 based on 2005 purchasing power parity (PPP) per day per person to US\$1.90 based on 2011 PPP per day per person.

Evaluation

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

Feed the Future Innovation Labs

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

Food security and nutrition

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

Gender

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

Gender equality

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

Hygienic

Conducive to maintaining health and preventing disease, especially by being clean; sanitary.

Key stakeholders

Actors engaged in efforts to advance global food security programs and objectives, including relevant federal departments and agencies; national and local governments in developing countries; other bilateral donors; international and regional organizations; international, regional, and local financial institutions; international, regional, and local private voluntary, non-governmental, faith-based, and civil society organizations; the private sector, including agribusinesses and relevant commodities groups; agricultural producers, including producer organizations, cooperatives, small-scale producers, and women; and agricultural research and academic institutions, including land-grant universities and extension services.

Land, marine, and resource tenure

The political, economic, social, and legal structure that determines how individuals and groups access and use land, water, and other resources—including trees, minerals, fish, living marine resources, and pasture. Tenure rules define how rights to use, control, and transfer land and resources are allocated within societies.

Malnutrition

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

Monitoring

The ongoing and systematic tracking of data or information relevant to U.S. Government strategies, projects, and activities. Relevant data and informational needs are identified during planning and design, and may include output and outcome measures that are directly attributable to or affected by U.S. Government interventions, as well as measures of the operating context and programmatic assumptions.

Multiplier(s)

The rate at which direct agricultural (or other) income or employment outcomes result in additional indirect income or employment outcomes in the overall economy. In general, small-scale producer agricultural investments have been documented to have significantly higher multipliers than investments in other sectors, with one job in agriculture often resulting in additional jobs via the linkages to additional employment and income via producer purchase of farm inputs, jobs in downstream processing, and producer expenditure on other locally supplied goods and services.

Overnutrition

The excess intake of energy or nutrients. This term includes overweight and obesity.

Performance indicator

A means to monitor expected outputs and outcomes of strategies, projects, or activities based on a Results Framework or a project's or activity's logic model. Performance indicators are the basis for observing

progress and measuring actual results compared to expected results. They help answer the extent to which an activity is progressing toward its objective(s), but alone cannot explain why such progress is or is not being made. Performance indicators are also sometimes known as performance metrics.

Protected area

A clearly defined geographical space, recognized, dedicated, and managed, through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values. This includes wildlife areas, national parks, and marine protected areas, among other examples.

Relevant federal departments and agency

Includes the United States Agency for International Development; U.S. Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, State, and the Treasury; Millennium Challenge Corporation; Overseas Private Investment Corporation; Peace Corps; Office of the United States Trade Representative; United States African Development Foundation; United States Geological Survey; and any other department or agency specified by the President.

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.

Shock(s)

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

Small-scale producer

Farmers, pastoralists, foresters, and fishers that have a low asset base and limited resources, including land, capital, skills, and labor, and, in the case of farmers, typically farm on fewer than five hectares of land.

Stress(es)

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

Stunting

A sign of chronic malnutrition and refers to a condition that is measured by a height-to-age ratio that is more than two standard deviations below the median of the WHO Child Growth Standards. Stunting is a result of suboptimal food and nutrient intakes; insufficient preventive healthcare and unhygienic environments; poor maternal nutrition; and inappropriate infant and young child feeding and care by mothers and other members of the family and the community during the most critical periods of growth

and development in early life. At a population level, stunting is associated with long-term poor health, delayed motor development, impaired cognitive function, and decreased immunity.

Sustainability

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

Target country

A developing country that is selected to participate in agriculture and nutrition programs under the Global Food Security Strategy pursuant to the selection criteria described in the “Targeting Approach” section of this document. Activities under this strategy will not be limited to target countries.

Undernourishment

When a person is not able to acquire enough food to meet the daily minimum dietary energy requirements, over a period of one year. Chronic undernourishment is an indicator for hunger.

Undernutrition

The various forms of poor nutrition caused by a complex array of factors including dietary inadequacy, infections, and sociocultural factors. Underweight, stunting, wasting, and micronutrient deficiencies are forms of undernutrition.

Youth

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

1. The Global Context

Unprecedented Progress and Momentum

The enactment of the Global Food Security Act of 2016 (GFSA), P.L. 114-195, occurred at an opportune time. For the first time in human history, the end of hunger, undernutrition, and extreme poverty is within our grasp. The world has seen dramatic declines in each of these areas, and food prices remain consistently lower and more stable after the food price spikes of 2007 and 2008.⁶ Developing and middle-income countries have made significant progress toward improving food security and nutrition, reducing poverty, and advancing agricultural development over the last decade. These gains were made in the context of the Millennium Development Goals, bolstered by commitments made by the United States and other countries at the 2009 G-8 Summit in L'Aquila, Italy.

L'Aquila injected the political will and additional resources for the fight against global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty. The worldwide actions resulting from L'Aquila—which included the establishment of Feed the Future, the President's global hunger and food security initiative—increased global investment in agricultural development and nutrition. Guided by the Rome Principles for Sustainable Global Food Security,⁷ these actions laid the foundation for this strategy to address the root causes of hunger, poverty, and undernutrition.

As described in the Rome Principles, we commit to work in partnership to:

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

A Turning Point

The adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)⁸ has set a shared global agenda for achieving global food security and has raised the bar from halving hunger, a target under the Millennium Development Goals, to eliminating hunger and malnutrition in all their forms everywhere by 2030. The Addis Ababa Action Agenda⁹ reinforced the importance of bringing multiple streams of financing—

including private sector funding and domestic public resources alongside official development assistance—to the table to achieve these ambitious goals.

The Sustainable Development Goals

U.S. Government global food security and nutrition efforts contribute directly to SDG 1 and SDG 2 and will also contribute to and benefit from many of the other 15 SDGs.

- **SDG 1:** End poverty in all its forms everywhere
- **SDG 2:** End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture

Despite our collective progress on food security and nutrition, a projected 702 million women, men, and children still live in extreme poverty; nearly 800 million people around the world are chronically undernourished;¹⁰ two billion are micronutrient deficient; and 159 million children under five are stunted,¹¹ forever robbing them of opportunities to reach their full potential. Malnutrition, unsafe food, and food-borne diseases are increasing health costs and mortality while reducing educational attainment, lifetime earnings, and economic productivity and growth. Dietary changes are also resulting in some countries facing a simultaneous “double burden” of undernutrition and overnutrition, with nearly two billion adults and 41 million children under five overweight or obese¹² and, as a result, prone to a variety of non-communicable diseases.

Contributing to Progress

In countries reached by U.S. Government efforts to improve global food security and nutrition, local capacity for lasting food security and good nutrition continues to grow stronger.

- **Poverty Reduction:** U.S. Government efforts have contributed to promising reductions in poverty in Cambodia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Liberia, and Malawi of between 12 and 26 percent in areas where Feed the Future works.
- **Stunting Reduction:** Child stunting, a measure of malnutrition, has also dropped between 12 and 32 percent in recent years in target areas of Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ghana, Honduras, Malawi, and Rwanda.

Note: As detailed in source, reductions were observed over a 2-6 year period depending on country and data source.

Source: Feed the Future. (2016). Ending hunger and poverty: A snapshot of progress.

<https://www.feedthefuture.gov/resource/ending-hunger-and-poverty-snapshot-progress>

At the same time, the global community is facing **emerging trends** that provide both challenges and opportunities for food security in the future. According to the U.S. Intelligence Community Assessment on global food security published in 2015,¹³ instability and conflict, changes in climate, agricultural disease outbreaks, environmental degradation, illegal fishing and overfishing, demographic changes, intensifying urbanization, and rising food demand will all have major impacts on progress against global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty. Some of the most important opportunities and challenges are detailed below.

Food security, instability, and conflict: Food security is a development and humanitarian issue that also presents major national security challenges. Growing concentrations of poverty and hunger—exacerbated by the effects of climate variability, environmental degradation, and demographic trends—threaten global security, leaving countries and communities vulnerable to increased instability, conflict, and the potential for violence.¹⁴ The overall risk of food insecurity in many countries will increase during the next 10 years, contributing to social disruptions and political instability.¹⁵ The number of displaced people around the world is currently the highest in history at 65 million people.¹⁶ In addition to *contributing to* conflict and instability, food insecurity can also *result from* conflict and instability, as illustrated by the situation in many conflict zones around the world. Projections indicate that more than two-thirds of the world's poor could be living in fragile countries, where state-society relations are already strained, by 2030.¹⁷

Climate and natural resource challenges: The intensifying challenge of changing climate patterns and extreme weather events such as droughts, floods, and extended periods of extreme temperatures pose major challenges to global food security,¹⁸ necessitating new food production practices along with enhanced monitoring and response to the growing threat of agricultural pests and diseases. Exacerbating the climate challenge is continued stress on ecosystems, marine environments, fisheries, and the land, water, and natural resource base upon which productive agriculture relies, and the complex intrastate governance challenges related to water resources. Responding to these challenges requires research to provide new tools and approaches for increasing agricultural productivity, monitoring and managing threats and risks, better managing and governing natural resources related to the food supply, adapting to the effects of a changing climate, and mitigating greenhouse gases, where possible.

Complex demographic challenges and relevance beyond rural areas: Demographic change presents a major challenge, with two-thirds of the world's people expected to live in cities by 2050,¹⁹ and 90 percent of this urban growth projected to occur in Africa and Asia.²⁰ Rapid urban growth presents unprecedented challenges but also new opportunities for global food security. Urban slum populations around the world are expected to continue swelling beyond the current one billion people,²¹ and current urban population growth rates across Africa are, on average, over twice as high as rural growth rates.²² These trends make investments in other aspects of the food system beyond farms and rural areas increasingly important in order to foster inclusive economic growth that enhances food security and reduces poverty. Rapidly growing secondary and tertiary cities, where the majority of urban growth will concentrate,²³ and megacities offer important opportunities for enhancing food security. At the same time, continued growth of Africa's rural population (which is predicted to continue exceeding Africa's urban population for more than a generation), where poverty is even deeper, accentuates these challenges. An aging workforce further complicates these issues across Asia in both rural and urban areas.

Continued gender inequalities: While limited access to resources and inadequate nutrition affect billions of women, men, girls, and boys, inequalities in resources, power, and roles in food and agriculture systems tend to affect women and girls more greatly. Although women comprise 43 percent of the agricultural labor force in developing countries, on average, they have disproportionately less access to resources (such as land and financing), markets, technologies and information, positions of influence, and means to manage risk.²⁴ Lack of access to credit, limited group membership, and high workloads are among the most pressing constraints for both women and men in agriculture, although the burden of disempowerment in these constraints is almost twice as much for women.²⁵ Social norms about women's and men's roles and responsibilities compound gendered barriers to resources and institutions, often limiting women's ability to earn income, manage risk, or influence how earnings are spent or what foods are available to feed young children. Where women do not have sufficient resources or power to act for their own and their children's health, nutritional outcomes suffer.

Opportunities for agricultural-led growth: Urban growth and accompanying diet changes provide new opportunities for enhancing food security in both urban and rural areas. Urban populations—and, increasingly, rural communities—purchase much of their food, which continues to be produced predominantly in rural areas. Urbanization and income growth are also creating new opportunities related to dietary transformation, as consumer demand for processed foods and more resource-intensive, higher-value food products increases. One of these opportunities is to focus efforts on building strong and resilient food and agriculture systems that can have a transformational effect on people's lives and societies as a whole, not in the least by creating jobs and spurring growth in rural and urban economies.

Strengthening linkages between rural producers and growing numbers of urban consumers through the development of input and output markets and related infrastructure (e.g., roads, ports, cold storage, and wholesale markets, as well as electricity, water, and information and communications technology) is key to assuring the availability and affordability of sufficient, safe, and nutritious food. Soft infrastructure, such as an enabling environment and education for producers and other members of the agriculture and food system workforce, is also needed to operate a more sophisticated, inclusive, sustainable, and diversified agriculture and food sector and to provide new growth and employment opportunities. Agricultural growth—across the full value chain including production, transportation, processing, trade, marketing and preparation—can reduce food prices, increase incomes, and provide employment opportunities for the rural and urban poor.

Mobile, digital, and finance opportunities: We have also witnessed incredible changes in market dynamics fueled by the explosive growth of mobile and digital technologies over the past five years. These forces have redefined economic growth models, empowered poor people with new, powerful communications tools, and facilitated more productive interactions and financial transactions among actors across agricultural value chains. In particular, with the rapid proliferation of digital payments, including mobile money, we now have the tools and knowledge to invest in financial infrastructure that fits the needs of rural households, providing them with the financial tools necessary to both weather shocks and seize economic opportunity. This is critical since more than two billion people worldwide—who are predominantly female and live in rural areas critical to food security—currently lack relevant financial products that would enable them to save, in order to mitigate shocks that impact consumption, and invest, in order to increase profitability.²⁶

Lessons for the Way Forward

Food security and malnutrition are complex, systemic challenges, and we have learned that no single intervention, policy change, or investment is sufficient to alleviate them. Building from our progress, learning from experience, and taking into consideration emerging trends, we have identified key lessons that inform our approach going forward.^a

Diversity of Contexts, People, and Pathways

- **Importance of resilience for addressing vulnerability:** We have learned that sustainably reducing extreme poverty requires a strong focus on reducing the risk of and building resilience to shocks and stresses, including natural disasters, emergencies, food price spikes, and long-term climate variability, especially among women and vulnerable populations including the very poor, and in fragile countries coping with conflict and crisis.
- **Gender integration:** Targeting women as beneficiaries is not enough to reduce gender inequality and empower women and girls. We will continue to promote women's access to resources and leadership in food and agricultural systems, challenging gender norms that hinder food security and women's empowerment, and intentionally involve men and communities in efforts to improve nutrition, gender equality, and empowerment for women and adolescent girls.
- **Youth:** We have recognized that U.S. Government food security and nutrition efforts could explicitly target youth more systematically in order to address the youth demographic more effectively. We will achieve this by drawing lessons from existing evidence on approaches that work well to advance economic opportunities for youth.
- **Rural and urban populations:** Many rural poor can benefit as consumers, producers, and employees from progress in making food systems and agricultural value chains work better. For the urban poor, a broader set of factors such as better food access through supply chain enhancements, non-farm employment opportunities in the food and agriculture sector (particularly in secondary and tertiary cities located close to rural production areas), non-agricultural job opportunities, and safety net policies are important.
- **Recognizing different pathways out of poverty:** Our efforts to strengthen agriculture and food systems that sustainably reduce poverty are primarily predicated on building strong private sector-led value chains. However, the ultra-poor, landless, and others may face constraints to engaging in these value chains due to a lack of assets or ability to manage the risks inherent in these systems. We therefore need to complement our value chain development activities with additional approaches to support various pathways out of poverty including outside of agriculture, reflecting the diversity of opportunities and constraints people face. Different contexts may require one or more approaches.

Systemic Approaches to Sustain Impact

- **Strengthening interagency coordination:** More sophisticated methods of U.S. interagency coordination and cooperation are needed to use the comparative strengths of agencies to deliver a comprehensive approach to global food security and nutrition. This includes improved

^a These lessons have been informed by multiple documents reflecting on global food security efforts since 2009, including the Synthesis of Evaluations Related to the Feed the Future Learning Agenda and drafts of the forthcoming Feed the Future Global Performance Evaluation.

interagency planning and investments so that various U.S. efforts are more closely aligned, integrated, and mutually reinforcing for maximum impact at both headquarters and the field.

- **Layering and integrating interventions for nutrition impact:** While we have placed the inclusion of nutrition-sensitive agriculture/livelihood interventions and nutrition-specific interventions at the center of our approach to date, operationalizing this approach requires a skillful coordinated effort across multiple sectors, including water and sanitation, education, environment, livelihoods, social protection, health, agriculture, and disaster relief. This approach requires that we target the same populations in specific geographic locations with interventions from multiple sectors.
- **Integrating development and humanitarian approaches:** Achieving lasting resilience and reducing the risk of food insecurity requires integrating development efforts with humanitarian approaches in appropriate ways that meet the humanitarian mandate of saving lives and reducing suffering while also reducing the economic impact on livelihoods. We can do this in part through coordination and collaboration between humanitarian and development actors, the use of good practices for sustainable interventions, and better accounting for risk in development programs.
- **The value chain approach in agriculture and food systems:** To help ensure our efforts result in higher incomes for small-scale producers as well as employment and entrepreneurship opportunities in rural and urban areas, we must expand our activities and better leverage and coordinate broader U.S. strategies and investments. This will allow us to implement a comprehensive value chain approach, focusing on key intervention points and markets while enabling and encouraging production diversification and technology diffusion at scale. Stronger investments in a range of transformational aspects of the agriculture and food system, such as research, infrastructure, finance, markets, an enabling environment for producers, traders, and other businesses, workforce development are crucial to enhance links between rural and urban areas.
- **Policy:** Our efforts to support policy reform have generated meaningful change and will require continued long-term investment. These efforts are needed to improve the functioning of public and private sectors that can sustainably provide extension, social safety nets, research, health, inputs, and other goods and services. Through diplomacy and programmatic support, we will continue to work closely with governments and with national and local stakeholders to advance and help implement an evidence-based policy agenda consistent with international obligations and U.S. policy objectives, including through strong land, marine, and water tenure.
- **Building local capacity and country ownership:** To minimize continued dependence on external assistance and to promote long-term sustainability, it is critical that U.S. approaches continue to recognize the need to build capacity of individuals, institutions, and governments in targeted countries. There also needs to be closer collaboration with in-country stakeholders in planning, program implementation, determination of objectives, measurement of progress, and adaptation of strategies to meet changing needs.

Evidence, Data, and Research

- **Evidence-based approach:** Our continued focus on generating evidence on what works; using rigorous monitoring and evaluation approaches focused on management and learning; and building strong mechanisms for learning and adaptation are essential for us to achieve maximum results.

- **Data:** Accurate, timely, and detailed data on global hunger, malnutrition, poverty, and agriculture are necessary to inform U.S. interventions and to measure their impacts. However, the United States and all of our partners are hindered by limited and outdated data. Under this strategy, we will seek to improve the data that our partners and we collect and use, and explore new approaches, tools, and technologies to ensure maximum impact of our policies and programs.
- **Innovative research:** We will continue to advance and scale the results of high-quality biophysical and social science research to help ensure a pipeline of innovations, tools, and approaches designed to improve agriculture, food security, resilience, and nutrition priorities in the face of complex, dynamic challenges. U.S. universities are critical to efforts to strengthen capacity of partner country research institutions to engage in locally and globally relevant research.

Building on a strong foundation of comprehensive U.S. Government food security and nutrition investments, the U.S. Government’s continued, bipartisan commitment to ending hunger, malnutrition, and poverty around the world was solidified in July 2016 with the enactment of the GFSA, which calls for an interagency strategy to improve global food security and nutrition.

This strategy refines the U.S. Government’s global food security and nutrition approach, building on lessons learned and taking account of a shifting global context. As outlined in the sections that follow, this strategy aims to break silos and integrate programming across sectors and agencies for maximum impact and effective stewardship of United States taxpayer dollars.

2. Goal and Objectives of the Strategy: The Results Framework

Inspired by the global agenda laid out in the SDGs and the objectives of the GFSA:

Our vision is a world free from hunger, malnutrition, and extreme poverty, where thriving local economies generate increased income for all people; where people consume balanced and nutritious diets and children grow up healthy and reach their full potential; and where resilient households and communities face fewer and less severe shocks, have less vulnerability to the shocks they do face, and are helping to accelerate inclusive, sustainable economic growth.

In support of this global vision, the below sections outline our theory of change for achieving our goal and objectives. A theory of change is a description of how we expect our activities will ultimately result in our goal through a series of causal linkages or impact pathways. Figure 1 illustrates our theory of change visually in the format of a Results Framework, which outlines our ultimate goal, the three objectives necessary to achieve that goal, and the Intermediate Results (IRs) that are necessary in order to achieve our three objectives. This figure provides a framework for presenting our strategy to achieve the

policy objectives in the GFSA and guides the comprehensive, multi-sectoral approach and resources that the U.S. Government brings to bear on addressing food security and nutrition globally.

Our overarching goal is to **sustainably reduce global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty**. See Section 5 on Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning for a discussion of our target-setting approach. Reaching this goal will require an integrated effort, which, our experience to date has shown, must include achieving three main Objectives:

- 1. Inclusive and sustainable agricultural-led economic growth:** There is broad consensus that sustainably reducing global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty will require accelerating inclusive agriculture sector-led growth that is environmentally sustainable and that local partners can maintain without further input of development assistance resources. Inclusive and sustainable agricultural-led economic growth provides many paths to poverty reduction, generating jobs and reliable incomes, directly across agricultural value chains and indirectly through multiplier effects across the broader economies of which they are a part. Growing the agriculture sector also increases the availability of affordable, diverse, and nutritious food, thereby supporting reductions in hunger and malnutrition.
- 2. Strengthened resilience among people and systems:** Households and communities are increasingly experiencing frequent and intense shocks and stresses that threaten food security and nutrition. A reduced vulnerability to these shocks and stresses and the ability to reduce, mitigate, adapt to, manage, and recover from them is particularly important to the extreme poor and the most vulnerable. Increased resilience among people and systems is necessary for men, women, and families to sustainably escape poverty.
- 3. A well-nourished population, especially among women and children:** Achieving our Goal requires well-nourished populations in which everyone, especially women and children, have the chance to live healthy and productive lives. Nutrition improvements are related to decreased health costs, higher economic productivity, and lower rates of mortality.²⁷ Undernutrition, particularly during the 1,000 days from pregnancy to a child's second birthday, leads to lower levels of educational attainment, productivity, and lifetime earnings.²⁸ Nutrition is also vital prior to pregnancy, including in adolescent girls.

These three Objectives are interrelated and interdependent. Agriculture-led economic growth, for example, is especially effective in leading to income growth among the poor, thereby increasing their ability to afford food to improve nutritional status, especially of women and children. Resilience to shocks and stresses is necessary before individuals can afford the risk inherent in increasing investment in their farms and other businesses that can lead to further income growth. And good nutrition, which starts early in life and depends on, though also requires conditions well beyond, improved income, is necessary for a healthy and productive workforce that is the backbone for all economic growth.

A number of Intermediate Results outline the pathways towards higher-level results. **Nine Intermediate Results** outline our approach to achieving the three Objectives. In addition, another **six Cross-Cutting**

Intermediate Results are foundational to all areas of food security and nutrition and contribute to achieving the other Intermediate Results, and thereby all three Objectives, and our overarching goal.


Achieving these Intermediate Results and the three Objectives will require a large, diverse set of activities that will vary by context. Recognizing this, and that many activity outcomes contribute to multiple Objectives or Intermediate Results, our Results Framework includes an **illustrative list of activity outcomes** contributing to each of these Objectives and Intermediate Results. The illustrative activities listed in the sections below may contribute to one or more of these outcomes.

In addition to the three Objectives that lead directly to our core global food security and nutrition development goal, we have identified **six complementary results** from other U.S. Government investments that benefit from and contribute to our global food security and nutrition investments. These results are not only necessary for food security and nutrition, but they also benefit from improved food security, creating a mutually reinforcing relationship across government policies and implementation. In Figure 1, these complementary results are represented in dotted boxes to illustrate that they are essential to our goal but depend on other programming and diplomatic streams.

Given that the relative importance of each of the Objectives and Intermediate Results to achieving our overarching goal will vary by context, we will tailor the activities needed to achieve the required results to address each food security and nutrition context. Thus, the U.S. Government team within each target country will develop a country-specific theory of change and Results Framework that reflects the unique challenges, opportunities, and contexts in that country. This theory of change will strategically focus our resources on those approaches and interventions that will deliver impact, at scale, in support of our overarching goals of sustainably reducing global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty, based on existing country-specific or global evidence, and cost-benefit, cost-effectiveness, and related analyses.

The different elements of our Results Framework and their relevant theories of change are explained below.

Figure 1: U.S. Government Global Food Security Strategy Results Framework



Illustrative Activity Outcomes: Building Blocks to Achieve Our Goals

Objective 1

- Increased sustainable productivity of all types of small-scale producers (also Obj 2)
- Stronger inclusive market systems (also Obj 2)
- Increased access to business development and financial services (also Obj 2)
- Improved infrastructure, including digital and other ICT solutions (also Obj 2)
- More efficient land, water, and input use
- Technology and innovations developed through research and adapted to local conditions
- Increased access to and wide adoption of inputs, and other technology and innovation
- Expanded access to knowledge through agricultural extension
- Increased access to market infrastructure, such as improved storage systems and basic retail marketing structures
- Reduced time and cost of moving goods across borders
- Improved quality of produce that meets market standards

Objective 2

- Increased use of risk management services and practices
- Improved safety nets (also Obj 1,3)
- Improved social capital (also Obj 1, 3)
- Diversified livelihood risk (also Obj 1)
- Expanded livelihood opportunities (also Obj 1)
- Application of risk reduction tools such as improved water management and drought/flood tolerant seeds (also Obj 1)
- Increased household and community assets, including savings
- Improved access to communal natural resources
- Improved use of early warning information
- Increased access to hazard, index, and other insurance
- Increased adoption of climate-smart practices (also Obj 1)

Objective 3

- Improved access to diverse and nutritious foods
- Increased demand for diverse and nutritious foods
- Improved access to nutrition services
- Improved demand for health services
- Improved infant and young child feeding practices and women's diets
- Increased commercial production of safe and nutritious food products, including fortified food (also Obj 1)
- Increased availability of evidenced-based food information for consumers (also Obj 1)
- Improved food safety systems (also Obj 1)
- Improved safe handling practices (also Obj 1)
- Improved access to clean water
- Improved access to sanitation
- Schoolchildren nourished through school feeding programs (also Obj 2)
- Improved access to handwashing facilities

Cross-Cutting Intermediate Results

CC IR 1 Strengthened global commitment to investing in food security

- Increased public and private investment in food security
- Strengthened bilateral and regional investment platforms

CC IR 2 Improved climate risk, land, marine, and other natural resource management

- Improved land and soil management
- Improved sustainable management of wild fisheries
- Improved and sustainable utilization of ecosystem services

CC IR 3 Increased gender equality and female empowerment

- Increased women's leadership skills and opportunities
- Increased women's decision-making power
- Strengthened women's access to financial services

CC IR 4 Increased youth empowerment and livelihoods

- Improved youth entrepreneurial skills
- Improved access to nutrition services for adolescent girls

CC IR 5 More effective governance, policy, and institutions

- Natural resource governance, including land and marine tenure
- Improved evidence-based policies
- Improved institutional architecture
- Improved mutual accountability systems
- Well functioning sanitary and phyto-sanitary systems
- Strengthened regional harmonization

CC IR 6 Improved human, organizational, and system performance

- Improved research, policy, regulatory, education, finance, data, and extension systems
- Improved skills for producers, scientists, civil society, private sector, and government actors
- Promotion of science, technology, and innovation

Objective 1: Inclusive and Sustainable Agricultural-Led Economic Growth

Rationale

Agricultural growth is a mechanism to reduce poverty, especially for the extreme poor in rural areas.^{29,30} A growing, resilient, competitive, inclusive, nutritious, and sustainable agriculture and food system increases producers' income through productivity and profitability improvements and can also lower real food prices, thereby improving producers' and consumers' access to adequate nourishment year-round. This is especially important for the world's poor, who spend the majority of their incomes on food. Well-functioning food and agriculture systems also spur urban and rural job creation and entrepreneurship opportunities in service delivery, input, transportation, food processing, storage, retail, and trade. Agricultural growth also has spillover effects into other sectors by driving demand for locally produced goods and services, creating additional economic opportunities and jobs for the poor in the countryside, towns, and cities.

Theory of Change

Agricultural supply chains and markets have been rapidly expanding and transforming across Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Caribbean. Increasing population growth and urbanization—from large cities to secondary cities and small towns—changing diets, and rising incomes have resulted in rapid increases in consumption of fruits, vegetables, meat, dairy, and processed foods. As a result, the relative importance of “traditional” food markets has given way to increasingly more integrated value chains that connect producers (including farmers, pastoralists, foresters, and fishers) to markets, often involving countless firms in agricultural inputs, transportation, logistics, storage, processing, wholesale, and retail.

As this transformation continues, the challenge for countries—and for development partners—is to promote agriculture-led growth that is both inclusive and sustainable, economically and environmentally. Transformation can be made more inclusive as small-scale producers and small and medium enterprises (SMEs), especially women, youth, and other marginalized groups, access inputs, assets, and services that allow them to participate more effectively in these markets. An inclusive food and agriculture system has opportunities for all. Those with assets and skills will participate as producers or service providers. Others will acquire these

Scaling Up for Impact

Inclusive and sustainable agriculture-led growth requires widespread adoption of improved technologies and practices by value chain stakeholders. To achieve widespread adoption, we will use scaling approaches to sustainably increase the reach of proven packages of technology innovations among significant numbers of potential adopters. In most cases, scaling requires promoting the diffusion of adoption beyond direct beneficiaries of development interventions. We will do this by working with delivery pathways (public and private) to demonstrate value and make technologies available to relevant value chain stakeholders, including service providers, input suppliers, smallholder producers, and processors. We will promote adoption through strategic consideration of stakeholder incentives, constraints, and preferences, especially those related to gender. We will place strong emphasis on the policy environment surrounding the incentives and constraints in order to catalyze systemic changes in value chains and market systems.

skills. Still others will benefit from the jobs that value chains and supporting sectors generate. Transformation can be more sustainable as producers adopt new approaches that allow production to thrive and adapt to changing climate conditions while protecting natural resources.

This transformation of food and agriculture systems into inclusive and sustainable agricultural-led economic growth requires comprehensive investments in key aspects of the system, from producers to policies and institutions that result in improvements in efficiency, including through reduced food loss and waste, and affect development across value chains and markets. To assist in this transformation, we will work with countries to strengthen their policies, institutions, and food and agriculture systems in ways that create and expand economic opportunities for agribusinesses, particularly small-scale producers and SMEs, while also promoting environmental sustainability. We will work at many levels to transform the food and agriculture system: supporting producers and other agribusinesses across value chains; boosting linkages to markets; improving the broader enabling environment to leverage responsible private sector investments; and encouraging the adoption of policies to support employment, entrepreneurship, and climate-smart approaches across these systems.

In order to achieve the inclusive and sustainable agricultural-led economic growth, outlined in this section, we will need to achieve the four mutually-reinforcing Intermediate Results detailed below, including: **strengthened inclusive agricultural systems that are productive and profitable**, especially for small-scale producers and small and medium enterprises; **strengthened and expanded access to markets and trade**; **increased employment and entrepreneurship**, especially for the landless, women, youth, and other marginalized groups; **increased sustainable productivity**, particularly through climate-smart approaches.

IR 1: Strengthened inclusive agriculture systems that are productive and profitable

Whether small-scale producers and SMEs benefit from changing food and agriculture systems depends partly on the broader enabling environment that opens opportunities for all firms, including access to finance, predictable policies, property rights, agricultural research, rural roads, and reliable electricity. At the same time, small-scale producers and SMEs face particular constraints to improving their productivity and profitability. In particular, distance from end markets, lack of information, lower skills, and smaller landholdings or insecure land and marine tenure all constrain their access to inputs, financial services, market information, and technical services. Many of these constraints tend to be especially acute for women, youth, the landless, and other marginalized groups.

Strengthening the broader enabling environment and supporting efforts of small-scale producers and SMEs to better connect within their respective value chains are therefore just as important for food security and nutrition as investments that support production. Our investments in both areas will support small-scale producers' and SMEs' own efforts to raise their incomes, an essential step to improving food security and nutrition.

Examples of activities we will support that contribute to this result include:

- Agricultural and food systems research, education, and extension that increase productivity and innovation as well as protects consumers

- Capacity development of the private sector to produce and add value to goods and services, compete, and deliver innovations
- Working across public, private, and civil society organizations to identify, adapt, and scale promising strategies and technologies, including advanced and emerging breeding technologies, to sustainably intensify and diversify local farming, aquaculture, and fisheries production and postharvest systems
- Improvements to the business environment for small-scale producers and SMEs, including through strengthening government capacity to develop and enforce science-based regulations
- Strengthening the relationships between actors in value chains, particularly those that enable small-scale producers and SMEs to access inputs, supplies, and machinery; and benefit from markets
- Commercializing functions across the value chain from input supply to processing and other postharvest functions
- Investing in digital technologies for real time data collection, analysis, and exchange that improve agricultural practices and yields, enable nimble market adjustments, and signal new food and agriculture system opportunities
- Increasing women, youth, and other marginalized groups' access to productive resources, extension services, and cooperative membership
- Increasing access to finance, financial inclusion, and financial intermediation throughout agriculture and food systems, including to financial services and digital tools, particularly among women, youth, and other marginalized groups
- Strengthening government capacity to develop and manage an open, transparent, and accountable policy environment that supports countries' commitments to the global rules-based trading system to open markets and thereby reduce the costs of doing business, improve the predictability of returns on investment, and facilitate inclusive growth

IR 2: Strengthened and expanded access to markets and trade

Improving value chain linkages between producers and consumers in domestic, regional, and global markets is critical to food security and agriculture-led growth. More functional markets and trade networks are vital to facilitating the movement of agricultural products from food surplus to food deficit areas, improving food access for areas that may have populations highly vulnerable to food insecurity. Improving access to strong markets and functional trade networks is also vital for small-scale producers and SMEs, including those owned and operated by women, youth, and marginalized groups. These groups often encounter difficulties accessing both input and output markets that are necessary for improved productivity and incomes.

While IR 1 focuses on facilitating the participation of small-scale producers and SMEs in value chains and diversifying food production, IR 2 focuses specifically on strengthening their connections to local, regional, and international end markets, including by improving rural-urban linkages and the flow of people, information, and finances. This also involves helping markets link with producers and SMEs. Since most countries rely to varying degrees on imports to achieve their food security and nutrition goals, we will also continue to promote countries' capacities for efficient markets and good governance to participate in international trade. Such integration through markets and trade creates better jobs, spurs

economic growth, and increases availability of food, including in areas with populations highly vulnerable to food insecurity.

Examples of activities we will support that contribute to this result include:

- Advancing efforts by the public and private sectors to improve roads, electricity, water, telecommunications and information services, improved storage systems, basic retail marketing structures, and other infrastructure to better link producers with end markets
- Increasing access to infrastructure and services for small-scale producers and SMEs, including women-owned enterprises
- Capacity building for producer associations to improve their skills, negotiating power, and private sector linkages
- Investing to link producers and other agribusinesses in the food system to end markets, particularly expanding markets in secondary cities and towns
- Building capacity to improve production and postharvest practices that help producers become more profitable, reduce food loss and waste, and meet market demands, including for food quality and safety
- Building institutional capacity and technical assistance to support transparent and science-based international food, animal, and plant health and safety standards, traceability requirements, and regional harmonization of those standards and requirements
- Organizational capacity building and technical assistance to increase availability of timely and accurate agricultural statistics and market analysis
- Implementing regional and multilateral agreements on technical barriers to trade, sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) standards, and trade facilitation
- Adopting science-based biosafety laws and regulations
- Advancing availability of timely market information

IR 3: Increased employment and entrepreneurship

The transformation of food and agriculture systems, based on underlying productivity drivers, consumer preferences, and market efficiencies, can be a major contributor to poverty reduction through the many multipliers transformation can generate in the local economy. Firms along value chains—from input suppliers to producers, processors, and retailers—generate much-needed jobs, including for women, youth, the landless poor, and other marginalized groups, including those in secondary cities, peri-urban, and urban areas. Value chains generate jobs directly by demanding labor, goods, and other services to support the flow of goods from production to consumption. Value chains also generate jobs indirectly: as more households engage in these value chains, they earn and spend more in their local economies, in turn stimulating more job creation and entrepreneurship.

To achieve inclusive and sustainable agricultural-led economic growth, we will support this transformation to benefit rural households, in particular, which are increasingly reliant on diversified livelihoods that combine incomes from agricultural production, jobs generated across food and agriculture system value chains, and other rural non-farm employment. This will also create many jobs and business opportunities that often require training, skills, and knowledge that may not be readily available. Our activities aim to equip small producers, SMEs (including small businesses), and others with the ability to produce goods and services, add value to them, and generate jobs in the process.

Examples of activities we will support that contribute to this result include:

- Lending facilities, partial credit guarantees, and other mechanisms to improve access to finance for SMEs
- Vocational and technical training for agribusiness managers and their employees, including for SMEs
- Analyzing potential for different activities to generate employment across and beyond value chains, particularly jobs suitable for women, youth, landless workers, and rural and urban households without access to land and resources
- Training in entrepreneurship, leadership, and workforce readiness, especially for youth and women

IR 4: Increased sustainable productivity, particularly through climate-smart approaches (also contributes to Objective 2)

To feed growing and rapidly urbanizing populations, countries need to increase productivity to make more safe and nutritious food readily available and affordable. However, this will need to be accomplished in an increasingly challenging environment, with changing climates and emerging plant and animal diseases threatening agriculture, fisheries, aquaculture, and the broader food and agriculture system. We will support producers' and policymakers' efforts to identify and adopt climate-smart approaches to food production and better confront the challenges posed by diseases and pests to food supplies. Climate-smart approaches emphasize sustainably increasing agricultural productivity and incomes, adapting and building resilience to changes in climate, and reducing or removing agricultural greenhouse gas emissions, where possible. We can take advantage of the research in the United States and other countries to address these emerging challenges.

Examples of activities we will support that contribute to this result include:

- Development of more productive and resilient crops, aquaculture, and animals that meet the needs of small-scale producers and guidance on their adaptation into prevailing agricultural contexts
- Support local development of input services, such as seed systems, to provide smallholder producers with affordable, locally-relevant inputs
- Extension services for production and postharvest practices that make producers more profitable, reduce food loss and waste, control pests and diseases, and assist with meeting market demands, including for food quality and safety
- Enhanced surveillance, detection of, and timely responses to plant, animal, and foodborne diseases
- Utilization of effective climate services to construct the evidence base necessary to accurately describe potential and realized risks posed by climate variability
- Research on and promotion of policies and production practices that contribute to a climate-smart approach and have potential for widespread adoption and impact, including practices that reduce food loss, reduce the impacts of pests and diseases, enhance efficient use of inputs, and support low-emissions development
- Access to irrigation systems and water management, especially small-scale schemes

Objective 2: Strengthened Resilience Among People and Systems

Rationale

Resilient individuals, households, and communities are able to manage adversity and change without compromising their future well-being. They are able to effectively anticipate, mitigate, and reduce risks and the negative effects of realized risks in the form of shocks and stresses without major, lasting consequences to their food security, nutrition, and economic well-being. They are also able to sustainably escape and remain out of poverty. By working to strengthen resilience, including the resilience of the most vulnerable, we can better ensure that our investments to reduce hunger, malnutrition, and poverty are inclusive and achieve lasting results.

Underlying our theory of change for strengthened resilience is the reality that the households and communities we serve live in increasingly complex and interconnected risk environments in which shocks are more frequent and stresses are ever-present. Increasingly, we find that negative impacts from climate variability, natural disasters, and environmental degradation on agricultural productivity, the stability and viability of livelihoods, food security, income, and nutrition are exacerbated by parallel risks that may include price volatility, population growth, health shocks, political fragility, conflict, and other threats. Together, these hazards pose major threats to securing viable livelihoods, increasing market access for all populations, and boosting access to opportunities for longer-term, inclusive economic growth.

In the extreme, the realization of these complex and compound risks results in recurrent crises and large-scale humanitarian emergencies that threaten the lives and livelihoods of the most vulnerable, negatively affect national and regional economies, and cost the U.S. Government and others billions of dollars in recurrent humanitarian spending and emergency food assistance. More broadly, these complex and compound risks and a lack of resilience also account for the alarming rates at which households that have escaped poverty descend back into poverty and non-poor households fall into poverty for the first time.³¹

Theory of Change

Resilience is an essential condition for achieving our goal to sustainably reduce global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty as well as to reduce reliance upon emergency food assistance. In order to build resilience, several context- and shock-dependent resilience capacities need to be strengthened at the individual, household, community, national, and systems levels. When these capacities are successfully strengthened and maintained, people will be able to better protect critical assets, food security will be improved and sustained, and populations will be well-nourished—even in the face of recurrent shocks and stresses.

The types of resilience capacities that we will build operate at different scales (individual, household, community, and systems), and are varied, as are the types of interventions that will help to strengthen and sustain them. This underscores the importance of holistic, multi-sector, and multi-scale approaches, as well as the linkages between building resilience and Objectives 1 and 3. It also underscores the importance of understanding and taking account of differences in both risks and resilience capacities that exist between and within households, including differences between men and women and male- and female-headed households.

We will design and implement investments that anticipate and treat recurrent shocks and stresses as perennial features, not as unanticipated anomalies. As outlined below this demands that we strengthen the capacity of people and systems to **proactively reduce, mitigate, and manage risk** and **adapt to and recover from shocks and stresses** in a manner that reduces chronic vulnerability and facilitates inclusive growth. It also demands that our investments be shock responsive and flexible in both funding and programming to help mitigate the impact of shocks on households and communities when they do occur.

Importantly, transformative capacity—the institutional, political, and systemic factors that are necessary conditions for resilience building—underlies our Intermediate Results for strengthened resilience. The cross-cutting IRs and complementary results outlined in the Results Framework help achieve transformative capacity. In its absence, efforts to strengthen resilience will not be scalable or sustainable. Key aspects of transformative capacity include women’s empowerment, social cohesion, improved governance, and access to local and global markets, quality social services, effectively managed natural resources, information, knowledge, new technologies, and infrastructure. Evidence also suggests that people's aspiration and other psycho-social factors such as people's self-perceptions about their ability to manage shocks and stresses play an important role in resilience in ways we are just beginning to understand.

IR 5: Improve proactive risk reduction, mitigation, and management

Potential and realized risks such as drought, flood, price shocks, pests, and diseases may not always be avoided. However, they can be anticipated. This means that they can be prepared for in ways that can reduce the likelihood that they occur and, if they do occur, can lessen their negative consequences. IR 5 is the pathway to strengthening resilience that is focused on the resources and strategies that enable individuals, households, communities, systems, and governments to anticipate, reduce, mitigate, and manage both potential and realized risks. These resources and strategies enable them to buffer and absorb the impact of shocks and stresses so that their well-being is less affected or not affected at all.

Examples of activities we will support that contribute to this result include:

- Strengthening the capacity of communities and governments to reduce and manage disaster and other risks, including through community early warning and response preparedness systems, and policy actions including maintaining open trade in times of shocks and stresses
- Increasing access to and adoption of crop, livestock, hazard, and other insurance and risk transfer products at multiple scales (from households to governments)
- Increasing access to other financial services, including savings, credit, and money transfer, to help mitigate and manage risk and enable productive and profitable enterprise
- Increasing asset accumulation and management to prevent a downward spiral of divestment leading to destitution, particularly among the most vulnerable
- Increasing access to and use of weather forecasting, hydrologic modeling and prediction, and improved early warning for decision making and early and preventative action
- Strengthening of formal and informal safety nets that individuals, households, and communities lean and rely on during times of stress
- Increasing use of climate-smart approaches spanning technologies; infrastructure; resource-conserving practices including drought-, heat-, and flood-tolerant crop varieties; stress-tolerant, productive animal varieties and disease control measures; improved soil and water management;

improved ecosystem services; and diversified livelihood systems that lead to greater productivity and incomes and help reduce, mitigate, and manage risk

IR 6: Improve adaptation to and recovery from shocks and stresses

In instances where shocks or stresses cannot be avoided, the resilience of individuals, households, communities, and systems can be strengthened to help them more effectively respond. IR 6 is the pathway to strengthening resilience that is focused on the resources and strategies that enable these proactive and informed responses to realized risk. This includes resources and strategies that enable individuals, households, communities, and systems to bounce back and recover more quickly in ways that do not undermine current and future well-being. It also includes the resources and strategies that enable them to adapt to longer-term trends and changes in their risk environment to not only protect, but improve, future well-being.

Examples of activities we will support that contribute to this result include:

- Using climate-smart approaches as outlined in IR 4
- Increasing access to and use of climate and other information on trends and changes to inform long-term planning and investment decision making at different scales
- Expanding and diversifying livelihood and economic opportunities on- and off-farm, including those that have different risk profiles than agricultural livelihoods
- Preparing men, women, and youth to take up new, different, and profitable income opportunities in and outside of agriculture, including those linked to migration
- Increasing the confidence of people, communities, and governments to adapt to changing risk environments through exposure to effective adaptation already underway
- Strengthening of formal and informal safety nets that enable individuals, households, and communities to be less risk averse
- Improving human capital through investment in health, nutrition, and education, including demand-driven workforce development
- Improving access to and management of communal natural resources

Objective 3: A Well-Nourished Population, Especially Women and Children

Rationale

Malnutrition restricts the attainment of human potential and productivity but also imposes a high burden of social and economic consequences on individuals, families, communities, and nations. Proper nutrition promotes the optimal growth and development of children. We are committed to improving nutrition to enhance health, productivity, and human potential and to save lives, as reflected in our U.S. Government Global Nutrition Coordination Plan for 2016-2021.³²

Nutrition is central to sustainable development and is required to make progress on issues such as health, education, employment, poverty, inequality, and the empowerment of girls and women. At the same time, a variety of multi-sectoral development issues contribute to poor nutrition. Further, the lack of safe, nutritious, and adequate food can be a destabilizing factor in countries that do not have the financial or

technical abilities to solve their own food security and nutrition problems. The problems of undernutrition and chronic disease risk are interrelated: Poor nutrition in early life is associated with greater susceptibility to such diseases later in life.

Progress toward decreasing the prevalence of stunting (the physical manifestation of prolonged undernutrition) has been uneven across countries and within countries. The immediate determinants of stunting often include poor nutritional status of women before and during pregnancy, suboptimal infant feeding practices, poor sanitation and hygiene, contaminated food, and frequent infection in young children. Other underlying causes of poor nutrition status can include the inferior social status of women and girls, inequality, poverty, and poor infrastructure of health systems and markets.

Theory of Change

The multifactorial causes of poor nutrition highlight the need for a multi-sectoral approach to address the problem. Our development hypothesis is that if people increase their consumption of nutritious and safe diets and their use of direct nutrition interventions and services, maintain more hygienic household and community environments, and have lower disease burden, then the population will be well-nourished. Global food security investments will directly address all parts of this development hypothesis except for lowering the burden of disease, which is addressed through complementary work to strengthen health systems.

To improve the nutritional status of the populations in the areas where we work, we will concentrate efforts on improving women's and children's nutrition, particularly during the critical 1,000-day window from pregnancy to a child's second birthday, with a focus on reducing child stunting. The Intermediate Results under this Objective, in combination with those leading to inclusive and sustainable agriculture-led economic growth and strengthened resilience among people and systems, we will contribute toward the global goal of ending malnutrition in all its forms and our goal to sustainably reduce hunger, malnutrition, and poverty.^b We will work through both nutrition-specific interventions (which address the immediate determinants of malnutrition, also known as direct nutrition services and interventions) and nutrition-sensitive interventions (which address the underlying and systemic causes of malnutrition), with a special focus on maximizing our impact and learning what works through nutrition-sensitive agriculture.

In order to achieve the goal of a well-nourished population, we will support global, national, and local policies, strategies, and processes. We will partner with foreign governments (both national and local), international organizations, civil society organizations, private sector actors, researchers and universities, and other stakeholders to leverage resources, encourage nutrition advocacy, promote coordinated actions, and advance country priorities. Building technical expertise and institutional capacity within countries to deliver services is an important aspect of supporting country-led efforts to ensure sustainability.

^b See the section on complementary results below for a summary of how related U.S. Government approaches to reduce disease burdens contribute to and benefit from these nutrition approaches.

IR 7: Increased consumption of nutritious and safe diets

A nutritious and safe diet is one that supplies adequate quantities of all nutrients required for growth and normal functioning of the body and is free of contaminants. Increased consumption of nutritious and safe diets requires increased supply of, and effective demand for, nutritious and safe foods.

On the supply side, we will integrate, coordinate, and layer agriculture and nutrition activities under IRs 2, 3, 4, and 7 to increase availability of diverse and nutrient-rich plant and animal source foods. We will expand commercial production of nutritious food and reduce food safety risks throughout the value chain, from farm to fork. We will support private sector actors across the value chain and strengthen market systems and infrastructure to help ensure local markets across the rural, peri-urban, and urban continuum have year-round availability of diverse, nutritious, safe, and affordable food.

On the demand side, we will strategically leverage nutrition education, training, and social and behavior change communication strategies with local stakeholders including trained nutrition and agricultural professionals to increase demand for a diverse diet and nutrient-rich foods. We will promote the importance of adequate diets for women and appropriate infant and young child feeding practices, including promotion of early and exclusive breastfeeding and appropriate complementary feeding starting at six months, with continued breastfeeding, and appropriate feeding of the non-breastfed infant or child. In addition, given the rise in dietary-related non-communicable diseases, nutrition programs will promote the importance of healthy, balanced diets that contain a variety of foods across and within all food groups and that reduce the amount of added sugars, sodium, and unhealthy fats.

Examples of activities we will support that contribute to this result include:

- Supporting nutrition-sensitive agricultural knowledge and information systems services
- Promoting production of biofortified crops and fortified food products
- Promoting good agricultural practices and food processing to prevent contamination of raw and processed foods by mycotoxins, microbial pathogens, viruses, and parasites, among others
- Building household and community capacity to preserve and process seasonal foods for year-round consumption
- Expanding sustainable early child development, preschool, and school meal programs that provide nutritious foods, and promoting nutrition education
- Promoting optimal infant and young child feeding in households and communities
- Promoting women's empowered decision making in households and communities and engaging men in supporting family nutrition
- Supporting research, including on nutrition surveillance systems and nutrition-sensitive agriculture approaches and impacts
- Improving the regulatory and policy environment to increase availability of evidenced-based information on food to consumers, including through the development of country or region-specific dietary guidance systems
- Providing support to countries to strengthen national food safety regulatory frameworks to improve the safety of both imported and domestic food

IR 8: Increased use of direct nutrition interventions and services

While malnutrition is attributable to multiple factors, current evidence suggests that nutrition-specific interventions and services, which are often delivered through the health sector, make a significant contribution to improved nutrition status, particularly of infants and young children.³³ In particular, the 2013 Lancet Series on Maternal and Child Nutrition³⁴ examined the evidence around a range of nutrition interventions and identified ten that have the greatest benefit on maternal and child nutritional status and reductions in mortality. These interventions, if scaled up to 90 percent coverage, could reduce stunting by 20 percent, prevalence of severe wasting by 61 percent, and deaths of children younger than 5 years by 15 percent.³⁵ We will focus our efforts on these interventions, primarily targeting pregnant and lactating women and children under two. We will do this in partnership with the health sector, which provides the platform for assessment of nutritional status and relevant counseling and support as core functions of clinical service delivery.

Examples of activities we will support that contribute to this result include:

- Ten priority interventions identified by the Lancet Series on Maternal and Child Nutrition:
 - Maternal multiple micronutrient supplements to all
 - Calcium supplementation to mothers at risk of low intake
 - Maternal balanced energy protein supplements as needed
 - Universal salt iodization
 - Promotion of early and exclusive breastfeeding for 6 months and continued breastfeeding for up to 24 months
 - Appropriate complementary feeding education in food secure populations and additional complementary food supplements in food insecure populations
 - Vitamin A supplementation between 6 and 59 months of age
 - Preventive zinc supplements between 12 and 59 months of age
 - Management of moderate acute malnutrition
 - Management of severe acute malnutrition
- Multi-sectoral efforts to prevent anemia
- Promoting dietary diversity

IR 9: More hygienic household and community environments

Improved access to clean and safe drinking water, food, and sanitation services along with overall hygiene is critical to improving nutritional status and preventing environmental enteropathy, which has been associated with cognitive and physical growth failure. Water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) interventions target underlying causes of hunger and malnutrition, such as health and nutritional deficits resulting from inadequate WASH access and behaviors. Sustainable access to WASH requires attention to the role of water and sanitation infrastructure and systems, behavior change, and the enabling environment, all of which should be incorporated into efforts to achieve lasting impact on nutritional status.

We will promote agriculture practices that are safe and environmentally sound as well as supportive of the efficient, sustained production of increased quantities of nutritious foods. We recognize that food production can create risks to health that must be addressed through training, access to technology, and monitoring of contaminants. At the core of our approach is a focus on healthy homes where family

members, especially young children, have year-round access to healthy foods while being protected from injury and contact with contaminants and pathogens.

Examples of activities we will support that contribute to this result include:

- Improving access to basic and safely managed water services
- Improving access to basic and safely managed sanitation services and promoting open defecation-free communities
- Promoting safe food handling and handwashing with soap
- Promoting safe storage and use of agricultural inputs
- Promoting construction of livestock housing to assure safe handling of wastes, prevention of pest populations, and reduction of zoonotic disease
- Locating irrigation systems to prevent contamination of drinking water sources
- Continuing research investments to better understand how hygienic environments affect nutritional status

Cross-Cutting Intermediate Results

Achieving our Goal and Objectives requires achieving the nine Intermediate Results outlined above. It also requires achieving six other Cross-Cutting Intermediate Results (detailed below) that contribute to more than one Objective by contributing to two or more of the other Intermediate Results.

Cross-Cutting IR 1: Strengthened global commitment to investing in food security

Reducing hunger, malnutrition, and poverty are global concerns that require sustained, long-term investment. While U.S. leadership helped spur US\$22 billion in total donor commitments through the 2009 L’Aquila Food Security Initiative and US\$10 billion in responsible private sector investment commitments in Africa through the launch of the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition at the 2012 G-8 Summit, there is still an estimated US\$260 billion annual shortfall in resources needed to achieve the SDG on hunger and food security.³⁶ To bridge this funding gap, we will strengthen global commitment to investing in food security from all streams of financing—domestic resources, development assistance, and responsible private sector investment—building on the momentum of the 2015 Financing for Development conference. Further, the U.S. will continue to support Nutrition for Growth commitments made in 2013 to better track nutrition resources and leverage new sources for increased nutrition investments.³⁷

The U.S. Government will continue to be a global leader in shaping the food security agenda through high-level, sustained diplomatic engagement with **partner governments, multilateral institutions, and regional fora**. We will continue to advocate for attention and action on food security and nutrition among the G-7 and the G-20, which, in recent years, have mobilized significant political will and financing for global food security and nutrition. We will continue to elevate food security and nutrition at the highest level in our bilateral relationships with foreign governments, and use our engagement in regional organizations to focus on regional challenges and solutions to improving food security and nutrition. Finally, the U.S. Government will continue to use our leadership at the United Nations, the World Bank,

and other international organizations to elevate food security and nutrition and integrate it across the work of multiple organizations.

While global and donor investment is crucial, countries' own **domestic spending** in agriculture outstrips official development assistance by a rate of nearly 15 to 1 globally.³⁸ However, many governments are not yet investing enough or have yet to ensure that investments are transparent, sustainable, and do not distort markets. Investments in some public goods and services have particularly strong potential to improve food security and nutrition including: infrastructure development, research and development, data systems, education and extension services for smallholder producers, nutrition services, and social protection to help build the resilience of highly vulnerable groups. Every dollar spent on these investments is returned multiple times over by the growth yielded.³⁹ We will support country-led efforts to increase and improve domestic spending on food security and nutrition through bilateral engagement and regional platforms and work with partners to develop transparent and detailed investment and spending plans.

While **domestic and international private entities** are interested in investing in developing country food and agriculture systems, they often view agriculture and related investments as risky due to weak and uncertain policy environments and inadequate finance. In addition to engaging with partner governments to improve the policy environment, we can help mitigate both real and perceived risk in various ways, partner directly with the private sector, and strengthen finance mechanisms. If successful, our private sector partners will increase their responsible investment, fostering innovation and resilience, build needed infrastructure, create and expand new markets, and facilitate trade for the benefit of local and global consumers. Our efforts will facilitate investment throughout agriculture and food systems—from production to marketing—to sustainably reduce global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty.

With an estimated US\$210 billion in demand for smallholder finance alone,⁴⁰ and a huge gap in finance for many SMEs (dubbed “the missing middle”), tailored financial services, products, and systems, as well as agriculture-focused capacity building for financial actors, will be key components to achieving outcomes across all Objectives. For small-scale producers, lack of secure tenure prevents the use of this resource as collateral for borrowing. To improve access to finance, financial intermediation, and financial inclusion, we will continue to support specific, effective financial mechanisms and approaches, both public and private, including the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP), a multilateral mechanism launched by the G-20 to help poor countries alleviate poverty, improve rural livelihoods, and improve food security. Our work with the private financial sector, including local bank and non-bank financial institutions, will be particularly essential to promoting sustainable development of the agriculture sector through which we will promote and facilitate adequate, appropriate, and accessible financial products that are structured to the needs of the agriculture value chain.

Examples of activities we will support that contribute to this result include:

- Exercising global leadership in multilateral fora including the G-7, the G-20, and the Committee on World Food Security
- Engaging with development partners and country governments bilaterally and through regional organizations and programs such as the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development

Programme (CAADP) to deliver on investment commitments and improve the quality of spending through transparent plans

- Guiding and shaping the priorities and approaches of international organizations and networks, such as the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, the World Trade Organization Sanitary and Phytosanitary Committee, International Fund for Agricultural Development, the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), the World Food Program, UNICEF, Nutrition for Growth, and the Scaling Up Nutrition movement
- Financing and investment promotion mechanisms such as the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP), partial loan guarantees, public-private partnerships, risk and other insurance products, savings, trade promotion, debt and equity instruments, blended finance, first-loss positions, and catalytic finance to attract additional financial intermediaries to provide finance

Cross-Cutting IR 2: Improved climate risk, land, marine, and other natural resource management

The sustainability of food security investments depends on improved climate-risk and resilience as well as environmentally-sound and sustainable management of production systems, whether terrestrial, freshwater, or marine. Natural ecosystems, including forests, grasslands, wetlands, and coastal and marine zones, provide environmental services that contribute to food security and sustainable productivity, such as biodiversity and water. Food security investments are dependent on ecosystem services and, when well-managed, contribute to a healthy environment, particularly with respect to soil, water, wild fisheries, forests, and other natural resources. Ecosystem degradation exacerbated by changes in climate, is widely viewed as contributing to national security risks and displacement of communities, conflict and instability.

Well-managed, environmentally sustainable agricultural and food security activities can benefit the wider ecosystems in which they are located. Healthy agriculture systems that conserve soils, water, and other resources reduce impacts on upstream and downstream environments and provide for the needs of both local communities and larger populations, urban and rural, and help protect natural resources both directly and indirectly. Agriculture and food system investments can contribute to better environmental outcomes through careful management of soil, water, and other resources that uses ecosystem services sustainably. Approaches that help reduce negative environmental impacts also confer greater resilience in the face of changes due to climate variability, including extreme temperatures, drought, and salinity. These sustainable approaches can also help reduce the production of greenhouse gas emissions by using fewer inputs for production and thus having less impact on the land. Sound environmental management of agriculture and wider food system investments also aligns with better economic outcomes, especially over the longer term. Sustainable ecosystems, and natural resources management that contributes to them, particularly benefit the most vulnerable populations, including indigenous communities, who often lack a voice in decision-making and have fewer resources to cope with environmental degradation.

Higher temperatures, drought, and increased rainfall variability require new approaches and information systems that help small-scale producers make decisions. Unsustainable and illegal practices, such as overfishing and illegal harvest of wild fisheries, exacerbated by both poverty and population growth,

threaten traditional production systems and lead to degradation of formerly productive resources that can affect food security. For example, a recent study predicts that more than 10 percent of the global population could face micronutrient and fatty acid deficiencies if management of wild fisheries is not improved and fish populations continue to decline.⁴¹ Aquaculture offers a strategy to supplement these finite wild stocks particularly in the face of declining water resources and impacts caused by a changing climate. Solutions require innovative approaches that sustainably manage wild fisheries and other resources and, at the same time, sustain income and healthy diets, including through diversification strategies that also help reduce climate risk. Aquaculture, including innovative aquaculture technologies, offers another strategy to supplement finite wild stocks, particularly in the face of declining water resources and impacts caused by a changing climate.

We are committed to helping the most vulnerable respond to the growing impacts of ecosystem degradation and climate variability. Sustainable, productive management of agricultural ecologies helps people contribute to broader environmental and climate resilience goals spanning terrestrial, coastal, and marine ecosystems. Innovative approaches can help producers and communities adapt to weather extremes and at the same time strengthen ecosystem services through improved management of resources.

Where necessary and appropriate, we will integrate agricultural development systems into existing wildlife and environmental conservation efforts in ways that help food insecure populations living in proximity to designated protected areas (such as national parks, wildlife areas, and marine protected areas) produce food without harming these ecosystems. While the largest numbers of food insecure people do not live in protected areas, they are still particularly important for biodiversity and preserving vital ecosystems, which in turn enhances human welfare.

Examples of activities we will support that contribute to this result include:

- Integrating improved practices and technologies that help advance both food security and environmental conservation
- Enhancing climate resilience through practices that conserve water and increase the water-holding capacity of the soil
- Managing crops, trees, livestock, aquaculture, and wild fish in ways that sustain productivity and reduce risk while conserving key resources and ecosystem services
- Advancing information systems that provide rural communities better ability to make informed choices that integrate economic, environmental, and climate resilience objectives that support food security
- Building capacity to sustainably manage agricultural production through systems-based approaches that sustain productivity and preserve ecosystem services
- Advancing approaches to food security that integrate resilience and economic and environmental goals in global fora focused on food security, climate, and the environment
- Fostering partnerships with the private sector to develop and scale cost-effective and practical tools for small-scale producers and others to respond to climate- and weather-related impacts
- Investing in innovative, environmentally sustainable, and productivity-enhancing technologies and applied science

Cross-Cutting IR 3: Increased gender equality and female empowerment

The multiple roles women play—producing food, generating income, giving birth, and providing care—place them at a critical nexus in food security and nutrition. Thus, increasing gender equality and female empowerment will be a central foundation of all of our efforts. It has been estimated that if women had the same access to productive resources as men, they could increase yields on their farms by 20-30 percent, potentially raising total agricultural output in developing countries by 2.5-4 percent and reducing the number of hungry people in the world by 12-17 percent.⁴²

By helping women throughout the value chain address the barriers they face and engage in higher value-added activities such as processing and trading, we advance women's participation in and contributions to food and agriculture systems as producers, entrepreneurs, traders, and workers and engage women as climate-smart producers and managers of resilient households, communities, and natural resources. Addressing gender is critical in building resilience as shocks and stresses affect men, women, boys, and girls differently (even in the same household) and often put additional stress on female members of the household which further impacts resilience capacities at all levels and compromises longer term recovery. Consistent evidence demonstrates that women's empowerment promotes children's and women's nutrition.⁴³ Empowering women and engaging men can improve diets, hygiene, and use of nutrition services, contributing to a well-nourished population.

Our programming, policy, and research efforts will engage women, men, communities, and institutions to regularly identify and address gendered needs and barriers throughout design, implementation, and monitoring, evaluation, and learning. Building on evidence generated by the groundbreaking Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index, developed in 2012 by the U.S. Government in partnership with the International Food Policy Research Institute and the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative, we will focus our agriculture and food security efforts on the greatest constraints of women's and men's empowerment and equality. We will apply evidence from the Index and other gender studies using the Gender Integration Framework, developed under Feed the Future, to effectively address the greatest constraints in each target country under the following domains: decision-making in agriculture, improving women's and men's access to and control over resources, control over income, social capital and leadership, workload, human capital, and access to technologies.

We will promote women's large-scale, active participation in activities throughout all components of food and agriculture systems and simultaneously leverage women's empowerment and men's engagement in nutrition approaches. Efforts to reach girls with nutrition and agriculture programming will align with the U.S. Global Strategy to Empower Adolescent Girls, which acknowledges that the inequalities adolescent girls and young women face limit their meaningful engagement in and benefit from food and agriculture systems, and can deepen the divide between boys and girls moving into the future. Efforts will also align, as appropriate, with the U.S. Government Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-based Violence, acknowledging that gender-based violence is both a barrier to women's greater participation in food and agriculture systems. We will continue to rigorously measure progress towards women's empowerment and gender equality in an integrated monitoring, evaluation, and learning system.

Examples of activities we will support that contribute to this result include:

- Helping women gain greater access to the inputs, extension, and other services, skills, resource management capacity, networking, bargaining power, financing, technologies and innovations, and market connections needed to sustain their long-term economic prosperity
- Participatory design and application of accessible and relevant gender-sensitive technologies, financial and extension services, and marketing support
- Promoting positive norms and practices to encourage more equitable control over income and more equitable roles in caregiving and workloads between women and men
- Promoting women's roles as entrepreneurs and leaders, across the private and public sectors
- Promotion of clear, secure, and transparent tenure rights, particularly those of women, small-scale producers, and communities
- Promotion of women's active leadership in decision-making and managing and governing land, marine, and natural resources
- Engaging both women and men directly in practices to promote children's nutrition and positive nutrition behaviors
- Identifying and addressing gender differentiated needs and roles in income-generating activities and in risk reduction, mitigation, and management activities

Cross-Cutting IR 4: Increased youth empowerment and livelihoods

Harnessing the energy, potential, and creativity of youth in developing countries is critical for sustainably reducing global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty while reducing the risk of conflicts and extremism fueled by growing numbers marginalized and frustrated youth. Youth will be a growing population segment in Africa and Asia,⁴⁴ globally, young people are three times more likely to be unemployed, and working youth are more likely to be extremely poor than older adults.^{45,46}

To address this employment challenge and reach our poverty reduction goals, youth need to be empowered with profitable and desirable opportunities. Many of these opportunities are found within rural and urban food and agriculture systems. For those youth who see their best prospects and pathway out of poverty as being outside of agriculture and in urban areas, urban livelihoods and migration afford a degree of livelihood independence from climate risks and can provide a more stable source of income that can be used for investment on- and off-farm. This stability builds resilience both for those migrating and for those who remain in rural areas and are connected to them (via social capital and remittances).

Rural to urban migration has been a historically inexorable force as youth seek employment, education, and opportunity in cities. Nonetheless, rural and urban youth, particularly young women, can benefit from and drive inclusive agriculture-sector growth through employment and entrepreneurship opportunities across value chains.

Empowering youth with nutrition education and services is important to improve nutritional status and gender equality outcomes. As many pregnancies occur during youth, empowering adolescent girls is especially important, since pregnancy and birth in adolescence are related to a number of poor outcomes for mother and child, including low birth weight, which is associated with an increased risk for stunting.⁴⁷

We will integrate youth issues, with particular attention to adolescent girls and young women, into programming and policy, and promote young people’s role in their design and implementation to reduce poverty, improve nutrition, and help men, women, and households become more resilient. Activities engaging youth will use proven methods that foster effective learning and excite young people, such as hands-on, experiential learning relevant to local needs and potential employment opportunities. In addition, we will promote digital technologies, which are proving to be a powerful pull factor for regaining the excitement of youth in agriculture, due to more dynamic information sharing, opportunities to think creatively, and new business models in the agricultural sector.

Examples of activities we will support that contribute to this result include:

- Addressing barriers and risks that disproportionately affect young people’s ability to enter into and profit from agricultural activities, including activities outside production
- Extending and innovating demand-driven agricultural education, extension, and applied research to build practical technical skills that empower youth in local agricultural systems and build resilience
- Applying technology to engage youth, with an emphasis on digital technologies such as mobile money, mobile devices, and the internet
- Agricultural business development and entrepreneurship skills training, including financial management and related skills needed for youth to succeed as producers, processors, input suppliers, or other entrepreneurial actors in the agriculture sector
- Developing youth-friendly nutrition services and nutrition-specific programming
- Developing innovative and appropriate business models and sources of capital to promote financial inclusion, business mentorships, and business advisory services

Cross-Cutting IR 5: More effective governance, policy, and institutions

We will work with stakeholders to strengthen governance, policy, and institutions at the global, regional, national, and local levels, while supporting the transformation of food and agricultural systems to scale and sustain our investments and impact. Improved governance includes the consistent application and enforcement of policies and regulations, respect for the enforcement of contracts, inclusive and transparent policy, and resource allocation processes, and effective delivery of public services. Institutions—the social and legal norms and rules that underlie economic activity—are the bedrock upon which good governance, effective policy systems, and inclusive food system transformations rest.

Effective governance, policies, and institutions can catalyze and accelerate the food and agricultural systems transformation required to reach our goal of sustainably reducing global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty. They are crucial in ensuring countries invest strategically in their own development, strengthening the private sector enabling environment, and building evidence-based participatory processes that will advance inclusive and sustainable agriculture-led growth, resilience, and nutrition. While we prioritize working in countries committed to policy reform and investment in food security and nutrition, we also recognize that some countries, particularly fragile states, may have a different starting place and will tailor our programming to ensure our assistance reaches populations most in need, including the extreme poor.

To achieve this result, we will support the development of improved policy systems in individual partner countries, comprised of three essential components:

1. A **prioritized policy agenda** of key actions needed to reduce hunger, malnutrition, and poverty that are informed by evidence and committed to by partner country governments. These policy actions might fall into areas such as nutrition policy; resilience and risk management policy; land and natural resources tenure, rights, and policy; agricultural inputs policy; agricultural trade policy; enabling environment for private sector investment; and institutional architecture for improved policy formulation.
2. An **institutional architecture** for predictable, transparent, inclusive, and evidence-based policy formulation and implementation. This approach deepens partner country and regional capacity for data collection and evidence-based policy analysis while also building stronger platforms for inclusive policy dialogue, decision-making, and monitoring policy impacts.
3. **Mutual accountability** through a transparent, inclusive, and continual process of managing for development results. This includes stakeholder commitment to align actions with the government's national agriculture, food security, and nutrition investment plans, and reporting on the execution of those commitments and their joint impact on poverty and hunger. Mutual accountability platforms increase collaboration and coordination among diverse groups, including government, private sector, civil society, and donors. In the African context, recently the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme has started developing a country scorecard to better present how well countries are performing on mutual accountability that reflects progress of multiple partners.

Examples of activities we will support that contribute to this result include:

- Building capacity for inclusive, transparent, and evidence-based dialogue among governments, civil society, and the private sector to accelerate sector progress
- Facilitating specific policy changes, such as bolstering the private sector enabling environment
- Strengthening land, marine, and resource tenure, rights, and systems, especially for women and small-scale producers
- Helping countries and regions to strengthen institutions and institutional processes, such as national agricultural, food security, and nutrition investment plans
- Building capacity to improve food safety policies, guidelines, and enforcement
- Building capacity for timely, objective policy and data analysis in key ministries, planning offices, and research institutes
- Supporting country-owned mutual accountability processes, including communication and collaboration, as appropriate, among local stakeholders in support of a multi-sectoral approach to food security and nutrition

Land, marine, and resource tenure

Tenure is characterized by the bundles of rights, rules, and institutions that define individual or community access to, and use of, resources such as land and water. Land, marine, and resource tenure is a particularly important governance and policy issue in the context of food security. Evidence shows that when land and resource rights are secure, agricultural productivity improves, and incomes rise.⁴⁸ Effective land, marine, and resource governance, policies, and institutions are particularly critical for women, who produce a significant amount of food grown in the developing world but who own or control only a small fraction of the land on which it is produced. When women have secure rights to land, they make investments to improve land and acquire better quality inputs, participate in land rental markets, and earn up to 3.8 times more income.⁴⁹ These decisions improve the food security and nutrition of the entire household: children whose mothers own land are up to 33 percent less likely to be severely underweight⁵⁰ and 10 percent less likely to be sick.⁵¹ Furthermore, as large-scale agricultural investment in developing countries increases, it is also critical that policies and institutions promote responsible land-based investment that benefits both investors and local communities and small-scale producers.

We will prioritize support to target countries and communities to respect and promote land, marine, and resource tenure of local sedentary and migratory communities, particularly those of women and small-scale producers. In all our work, especially in partnerships to enable responsible private sector investment, we will support implementation of and alignment to the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries, and Forests in the Context of National Food Security.^c The Guidelines provide a framework for countries to use for the establishment of laws and policies, strategies, and programs that clarify and secure tenure rights.

Cross-Cutting IR 6: Improved human, organizational, and system performance

The long-term sustainability and success of food security and nutrition interventions is dependent on strong and functional organizations that are able to achieve their missions and contribute to far-reaching social change, together with skilled citizens who effectively apply professional competencies and achieve their full potential. Our approach to improving human, organizational, and system performance will be rooted in local capacity development—a “process of unleashing, strengthening and maintaining the ability of people, organizations, and society as a whole to manage their affairs successfully”⁵²—and will take a long-term view, recognizing that success in this area is contingent on building trust and relationships. We will seek to improve the capacity, capability, performance, and effectiveness multiple actors across the system, including small-scale producers, producer cooperatives and associations; civil society organizations; agribusiness and trade associations; industry, market, and trade systems; integrated extension, education, and research systems; financial institutions; and national and local governments.

^c The Voluntary Guidelines are an internationally negotiated document adopted in 2012 by the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) under the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO) after nine months of negotiations, chaired by the United States, involving 96 member countries and over 30 civil society organizations.

Strengthening the adaptability of the local system that allows these actors and their interrelationships to accommodate shocks, respond to changing circumstances, and take advantage of current opportunities will help us to further sustain development outcomes over time⁵³ and help meet the strategy Objectives of inclusive agricultural-led economic growth, improved resilience, and improved nutrition. We will work to develop a network of organizations, enterprises, and individuals focused on change and on bringing new products, processes, and forms of organization into economic use to contribute to job creation, income generation, poverty alleviation, improved productivity, competitiveness, economic growth, and social development.⁵⁴

Examples of activities we will support that contribute to this result include:

- Targeted local capacity development interventions for strengthening strategic organizational actors and building a critical mass of qualified people in relevant organizational partners, including through degree and certificate training in host countries, in the U.S. and through regional partnerships
- Piloting and scaling demand-driven capacity development tools, including twinning programs and long-term relationship building; peer-to-peer learning; coaching and mentoring; shared accountability, risk, and responsibility with local partners; cash on delivery for benchmarked accomplishments; brokering and convening to foster extensive internal and external social capital; strategic partnering; leadership development; and custom training
- Facilitating partnerships between U.S. universities and colleges and universities and technical schools in target countries to support curriculum strengthening, institutional development, and technical expertise
- Up-front analysis to understand individual and organizational structures and their cultural and political economy context, and how our investments can help drive change
- Facilitating networking among diverse actors in target countries to identify development challenges, and promoting interactions, alliances, and partnerships for context-driven problem-solving

Complementary Results

As emphasized by the integrated nature of the SDGs, reducing global poverty and hunger and achieving food security and nutrition require a broader set of results that come from aligning with and leveraging other U.S. strategies, investments, and programs. Explicitly connecting to and supporting these work streams helps ensure that this strategy leverages investments and key stakeholder contributions across the U.S. Government to maximize results. We will not report results from these investments against this strategy.

Effective response to emergency food security needs

Many of the world's poor live in countries experiencing political fragility and subject to environmental risks. In these situations, people often rely on humanitarian assistance to meet chronic and/or recurrent needs. Emergency food assistance plays several roles in supporting the objectives of this strategy: it provides life-saving food and nutritional support to men, women, and children during times of natural disaster or prolonged conflicts and crises; it protects the assets and livelihoods of vulnerable populations under stress; and it can jump-start agricultural activity and stimulate local markets to accelerate crisis recovery. While the primary mandate of humanitarian assistance is to save lives and livelihoods, the right humanitarian tools used in the right way can help to prevent the deepening of—or people's descent into—poverty and reduce the erosion of development gains in agriculture, education, health, and nutrition during times of crisis. Emergency food assistance also serves as a stabilizing mechanism during times of vulnerability when people are faced with often tough economic choices following a disruption in daily life. The provision of basic necessities allows vulnerable populations to focus on stability. As noted in the GFSA, innovative and flexible humanitarian response is an investment in recovery, resilience, and ultimately, our own national security interests.

Given how, when, and where emergency assistance is allocated during crises, and that humanitarian needs are continuously changing, U.S. Government emergency food security financial resources cannot be accountably integrated into the relevant agency implementation plans included in Annex 1. However, this strategy supports the commitment made by the United States in the GFSA as well as at the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit* alongside international partners, to seek ways to build greater efficiencies into the humanitarian system,^a and to strengthen collaboration and planning between humanitarian and development assistance efforts. Ultimately, the goal is to end—not just meet—humanitarian need.

* The White House Office of the Press Secretary. (2016). *Fact sheet: World humanitarian summit - U.S. Government priorities*. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2016/05/24/fact-sheet-world-humanitarian-summit-us-government-priorities>

Economic growth in complementary sectors

Complementary investments in trade, transport, energy, financial services, information systems, communication services, and infrastructure can catalyze economic growth in agriculture and non-agriculture sectors. Access to affordable, reliable electricity, for example, enables small-scale producers to increase their productivity; small and medium enterprises to power their businesses; larger domestic and international investors to finance agriculture; and all of these groups to add value throughout the food and agriculture system. An improved and expanded transportation network, for example, serves as a critical link in allowing producers to access markets but also enables agriculture businesses to reach producers with inputs and cold storage facilities for perishable crops and irrigation systems. Telecommunications and the internet facilitate greater information flow, data collection and analysis, financial transactions, and efficiencies across value chains.

Conversely, growth in agriculture benefits other sectors as well, creating multiplier effects. Increased agriculture productivity, for example, creates a demand for financial markets to assist both agricultural and non-agricultural households to invest in wealth creating ventures (e.g., agribusinesses and export firms) that have a positive impact on all economic agents.

Last, growth in other sectors can also contribute to reducing hunger, malnutrition, and poverty, providing sources of income that serve as a substitute for or complement to livelihoods based in the agriculture sector. Growth in the manufacturing and services sectors in particular can provide valuable employment opportunities, especially in urban areas, and act as a complement to growth in agriculture. As part of structural transformation, often spurred by agricultural growth and productivity, economies often move from being primarily based on agriculture, to being larger and more diverse with industrial and other urban-based activities playing a much bigger role.⁵⁵

Healthy ecosystems and biodiversity

Healthy ecosystems and biodiversity, supported by other vital U.S. Government investments, play key roles in reducing global poverty and hunger and achieving food security and nutrition. The support of ecosystem goods and services in agricultural development extends beyond a traditional focus on on-farm natural resource management practices. Ecosystem goods include natural resources that are both intentionally managed and unintentionally impacted, such as wild fisheries, pollinators, and biodiversity. They provide communities with ecosystem services that are vital to sustainable food security and resilience such as wild fish, efficient pollination of crops, nutrient cycling and healthy soils, usable water supplies, wild foods for people, and grazing for livestock. Healthy ecosystems and biodiversity are also critical to developing community and producer resilience to natural disasters and incidents that adversely affect agricultural productivity. The U.S. Government has a strong record of strengthening ecosystem services and conserving biodiversity both on land and at sea throughout the world. Complementary investments focus on ocean and coastal resources management, climate mitigation, ecosystem-based adaptation, watershed management, forest and rangeland management, and biodiversity conservation.

Stable, democratic societies that respect human rights and the rule of law

Strong democratic institutions, respect for human rights, and accountable governance are crucial elements for improving people's lives in a sustainable way and making progress toward food security and nutrition. Through democracy, human rights, and governance (DRG) programs, the U.S. Government:

- Promotes participatory, representative, and inclusive government institutions, including political processes that engage civil society and other stakeholders;
- Fosters greater accountability of institutions and leaders to citizens and enforcement of the law;
- Protects and promotes universally-recognized human rights; and
- Improves development outcomes through the integration of DRG principles and practices across the U.S. Government's development portfolio.⁵⁶

In addition to DRG's complementary programming, we will work together to promote participation, inclusion, transparency, and accountability to achieve and sustain our food security and nutrition goal in the countries where we work. Through our collaboration and complementary programming, we aim to strengthen local systems and governance, while enabling people to reach their full potential, accelerating economic growth, and advancing human dignity.

A reduced burden of disease

A reduced burden of disease is an essential contributor to economic growth, education, participatory governance, and overall prosperity, all necessary for achievement of this strategy. However, preventable diseases, including malaria, HIV, and tuberculosis, and illnesses such as diarrhea, continue to plague much of the developing world. In pregnant women and young children, especially, illness and malnutrition can become cyclical, often resulting in death that would not have occurred if nutrition were adequate.⁵⁷ Further, even mildly poor health in young children is thought to contribute to impairments in nutrient absorption, manifesting in physical stunting and suboptimal cognitive development.⁵⁸

While access to safe water and sanitation, appropriate hygiene practices, and nutrition-specific services (actions supported under Objective 3) are clear contributors to reducing the burden of disease, provision of broad health services through complementary U.S. Government programs is crucial in order to reap the nutritional benefits of food security efforts. Most specifically, maternal and child health programs, the President's Malaria Initiative (PMI), the U.S. President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), and resources leveraged through USAID's Neglected Tropical Diseases efforts will continue to support the effective prevention and management of illness and infectious disease. Such health services are essential to improving the nutritional status of children, women, and men in the places where we work.

Well-educated populations

Inclusive, equitable, quality education for all, especially for girls, is vital to achieving the goals of this strategy, particularly Objective 3 (A well-nourished population, especially women and children) as a mother's education is associated with better health and nutrition of her children. U.S. Government investments complementing the strategy span the continuum of early childhood, primary, secondary, and higher education, educating the next generation of female and male leaders, entrepreneurs, policy makers, and other professionals necessary to lead the food and agriculture system. These investments, focused on quality education for all, empower people with the basic knowledge and skills to enter the 21st century knowledge-driven global economy, including the ability to understand and apply science-based evidence that underlies innovation for advancing global food security and nutrition. Likewise, critical thinking, problem-solving, and entrepreneurship skills developed through education directly translate into the ability to undertake research, make technology more available, product development, and more vibrant agricultural innovation, which, in turn, drives productivity gains, economic growth, new market creation, and employment.

3. Targeting Approach

We must take a strategic and focused approach to maximize our impact. This includes focusing our investments on interventions that will be most effective at achieving impact at scale and concentrating our efforts and resources in countries—and in targeted areas and communities within those countries—where our investments have the greatest potential to achieve sustainable improvements in food security and nutrition. While we seek to focus our resources, we will still provide assistance outside our target

countries, areas, and communities where more limited investments can play a critical role in supporting food security and nutrition.^d

We will select our target countries, areas, and communities based on the following criteria, although some target areas may not meet each criterion:

1. **Level of need:** We will focus U.S. Government investments where there are high levels of food insecurity, poverty, and malnutrition, and where the cost of *not* investing may also be great, such as where it might lead to continued or growing reliance on emergency food assistance.
2. **Potential for agricultural-led growth:** We will prioritize areas where there is significant potential to accelerate inclusive economic growth in agriculture and food systems to reduce hunger, malnutrition, and poverty.
3. **Opportunities for partnership:** We will focus efforts in areas where we can leverage complementary resources and expertise and support capacity development through partnerships with the private sector, other donors, producer organizations, cooperatives, civil society, faith-based organizations, and agricultural research and academic institutions.
4. **Opportunities for regional economic integration:** We will focus work in areas that present strong opportunities to strengthen regional trade and development corridors, integrate markets and accelerate regional growth, and increase urban/rural links both within and across countries.
5. **U.S. Government resource availability:** A central tenet of our strategy is that creating lasting progress in food security and nutrition will require significant investments across several sectors with support from a number of U.S. Government agencies. Robust investments require management and oversight capabilities. Therefore, our food security and nutrition efforts will be concentrated in areas where our financial and human resources are adequate for us to achieve our goals. This includes focusing in areas where we can align with and jointly leverage existing U.S. Government food security, nutrition, and complementary programs.
6. **Government commitment to food security investment and policy reform:** We seek to work in countries whose governments are actively prioritizing food security and nutrition for all of their people, such as through national food security and nutrition investment plans, policy reforms, and mobilization of domestic resources for food security and nutrition.

As an example of when a target area may not meet all of the criteria, some of the areas with the highest need for assistance, such as fragile states, may fall on a continuum of operating environments that includes elements of weak government commitment. This is especially important given that food insecurity in weakly-governed countries may provide opportunities for insurgent groups to discredit governments for their inability to address basic needs. In these contexts, which present a number of risks to long-term impact or program and policy stability, we will manage risk in part by looking for windows of opportunity in agriculture that leverage the experience of our humanitarian partners in strengthening local capacities, promoting transparency and social accountability, and providing a platform for civil society advocacy and policy dialogue. Where these opportunities exist, we will monitor progress using metrics that reflect the challenges of the specific country context, including monitoring the level of external humanitarian assistance needed.

^d Statutory requirements shape the specific targeting approaches and implementing models of individual agencies, as outlined in agency-specific implementation plans in Annex 1. For example, MCC's governing statute establishes criteria around partner country eligibility, as well as specific implementation elements required to be included in each of its compacts.

In addition to country-specific programs, we will also invest in regional programs where target countries are located to address significant challenges to food security that require cooperation across national borders.

Target groups: Within our target areas, our assistance will be intended to ultimately benefit rural and urban people who are hungry, malnourished, and/or poor, including the most vulnerable, and with a focus on women, the extreme poor, youth, and small-scale producers. It will also target people whose livelihoods will benefit from improved agriculture and food systems. These populations face constraints in accessing safe, nutritious food. They are also vulnerable to an array of shocks and stresses. The risks and constraints they face vary by context, by household, and among individuals within households. Likewise, the assets and opportunities they have to sustainably escape poverty and vulnerability also vary.

Targeting our poverty-reduction efforts requires a nuanced understanding of these varying risks, constraints, assets, and opportunities. For example, a resilient and sustainable pathway out of poverty for vulnerable households with very limited assets or hard constraints to profitability and productivity (including limited land and water) may require that they “step out” of agriculture production and pursue rural and urban employment and entrepreneurship opportunities in and outside the agricultural sector. For small-scale producers with more profit potential and primarily soft constraints such as limited access to information or markets, “stepping up” within commercial agricultural systems not only presents a viable pathway out of poverty through increased income but a means of buffering against risks through increased savings and assets, and improved access to insurance and other risk management tools.⁵⁹ The poverty reduction strategies we will pursue will reflect this diversity of context, people, and pathways.

While we will target specific beneficiaries for short- to medium-term impact, our strategy is not primarily a service delivery strategy, nor is it primarily about reaching the same people with direct benefits year after year. Rather, our strategy is to improve the institutions, markets, choices, and opportunities faced by much larger numbers of poor and hungry people now and in the future to help them move along a sustainable path to better lives. Therefore, to maximize long-term impact on our ultimate beneficiaries in our target areas, we will engage a wide variety of **actors** in our programs to achieve objectives effectively and sustainably, who may also benefit from this engagement. These actors may include:

- **Public sector actors**, including policy makers, agriculture and health extension agents, health and education system actors, and national agricultural research institutions
- **Private sector actors**, such as producer associations, small and medium enterprises in the agriculture and food sectors, entrepreneurs, lenders, and insurance providers
- **Civil society and community-based actors**, including faith-based and civil society advocates for the poor and hungry, and women’s and youth organizations

Selection process: The interagency will select target countries within the first year of the strategy. Throughout implementation, we will monitor the global context periodically to assess changing environments and, as needed, review the targeting of our investments to maximize their impact.

Graduation: Criteria and methodologies for graduating target countries and communities will be developed around the effectiveness and sustainability of our food security and nutrition programming, while recognizing that transforming systems and achieving reductions in stunting are long-term efforts.

The criteria and methodologies will also consider to what extent lasting progress against poverty, malnutrition, and hunger is experienced sufficiently across target populations, particularly among women and vulnerable groups.

As a country progresses towards greater food security and nutrition, its relationship with relevant U.S. federal departments and agencies will change. For example, countries emerging from conflict or crisis may transition from humanitarian assistance to development assistance. After a country has achieved improved resilience capabilities and an enabling environment, U.S. Government assistance will be better able to target support for the private sector to develop a more competitive agriculture sector. The graduation analysis process will provide an opportunity to identify how U.S. Government assistance can support long-term agricultural transformation and inclusive economic growth leading to sustainable reductions in malnutrition, hunger, and poverty.

4. U.S. Approach

To sustainably reduce hunger, malnutrition, and poverty, this strategy presents a comprehensive, multi-faceted approach that is rooted in lessons learned and evidence to date and reflects emerging trends. In support of this strategy, we will continue to leverage the expertise and programs of all relevant U.S. federal departments and agencies to promote a comprehensive whole-of-government approach and ensure the effective use of U.S. taxpayer dollars. We will also work with host-country governments, businesses, smallholder producers, research institutions, universities, and civil society organizations.

Whole-of-Government Coordination

The relevant federal agencies and departments involved with implementing this strategy provide diverse and complementary technical, programmatic, in-kind, and financial contributions to this strategy, as outlined in the agency-specific implementations plans in Annex 1. This strategy also aligns with and leverages other complementary U.S. strategies and investments, as outlined in Annex 3.

To coordinate relevant U.S. Government agencies and departments, we propose to build upon platforms and enhanced mechanisms at the global, regional, and country levels to leverage technical expertise, data, and resources.⁶ These platforms will continue to ensure regular consultation and collaboration with key stakeholders (defined in the glossary and the GFSA) and the appropriate congressional committees to maximize impact and avoid duplication of U.S. Government investments. Coordination will center on identifying shared and complementary goals and utilizing each agency's comparative advantages, both technical expertise and financial resources. Special attention will be placed on raising awareness among the U.S. Government agencies at all levels (Washington, regional, and country) of the tools, resources, and technical abilities each agency possesses to advance global food security. For example, we will more efficiently and effectively mobilize and facilitate the participation of the U.S. private sector as well as the global private sector into specific investments and financial facilities that further global food security.

⁶ The Global Food Security Act defines "relevant Federal departments and agencies" as the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Peace Corps, the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the United States African Development Foundation, and the United States Geological Survey.

Increased interagency engagement will build a stronger alliance of effort and more effective coordination. Platforms will engage and, when appropriate, integrate with other U.S. Government coordination mechanisms, such as the Global Nutrition Technical Working Group established under the U.S. Government Nutrition Coordination Plan.

U.S. Government coordination will involve joint and complementary actions to implement this strategy. Collaboration will advance strategic and technical coherence by:

- Unifying and integrating planning and implementation efforts;
- Sharing data and information regularly;
- Leveraging each agency’s relevant investment plans and investment operationalization;
- Capitalizing on agencies’ abilities to mobilize a diverse group of stakeholders and interest groups;
- Training and utilizing interagency staff; and
- Applying innovative approaches to accelerate progress and reduce or eliminate the binding constraints to achieve global food security.

This approach builds upon lessons learned to date and will foster more integrated work of key stakeholders.

At the **global level**, USAID has led and will continue to lead interagency coordination efforts, taking into account resources and expertise across the interagency, past experience and lessons learned. USAID will facilitate robust coordination among federal agencies through an interagency working group as well as consultations with congressional committees and key stakeholders, including other governments. As currently envisioned, and already in place for purposes of drafting this strategy, each relevant Federal department and agency will designate a representative plus one additional person to participate in the interagency working group and serve as a communication and coordination focal point with their department or agency. Coordinating platforms will be flexible in their structure to accommodate changing needs, but at a minimum, this approach will support holding regular interagency coordination meetings to ensure strategic coherence of U.S. Government efforts. Given significant involvement from multiple agencies, thematic groups may be established around specific topics such as: policy enabling environment; trade; data; investment mobilization and private sector engagement; resilience; and monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL). For example, the investment mobilization and private sector engagement working group could develop and track a pipeline of transactions that leverage each agency’s relevant tools, from technical assistance to debt and equity. In particular, unified coordination in support of responsible private sector investments and financial facilities will build from the long track record of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the USAID Development Credit Authority, the USAID Global Development Lab, MCC, various programs at USDA such as Food for Progress, as well as lessons learned about public-private partnerships within Feed the Future and Power Africa. These working groups would meet regularly, and topics could be added or eliminated on an as needed basis. Each agency’s implementation plan is expected to reinforce the interagency coordination process.

Proposed engagement at a **regional level** will strengthen coordination between Washington policymakers and field implementation agencies. As not all U.S. Government agencies have presence at the bilateral level, larger embassies with a strong interagency presence (e.g., Thailand, Kenya, or Colombia) may be well-placed to serve as regional “hubs” to better connect Washington and field-based efforts. These

regional “hubs” can provide an important communication function by sharing U.S. Government food security and nutrition priorities, lessons and information across the region and supporting interagency learning events and training among key stakeholders. Regional engagement could involve cross-border food security issues, and the collection of regional data can help to inform strategic decisions in Washington through interagency meetings and working groups. In addition, hubs can support regional coordination to help accelerate work in targeted countries. In consultation with interagency representatives in Washington and in the region, regional coordinators could be designated to engage with intergovernmental bodies to advance food security interests and coherence on a regional level. U.S. Government regional hubs could also provide support to countries where U.S. agencies have a limited presence.

Country-level coordination will vary depending on U.S. Government assistance and investment interests. For those countries selected as target countries, the interagency in consultation with the Chief of Mission and agencies with the largest equities in country^f should identify an interagency Country Coordinator to facilitate a whole-of-government strategy/plan with country-specific targets and objectives, coordinated implementation, and a collaborative approach to MEL. Suggested responsibilities and guidelines will be approved by the interagency at headquarters and shared with Posts to be further tailored to meet the in-country needs. The Country Coordinator should facilitate regular meetings led by the Ambassador or his/her designee.

Upon the selection of targeted countries and regions, interagency teams at Post should work together to update existing or develop new plans in alignment with this strategy that build upon experience to date. To facilitate interagency knowledge sharing, each Post should regularly report, including by cable, to all relevant agencies on food security progress, any strategic adjustments to U.S. Government engagement, and emerging opportunities. USAID’s Office of Food for Peace and USDA’s Foreign Agricultural Service will consult with the Coordinator in the planning of non-emergency food assistance programming to promote coordination in target countries. An annual interagency portfolio review should be planned with participation by U.S.-based and field-based interagency colleagues.

The primary responsibility for overseeing implementation within host countries, as well as coordination with country teams and implementing departments and agencies, will be retained by Chiefs of Mission. Nothing in this strategy shall be construed to impair or otherwise affect the authority granted by law to an executive department, agency, or the head thereof, or the coordination or implementation of emergency response operations.

In non-target countries that have significant U.S. interests in food security- and nutrition-related issues, the Post should identify a U.S. Government food security coordinator to provide appropriate coordination functions.

During the first year of this strategy’s implementation, priority engagement will focus on: rolling out the new strategy, selecting target countries, identifying benchmarks for interagency coordination based on agency-specific implementation plans, and developing country-level implementation plans. Upon

^f This may include U.S. Government agencies without a presence at Post, including those whose technical expertise would be beneficial to address particular country-level needs.

selection of target countries and regions, interagency teams in each country/region will identify mechanisms for regular, meaningful engagement with governments, civil society, academia, and the private sector. All work at the country level will seek to support and align with the host country government's food security and nutrition agenda. A list of regional and country coordinators will be available publicly to facilitate inclusive coordination. Further adjustments to whole-of-government coordination under the new administration will be taken into account throughout implementation and incorporated into the annual Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) implementation reports.

Engagement with Congressional staff will take place at all levels, including: regular briefings in Washington, DC, on strategy implementation and results; briefings by U.S. Government leadership based in priority countries when they are in Washington; and visits to regional hubs and target countries by Congressional representatives or staff.

Country and Local Ownership

Our approach will emphasize local ownership, local capacity development, alignment around a country's development strategy, and collaborative partnerships among development partners and local actors inspired by the values of the High Level Fora on Aid Effectiveness and outlined in the Paris Declaration and related partnership agreements. This approach recognizes that developing countries, above all others, must own and be empowered to lead and guide these efforts to drive progress. By supporting partner countries in their efforts to reform policies and deliver services to promote inclusive economic growth, resilience, and a well-nourished population, we strengthen the durability of development results and reinforce the international consensus that the SDGs cannot be achieved without the active and sustained participation of all sectors of society.

Global food security and nutrition requires steadfast country leadership at all levels of government, including political will, commitments to results, evidence-based action, and accountability. We will partner with target countries committed to increasing and improving their investments in food security and nutrition, creating an enabling environment for strong economic growth and nutrition outcomes, and supporting the public goods and services needed to drive that growth and make the private sector more efficient. Comprehensive, evidence-based national investment plans, developed in consultation with a wide range of citizens and stakeholders, will outline the country's agricultural development, nutrition, and food security priorities, which in turn will guide our investments. These plans provide a foundation for harmonized support and help countries prepare for successful implementation to accelerate progress toward achieving the SDGs.

Where national and local governments are active partners in the fight against hunger, malnutrition, and poverty, we will provide support to country leadership and the public sector to increase coordination across government agencies and develop institutional capabilities, accountability mechanisms, and strong working relationships with the private sector and civil society, including producers' organizations, faith-based organizations, and other non-governmental organizations (NGOs). With strong country leadership and catalytic development assistance committed to empowering and unlocking the potential of the poor, we can meet our shared goals.

An explicit premise of aid effectiveness is that local stakeholders—the citizens, civil society, private sector, academia, and institutions of developing countries—should be active agents of development rather than passive recipients of it. This is supported by recent evidence that has shown that Feed the Future programs saw better results when they sought to empower people to take ownership of their own advancement.⁶⁰ Therefore, beyond partnering with host-country and local governments, we work hand in hand with local stakeholders in the design, implementation, and evaluation of our activities, fortifying local systems while empowering businesses, civil society, producers, and other actors to lead the way. Civil society, in particular, must have a seat at the table given the vital role it plays in aggregating and representing citizen interests and holding public and private institutions accountable. Effective non-state actor participation in policy dialogue and other development processes not only increases the legitimacy of a given policy, process, or even local government, but also produces more sustainable results by creating constituencies for reforms. By bringing greater public and private resources to our strategic investments and promoting effective platforms for inclusive dialogue and mutual accountability, our assistance will strengthen the local stakeholders and systems through which agricultural transformation ultimately takes place.

While the country-led approach is essential for sustainability and effectiveness, the approach may sometimes be vulnerable to a number of risks, including weak systems and internal controls, limited capacity, and competing interests. In cases where we decide to work directly with partner governments and local organizations, we will conduct necessary assessments and use monitoring plans to reduce and mitigate risks, and maximize results. By diversifying partners, encouraging broad stakeholder engagement, and strengthening host country capacity in all segments of society, we will reduce and mitigate risks while also ensuring our assistance reaches people most in need.

Sustainability

Sustainability is an essential component of development, and to be sustainable, all development investments should catalyze the economic, political, and social processes within those countries that yield ever-improving lives for their citizens. Through our development programs, we aim to stimulate transformative systems change to create the conditions where our assistance is no longer needed.

In addition to emphasizing local capacity and ownership, the U.S. Government systems-based approach will prioritize facilitating interventions rather than directly providing services, whenever possible. Our approach will build inclusive, competitive, and resilient food and agriculture systems to help ensure the sustainability of food security and nutrition outcomes and to generate opportunities for women, youth, the poor, small-scale producers, and other marginalized groups. The systems will be environmentally sound, climate-smart, and characterized by a multiplicity of long-term, commercial relationships that enable a diversity of actors to compete in the market. We will further work to ensure that the capacity to reduce and manage risk and navigate market uncertainty is present at multiple levels and involves a broad range of system actors, including government, civil society, and private sector, from local to international.

A strong understanding of the system in which we work when we strategize, plan, and implement development assistance will be critical to ensuring the sustainability of our investments. Our facilitative interventions aim to stimulate change and build local capacity rather than take a direct role in the system or create a parallel system. When we align incentives of public and private actors, those stakeholders can

carry forward and own the change process. For example, empowering the private sector, including small-scale producers, to innovate and invest in agricultural value chain development, allows for U.S. Government exit. In cases where local actors are extremely weak or systems do not function at a basic level, such as extremely poor regions or areas of conflict, we will take a more direct approach to intervention.

By working through local actors, the U.S. Government will help ensure that they are drivers of the change process. Local actors build organizational and technical capacity and sustained ownership of outcomes when they choose to engage in action for change. The approach will emphasize diffusion of technology and knowledge adoption, for example, as a strategy for extending the reach of donor funding and designing programs that will have a long term impact. By utilizing these principles and embedding our work in local systems, we will be able to multiply impacts beyond direct programmatic reach and will target leverage points in food and nutrition systems to catalyze wider spillover effects, thereby expanding our impact to larger numbers of people and communities. Our strategy also provides strong support and engagement on the ecosystems, environmental, and natural resources aspects of sustainability, in particular through IR 1, IR 4, and CC IR 2.

Partnerships

Through collective action and partnership with key stakeholders, the U.S. Government will leverage the required skills, expertise, technologies, assets, and resources to improve our reach, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of development efforts. We will redouble efforts to bring together governments, multilateral development institutions, other international donors, civil society, the global research community, U.S. universities, and the private sector, finding new ways to leverage our investments and spur action by others to deliver cost-effective and results-oriented development solutions.

The process of identifying and assessing implementing partners will be transparent, simplified, and inclusive, and will emphasize open and streamlined competition to ensure a broad range of partners. We will employ the most appropriate procurement mechanisms including, as necessary and appropriate, leveraging open innovation that includes components of tiered-financing, smart risk-taking, and innovative funding mechanisms to allow for more adaptive and agile programming, with quicker feedback loops for better decision-making and iteration.

Our approach to working with this diverse set of partners will be strengthened through our facilitation of a communication and knowledge-sharing platform to coordinate efforts between the U.S. Government, our partners, and other donors to optimize and amplify messaging and regular consultation and collaboration with key stakeholders. We will identify points of contact within partner organizations with the capacity and mandate to facilitate communication and engagement across partners and will build on existing collaborative processes to strengthen interagency coordination on strategic communications as outlined above in the Whole-of-Government coordination section. As detailed in the Country and Local Ownership section above, we will be partnering with **partner country governments** and other local stakeholders to identify and advance local priorities, support coordination and accountability mechanisms, and sustainably build and advance food and agriculture systems.

Partnership approaches for key stakeholder types are outlined below.

Research and education organizations

Partnerships with research and academic organizations are crucial to achieving our goals. Building on decades of engagement between U.S. universities and the universities and national agriculture research systems in developing countries, U.S.-based researchers will invest in the human and organizational capital needed to increase the effectiveness and relevance of these local organizations. This capacity building will promote innovation and cutting-edge science as well as technical training and critical workforce development in support of food security and nutrition goals. The U.S. Government will seek to leverage its investment in domestic agricultural research, education, and extension in U.S. land grant and other U.S. universities and colleges to achieve global impacts, as well as seek partnerships with other countries and international organizations to address issues of mutual concern for global food security.

The extensive and long-running partnerships between the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Agency for International Development, other U.S. Government agencies, and the U.S. university community will be utilized to share findings and experiences relevant to other countries. The U.S. university-led Feed the Future Innovation Labs, which support collaborative research between U.S. universities, including land-grant universities, and research organizations in target countries, and other U.S. university-led research and capacity building programs will continue to leverage the best of U.S. science to advance novel solutions that support our goals to reduce global hunger, poverty and malnutrition. The Board for International Food and Agricultural Development is a critical vehicle for bringing the assets of U.S. land-grant universities to bear on agriculture and food security development challenges. The U.S. Government will also continue to support the CGIAR and other international research bodies and multilateral partners to advance global agriculture and nutrition research.

Feed the Future Innovation Labs draw on the expertise of top U.S. colleges and universities in collaboration with developing country research and educational institutions to tackle some of the world's greatest challenges in agriculture, food security, and nutrition. Led by U.S. universities, the Feed the Future Innovation Labs are on the cutting edge of efforts to research, develop, and take to scale safe and effective technologies that address current and future challenges posed by a changing climate and the need to feed a growing global population.

Multilateral development institutions

A key component of this strategy is our leadership in multilateral financial and development institutions and trust funds, such as:

- The World Bank;
- Regional development banks;
- The United Nations (UN), including the Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Food Program, the World Health Organization, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF); and
- The Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP).

As one multilateral component of our efforts, GAFSP’s institutional design reflects best practices of modern development effectiveness and is a model of a stronger and more sustainable financing architecture that supports countries committed to achieving the SDGs. Our investments in these institutions represent an opportunity to leverage significant resources to address food insecurity challenges. Strong U.S. leadership and continued partnership with multilateral institutions will support developing countries’ efforts to make concrete investments in food security that alleviate poverty and spur agriculture-led economic growth. We will use the historic agreements of 2015 made within the UN system—the Sustainable Development Goals, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, and the Paris Agreement—to turn our attention to implementation and impact on the ground. Further, we will consider the geographical and thematic overlap of our efforts with those of other international donors or multilateral organizations to help ensure that we identify opportunities for complementarity and leverage the comparative U.S. Government advantage in coordination.

Private sector

The local and international private sector, including entrepreneurs and producers, is also a critical contributor to development progress and key to achieving the goal of this strategy. The private sector brings unique expertise and market-based solutions to improve social and economic conditions in developing countries and is a vital component to food and agriculture systems that sustain results beyond the life of development assistance. We will continue to partner with the private sector, bilaterally and through multilateral mechanisms such as GAFSP, to mobilize domestic resources and other private sector investments in support of food security and nutrition where there is strong alignment between business interests and development objectives. We will pursue various approaches to private sector engagement, building on previous efforts. We will operate to deliver shared value to all parties and align around shared goals, with shared resources, risks, and responsibilities. Our alliances with the private sector will not simply leverage financial and intellectual resources but will also serve to broker fair, long-term, and productive relationships between corporate shareholders and smallholders.

Public-private partnerships will leverage unique core capacities and resources, such as financial contributions, donated services or property, or intellectual property and contribute to many results of the strategy. Through this strategy, we will more efficiently and effectively mobilize and facilitate the participation of the U.S. and global private sector into specific investments and financial facilities that further global food security and nutrition. Inclusive agricultural value chain development partnerships will help small-scale producers, especially women, gain greater access to the inputs, skills, resource management capacity, networking, bargaining power, financing, and market connections needed to sustain their long-term economic prosperity. Partnerships with financial intermediaries will target unlocking additional investment and credit to value chain stakeholders, especially smallholder producers, cooperatives, and small and medium enterprises. Partnerships will also:

- Provide employment opportunities for youth by developing labor markets, participating in programs to promote entrepreneurship, and providing training or internship opportunities;
- Promote investment in agro-processing and related infrastructure;
- Advance the food security research agenda;
- Improve the provision of financial, water, sanitation, and hygiene services;

- Harness the growing uptake of digital (including mobile) technologies and internet-based business models and entrepreneurship; and
- Disseminate cutting-edge research and technologies at scale.

Non-governmental organizations and civil society

Civil society partners play an integral role in our work to end hunger, malnutrition, and poverty around the world. These stakeholders include affected populations, producer associations, nongovernmental organizations, cooperatives, foundations, local civic and faith-based organizations, labor unions, and women-focused organizations. Civil society partners can not only elevate the voice of the poor and advocate for disadvantaged groups, they can also build local capacity and promote rural and urban development and sustainable agriculture practices. Engaging civil society partners in a collaborative manner will strengthen our programs and help make our efforts sustainable. Building on the Feed the Future Civil Society Action Plan,⁶¹ and drawing from civil society consultations that informed this strategy, we will continue to promote the participation of civil society in planning and implementation and consult with representative groups as we move forward and refine our approach, embracing and deploying their expertise and seeking their technical assistance.

We will demonstrate and promote inclusive engagement through deliberate outreach to marginalized and vulnerable groups and by ensuring that civil society, including producer organizations and faith-based groups, both within the U.S. and in target countries, has clear and simple ways to inform priority-setting processes, provide input as programs are designed and evaluated, and participate as partners on the ground.

Science, Technology, and Innovation

Investments in science, technology, and innovation are critical not only for reducing global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty, but also to sustain advances made as new threats to sustainable agricultural production, nutrition, and food safety regularly emerge and must be addressed. From developing climate-smart agricultural approaches, to advancing information and communication technology (ICT) solutions, innovations accelerate progress, improve the efficacy of our interventions, and leapfrog over existing approaches to save time and money.

Research agenda

Dynamic responses to increasingly variable production environments—which include increased occurrence of drought, higher temperatures, and greater climate variability, and shifting social norms, such as women’s roles in production and marketing—require a robust research and development agenda that offers options and ideas for adapting in a fast-changing world. Research can help identify critical levers in complex social, policy, and economic environments that contribute to the development of an enabling environment for growth and investment. Research investments in agricultural productivity are among the most effective strategies for significantly reducing poverty, particularly in Africa and Asia.⁶²

Research activities under this strategy will engage both men and women researchers and leverage domestic research investments made by U.S. science agencies, including the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy, and the National Institutes of

Health, as well as private sector research and development endeavors. These efforts, while focused on developing-country food security outcomes, also contribute to strengthening U.S.-focused research entities and businesses in ways that serve the American people directly, such as offering new ways to address threats to domestic crops, human, and animal health, or building connections to global markets.

Our purpose-driven research investments will underpin our development efforts and be oriented to:

- Address the most critical food security and nutrition issues at global, regional, national, and sub-national levels,
- Deliver a spectrum of innovations from international public goods, technologies, policies, and improved natural resource management to financial products that can help small-scale producers manage risk, and
- Deliver widespread impacts within and beyond our target countries.

Building from the Feed the Future Research Strategy and learning from its implementation, these investments will generate new knowledge across multiple sectors of research with particular attention to gender. Key research areas will include improving productivity in livestock, fish, and crops including legumes and cereals; addressing critical plant and animal pests and diseases; sustainably intensifying production systems with strong linkages to markets; addressing critical value chain bottlenecks, including around processing, storage, and transport; improving nutrition; water; and food safety. This research portfolio will build on and continue decades of collaboration between U.S. and international researchers through the Feed the Future Innovation Labs (formerly known as Collaborative Research Support Programs).

We will use advanced breeding approaches to deliver new crop varieties, such as disease-resistant potatoes, cassava, bananas, and other tropical staples, crops critical for the poorest farmers. We will use the latest scientific approaches to rapidly deliver animal health gains and help smallholder producers adapt to weather variation and new or worsening pests and diseases.

Our research portfolio will also contribute to improving the nutritional status of women and children. Through it, we will build capacity for agriculture and nutrition research and establish strong links between agriculture and nutrition scientists to help ensure nutritional adequacy of diets, with attention to quality and safety. We will strengthen science policy generally and support countries to establish or implement science-based policies and regulations.

Measuring the impacts of research requires unique monitoring, evaluation, and learning approaches that reflect the long-term, global nature of these investments. We will develop research-specific methodologies and metrics to capture the impacts of these investments and inform programming and prioritization under this strategy.

Digital and other information and communication technology

Information and communication technology (ICT), including the internet and mobile phones, accelerates economic activity. Targeted application to food and agriculture systems can spur broad-based economic growth and poverty reduction. The rapid global growth of mobile and digital technologies has upended business models and expanded the frontiers of information access and application in the developing

world; for example, by delivering access to more efficient and cheaper payment and savings tools, bringing weather forecasts to actors throughout the value chain, and providing real-time pricing information to small-scale producers.

Digital technologies in agriculture, such as sensing technologies, geospatial data, big-data analysis of production and weather, and telemetric farming can make agriculture more precise, productive, resilient, profitable, and financially inclusive. We will apply digital tools in new ways in food and agriculture systems to improve food security and nutrition, taking advantage of the decreasing costs of these technologies. Data-driven, intensive, hyper-local agriculture is emerging in several contexts. It requires an integrated set of digital approaches to be successful, such as linking big-data crop models, targeted weather forecasting, and specific variability in soils to provide localized information on farm inputs and practices. Furthermore, supporting systems such as ICT-enabled extension over phones, radio, and video and innovations in improved seed distribution will be required to turn these analytics into good practice on farms and in value chains.

Uptake of technologies

In order for technologies and innovation to drive economic development and improve food security and nutrition around the globe, they must be relevant and adopted at scale. Taking innovations to scale is complex and involves diverse actors and contexts. To ensure the relevance and adoption of innovations, we will consider the economic, political, and social drivers that contribute to their scalability. We will define and cultivate appropriate public and private delivery pathways based on the nature of the innovation and the context in which it is being scaled. We will support country governments to improve the quantity and quality of agricultural research and development, extension services, and legal and regulatory frameworks that facilitate the availability and adoption of innovations. Through a number of tools, including credit guarantees, innovation challenges, and prize competitions, we will incentivize the private sector to transform research into marketable technologies.

We will harness science and technology to help foster greater resilience in households and communities through introduction and diffusion of innovations, including financial management and insurance approaches that can reduce risk and help households manage shocks. Increasingly digital financial services are being recognized as the primary avenue to reach previously un-served, low-income customers, due to low costs and easy access made possible by the global expansion of mobile phones. There is strong evidence that financial inclusion accelerates economic activities and that this can be applied across value chains, from vulnerable smallholders to large agribusinesses. At the household and community level, innovations will help small-scale producers, especially women, increase their profitability along the value chain, from production to end-market retail.

The Importance of Open Data

Data are vital to sustainably reducing global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty as they support evidence-based investments, accountability, and transparency and enable the measuring of progress toward the Sustainable Development Goals and other global, regional, and local commitments. Open and accessible data are essential assets that provide a foundation of evidence for scientists and decision-makers globally and help fuel entrepreneurship, innovation, and scientific discovery in food security and nutrition.

Data on programmatic results, climate, poverty, demographics, health, and many other issues are also essential for managing our own programming. Real-time data feedback loops, for example, provide insights that can inform programmatic adjustments. Geospatial analysis provides visualization that helps focus our efforts where they are most needed. And monitoring progress and climate and production data can help us anticipate and prepare for food shortages and other emergencies.

As part of our programming, the U.S. Government will also continue to support countries' capacity to collect and analyze open, timely, and high-quality food security and nutrition data. These efforts will be in line with global efforts such as the Global Strategy to Improve Agricultural and Rural Statistics, which are important to monitoring progress on improving food security and nutrition at the national and sub-national levels.

In support of the Open Government Initiative, the U.S. Government will champion open data by making data from our activities publicly available and encouraging our partners to do the same. We recognize that we will need global platforms and fora to leverage support from the global community to accomplish this goal. For example, as part of the U.S. Government commitment to Global Partnership for Sustainable Data, USDA and USAID will continue to provide financial support to the Global Open Data for Agriculture and Nutrition secretariat to expand its work in promoting the opening of agriculture and nutrition data sets.

5. Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning

Through a country-led approach that harnesses opportunities in the agriculture and nutrition sectors, we seek to have growing and lasting development impact over time. Measuring progress toward our ambitious goal of sustainably reducing global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty is key and ensures the effective use of U.S. taxpayer dollars to further our objectives. Therefore, we are committed to rigorous monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) to track progress, facilitate performance-based and adaptive management, remain accountable on our commitments, and learn more about effective and evidence-based approaches to food security and nutrition. U.S. Government agencies and implementing partners will use appropriate MEL practices to continually assess the performance of programs, integrate lessons learned, adapt their approaches, and make course corrections based on evidence and new findings.⁸ We will implement these practices through a balanced approach that enables the comprehensive tracking of

⁸ As an example, this strategy was informed by the draft findings of the Feed the Future Global Performance Evaluation currently underway.

progress across the entire Results Framework but strategically focuses on key results to ensure the approach is manageable and not overly burdensome.

To accomplish that, we will coordinate our global food security and nutrition efforts under a common approach to transparency, accountability, and learning that includes:

1. A common food security and nutrition Results Framework
2. A performance monitoring process and standard performance indicators
3. An evaluation approach that employs impact and performance evaluations
4. A learning agenda that prioritizes key evidence gaps to be addressed through MEL
5. A focus on strengthening target country data systems and processes that support MEL

The foundation of our MEL efforts is the **Results Framework** (Section 2) that maps connections between activities and their Intermediate Results as they relate to Objectives and the overall Goal of sustainably reducing global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty. This framework assists us in designing effective programs and measuring progress by providing a structure against which to plan country-specific programs and by outlining causal pathways toward our end goal. These causal relationships have been identified through multidisciplinary research focusing on the reduction of global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty.

As we align investments under the Results Framework, we will use **performance monitoring and indicators**, also called performance metrics, associated with that framework to track the progress of our programs. Across the framework, at least one standard indicator will be associated with each intended Intermediate Result, Objective, and Goal. Sample indicators that the framework may include are:

- **Goal-level:** *Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age; Prevalence of US\$1.90 a day poverty (2011 PPP); Prevalence of moderate or severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale*
- **Objective-level:** Objective 1: *Daily per capita expenditures in U.S. Government-assisted areas;* Objective 2: *Depth of poverty at the US\$1.90 poverty line (2011 PPP);* Objective 3: *Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age*
- **Intermediate Result-level:** IR 1: *Value of smallholder incremental sales generated with U.S. Government assistance;* IR 7: *Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet*

Across the levels of the Results Framework, we aim to achieve results through our programs that move from **outputs** (tangible and intended products or consequences of an activity such as number of households trained), to **outcomes** (the short-term results of those products and consequences such as value of smallholder incremental sales generated), and eventually to **impacts** (medium to long-term effects produced by a project or program that change the development situation of a country such as the poverty rate). In addition to these indicators directly related to our Results Framework, we will monitor **context indicators** that are outside the control of the activity or program, but have the potential to affect the achievement of expected results.

Relevant federal departments and agencies will collect and report annually on standard indicators relevant to their programs. Whole-of-government reporting will occur through a web-based data system managed

by the U.S. Agency for International Development. To strengthen interagency coordination in this area, all relevant federal departments and agencies should report on as many indicators as applicable under the Results Framework each year. We will include indicators that more than one agency report on each year in the annual report on progress. These indicators will help demonstrate the breadth of our global food security and nutrition efforts and the outcomes they are achieving. While we will use additional outcome and output indicators going forward, examples of indicators on which multiple agencies have historically reported include: *Number of farmers and others who have applied improved technologies or management practices with U.S. Government assistance* and *Value of agricultural and rural loans as a result of U.S. Government assistance*.

An interagency working group will collaborate to finalize the set of U.S. Government food security and nutrition indicators before the start of the FY 2017 reporting season. To the degree possible, indicators will align with indicators used for the Sustainable Development Goals, particularly SDG 1 (end poverty) and SDG 2 (end hunger) and take into account the World Health Assembly targets. This alignment will facilitate coordination with other development partners and optimize potential availability and use of existing data. For all indicators, we will prioritize appropriate disaggregation, including disaggregation by sex and location (e.g., rural, urban/peri-urban).

U.S. Government teams in each target country will determine which components of the Results Framework are most applicable in their country context and which causal linkages will have the greatest potential for change. They will then build a **country-level Results Framework** from those components of the common Results Framework and will select relevant indicators from the set of standard indicators to measure progress against the framework. Federal agencies will encourage implementing partners to collect and report on all standard indicators that are applicable to their programs and useful for adaptive management. Agencies and implementing partners will be encouraged to use proven, cost-effective, and real time digital or mobile tools to collect and analyze data to the degree possible. In addition to applicable standard indicators, programs will collect data for custom indicators that are essential for tracking performance and supporting adaptive management of the specific program. For each indicator selected, country teams and partners will establish baselines, set targets, and routinely track progress toward them. While routine indicator data are central to maintain accountability of our investments to stakeholders, they are also critical for enabling sound performance-based management practices that maximize the impact of our resources.

Because rigorous **strategy-wide targets** can only be developed from the bottom up after target countries are selected, programmatic approaches are determined, and baseline information is available, targets are not yet available. However, once these steps are complete, we will set strategy-wide specific, measurable, and time-bound targets for indicators representing our overarching goal of reducing hunger, malnutrition, and poverty: *Prevalence of Hunger*, *Prevalence of Stunting*, and *Prevalence of Poverty*. These indicators, like the goals they represent, align directly with SDG 1 and SDG 2. Our food security and nutrition efforts will align with those higher international goals of ending hunger and malnutrition and eliminating poverty around the world by 2030. We will set five-year, whole-of-government targets for reductions in *Hunger*, *Stunting*, and *Poverty* that demonstrate our contribution to the SDGs in the areas where we work. Because SDG 2 guides us to address all forms of malnutrition, we will also track progress against World Health Assembly targets related to other aspects of malnutrition.

To inform the strategy-wide targets, **country teams will set five-year targets** for reducing *Hunger*, *Stunting*, and *Poverty* in the targeted geographic areas where U.S. Government global food security and nutrition programs work. Our target-setting approach will be based on factors related to the strategic approach and size of the U.S. Government global food security and nutrition programs in country, trends in the goal-level indicators, agriculture-led economic growth conditions, current nutritional status of the population, and the capacity of the health sector to address nutrition. Strategy-wide targets will depend on, or will be built from, targets set at the country level. Therefore, the target-setting process will commence once target countries have been selected, and targets will be set within six months of establishing baselines. Data to verify the achievement of the five-year targets will be collected within five years of the baseline and published once available.

The targets we will develop for this strategy will build on evidence and experience from the existing target-setting process under Feed the Future. Feed the Future set five-year targets for reducing *Poverty* and *Stunting* by an average of 20 percent across geographic zones of influence in focus countries by 2017. U.S. Government global food security and nutrition programs will continue to strive for the targets set for 2017 until they have been measured and achievement has been assessed following data collection and analysis in 2018.

While monitoring results through indicators is important for managing performance, **evaluations** are needed to provide an external examination of programs to thoroughly understand any resulting changes and ultimately improve program effectiveness and cost effectiveness. In alignment with the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act⁶³ and relevant department and agency policies, we will use impact and performance evaluations strategically across programs for those purposes. Performance evaluations can provide key insights to improve the management of programs or inform the design of future ones. Impact evaluations help increase our understanding of what works and in which circumstances, thus providing evidence that is useful across all programming.

To optimize the utility of those evaluations, we will develop and design them and periodically assess their findings against a common **learning agenda**. Based on experiences from Feed the Future, a common learning framework helps coordinate evaluation efforts across federal departments and within agencies to strategically answer the most critical questions and fill in major evidence gaps related to food security and nutrition. Much work has occurred in recent years to harmonize MEL efforts between partners working in food security, and we will build off and align our learning agenda with the joint Food Security Learning Framework that was endorsed by 10 donors and food security partners in 2013.⁶⁴ Within one year of the start of the strategy, we will develop a common learning agenda that lays out priorities for generating evidence and delineates how each agency will contribute to the agenda in terms of evidence and resources. The common learning agenda will enable the setting of individual relevant federal department and agency evaluation plans for the short- and medium-term. In addition to evaluations, we will also use other types of evidence-generating tools such as meta-analyses, gender and social assessments, and other assessments and research to help answer questions in the learning agenda. At an interim point and at the end of the strategy period, we will assess the status of evidence generated by all relevant federal departments and agencies under the strategy and the conclusions that can be drawn to help answer the questions identified in our learning agenda.

MEL efforts are and will always be essential to ensuring our global food security and nutrition programs are effective, cost-effective, and performing well. Over time, however, we aim to reduce the burden and costs of our MEL efforts by **strengthening target country data systems, MEL processes, and mutual accountability systems** to the degree possible. As part of a country-led approach to development, we will provide technical assistance and support investment in national data systems and capacity to use data to inform policy and program design and implementation in the countries selected under this strategy. In particular, we will support target countries in data collection and analysis efforts related to food security and nutrition that provide data for SDG monitoring processes and aid our own MEL data needs.

Under the components outlined above, we will implement MEL approaches that reflect international best practices for transparency and accountability. We will select and use MEL tools that are practical, appropriate, and cost-effective for our food security and nutrition programs. We will encourage the participation of local experts in data collection and analytical processes in order to strengthen capacity and local leadership in MEL. At the same time, we will provide intellectual leadership within the broader food security and nutrition community to develop new tools for measurement and learning where they are lacking. One priority, for example, will be testing innovative metrics to monitor systems-level change in agriculture and food systems. Our MEL leadership will forge the way to continually closing evidence gaps remaining within the food security and nutrition sector.

6. References

- ¹ One Hundred Fourteenth Congress of the United States of America. (2016). *Global Food Security Act of 2016*, (Public Law 114-195. Page 130 Stat. 675). <https://www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ195/PLAW-114publ195.pdf>
- ² The World Bank Group. (2015). *World Bank forecasts global poverty to fall below 10% for first time: Major hurdles remain in goal to end poverty by 2030*. <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2015/10/04/world-bank-forecasts-global-poverty-to-fall-below-10-for-first-time-major-hurdles-remain-in-goal-to-end-poverty-by-2030>
- ³ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2015). *The state of food insecurity in the world - meeting the 2015 international hunger targets: taking stock of uneven progress*. Rome, Italy. <http://www.fao.org/3/a4ef2d16-70a7-460a-a9ac-2a65a533269a/i4646e.pdf>
- ⁴ International Food Policy Research Institute. (2016). *From promise to impact: Ending malnutrition by 2030*. Global nutrition report 2016. Washington, DC. <https://www.ifpri.org/publication/global-nutrition-report-2016-promise-impact-ending-malnutrition-2030>
- ⁵ Bresciani, F. & Valdés, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Beyond food production: The role of agriculture in poverty reduction*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- ⁶ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2016). *Production - crops*. <http://faostat3.fao.org/compare/E>
- ⁷ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2009). *Declaration of the world summit on food security*. Rome, Italy. http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/wsfs/Summit/Docs/Final_Declaration/WSFS09_Declaration.pdf
- ⁸ Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform Website. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdgs>
- ⁹ United Nations. (2015). *Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development*. Adopted at the Third International Conference on Financing for Development (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 13–16 July 2015) and endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 69/313 of 27 July 2015. New York. http://www.un.org/esa/ffd/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/AAAA_Outcome.pdf
- ¹⁰ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2015). *The state of food insecurity in the world - Meeting the 2015 international hunger targets: taking stock of uneven progress*. Rome, Italy. <http://www.fao.org/3/a4ef2d16-70a7-460a-a9ac-2a65a533269a/i4646e.pdf>

- ¹¹ International Food Policy Research Institute. (2016). *From promise to impact: Ending Malnutrition by 2030*. Global nutrition report 2016. Washington, DC. <https://www.ifpri.org/publication/global-nutrition-report-2016-promise-impact-ending-malnutrition-2030>
- ¹² Ibid.
- ¹³ Office of the Director of National Intelligence. (2015). *Intelligence Community Assessment - Global Food Security*. <https://www.dni.gov/index.php/newsroom/reports-and-publications/207-reports-publications-2015/1265-global-food-security-intelligence-community-assessment>
- ¹⁴ Ibid.
- ¹⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁶ UNHCR The United Nations Refugee Agency. (2016). *Global trends: Forced displacement in 2015*. <https://s3.amazonaws.com/unhcrsharedmedia/2016/2016-06-20-global-trends/2016-06-14-Global-Trends-2015.pdf>
- ¹⁷ Chandy, L., Ledlie N., & Penciakova V. (2013). *The final countdown: Prospects for ending extreme poverty by 2030*. The Brookings Institution: Washington, DC: <https://www.brookings.edu/interactives/the-final-countdown-prospects-for-ending-extreme-poverty-by-2030-interactive/>
- ¹⁸ Brown, M. E., Antle, J. M., Backlund, P., Carr, E. R., Easterling, W. E., Walsh, M. K., . . . Tebaldi, C. (2015). *Climate change, global food security, and the U.S. food system*. http://www.usda.gov/oce/climate_change/FoodSecurity2015Assessment/FullAssessment.pdf
- ¹⁹ United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2015.) *World urbanization prospects: The 2014 revision*. <https://esa.un.org/unpd/wup/Publications/Files/WUP2014-Report.pdf>
- ²⁰ United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2014.) *Our urbanizing world. Population Facts No. 2014/3*. http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/popfacts/PopFacts_2014-3.pdf
- ²¹ Participatory Slum Upgrading Programme. (2016). *Slum almanac 2015/2016*. http://www.worldurbancampaign.org/sites/default/files/subsites/resources/Slum%20Almanac%202015-2016%20EN_16.02_web_0.pdf
- ²² United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2015.) *World urbanization prospects: The 2014 revision*. <https://esa.un.org/unpd/wup/Publications/Files/WUP2014-Report.pdf>
- ²³ Berdegué, J. A., Proctor, F. J., & Cazzuffi, C. (2014). *Inclusive rural-urban linkages (Working Paper Series N° 123)*. Working Group: Development with Territorial Cohesion. Territorial Cohesion for Development Program. Rimisp, Santiago, Chile.
- ²⁴ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2011). *The state of food insecurity in the world – women in agriculture: Closing the gender gap for development*. Rome, Italy. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i2050e/i2050e.pdf>
- ²⁵ Malapit, H., Sproule, K., Kovarik, C., Meinzen-Dick, R., Quisumbing, A., Ramzan, F., Hogue, E., & Alkire, S. (2014). *Measuring progress toward empowerment: Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index: Baseline report*. Washington, DC. <https://feedthefuture.gov/resource/measuring-progress-toward-empowerment-womens-empowerment-agriculture-baseline-report>
- ²⁶ The World Bank Group. (2015). *The Global Findex Database 2014: Measuring financial inclusion around the world (Policy Research Working Paper 7255)*. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/187761468179367706/pdf/WPS7255.pdf#page=3>
- ²⁷ *The Lancet’s Series on Maternal and Child Undernutrition Executive Summary*. (2013). <http://thousanddays.org/t-days-content/uploads/Lancet-Article-ExeSum.pdf>
- ²⁸ Ibid
- ²⁹ World Bank Group. (2007). *World development report 2008 - agriculture for development*. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTWDR2008/Resources/WDR_00_book.pdf
- ³⁰ Christiansen, L., Demery, L., & Kuhl, J. (2011) *The (evolving) role of agriculture in poverty reduction: An empirical perspective*. <http://www.oecd.org/agriculture/agricultural-policies/46412732.pdf>
- ³¹ Overseas Development Institute. (2015). *The chronic poverty report 2014-2015*. London, UK. <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8834.pdf>
- ³² U. S. Government Technical Working Group. (2016). *U.S. Government global nutrition coordination plan 2016–2021*. <https://www.usaid.gov/what-we-do/global-health/nutrition/usgplan>

- ³³ Ruel, M. T., & Alderman, H. (2013). Nutrition-sensitive interventions and programmes: How can they help to accelerate progress in improving maternal and child nutrition? *Lancet*, 382(9891), 536–551. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(13\)60843-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60843-0)
- ³⁴ Black, R. E., Victora, C. G., Walker, S. P., Bhutta, Z. A., Christian, P., de Onis, M., . . . Maternal and Child Nutrition Study Group. (2013). Maternal and child undernutrition and overweight in low-income and middle-income countries. *Lancet*, 382(9890), 427–451. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(13\)60937-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60937-X)
- ³⁵ Bhutta, Z. A., Das, J. K., Rizvi, A., Gaffey, M. F., Walker, N., Horton S., . . . Maternal and Child Nutrition Study Group. (2013). Evidence-based interventions for improvement of maternal and child nutrition: What can be done and at what cost? *Lancet*, 382(9890), 452–477. [http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(13\)60996-4/abstract](http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(13)60996-4/abstract)
- ³⁶ United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2014). Investing in SDGs: An action plan for promoting private sector contributions (Includes only capital expenditure and not operating expenditure). In World Investment Report 2014. http://unctad.org/en/PublicationsLibrary/wir2014_en.pdf
- ³⁷ Nutrition for Growth Summit stakeholders. (2013). *Global Nutrition for Growth compact*. London, UK. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/207274/nutrition-for-growth-commitments.pdf
- ³⁸ Chandy, L., Ledlie N., & Penciakova V. (2013). *The final countdown: Prospects for ending extreme poverty by 2030*. The Brookings Institution: Washington, DC: <https://www.brookings.edu/interactives/the-final-countdown-prospects-for-ending-extreme-poverty-by-2030-interactive/>
- ³⁹ Fan, S. (Ed.). (2008). *Public expenditures, growth, and poverty: Lessons from developing countries*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press for the International Food Policy Research Institute. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/6289252.pdf>
- ⁴⁰ Rural & Agricultural Finance Learning Lab. (2016). *Inflection point: Unlocking growth in the era of farmer finance*. http://www.mastercardfdn.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Inflection-Point_April-2016.pdf
- ⁴¹ Golden, C. D., Allison, E. H., Cheung, W. W. L., Dey, M. M., Halpern, B. S., McCauley, D. J., . . . Myers, S. S. (2016). Nutrition: Fall in fish catch threatens human health. *Nature*, 534(7607): 317–320. doi:10.1038/534317a. <http://www.nature.com/news/nutrition-fall-in-fish-catch-threatens-human-health-1.20074>
- ⁴² Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2011). *The State of Food Insecurity in the World – Women in agriculture: Closing the gender gap for development*. Rome, Italy. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i2050e/i2050e.pdf>
- ⁴³ World Bank Group. (2009). *Gender in agriculture sourcebook*. Washington, DC. <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTGENAGRLIVSOUBOOK/Resources/CompleteBook.pdf>
- ⁴⁴ United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2015). Youth population trends and sustainable development (Population Facts No. 2015/1). http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/popfacts/PopFacts_2015-1.pdf
- ⁴⁵ International Labour Organization. (2015). World Employment Social Outlook Trends 2015. http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@dgreports/@dcomm/@publ/documents/publication/wcms_337069.pdf
- ⁴⁶ International Labour Organization. (2015). Global employment trends for youth 2015. http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/—dgreports/—dcomm/—publ/documents/publication/wcms_412015.pdf
- ⁴⁷ World Health Organization. (2014). Stunting policy brief. http://www.who.int/nutrition/topics/globaltargets_stunting_policybrief.pdf
- ⁴⁸ Lawry, S., Samii, C., Hall, R., Leopold, A., Hornby, D., & Mtero, F. (2014). The impact of land property rights interventions on investment and agricultural productivity in developing countries: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 10(1). <http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/lib/project/220/>
- ⁴⁹ Peterman, A. (2011). Women’s property rights and gendered policies: Implications for women’s long-term welfare in rural Tanzania. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 47(1), 1–30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220381003600366>
- ⁵⁰ Allendorf, K. (2007). Do women’s land rights promote empowerment and child health in Nepal? *World Development*, 35(11), 1975–1988. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3657746/>
- ⁵¹ Menon, N., van der Meulen Rogers, Y., & Nguyen, H. (2014). Women’s land rights and children’s human capital in Vietnam. *World Development*, 54, 18–31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.07.005>
- ⁵² Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development-Development Assistance Committee. (2006). *The Challenge of Capacity Development: Working Towards Good Practice*. Paris. http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/capacitybuilding/pdf/DAC_paper_final.pdf

- ⁵³ USAID. (2014). *Local systems: A framework for supporting sustained development*. Washington, DC. <https://www.usaid.gov/policy/local-systems-framework>
- ⁵⁴ World Bank Group. (2012). *Agricultural innovation systems: An investment sourcebook*. Washington, DC. <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTARD/Resources/335807-1330620492317/9780821386842.pdf>
- ⁵⁵ Badiane, O., & Makome, T. (2015). *Beyond a middle income Africa: Transforming African economies for sustained growth with risking employment and incomes*. ReSAKSS Annual Trends and Outlook Report 2014. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). <http://dx.doi.org/10.2499/9780896298927>
- ⁵⁶ USAID. (2013). *USAID strategy on democracy, human rights and governance*. <https://www.usaid.gov/democracy-human-rights-and-governance-strategy>
- ⁵⁷ Black, R. E., Victora, C. G., Walker, S. P., Bhutta, Z. A., Christian, P., de Onis, M., . . . Maternal and Child Nutrition Study Group. (2013). Maternal and child undernutrition and overweight in low-income and middle-income countries. *Lancet*, 382(9890), 427–451. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(13\)60937-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60937-X)
- ⁵⁸ Lunn P. G., Northrop-Clewes, C. A., & Downes, R. M. (1991). Intestinal permeability, mucosal injury, and growth faltering in Gambian infants. *Lancet*, 338(8772), 907-910. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1681266>
- ⁵⁹ The concepts in this paragraph were informed by: Dorward, A. (2009). Integrating contested aspirations, processes and policy: Development as hanging in, stepping up and stepping out. *Development Policy Review*, 27(131–146). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7679.2009.00439.x>, Fan, S., Brzeska, J., Keyzer, M., & Halsema, A. (2013). From subsistence to profit: Transforming smallholder farms. *Food policy report*. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). <http://dx.doi.org/10.2499/9780896295582>, and Department for International Development. (2015). *DFID's Conceptual Framework on Agriculture*. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/472999/Conceptual-Framework-Agriculture2.pdf
- ⁶⁰ USAID. (2016). *Synthesis of evaluations related to the Feed the Future Learning Agenda*. <https://agrilinks.org/library/synthesis-evaluations-related-feed-future-learning-agenda>
- ⁶¹ Feed the Future. (2014). *Feed the Future civil society action plan*. <https://feedthefuture.gov/resource/feed-future-civil-society-action-plan>
- ⁶² Thirtle, C., Lin, L., & Piesse, J. (2003). The impact of research led agricultural productivity growth on poverty reduction in Africa, Asia and Latin America. *World Development*, (31)12, 1959–1975. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2003.07.001>
- ⁶³ One Hundred Fourteenth Congress of the United States of America. (2016). Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act of 2016, (Public Law 114-191). Page 130 Stat. 666). <https://www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ191/PLAW-114publ191.pdf>
- ⁶⁴ The M&E Harmonization Group of Food Security Partners. (2013). Food Security Learning Framework. <https://www.ifad.org/documents/10180/b3a8f0f2-5c3f-42e5-8153-5457f352ac90>

Annex 1. Agency-specific Implementation Plans

The anticipated financial and in-kind contributions the U.S. Government will use to implement this strategy are summarized in the department- and agency-specific implementation plans below. These plans reflect each relevant federal department and agency's unique set of tools and expertise for achieving our collective Goal and Objectives. These implementation plans present anticipated financial contributions based only on the FY 2017 Congressional Budget Justification submitted to Congress in February 2016. The next administration will develop the FY 2018 budget request.



U.S. Agency for International Development Global Food Security Implementation Plan

USAID Food Security Overview

USAID works to end extreme global poverty and enable resilient, democratic societies to realize their potential. USAID leads the U.S. Government's global hunger and food security initiative and will continue to coordinate with partner agencies to implement the new whole-of-government Global Food Security Strategy. USAID will also develop new, inclusive processes for joint collaboration and planning across the inter-agency to implement the strategy.

Technical, Programmatic, and In-Kind Contributions to the Global Food Security Strategy

To implement the strategy, USAID will coordinate and leverage the full complement of its resources across country missions, regional missions, and Washington-based bureaus. In pursuit of the objectives below, USAID food security tools include: capacity building and extension; private sector and market development; financing and investment; policy/governance engagement; infrastructure—including information and communications technology; women's empowerment; multi-sectoral nutrition approaches; natural resource management and land tenure; climate smart agriculture approaches across value chains; resilience; and relief and rehabilitation.

Global Food Security Results Framework Objectives:

- **Objective 1. Inclusive and sustainable agricultural-led economic growth:** In partnership with other agency activities, USAID will continue to focus on helping women, small-scale producers, and small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) improve their productivity and profitability. The focus of these activities will be gender-sensitive value chain and broader food and agriculture system improvements that strengthen the production, processing, storage, transport, financing, and marketing of key high-value, nutritious, and staple crops, livestock, and fish.
- **Objective 2. Strengthened resilience among people and systems:** USAID activities will strengthen formal and informal support systems; promote reduction of, mitigation for, adaptation to, and recovery from shocks and stresses, including those that are climate-related; improve the adoption of risk reduction activities, such as the adoption of drought-resistant seeds; include risk management activities and products, such as mobile money and insurance; increase access to markets; diversify livelihood opportunities beyond the agriculture sector; strengthen social safety nets for the most vulnerable populations; and empower women, the landless, and other marginalized groups.
- **Objective 3. A well-nourished population, especially among women and children:** USAID activities will improve nutrition to enhance human potential, health, and productivity. As outlined in the USAID Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy and the U.S. Government's Nutrition Coordination Plan, USAID nutrition investments will concentrate efforts on improving the nutrition status of women and children, particularly during the critical 1,000-day window from pregnancy to a child's second birthday, with a focus on reducing child stunting. Interventions will focus on increasing consumption

of nutritious and safe diets; increasing use of nutrition-specific services; ensuring that women and men have the time, space, and support to feed and care for their children; creating more hygienic household and community environments through water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) interventions; and increasing the use of other nutrition-sensitive approaches.

Cross-Cutting and Complementary Workstreams:

- Cross-Cutting Intermediate Results: USAID will also make investments to advance the following foundational intermediate results: strengthened global commitment to investing in food security (CC IR 1); improved climate-risk, land, marine, and other natural resource management (CC IR 2); increased gender equality and female empowerment (CC IR 3); increased youth empowerment and livelihoods (CC IR 4); more effective governance, policy, and institutions (CC IR 5); and improved human, organizational, and system performance (CC IR 6).
- Timely and Integrated Emergency Food Assistance: USAID emergency food security interventions (including U.S.-purchased “in kind” food aid) are driven by immediate humanitarian need; are aimed at saving and protecting lives and jump-starting the recovery of livelihoods and markets; and play a critical role that is complementary to development assistance programs.
- Complementary Investments: USAID will leverage other investments that benefit from, and contribute to, food security. These investments promote economic growth in non-agriculture sectors; healthy ecosystems and biodiversity; stable, democratic societies that respect human rights and the rule of law; a reduced burden of disease; and well-educated populations.
- Research and Development: USAID will support a robust and targeted research and innovation portfolio designed to address major global, regional, and national food security and nutrition challenges. This will include collaboration and leveraging of wider U.S. Government research investments with Department of Agriculture, National Science Foundation, and National Institutes of Health. A diverse set of public and private partners will support the effort, including the U.S. university-led Feed the Future Innovation Labs.
- Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL): USAID leads the whole-of-government monitoring, evaluation, and learning effort, including the management of an online reporting system that captures whole-of-government and activity-level data; a learning agenda that coordinates evaluation and analytic efforts across the inter-agency; and performance indicator standards.

In implementing activities within these areas, USAID will follow a comprehensive, multi-faceted approach that is rooted in lessons learned and evidence to date. The design and implementation of food security interventions will incorporate coordination; country and local ownership; collective action and partnership with key stakeholders; investment in science, technology, and innovation; sustainability; graduation; transparency; and accountability.

USAID will continue to work with a wide range of partners, including country governments, civil society, faith-based and community organizations, the private sector, colleges and universities, other donor partners, non-governmental organizations, and the financial sector, and foster greater collaboration through use of a broad set of flexible and adaptive mechanisms, emphasizing competition and best value for money. Our work with regional and sub-regional bodies will support policy harmonization, helping to better integrate national and regional markets, increase private sector investment, and expand access to improved technologies. Together, we will utilize our collective expertise, resources, and innovations to

develop impactful programs and lasting solutions to food security and nutrition challenges. As part of the performance monitoring process, we will set strategy-wide specific and measurable targets for indicators representing our overarching goals of reducing hunger, malnutrition, and poverty, including: Prevalence of Poverty and Prevalence of Stunting in Children under Five Years of Age.

Additionally, USAID will facilitate a process to improve coordination and planning efforts across sectors to integrate core and complementary work streams at the country level. This will ensure that USAID's implementation of the Global Food Security Strategy leverages significant investments and key stakeholder contributions from across the agency to maximize our results. In addition, USAID will work with the inter-agency to establish platforms for engaging with key local and international stakeholders on the implementation of the strategy and our collective learning agenda.

Organization and Structure

USAID leads the whole-of-government effort to implement the Global Food Security Strategy by collaborating with a diverse group of U.S. Government departments and agencies as well as private sector and civil society partners to ensure that resources are aligned to achieve these objectives. Within USAID, the Bureau for Food Security (BFS), along with regional bureaus, provides resources and technical and organizational leadership to coordinate the implementation of food security programming by country and regional field offices. BFS' primary office components focus on country strategy and implementation, research and development, policy, private sector engagement, and monitoring and evaluation. BFS coordinates closely with the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance; the Global Health Bureau; the Center for Resilience; the Global Development Lab; and the Bureau for Economic Growth, Education, and Environment.

Impact and Sustainability

To maximize effectiveness and impact, USAID will promote the following approaches to sustainably reduce global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty:

- **Capacity building:** Capacity building of research, policy, education, finance, data, and extension organizations will help lay a long-term foundation for a high-performing food and agriculture system able to sustain results without project assistance.
- **Private-sector focus:** Private-sector-led inclusive food and agriculture systems and value chains will create jobs and provide small-scale producers (especially women) with access to inputs, markets, financial services, information, proven innovations, and climate-smart approaches beyond the life of our projects.
- **Targeted geographies:** We will concentrate our resources on countries, regions, and communities where we can be most effective in achieving results in reducing poverty and stunting while promoting resilience in alignment with the strategy's targeting approach.
- **Country ownership:** We will support country-led policies, strategies, and inclusive processes that contribute to local ownership of investments and policies, improved governance (including land and marine tenure), and mobilization of domestic resources.
- **Resilience:** Activities to strengthen and build resilience are essential to the overall sustainability of our efforts by helping reduce risks to the world's most vulnerable people and helping them prepare for, and recover from, shocks and stresses such that development gains will be advanced and improved upon, not lost.

- **Durable humanitarian solutions:** In fragile contexts, where humanitarian assistance is often relied upon to meet chronic and/or recurrent needs, we will strive to implement durable solutions that leverage the experience and evidence of our Title II and other humanitarian partners and programs in order to reduce requirements for international humanitarian assistance.
- **Rigorous monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL):** We will use rigorous MEL techniques, including strategic use of impact evaluations, measurement of impact-level indicators in target areas, and annual monitoring for every activity. Evaluations will be designed around a common learning agenda to strategically answer the most critical questions and address major evidence gaps, including with respect to cost-effectiveness. We will apply adaptive management strategically, using evidence and performance information to inform project design and implementation adjustments.

Resources Requested and Budget Table¹

Sector ² and Account	FY 2017 Financial Contribution (\$000s)	Narrative Explanation
Agriculture		
Development Assistance	\$870,800	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Agriculture funding (including nutrition-sensitive agriculture) is allocated across USAID country, regional, and Washington bureaus to support a proven, comprehensive approach to achieving food security outcomes in reducing poverty, hunger, and malnutrition while promoting resilience. ● FFP provides development food assistance to target the underlying causes of poverty, hunger, and malnutrition ● USAID programs in FFP Title II resources and Community Development Funds towards multi-sectoral development food assistance and resilience programs annually. ● Funding for FFP Development Food Assistance and agriculture funding for Afghanistan and Pakistan are <u>not</u> part of the FY 2017 Feed the Future request and are listed for informational purposes. ● The \$870.8 million (Development Assistance) and \$107.2 million (ESF) requests for agriculture together represent the total \$978 million FY 2017 Feed the Future request. ● The FY 2017 Feed the Future request includes \$28 million for State Department multilateral activities related to climate-smart agriculture, which is further described in the State Department implementation plan.
Economic Support Fund – Other	\$107,200	
Economic Support Fund (ESF) – Afghanistan and Pakistan	\$99,000	
Food for Peace (FFP) –Non-Emergency ³	\$261,592	
Subtotal	\$1,338,592	

¹ The sectoral financial contributions presented in this table are limited to funding requested explicitly for food security; agricultural development; nutrition, water supply and sanitation; and science, technology, and innovation programs in the FY 2017 Congressional Budget Justification (CBJ). A wide range of complementary investments across multiple sectors also contributes to food security. However, complementary investments are not listed in the financial contributions table because the causal relationship to reductions in global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty is complex and very difficult to measure.

² Although resilience activities are a core contribution to the strategy, resilience is not listed as a separate sector as it is integrated across multiple sectors, and USAID does not specify all its resilience funding in the CBJ. Some resilience funds are included in the agriculture, nutrition, and water requests for the Development Assistance, Economic Support Fund, Food for Peace Title II, and Global Health Programs account requests.

³ USAID provides emergency food assistance to vulnerable populations affected by natural disasters, such as droughts and floods, and in response to conflict, which may complement other food security programs. However, these funds are not included here as they are programmed on a contingency basis (i.e., based on unexpected events) and are not requested for food security development efforts. This aligns with the Global Food Security Act, which is primarily focused on food security development.

Sector ² and Account	FY 2017 Financial Contribution (\$000s)	Narrative Explanation
Nutrition		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for Nutrition is not part of the FY 2017 Feed the Future request and is listed for informational purposes. • These funds support the Food Security Strategy through nutrition-specific interventions. • Nutrition programming under the Global Health Initiative and Feed the Future agricultural projects, as well as FFP Title II development food assistance, aims to improve the nutritional status of women and children. Programs work across humanitarian and development contexts with an emphasis in health, agriculture, and resilience.
Global Health Programs	\$108,500	
Development Assistance	\$9,900	
Economic Support Fund	\$36,500	
Food For Peace – Non-Emergency	\$87,642	
Subtotal	\$242,542	
Water Supply, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for Water Supply, Sanitation, and Hygiene is not part of the FY 2017 Feed the Future request and is listed for informational purposes. • Funding represents support for Water Supply and Sanitation activities as part of the FY 2017 request. Investments in household level water, sanitation, hygiene, and environment are in addition to this funding.
Development Assistance	\$75,787	
Economic Support Fund	\$145,995	
Food for Peace – Non-Emergency	\$766	
Subtotal	\$222,548	
Other Science, Technology, and Innovation	\$6,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The U.S. Global Development Lab anticipates supporting the strategy through its Digital Development for Feed the Future collaboration with the Bureau for Food Security.
Subtotal	\$6,000	



U.S. Department of Agriculture Global Food Security Implementation Plan

U.S. Department of Agricultural Overview

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) provides leadership, expertise, and programs to benefit U.S. agriculture and food security and helps the United States supply high quality food to the world. USDA contributes to global food security and nutrition through its international food assistance; international capacity building and development programs; basic and applied research programs; data and information sharing; and the promotion of science-based policies and regulations that expand agricultural markets and trade. USDA has offices at over 90 American Embassies and a long institutional history of collaborating with foreign governments, multilateral organizations, non-government partners, and other stakeholders to achieve food security goals. USDA assigns regional responsibilities to its offices abroad, even when a USDA official is not resident in a country. USDA also provides leadership in multilateral food security initiatives, such as Global Open Data for Agriculture and Nutrition (GODAN) initiative, the Global Alliance for Climate Smart Agriculture, the Committee on World Food Security, G20 Meeting of Agricultural Chief Scientists, and others.

All of these USDA activities will continue in Fiscal Year (FY) 2017, and where appropriate, USDA's partnerships will be expanded and/or strengthened to meet the goals of the Global Food Security Strategy. USDA aims to expand collaborations with the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), U.S. Department of State, and other government agencies that can benefit from USDA's programs and expertise. USDA also will continue its partnerships with the private sector, universities and research institutions, international organizations, private voluntary organizations, and others to meet the Strategy's goal and objectives. Because some countries must import to maintain food security, and international trade affects agricultural livelihoods, USDA actively assists countries to fulfill trade obligations and make trade-related decisions that are based on sound science and international standards for safe, sustainable trade.

Programmatic, Technical, and/or In-kind Contributions to the Global Food Security Strategy

USDA's objectives for its international capacity building and development programs and international research collaborations already align with the goal and objectives of the U.S. Global Food Security Strategy. With an overarching caveat that the United States has not yet prioritized partner countries for the Strategy, USDA anticipates the following programmatic, technical, and in-kind contributions towards the intermediate results of the Strategy.

Programmatic contributions: The Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) plans to implement USDA international food assistance programs and its agricultural trade and scientific exchange and fellowship programs, including: Food for Progress Program, McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and

Child Nutrition Program, Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Program, Norman E. Borlaug International Agricultural Science and Technology Program fellowships, Cochran Program fellowships, and the Faculty Exchange Program. USDA will align these programs' activities to the Strategy in a similar manner to previous alignments to Feed the Future, particularly to leverage aspects that add value to international food security. For example, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) plans to offer its international courses to help foreign counterparts improve their capacities to manage agricultural diseases and pests and participate in international markets. In the area of research, USDA can leverage over \$2 billion in annual investments in the Agricultural Research Service (ARS), Economic Research Service (ERS), and National Institute for Food and Agriculture (NIFA), which contribute to a wide range of research programs focused on global food security. USDA research investments can directly, or indirectly, support U.S. Department of State- and USAID-funded international research collaborations for food security. In a number of key programmatic areas, such as animal health, crop diseases, food safety, nutrition, and natural resources management, USDA concurrently contributes to global food security partnerships and its mission to serve U.S. farmers. USDA plans to deliver additional international programs through existing or new project-specific agreements and partnerships with USAID, U.S. Department of State, and other U.S. agencies.

Technical contributions: USDA embodies robust technical and policy expertise for sustainable agriculture, nutrition, and food systems. USDA's expertise and work—such as research, education, and economics—concurrently meet the needs of U.S. agriculture and support global food security. In addition, USDA experts are directly engaged in international cooperative research and capacity building and development programs, both independently and through reimbursable partnerships. For example, several agencies (e.g., FAS, APHIS, ARS, ERS, the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the Food and Nutrition Service, and the U.S. Forest Service) plan to provide subject matter experts and/or conduct cooperative research to support USAID's food security and nutrition work worldwide. Additional USDA technical and regulatory agencies (e.g., the Food Safety and Inspection Service, the Grain Inspection, Packers, and Stockyards Administration, NIFA, the National Agricultural Statistics Service) provide technical expertise for international capacity building, depending upon the specific needs, opportunities, and availability of resources.

In-kind contributions: USDA's market information and analyses on the global production, supplies, and demands of agricultural commodities are publicly available and will continue to enable U.S. and foreign stakeholders to make better business and policy decisions for food security and nutrition and maintain efficient operations of markets. For example, USDA will continue to contribute to the Agricultural Market Information System to improve data collection and provide earlier warning of commodity price volatility. USDA technical and regulatory experts routinely contribute U.S. representation to international standard-setting bodies for plant health, animal health, and food safety and other multilateral initiatives for global food security and nutrition. Likewise, USDA often leverages its tools and ongoing U.S.-based programs to help accelerate international food security and nutrition initiatives. For example, through the National Plant Germplasm System and the Animal Genetic Resources and Microbial Genetic Resources Programs, USDA distributes information and samples to scientists globally. NIFA's domestic research agenda will provide a foundation for new and ongoing USDA international partnerships in key areas such as agricultural production and resiliency, food safety, nutrition, youth development, and agricultural extension. USDA leads the U.S. Government participation as a GODAN partner, actively promoting

global open data policies, with an emphasis on identifying agriculture and nutrition data as a global public good. Global open agriculture and nutrition data enables informed decision making and discoveries of comprehensive global food security solutions. As noted above, in partner countries where USDA has an in-country presence or regional assigned coverage, USDA Foreign Service Officers and Locally Employed Staff will contribute to Embassy teams communicating, planning, implementing, and monitoring the Strategy.

USDA's FY 2017 intramural and extramural research activities will directly contribute to the Strategy's target intermediate results, for example:

Strengthened inclusive agriculture systems that are productive and profitable (IR 1)

Wheat Improvement and UG99 USDA has active research addressing one of the greatest threats to the global wheat supply. UG99, the highly virulent wheat stem rust, continues to be a major threat to what is arguably one of the most important food commodities, and actively preventing this threat from spreading any further is a high priority globally. USDA coordinates intramural and extramural research in wheat, particularly UG 99, through the Borlaug Global Rust Initiative, the International Wheat Yield Program, and the International Wheat Consortium, in addition to coordinating with producer organizations and universities in the United States.

Livestock Improvement and Health USDA intramural research is cooperating with USAID and an international consortium of researchers to develop a new generation vaccine for East Coast fever, a devastating disease of cattle in East Africa. In addition, USDA is cooperating in bringing advanced genomics and genetic approaches to improving goat production in Africa. These projects are funded under Feed the Future but are leveraged by existing ARS research funding support of intramural research projects and by the extensive network of cooperation that includes several Land Grant universities.

Increased sustainable productivity, particularly through climate-smart approaches (IR 4)

Agricultural Model Intercomparison and Improvement Project (AgMIP) USDA coordinates with the AgMIP, a distributed climate-scenario simulation exercise for historical model intercomparison and future climate change conditions, with participation of multiple crop and world agricultural trade modeling groups around the world. AgMIP is an important tool in identifying the impacts on crop, and eventually animal, production and will help policy makers prepare in advance as climate shifts and impacts the viability of various production systems.

Organization and Structure

While every USDA mission area is involved in U.S. and global food security and nutrition initiatives, this plan focuses on the USDA agencies directly involved in Feed the Future or intending to implement relevant international programs. The USDA Intradepartmental Coordination Committee on International Affairs will ensure a structure, including USDA offices at headquarters and abroad, for communication, planning, coordinating, and monitoring of the Strategy and this implementation plan.

Impact and Sustainability

USDA previously aligned its monitoring and evaluation of international programs with relevant Feed the Future indicators, and USDA has annually reported those outcome metrics, for example:

- Number of individuals who have applied improved farm management practices (e.g., governance, administration, or financial management) as a result of USDA assistance
- Number of hectares under improved techniques or technologies
- Number of new technologies or management practices under development
- Value of sales by project beneficiaries
- Value of project-leveraged new public and private sector investment

As the United States confirms target partner countries and standard performance indicators for the new Strategy, USDA will further align its program monitoring and evaluation accordingly to reflect the relevant indicators, and USDA will coordinate with USAID, the U.S. Department of State, and other government agencies to monitor the respective outcome metrics in target partner countries. Overall, USDA international programs ensure impact and sustainability by focusing on results for effective institutions and partnerships; science and trade capacities; evidence-based management and decision-making processes; and monitoring, evaluation, and learning systems. In addition, USDA's international work emphasizes education, training-of-trainers, and overall workforce development and long-term beneficial impact throughout the food and agriculture sector.

For example, USDA promotes sustainability of project outcomes in all of its international programs by prioritizing local ownership, measuring indicators of sustainability, and requiring the development of strategic partnerships. USDA and its partner organizations work to ensure that the communities served by USDA's programs can ultimately continue the sponsored activities on their own or with support from other sources such as the host government or local community. A recent successful example of USDA program graduation is the McGovern Dole Food for Education program in Kenya, where primary schools in Samburu County have successfully transitioned from donor-supported school feeding to the Government of Kenya's Home Grown School Meals program. USDA will continue to work with implementing partners in Strategy countries to facilitate food assistance and other USDA program graduation and local sustainability, including through assessing and reporting on relevant outcome metrics.

Many countries, including the United States, import to maintain food security. USDA's approach recognizes that agricultural markets, value chains, and trade flows are integrally linked to sustainable agricultural production, rural livelihoods, jobs in the food and agriculture sector, and global food security and nutrition. By promoting efficient markets and stable, modernized governance and economic systems, USDA's work helps to sustain agricultural value chains and avoid market-distorting domestic programs that could inadvertently make farmers less competitive and, overall, make nutritious foods less affordable. FAS and ERS provide crucial analytic underpinning to broader U.S. Government food security strategies and investments. As noted above, in assigned countries, USDA Foreign Service Officers monitor and routinely report on institutional capacities, challenges, and key developments and progress towards food security goals.

USDA and its partners include climate vulnerabilities and resilience among considerations when planning USDA international development programs and, as appropriate, USDA integrates and promotes climate-smart agriculture approaches through those programs. USDA also helps partner countries build systemic capacities for analyzing agricultural pest and disease risks and developing appropriate interventions to reduce such risks, while aligning with international standards, which are critical to facilitate trade and to help partner countries access the best available science on food safety, nutrition, and animal and plant health. In many situations, such international engagement bolsters USDA’s ability to help protect U.S. agriculture from transboundary threats.

Resources Requested and Budget Table

Through both discretionary and line-item specific budget requests, USDA estimates that its FY 2017 contributions towards alignment with, and implementation of, the Strategy will be \$350,300,000 as summarized in the table below.

	Estimated FY 2017 Financial Contribution (\$000s)	Narrative Explanation
Food for Progress Program	\$135,000	FAS administered. Line-item request.
McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program	\$182,000	FAS administered. Line-item request.
Local and Regional Procurement	\$15,000	FAS administered. Line item request.
International Trade and Scientific Exchange and Fellowship Programs	\$7,500	FAS administered. Discretionary.
Global Open Data for Agriculture and Nutrition (GODAN)	\$400	REE administered. Discretionary.
Livestock improvement and health research	\$3,938	ARS administered.
Wheat stem rust/UG99 research	\$3,149	ARS administered.
Agricultural Model Intercomparison and Improvement Project	\$2,675	ARS administered.
ARS Office of International Research Programs	\$638	ARS administered.
TOTAL	\$350,300	



U.S. Department of Commerce Global Food Security Implementation Plan

U.S. Department of Commerce Overview

The Department of Commerce (DOC) contributes to the Global Food Security Strategy through its National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and International Trade Administration (ITA) Bureaus. NOAA provides its global partners access to comprehensive oceanic, atmospheric, and geophysical data. It offers direct capacity building assistance to address food insecurity through improved weather forecasting, drought early warning systems, and climate change resilience and adaptation. NOAA additionally provides policy-focused capacity building associated with sustainable fisheries, including ecosystem-based management; fisheries monitoring and enforcement; halting/mitigating illegal, unregulated, and unreported (IUU) fishing; and U.S. food safety and hazard analysis and critical control points regulations. ITA's mission is to strengthen the competitiveness of U.S. industry, promote trade and investment, and ensure fair trade through rigorous enforcement of our trade laws and agreements. The open trading system that this work advances can help drive economic growth abroad, including at the individual, community, and country levels and help vulnerable populations to become more economically secure and better trading partners with the United States.

On a regular basis, NOAA and ITA will work in closely coordinated fashion across bureaus, as well as with the U.S. Government interagency coalition, to explore synergies to amplify DOC's contribution.

Technical, Programmatic, and/or In-kind Contributions to the Global Food Security Strategy

NOAA Contributions to the Global Food Security Strategy:

Capacity Building:

- National Weather Service (NWS) provides global capacity building for (among other things): weather forecasting; hydrologic modeling and prediction; and drought early warning. Forecasting and other advanced warning systems directly contribute to increased profitability and resilience (Objective 1: IR 1, Objective 2: IRs 4-6) by increasing the capacity of international partners to engage in pro-active mitigation and risk management (CC IR 2) against damaging or severe climate and weather events that impact food supplies (crops, livestock, fisheries).
- National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service facilitates domestic and international access to NOAA satellite data in support of weather forecasting and science and provides data to: the Global Drought Information System, the Global Historical Climate Network,

the global Climate Data Record, and the International Comprehensive Ocean-Atmosphere Data Set and maintains many more international initiatives and partnerships. Sharing satellite data with global and regional data networks increases access by international partners that may not have the capacity to produce such data. This access results in increased profitability and resilience (Objective 1: IR 1; Objective 2: IRs 4, 5, 6) by increasing the capacity of international partners to engage in pro-active mitigation and risk management (CC IR 2) against damaging or severe climate and weather events that impact food supplies (crops, livestock, fisheries).

- Climate Program Office (CPO), within the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, manages competitive research programs in which NOAA funds high-priority climate science, assessments, decision support research, outreach, education, and capacity-building activities designed to advance understanding of Earth's climate system and to foster the application of this knowledge in risk management and adaptation efforts. CPO-supported research is conducted in regions across the United States, at national and international scales, and globally. Support for continued improvements in climate research and science contribute to increased profitability and resilience (Objective 1: IR 1, Objective 2: IRs 4-6) by increasing global knowledge and the ability to address challenges associated with climate change, including by pro-active mitigation and risk management (CC IR 2) against damaging impacts the changing climate on food supplies (crops, livestock, fisheries).
- National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) seeks to increase sustainable marine aquaculture production through streamlined permitting, science-based management, and technology development and transfer. These activities can increase profitability, market access, and employment (Objective 1: IRs 1-3) by reducing time, administrative, and other costs to aquaculture businesses and improving the quality, health (e.g., through disease prevention), and productivity of the aquaculture product. Science-based management increases sustainability (Objective 2: IR 4), and all of these activities support increased consumption and safer diets (Objective 3: IR 7) by creating a safer, more affordable product.
- NMFS provides capacity building trainings and workshops in Southeast Asia, Africa, South America and the Caribbean on many topics relevant to food security, including: U.S. food safety and HACCP requirements; ecosystem approaches to fisheries management; fisheries observers; fisheries enforcement; fisheries law development; IUU fishing; and marine special planning. NMFS also provided key support to the Presidentially-mandated IUU Fishing Task Force and development of recommendations on domestic and global actions. These capacity building activities support increased profitability, market access, and employment by export partners (Objective 1: IRs 1-3), by ensuring the safety and quality of seafood destined for US markets (Objective 3: IR 7). Additionally, these activities help to strengthen resilience relative to food security by improving sustainability, sharing state-of-art fisheries management and science, and addressing adaptation (including climate-related) and stock recovery in order to ensure long-term availability of global fisheries resources. (Objective 2: IRs 4-6).

ITA Contributions to the Global Food Security Strategy:

- Finance/Investment: Business to Business matching through ITA's U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service, and ITA-led trade missions/shows to increase market openness and strengthen local trade. Objective 1: IRs 1, 2, 3

- Capacity Building: Introduction of relevant U.S. new technologies and services that address food insecurity and supply chain development, including cold chain. Objective 1: IR 1, 2 ; Objective 2: IRs 4-6
- Capacity Building: Data that contribute to general understanding of market landscapes in U.S. and food insecure countries. Objective 1: IRs 1, 2, 3
- Capacity Building: Inject U.S. private sector perspective into trade research on technologies that address global food insecurity, including financial inclusion, supply chain resiliency, etc. These tools can help build trading capacity in food insecure populations. Objective 1: IRs 1, 2, 3

Organization and Structure

Within Commerce Department, two Bureaus—ITA and NOAA—contribute to this strategy.

NOAA Organization and Structure:

NOAA’s organizational mission is to understand and predict changes in climate, weather, oceans, and coasts, to share that knowledge and information with others, and to conserve and manage coastal and marine ecosystems and resources. NOAA’s seven Line Offices work in partnership through integrated programs areas (e.g., weather, climate, satellites, and research) to contribute scientific and policy expertise to U.S. Government efforts to address domestic and global food security. NOAA’s progress reporting will be coordinated with ITA.

ITA Organization and Structure:

The Senior Level Commerce Department Point on global food security issues is the Assistant Secretary for Industry and Analysis within ITA. The implementation lead for ITA resides within the Office of Consumer Goods (OCG) in ITA’s Industry and Analysis Unit. OCG coordinates efforts and draws cross-cutting expertise from multiple offices within ITA, including Office of Africa and Office of Supply Chain, as well as ITA’s domestic and global Commercial Services network. ITA’s progress reporting will be coordinated by OCG.

Impact and Sustainability

NOAA:

- NOAA will continue to support global food security by sharing satellite and other data for use in weather forecasting; hydrologic modeling and prediction; drought early warning; and climate change impact, mitigation, and adaptation both bilaterally and through our international commitments with global entities, such as the World Meteorological Organization.
- NOAA will continue to engage in international capacity building activities to enhance our partners’ abilities to improve domestic weather forecasting; hydrologic modeling and prediction; drought early warning; and climate change impact, mitigation, and adaptation in service of food security.
- NOAA will maintain its mission to provide high quality science, services, and policies to support sustainable wild fisheries and the significant expansion and sustainability of marine aquaculture. We continue working closely with international partners to promote ecosystem based management on marine fisheries, halt illegal, unregulated, and unreported fishing and seafood fraud, and on joint research and management to support sustainable increases in aquaculture globally.

- NOAA’s mission calls on us to understand and predict changes in climate, weather, oceans, and coasts; share that knowledge and information with others; and conserve and manage coastal and marine ecosystems and resources. Although these activities are not explicitly focused on (or funded for) ensuring food security, their contributions to that effort are clear. The sustainability of these programs is dependent on the ability of NOAA to pursue its mission. The impacts of these activities relative to food security are difficult to quantify at this time, as indicators that NOAA uses to monitor, measure, and evaluate its performance in these areas are not designed to address food security.

ITA:

- To achieve sustained, beneficial global trade, ITA seeks to support the trading capacities and enabling environments of our trading partners. ITA will continue this work.
- ITA facilitates U.S. food/agriculture private sector contributions to U.S. Government food security efforts and maximizes trade relations that will benefit U.S. businesses.
- ITA, through trade missions and reverse trade missions, facilitates knowledge exchange and adoption of newest agriculture and food processing technologies, including cold chain, which will strengthen global food supply chains.
- ITA will convene meetings with the U.S. food/agriculture private sector to facilitate strategies to merge Corporate Social Responsibilities with revenue generating strategies which will result in a more holistic and robust approach that will increase revenue streams while more powerfully address global food insecurity.
- Both NOAA and ITA will work closely with the interagency coalition to harmonize reporting metrics.

Resources Requested and Budget Table

ITA conducts the activities identified in the narrative as part of our overall trade promotion and trade development efforts. Funding is not directly assigned to the Global Food Security Strategy implementation from our appropriated funds for FY 2017, nor is the level of effort—such as number of hours per employee devoted to the strategy—readily available. ITA’s appropriation is subdivided into an administrative program unit and three business units (Global Markets, Industry and Analysis, and Enforcement and Compliance); funding is not specified for particular programs, which are supported by staff assigned to specific units. GFSS-related activity primarily takes place within Industry and Analysis.

NOAA Budget:

NOAA conducts the activities identified in the narrative as part of our overall capacity building efforts. While these activities contribute to the GFSS, funding is not directly assigned to GFSS implementation in FY 2017. 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; however, funding is not specified for that particular purpose.



U.S. Department of State Global Food Security Implementation Plan

Department of State Overview

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

Technical, Programmatic, and In-kind Contributions to the Global Food Security Strategy

The Secretary's Office of Global Food Security (S/GFS)

- Leads diplomatic engagement and coordinates U.S. policy on food security and nutrition in bilateral and multilateral fora, including G-7, G-20, and the Committee on World Food Security as well as regional fora such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
- Leads U.S. Government global food security and nutrition diplomatic efforts. As part of this role, supports efforts to identify, monitor, and advance global food security policy priorities with interagency colleagues at post, in coordination with USAID, State/EB, and State functional and regional bureaus.
- Leads U.S. diplomatic and multilateral engagement for the Sustainable Development Goals related to food security and nutrition
- Leads Department's public diplomacy efforts on global food security and nutrition
- Identifies, analyzes, and takes action on emerging issues, including urbanization and food security, food security in conditions of protracted conflict, and the impacts of climate change on food security. This includes developing new initiatives and fostering U.S. interagency cooperation on these issues, such as the Climate Smart Food Security Initiative.
- Forms partnerships with the private sector, civil society, research institutions, and other donors to address food security and nutrition, particularly in light of these emerging issues and with an emphasis on data (and data gaps) and long-term sustainability
- Champions the importance of nutrition in health and food security, especially in preventing stunting in children, particularly through leadership in multilateral fora such as the Scaling Up Nutrition Movement, Nutrition for Growth, and the UN Decade of Action on Nutrition

- Contributes to the interagency monitoring, evaluation, and learning process and ensures the Department is using established methodologies, collecting baseline statistics, evaluating impact, and reporting results as part of the interagency global food security monitoring process

The Bureau of International Organizations Affairs, Office of Economic and Development Affairs

- Addresses food security within the context of the United Nations system, including through managing U.S. government interactions with the Rome-based food security agencies (the World Food Program, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and other international organizations, and when food security is addressed at the UN in New York
- Coordinates U.S. policy across other departments and agencies with regard to the management, functions, and programmatic work of the UN food agencies from both the development and humanitarian perspectives
- Advances U.S. national interests while promoting efficiency, effectiveness, transparency, sustainability, and accountability in the UN food security agencies in combatting hunger globally
- Manages the negotiation of food security related resolutions during the UN General Assembly, and coordinates the larger interagency process to ensure that U.S. priorities are addressed

The Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, Office of Agricultural Policy

- Promotes agricultural biotechnology as a tool to increase long-term agricultural productivity, improve food security and nutrition, and raise farmer incomes globally
- Encourages countries to adopt transparent and science-based regulations and practices that enable them to improve food security
- Works with other U.S. agencies to promote global food safety standards and to remove barriers to trade in order to open markets for agriculture and food products
- Coordinates with other U.S. agencies, including USAID and USDA, on effective food assistance policies

The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, Office of International Health and Biodefense

- Advocates through bilateral and multilateral engagement greater awareness of the threat that antimicrobial resistance (AMR) poses to food security and of the interactions between the agriculture sector and AMR. AMR may generate infections or diseases that become more difficult or impossible to treat, which threatens food production through loss of stock, decreased yield, and or diminished economic viability.
- Engages civil society, research institutions, and other stakeholders to promote the availability of sustainably effective antimicrobials for agriculture (terrestrial and aquatic) use
- Works to bring together human, animal, and environmental health actors (the “One Health approach”) to lower zoonotic disease risk and improve the health of humans and other animals

The Bureau of Oceans, Environment, and Science, Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)

- Negotiates bilateral and multilateral fisheries agreements and participates in the work of nine international fishery commissions as well as other international organizations and arrangements dealing with conservation and management of living marine resources

- Advocates for science-based and transparent international fisheries governance, regulations, and management, as well as sector-based international development strategies, to maintain the sustainability and productivity of fish stocks
- Represents the United States at the Food and Agricultural Organization Council’s Committee on Fisheries
- Supports the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries developed under the FAO by OES/OMC as lead for the U.S. Government, which is the first international instrument to develop consensus principles and guidance on addressing small-scale fisheries
- Supports the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development—in particular Goal 14 concerning sustainable fisheries and oceans—and integration of Goal 14 objectives across U.S. foreign policy

The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, Office of Global Change

- Coordinates with S/GFS on the planning and obligation of Climate Smart Agriculture activities, including the Climate Smart Agriculture for Food Security initiative in Central America, as relevant to the programmatic goals of the Global Climate Change Initiative (GCCCI)
- Provides administrative and monitoring oversight of funded Climate Smart Agriculture projects
- Tracks the outcomes of the funded Climate Smart Agriculture program to include such results in annual Department reporting required under the GCCCI

The Office of the Special Envoy for Climate Change

- Coordinates with other agencies on Climate Smart Agriculture work
- Coordinates engagement with private-sector actors on the State Department’s Climate Smart Agriculture activities

The Bureau for Intelligence and Research, Office of the Geographer and Global Issues

- Provides timely, independent research and analysis on food security to support foreign policy objectives at the Department of State
- Coordinates with other offices within the Bureau for Intelligence and Research that provide analysis on food security and related topics based on their regional and functional expertise
- Serves as a liaison to the U.S. intelligence community to ensure that intelligence activities support and inform Department of State priorities related to food security, as appropriate
- Conducts outreach to outside experts from private sector, academia, and non-governmental organizations on food security to inform analysis, research, and foreign policy decision-making
- Fosters links with governments, universities, non-governmental organizations, and private sector companies to build technical capacity and create open geospatial data to support sustainable development and humanitarian efforts worldwide, particularly through the MapGive and Secondary Cities projects

Additional Information

- S/GFS and other offices and bureaus engage with our chiefs of mission to emphasize the role of food security and nutrition in the stability and development of the countries in which they serve. In 2017, S/GFS plans to coordinate a day-long event around the annual Chiefs of Mission Conference. Invited to this event will be chiefs of mission of all countries experiencing food

insecurity, not limited to countries currently participating in U.S. global food security initiatives. This event will highlight the work of all of the Department’s offices and bureaus that promote food security and nutrition in developing and middle-income countries.

Organization and Structure

The Department of State is organized through numerous regional and functional bureaus. Under the mandate of the Secretary of State, the Special Representative for Global Food Security leads the department’s global food security efforts. The Special Representative’s office collaborates closely with the offices included in this implementation plan and other offices, and with other agencies and departments, to promote long-term global food security, nutrition, and sustainable agricultural development.

Impact and Sustainability

The Department of State promotes global, regional, national, and sub-national policies that foster sustainable reductions in hunger and malnutrition, and sustainable increases in agricultural development. For example, OES/OMC works closely with countries to build their capacity to combat illegal, unregulated, and unreported (IUU) fishing, and seeks to ensure food security for developed and developing countries through science- and ecosystem-based fisheries conservation and management, sustainable economic development related to fisheries and other oceanic economic activities and planning (e.g., “blue economy”), and the facilitation of trade of safe and healthful seafood and seafood products. The Department is committed to working with the interagency to identify appropriate metrics on evaluating its work on global food security.

Resources Requested and Budget Table

	Estimated FY 2017 Financial Contributions (\$000s)	Narrative Explanation
Contributions to International Organizations	\$111,690 (estimated)	U.S. assessed contribution to FAO for Calendar Year 2017.
Contributions to International Organizations	\$176	U.S. assessed contribution to World Animal Health Organization
Diplomatic and Consular Programs	\$500	Biotechnology Outreach – proposals solicited from posts
Economic Support Funds	\$28 ,000	U.S. contribution to multilateral climate-smart agricultural work in Central America, part of the Global Climate Change Initiative and the U.S. Strategy for Engagement in Central America. This funding is included as part of the FY 2017 Feed the Future request. The full Feed the Future request is further described in the USAID implementation plan.



U.S. Department of the Treasury Global Food Security Implementation Plan

U.S. Department of the Treasury Overview

The U.S. Department of the Treasury oversees the multilateral development banks (MDBs), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), and the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) in order to shape their agendas and improve their impact on global food security. In addition, Treasury, through its dialogue with Ministries of Finance, can encourage developing countries, as appropriate, to increase domestic spending on agriculture and nutrition and to improve the quality of such spending through the development of well-targeted, evidence-based food security spending plans. Finally, Treasury can also encourage countries to undertake policy reforms needed to increase domestic resource mobilization and attract greater levels of private financing for food security activities.

IFAD and the MDBs have a primary mission to reduce poverty and spur economic growth and invest billions of dollars annually in food security-related projects in emerging market and developing countries. GAFSP was launched in 2010 as the new multilateral component of the President's Feed the Future initiative. It is a multi-donor trust fund housed at the World Bank that provides financing to assist the smallholder farmers in the world's poorest countries.

Investments in food security by IFAD, the MDBs, and GAFSP are already well-aligned with the GFSS's proposed approaches to sustainably reduce global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty. These institutions take an evidence-based, country-owned approach in the design, preparation, and implementation of their projects and rigorously monitor the results of their investments. At the urging of the United States, these institutions also increasingly incorporate cross-cutting considerations into the design of their investments. For instance, reducing gender inequality, accounting for the impacts of climate change, and integrating nutrition are common objectives in many of the food security investments of IFAD, the MDBs, and GAFSP. GAFSP is particularly well-aligned with U.S. food security investments given its focus on the world's poorest countries (including many of the focus countries in the existing Feed the Future initiative), a Results Framework that has strong areas of overlap with the GFSS Results Framework, and co-investment with U.S. food security activities in countries such as Rwanda and Honduras.

Going forward, Treasury will continue to work in close partnership and coordination with U.S. Government agencies to enhance the alignment between U.S. food security programming and that of IFAD, MDBs, and GAFSP by encouraging the institutions to maintain robust levels of financing for food security; align their programming and food security Results Frameworks, as appropriate, with the GFSS

Results Framework; and improve their integration of cross-cutting issues such as gender equality and climate change in their programming.

Technical, Programmatic, and/or In-kind Contributions to the Global Food Security Strategy

- **GAFSP**: GAFSP promotes U.S. global development goals by supporting long-term, sustainable investments in agricultural productivity and nutrition, which cut across multiple categories of the U.S. Global Food Security Strategy's Results Framework. For example, more than half of the Public Sector Window projects include nutrition-related activities (IR 7, IR 8). Additionally, more than two thirds of GAFSP projects include activities that provide climate change adaptation benefits (like improved watershed and soil management) and/or mitigation benefits (like afforestation or adoption of organic fertilizer production) (CC IR 2). GAFSP is unique in the multilateral food security financing architecture due to the combination of its exclusive focus on the world's poorest countries, its competitive process for awarding funding, its stress on country ownership, its ability to support public and private sector institutions, and its inclusive governance model. In 2017, Treasury, working with interagency partners, will seek to secure additional financial contributions from other existing and prospective GAFSP donors. U.S. contributions to GAFSP have delivered significant financial leverage, with other donors contributing nearly \$2 for every \$1 from the United States.
- **IFAD**: IFAD is a multilateral fund dedicated to alleviating rural poverty in developing countries by supporting agricultural development and strengthening food security. Most IFAD-supported projects are in remote rural areas where few donors operate. IFAD's activities cut across many of the categories in the strategy's Results Framework. For example, IFAD works to increase the profitability of food system activities (IR 1); increase the access of remote regions to markets and trade (IR 2); and reduce malnutrition; improve performance in fragile, conflict-affected states; partner with the private sector; and leverage innovative financing tools to support smallholder agriculture (IR 3). IFAD also focuses on building climate resilience and adaptation (IR 4 and IR 6) and aims to mainstream climate into all of its projects by 2018.
- **MDBs**: The United States is a shareholder of the World Bank, African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and sits on the Board of Directors at each institution. Treasury closely coordinates with the Office of the United States Executive Director, relevant staff at other U.S. agencies, and project staff on all MDB strategies and operations proposed each year, including those linked to reducing global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty. The MDBs have made significant commitments to financing activities that strengthen food security. For example, agriculture is one of the African Development Bank's (AfDB) five strategic priority areas. The AfDB's new 10-year agriculture strategy focuses on scaling up African agribusiness through support for 15 priority commodity value-chains. The food security-related activities of the MDBs, which total several billion dollars annually, cut across the categories of the Results Framework.
 - **African, Asian, and Inter-American development banks**: These regional development banks have made significant commitments to finance food security in their client countries. Treasury will continue to engage with these institutions to shape their

approaches to food security and encourage greater coordination with other development partners (including the United States).

- World Bank Group: Given the critical role of the World Bank in shaping global thinking on key food security issues and in financing food security projects in many countries, the Treasury will encourage the World Bank Group to reinvigorate its leadership in this important sector.
- Ministers of Finance: Treasury will leverage its relationships with Ministers of Finance in focus countries to encourage: 1) rigorous, evidence-based spending plans for food security; 2) increased fiscal commitments, as appropriate, for agriculture and nutrition; and 3) policy reforms needed to mobilize greater levels of private financing for food security investments.

Organization and Structure

Treasury's Office of International Affairs houses the International Development Policy depute, which has the responsibility for managing U.S. equities in the multilateral development banks, including their work to end food insecurity and increase agricultural led economic growth. There are three offices within this depute. First, the Office of Debt and Development Policy focuses on development policy issues, including food security, across all multilateral institutions and in international fora such as the G-7 and G-20. Second, the Office of Development Results and Accountability reviews all MDB operations to determine whether proposed projects are likely to deliver positive development outcomes. Third, the Office of Multilateral Development Banks focuses primarily on organizational-level policies at the multilateral institutions.

Impact and Sustainability

- GAFSP, IFAD, and the MDBs combined are the largest source of development assistance for food security globally and their combined funding has increased significantly over the last eight years. For example, the World Bank and International Finance Corporation (IFC) financing for food security grew from \$2.12 billion in FY 2008 to \$8 billion in FY 2015. Treasury will encourage these institutions to maintain their robust levels of funding for food security in the coming years while also supporting efforts to make the outcomes of this funding more sustainable by, for example, promoting rigorous monitoring and evaluation frameworks, focusing assistance on the vulnerable, and incorporating the potential impacts of climate change in project design.
- GAFSP promotes sustainable investments that are focused on poor and food insecure countries that are committed to agriculture development. At current funding levels, GAFSP is expected to sustainably increase the incomes of at least 12 million smallholder farmers and also lead to improved nutrition. Two examples of GAFSP's impact to date include:
 - A \$50 million GAFSP grant to Rwanda is helping the government to scale up its flagship Land Husbandry, Water Harvesting, and Hillside Irrigation project. The project aims to increase the productivity and commercialization of hillside agriculture through community-based infrastructure approaches paired with access to finance, agricultural extension, and farmer cooperative building components. To date the project has reached nearly 300,000 farmers with significant increases in household income levels (up to 500

percent gains in some areas) and better access to financial services (nearly 85 percent of beneficiaries have access to financial services).

- A \$5 million GAFSP loan to the PRAN Group in Bangladesh is financing the company’s expansion of its food processing operations while also supporting climate adaptive technologies and practices. This project focuses on areas with significant environmental stress and farmers are being introduced to new production technologies. The project has enabled the PRAN Group to successfully expand its production capacity, create 1,200 new rural jobs, and integrate small farmers into retail supply chains. The increased distribution network has also helped the company to reach under-served, impoverished communities and provide them with affordable, essential food products of high quality.
- IFAD invests in a range of projects designed to reduce poverty, hunger, and malnutrition among the rural poor. For example, in 2014, IFAD completed a \$25 million project to reduce the poverty level of small traders (especially women), primary producers, and women laborers in coastal regions of Bangladesh. By improving the facilities and terms of access for men and women to rural markets, increasing employment for poor women, increasing production and sale of products for the market, and moving poor producers up the value chain, the project reached over 125,000 direct beneficiaries in 89,000 households and contributed to the lifting of 38,000 households out of poverty. As IFAD’s largest historical donor, Treasury will continue to play a key role in providing input on IFAD’s strategic approach to alleviating rural poverty.

Resources Requested and Budget Table ¹

	Estimated FY 2017 Financial Contribution (\$000s)	Narrative Explanation
GAFSP ²	\$23,000	This figure represents the U.S. contribution to GAFSP.
IFAD	\$30,000	This figure represents the U.S. contribution to IFAD and is the second (of three) payments to the IFAD-10 replenishment cycle.
TOTAL	\$53,000	

¹ Total FY 2017 Budget request. Total does not include estimated pro-rata U.S. share of MDB agricultural development portfolios. In FY 15, the World Bank and IFC funded projects totaling \$8 billion for food security, the African Development Bank \$713 million, and the Inter-American Development Bank \$173 million. In 2014, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development approved \$968 million in food security investments and from 2012-2014, the Asian Development Bank provided \$3.15 billion in agriculture and food security related projects.

² U.S. contributions to GAFSP are provided on a matching basis to incentivize other donors. In October 2012, the U.S. pledged to provide \$1 for every \$2 in new contributions by other donors up to a limit of \$475 million through at least 2016. In the 2017 Budget, the administration requested \$23 million towards the 2012 pledge.



The Millennium Challenge Corporation Global Food Security Implementation Plan

Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) Overview

The MCC transforms lives and creates opportunities by partnering with the best-governed poor countries to reduce poverty through economic growth. MCC, an independent U.S. Government agency, provides development assistance—through a competitive selection process—to countries that demonstrate positive governance and social and economic performance. MCC’s partner countries, informed by economic analysis and in consultation with civil society and the private sector, develop programs (compacts) to address their most significant barriers to economic growth and poverty reduction. Decisions are based on data and rigorous analysis, and the results are monitored, measured, and publicly shared.

Since 2004, and as of March 2016, MCC has signed 32 compacts with 26 countries totaling \$9.56 billion¹ of obligated funds. Twenty-two of these compacts have included substantial food security-related investments, which account for roughly half of MCC’s obligated funds, with additional agricultural-related programming in Niger expected to be obligated before the end of FY 2017. These investments include rehabilitating and expanding large-scale irrigation systems; rehabilitating and constructing farm to market roads and ports; building post-harvest infrastructure; reforming policies, laws, and institutions to increase security of land rights and improve land administration and management; training farmers’, fishers’, and producers’ organizations; increasing access to finance; and improving nutrition and sanitation. Countries are responsible for implementing the MCC-funded programs with strict oversight of procurements and disbursements, as well as strict requirements for comprehensive monitoring and evaluation as measured by independent evaluators.

Technical, Programmatic, and/or In-kind Contributions to the Global Food Security Strategy

MCC takes an integrated, market-led approach to addressing the key constraints to food security, including strengthening agricultural and rural economies and promoting reliable access to sufficient, safe, and affordable food in the countries where it invests. In addition, MCC’s leadership and technical expertise in infrastructure and urban planning projects, including farm to market roads and other key transportation links, will allow MCC to continue to address food security issues in a time of shifting demographics from rural to urban areas.

¹ In addition to compacts, MCC funds smaller threshold programs to assist countries to become compact eligible by supporting their efforts to implement key policy and institutional reforms and thereby demonstrate their commitment to MCC’s eligibility criteria for compacts. MCC has supported 26 threshold programs in 24 countries totaling \$583.6 million.

Prior and ongoing programs provide a foundation for MCC's contribution to the Global Food Security Strategy through the country-owned model. Examples of current MCC interventions aimed at strengthening food security in the developing world include:

- In Indonesia, the \$129.5 million ***Community-Based Health and Nutrition Project*** (2013-2018) integrates sanitation, maternal and child health, and nutrition interventions in order to reduce stunting. The project partners with the World Bank, using incentives-based community grants to increase demand for health, nutrition, and education services, and improves the health sector's capacity to respond at the facility and community level. This aligns directly with IRs 7 and 8 and CC IR 6 of the Food Security Results Framework.
- Also in Indonesia, the \$332.5 million ***Green Prosperity Project*** (2013-2018) improves land use practices and expands supply and access to renewable energy, thereby increasing agricultural productivity and reducing land-based greenhouse gas emissions. This aligns directly with IR 4 and CC IR 2 of the Food Security Results Framework.
- In Zambia, over a million people are projected to benefit from improved city drainage, water and sanitation, and water sector reform. The expected benefit of the \$310.6 million ***Water Supply, Sanitation, and Drainage Project*** (2013-2018) is decreased water-related disease and productive days lost due to disease and time to collect water. This aligns with IRs 5, 6, and 9 as well as CC IR 2 of the Food Security Results Framework.
- In Morocco, the \$33 million Rural Land Activity under the ***Land Productivity Project*** (signed but not entered into force) aims to increase rural productivity by streamlining the process for privatizing collective lands, while making it more inclusive and more protective of the rights of land holders, including women. In addition, the \$10.5 million Land Governance Activity will support legal, policy, and institutional reforms that will improve the investment environment for investment in agriculture and food security. This project aligns directly with IR 1 and CC IR 5 as part of the Food Security Results Framework.
- In Niger, the \$254.6 million ***Irrigation and Market Access Project*** (signed but not entered into force) is designed to improve irrigation in order to increase crop yields, sustainable fishing, and livestock productivity. The project will also upgrade road networks to improve access to markets and services, provide technical support for farmers—with a focus on women and youth—to improve performance of their businesses, and establish market platforms to competitively position farmer groups in the marketplace. This aligns directly with IRs 1, 2 and 3 and CC IRs 4 and 6 of the Food Security Results Framework.
- Also in Niger, the \$96.5 million ***Climate-Resilient Communities Project*** (signed but not entered into force) aims to increase incomes for small-scale agriculture-dependent and livestock-dependent families in rural areas by improving crop and livestock productivity, sustaining natural resources critical to long-term productivity, and increasing market sales of targeted commodities. The project will be implemented in partnership with the World Bank. This aligns directly with IRs 1 through 6 of the Food Security Results Framework.
- Under the Threshold Program in Sierra Leone, the \$16 million ***Water Sector Reform Project*** (2016-2020) improves access to reliable and safe water and sanitation (WASH) services through water sector reform, improved utility management and efficiency, and improved WASH practices at the household level. The anticipated result is increased productivity related to lower direct and indirect health costs for firms and households, aligning with IR 9 and CC IR 6 of the Food Security Results Framework.

As MCC continues to develop and implement projects furthering its food security objectives, the agency will coordinate with partners and ensure alignment and contribution to the Food Security Results Framework. The extent to which we will be able to report on the projects/activities will be determined once the indicators have been developed for the strategy.

Organization and Structure

Country-driven project development and implementation is one of MCC's guiding principles. MCC's partner countries develop compact proposals to address their most significant barriers to economic growth and poverty reduction. Compact development begins with an analysis of the constraints to economic growth in conjunction with an initial gender and social inclusion assessment and an investment opportunity assessment, as well as consultations with civil society and the private sector. Compacts are implemented through a Millennium Challenge Account established by the partner country and overseen by a local Board of Directors.

Technical expertise at MCC resides within practice groups, led by a Senior Director. The practice groups that will have the most responsibility for implementing this strategy include Agriculture and Land, which includes property rights and land policy; Human and Community Development, which includes nutrition and health; Gender and Social Inclusion; Water, Sanitation, and Irrigation; Transportation and Vertical Structures; Finance, Investment, and Trade; and Monitoring and Evaluation. Recognizing that there is no "one size fits all" solution to food security, each MCC compact is supported by the appropriate mix of technical staff. This team oversees the projects from development to implementation and monitoring to ensure target outcomes are optimized. MCC also evaluates the impact of its investments after the compact has closed.

Impact and Sustainability

MCC has and will continue to strive to maximize the impact and sustainability of its food security-related investments by—first and foremost—prioritizing country ownership. Beneficiary countries are responsible for generating results and sustaining them. To ensure the capacity of partner countries to deliver long-term results from projects, MCC's interventions will maintain focus on strengthening local institutions that are responsible for operating and maintaining compact-financed infrastructure post-compact, as well as investments in behavior change among impacted community members. Regarding food security, this may include:

- Strengthening water-use associations and producers' organizations as part of irrigated agriculture projects
- Partnering with the private sector to encourage investment in targeted value chains, including through commercial co-financing to establish cooperatively owned and managed processing plants
- Strengthening the capacity of local and national land administration institutions for more efficient and inclusive land allocation and improved security of land rights to ensure sustained incentives of rights-holders to invest in and benefit from their land
- Establishing a national fund to assure routine maintenance of farm-to-market roads

As in the past, MCC will consider the donor landscape in the countries where it invests and work collaboratively with other U.S. Government agencies to ensure complementary investments. As the development of a second compact in the Philippines advances, MCC will collaborate and learn from the on-going efforts of USAID, USDA/FAS, and the Peace Corps, which are supporting activities that a second MCC compact may be able to expand.

Furthermore, MCC investments are designed with a specific program logic that includes, from the outset, an identification of the appropriate indicators by which to monitor and evaluate success. MCC commits to the continued monitoring and evaluation of food security-related project outputs and outcomes to allow for course correction, measurement of impacts, as well as generation of lessons and sharing of best practices. Our indicators are and will continue to be consistent with U.S. Government food security metrics. MCC's evaluations are shared openly here: <https://data.mcc.gov/evaluations/index.php/catalog>.

The impacts of MCC's investments in food security include the following:

- Agriculture and irrigation projects in 16 compacts, which have trained over 270,000 farmers, brought 170,000 hectares under improved irrigation and 42,000 hectares under improved agricultural practices, and distributed over \$87 million of agricultural and rural loans to more than 1,000 borrowers. While impact evaluations conducted shortly after compact closure do not capture the full benefits, the following impacts have been recorded:
 - A project in Nicaragua designed to increase the value added and productivity of farms by providing technical and financial assistance has shown a 15 to 30 percent increase over baseline farm income.
 - Evaluation of the Fruit Tree Productivity Project in Morocco found a 7.8 percent increase in olive production and a 4 percent increase in olive value chain revenues during a three-year period, and estimated a job creation effect of 4,000 to 5,000 direct jobs annually.
- Land projects and activities in 13 compacts leading to the adoption of 121 legal and regulatory reforms, formalizing land rights for over 300,000 households, as well as commercial and other legal entities, and mediating over 12,000 conflicts. Completed evaluations for these activities have revealed:
 - For Mongolia's Peri-Urban Rangeland Project implemented around the three major urban centers, some early evidence of project effects on herder behavior have been measured by shifts in herd composition toward improved breed milking cows and complementary reduction in percentage of goats, reduced herd size, reduced mortality of sheep and goats, increased likelihood to grow fodder crops and increased investment in immovable property. Project impacts are expected to manifest over a period of several years and will be assessed in future survey rounds, the final of which is planned for 2017.
 - In Benin's rural communes, early impacts on cultivation have been found from the village-level land use plans that were part of the Access to Land Project. Demarcation activities led to significant increases in longer-term farm investments, including planting of trees and perennial crops.
- Water and sanitation projects in nine compacts, which constructed 1,181 water points and trained 12,038 people in hygiene and sanitary best practices. Of those trained, nearly 6,000 were women. The first evaluation completed in this sector, for the Mozambique Rural Water Supply Activity, found that household access to improved water sources increased by 23.4 percent and the time

spent collecting water significantly decreased as evidenced by the median roundtrip time to the primary water source falling by over an hour. An even greater impact occurred in the dry season, with a more than two-hour decline in the median roundtrip time to a primary water source. While no impacts on health outcomes were found to be significant—due, in part, to household storage practices—this provides important learning for future MCC compacts.

Resources Requested and Budget Table

	Estimated FY 2017 Financial Contribution (\$000s)	Narrative Explanation
Millennium Challenge Corporation	TBD	The President’s FY 2017 Budget Request includes a request of \$1 billion for MCC. Almost \$800 million of this amount is for compact and threshold programs and, depending on the outcome of MCC’s diagnostic constraints analysis process, a portion of that may be spent on food security-related projects and activities. The timing of the disbursement of this assistance to partner countries will depend on a number of factors, such as country capacity, Board approval, when the agreement is signed, and when it enters into force.
TOTAL	TBD	

MCC estimates it will disburse approximately \$129.5 million of prior year funding through the following projects and activities that will contribute to achieving outcomes and impacts that align with the Global Food Security Strategy Results Framework in FY 2017:

Indonesia: Community-Based Health and Nutrition Project	\$ 19,268,785
Indonesia: Green Prosperity Project	\$ 60,933,305
Zambia: Water Supply, Sanitation, and Drainage Project	\$ 41,076,219
Morocco: Land Productivity Project	
• Governance Activity	\$ 460,826
• Rural Land Activity	\$ 344,960
Niger: Irrigation and Market Access Project	\$ 3,153,480
Niger: Climate Resilient Communities Project	\$ 2,524,500
Sierra Leone: Water Sector Reform Project	\$ 1,716,990
 Total	 \$ 129,479,066



Overseas Private Investment Corporation Global Food Security Implementation Plan

Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) Overview

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

Technical, Programmatic, and/or In-kind Contributions to the Global Food Security Strategy

OPIC is a self-sustaining agency that provides financing and political risk insurance to private investments in a broad range of sectors, including agriculture and other food security projects.

OPIC efficiently leverages federal dollars to mobilize external investments towards projects OPIC supports. For every dollar of OPIC project commitments, OPIC mobilizes approximately \$2.60 from external capital sources. FY 2015 commitments of \$4.4 billion mobilized \$11.44 billion of non-OPIC resources. OPIC support includes direct loans, loan guarantees, insurance, and investments made through OPIC-supported investment funds.

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

Structured Finance & Insurance: OPIC provides guaranties in support of larger U.S. investors. OPIC can support projects located in high-priority foreign policy areas where neither local nor international private capital markets are willing to enter. Political risk insurance mitigates risks by covering against possible damage or loss to tangible assets, value of investment, or earnings or returns of the investment.

Small and Medium Enterprise Finance: OPIC assists small and mid-market companies in developing their overseas businesses by providing direct loans and investment guaranties. Many innovative financial intermediaries, which support smallholder farmers and small food-related enterprises, have been financed through this department.

Example: OPIC provided a \$10 million loan to One Acre Fund to fund receivables from smallholder farmers in Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, and Tanzania. One Acre Fund provides a market bundle on credit to individual farmers, which includes: 1) seed and fertilizer; 2) education on technical skillsets; and 3) market and trade practices.

Investment Funds: OPIC addresses the lack of sufficient equity funds in certain regions or sectors in emerging market economies. By providing long-term, patient growth capital and facilitating critically needed technology and management skills development, these funds act as a catalyst for private sector economic activity in the developing countries served. Along with OPIC's insurance and project finance activities, investment funds serve to carry out OPIC's mission to mobilize and facilitate the participation of U.S. private capital and strengthen OPIC contributions to international development, including food security related projects as well as complementary sectors such as power, infrastructure, and inclusive financial services.

Example: OPIC-supported Silverlands Fund invests across the value chain in the agricultural sector, with a core focus on farmland and primary production businesses. The Fund's investments have multiplier effects throughout the African regional economies by allowing companies to expand operations and provide more goods and services to customers.

Organization and Structure

OPIC has 300 employees that allow it to carry out its mission. To carry out its financing and insurance programs, OPIC is organized into departments supporting the three product lines described above: Structured Finance & Insurance, Small and Medium Enterprise Finance, and Investment Funds, each of which contribute to supporting food security projects.

The Office of Investment Policy ensures that OPIC projects meet the highest impact and development standards, as described below.

OPIC's internal Task Force on Renewable Natural Resources regularly meets to discuss the OPIC project pipeline for the food security sector, strategize about new products, and facilitate interagency collaboration. OPIC has a designated internal point of contact for the Feed the Future process, Empowering Agriculture, and the Global Food Security Strategy.

Impact and Sustainability

OPIC's impact is best measured by the volume of private capital it mobilizes that supports food security in emerging markets. In addition, OPIC's Office of Investment Policy (OIP) collects development data for each private investment it supports, in addition to ensuring compliance with all Congressionally-mandated statutory requirements, general OPIC policies, and OPIC's stringent environmental and social impact criteria.

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

- **Developmental Reach:** This factor measures the extent to which a project improves the host country's infrastructure or provides specific benefits to lower-income or underserved geographies or segments of the population, including women.
- **Jobs & Human Capacity Building:** In addition to the creation of direct, permanent jobs, this factor takes into consideration the creation of temporary/construction jobs, female employment, and job quality as measured by benefits, human capacity building, and wages.
- **Demonstration Effects:** This factor measures a project's impact on technology and knowledge transfer; technical assistance to customers, suppliers, or borrowers; the introduction of new

products, including financial products; alignment with the host government's initiatives in the sector; regulatory and legal reform; and the voluntary adoption of internationally-recognized quality or performance standards.

- **Macroeconomic and Fiscal Impact:** This factor measures a project's downstream impact through the procurement of local goods and services (both initial and operational), as well as a project's fiscal and foreign exchange impacts on the host country.
- **Environmental and Community Benefits:** This factor captures a project's environmental benefits, such as remediation of brownfield sites or use of energy-efficient equipment, as well as a project's philanthropic efforts to help the community in which it operates.

OIP also collects data on the project's impact on revenue growth, including exports and agricultural yield. In addition, OIP conducts ongoing evaluations of projects through surveys and randomly selected site visits to portfolio investments in order to compare expected impacts to actual outcomes and generate lessons learned for assessing future projects.

OPIC tailors its investment tools to the needs of individual projects and helps clients meet or exceed minimum performance standards. By offering financing and insurance to products that incentivize sustainable environmental and social outcomes, OPIC projects contribute to a positive development impact and economic stability. For example, OPIC actively seeks to support projects that provide essential services, including food security, particularly for vulnerable groups, or in post-conflict environments where private investment contributes to public health improvements by encouraging development and economic stability.

From the time that OPIC receives a request for support, it applies its full suite of policies to ensure each client complies with OPIC's environmental, economic, labor, human rights, and social impact requirements throughout the duration of OPIC's involvement. From early client engagement to approval through post-disbursement monitoring, OPIC promotes economic, social, and environmental sustainability.

Financial Contributions

- OPIC will coordinate with other U.S. Government agencies such as USAID and USDA to leverage different U.S. Government resources into the same food security projects, including support for early project evaluation by independent experts for highly developmental food security projects.
- OPIC's financial tools are crucial to the success of the Global Food Security Strategy, but OPIC's current year-by-year authorization provides a degree of uncertainty to the companies who may be candidates for OPIC support. Longer-term Congressional authorization for OPIC would provide greater certainty and demonstrate the U.S. Government's commitment to global food security, particularly investments in underserved regions.
- In order to align financial products with food security needs, OPIC will consider finance models that align with seasonal food production cash flows as well as and long-term crop cycles such as fruit tree crops.

- To better enable OPIC's efforts to support food security projects, OPIC will seek support to solicit and facilitate, to the maximum extent possible, the participation of local and regional companies through the use of local currency-denominated financing and risk insurance.

Resources Requested and Budget Table

A portion of OPIC's portfolio in FY 2017 is expected to support global food security investments, which is dependent on private sector demand for OPIC's products that complies with OPIC policy requirements, and requires internal or Board approval of projects.



Peace Corps

Global Food Security Implementation Plan

Peace Corps Overview

Peace Corps contributes to the mitigation of food insecurity by improving nutrition outcomes for mothers and children, addressing climate change and resiliency, and reducing poverty on a global scale. Since its inception, Peace Corps has promoted methodologies and approaches that are proven, evidence-based, and considered among development practitioners to hold promise for positive results and impact. Peace Corps' approach is to build local capacity at the individual, group, and community level to promote sustainability. Peace Corps' comprehensive food security strategy revolves around Peace Corps Volunteers' contributions to the four pillars of food security as defined in the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS): **availability, accessibility, utilization, and stability**. As Volunteers focus their collective efforts on food security innovations and interventions, the agency is moving ahead to invest in, support, and extend these activities throughout the world.

Technical, Programmatic, and/or In-kind Contributions to the Global Food Security Strategy

Objective 1: Inclusive and sustainable agricultural-led economic growth

The Peace Corps contributes to Objective 1 in the GFSS by assisting smallholder farmers to increase agricultural productivity and income through activities such as: improving soil fertility and water storage capacity; composting, green manure, and use of other organic soil amendments; maximizing water availability and usage by employing drought-resistant crop varieties and use of mulch and other appropriate water conserving techniques; reducing soil erosion; and increasing profitability by using companion planting, crop rotations, and integrated pest management.

Volunteers support increased food security, poverty reduction, and improved nutrition by providing technical assistance to individual farmers, farmer organizations and households via extension, demonstrations, direct/indirect advising/training methods, support groups, and counseling sessions all focused on behavior change. By living and working in communities alongside their counterparts, beneficiaries and local NGOs and community-based organizations, Volunteers increase capacity and strengthen entrepreneurship, small business, and organizational development in alignment with Intermediate Result (IR) 3 and Cross-Cutting Intermediate Result (CC IR) 6. In support of IR 3, Peace Corps Volunteers help individuals, particularly small-holder farmers, farm households, youth, and women, initiate new income-generating enterprises and help them improve the business skills they already possess. This work includes promoting sound business practices, including creating marketing strategies to encouraging sound financial management and accounting practices.

Objective 2: Strengthened resilience among people and systems

Peace Corps Volunteers promote climate-smart agriculture techniques at all levels of farming. They encourage farmers to use improved and adapted crop varieties, to be environmentally friendly (for example, by using organic practices), and to plan ahead for droughts and other climate events by harvesting rainwater, improving soil structure, and reducing soil erosion, increasing sustainable productivity in support of IR 4. Peace Corps Volunteers provide disaster reduction support by promoting appropriate soil and water management techniques such as sloping agricultural land techniques, agroforestry techniques, as well as coastal and marine management. They encourage evidence-based sustainable environmental and natural resource management practices to many populations, including youth in support of IR 4 and CC IR 2, thus bolstering the adaptability and recovery capacity of households and communities faced with shocks and stresses.

Objective 3: A well-nourished population, especially among women and children

Peace Corps Volunteers work to integrate nutrition in agriculture programming by promoting the production of nutrient-dense foods, especially in home and school gardens. Activities aim to diversify diets that utilize local foods, and target farmers, schools, and mothers in support of Objective 3, IR 7.

Peace Corps programs strategically target vulnerable groups such as poor households with children under two and breastfeeding mothers, pregnant women, adolescent girls, people living with HIV and AIDS, and food insecure households. With this targeting approach, Volunteers contribute to IR 8 through training and capacity building of health care providers, extension agents, and local leaders. Volunteers and their work partners educate, train, and provide counseling and support primarily through the use of the Essential Nutrition Actions framework to promote dietary diversity, optimal breastfeeding, and complementary feeding practices and work to reduce risk of micronutrient deficiencies and disease, primarily in women and children.

Through the provision of training and initiation of community projects with community groups, schools, and households, Peace Corps Volunteers promote handwashing, improved hygiene, and healthy sanitation practices; assist with small infrastructure improvements to improve access to clean water; and help small-holder farmers, farm households, youth, and women to develop sanitary and environmentally-sound solid waste management practices in support of IR 9.

Cross-Cutting Intermediate Results

Peace Corps Volunteers work within schools and with counterparts to develop youth clubs and camps providing evidence-informed skills development and leadership training for youth populations in support of CC IR 4. Volunteers help youth learn fundamental agricultural and natural resource management practices and introduce approaches to being leaders and change agents to bring about constructive change in their communities.

Organization and Structure

Peace Corps country programs implement the activities of the agency's global food security efforts by placing Volunteers in communities at-risk and vulnerable to food insecurity. Volunteers live side by side with their host country counterparts, learning the local language and culture. Peace Corps' Food Security Programming & Training staff, both at the headquarters and country program level, provide technical and

organizational leadership for Peace Corps' food security efforts, and supports the U.S. government's global food security strategy. In 2017, Peace Corps/Washington will actively involve leadership in Washington-based interagency coordination and at the country program level and facilitate and support interagency collaboration and alignment at post.

The Peace Corps Office of Overseas Programming and Training Support will continue to coordinate with Regional offices to provide global food security programming, training, and evaluation activities, collaborating with regional staff and post-level coordinators to align, monitor and evaluate programming activities. The Peace Corps Office of Strategic Partnerships will complete the implementation of the Peace Corps' Global Food Security Agreement with the USAID Bureau for Food Security and work to negotiate new partnership agreements focused on food security programming.

Impact and Sustainability

- The scope of Peace Corps' involvement in global food security goes outside of Feed the Future's current focus and aligned countries, as Peace Corps Volunteers, worldwide, are involved in activities that increase food security. Peace Corps will continue to prioritize evidence-based methodologies identified by the whole of government working group and align its approaches to sectors that are not represented in the GFSS (e.g., education, youth) and approaches that facilitate increased food security.
- Peace Corps promotes community-led approaches to reducing poverty, hunger, and malnutrition. For example, PCVs use participatory techniques to engage community members and civil society in identifying and addressing areas of need and priority, setting development goals and targets, implementing sustainable projects, and monitoring and evaluating results.
- Peace Corps' capacity building approach in agriculture, environment, education, health, community economic development, and youth and development programming, helps lay a foundation for sustainable and resilient food systems at the community level.
- To ensure all programs involved in Peace Corps' food security efforts are achieving desired outcomes or the defined objectives, Peace Corps uses a global database to monitor and report measurement of outcome-level indicators in target areas for Volunteer activities and conducts process, performance and outcome evaluations on sector based activities.
- Peace Corps food security interventions target communities, non-governmental organizations, smallholder farmers, and interested community members leading to increased resilience, improved access to information and increased knowledge and related skills in improved technologies and management relevant to agriculture, natural resource/environmental management, small business development, youth development, nutrition, and maternal and child health.
- Strategic partnerships play a key role in augmenting Peace Corps' effectiveness. Partner agencies often have greater resources combined with a mandate to cover large geographical areas but may not have adequate human resources on the ground. Peace Corps Volunteers are widely and strategically placed throughout the countries in which they serve, and where portfolios match and support is available, this combination can amplify both Peace Corps and its partners' food security activities. As community mobilizers who have fully integrated into remote villages, volunteers serve as a bridge between rural communities and other Feed the Future programs, expanding the effectiveness and reach of other U.S. investments to address hunger and poverty.

In FY 2015 alone, Volunteers in Tanzania trained more than 2,500 Tanzanians on agricultural productivity or food security and more than 3,000 in child health and nutrition with support from USAID Feed the Future funding. Since 2013, nearly 2,000 Tanzanian farmers have applied improved technologies or management practices thanks to the collaboration between Peace Corps and USAID.¹

Resources Requested and Budget Table

Peace Corps Region	Posts	Estimated FY17 Financial Contribution (\$000s) ²	Narrative Explanation
Africa	21	\$21,940	Represents estimated amounts of the Peace Corps FY 2017 request used in support of food security programming, which includes post staff salaries, volunteer support costs, and trainings. ³
Europe, Mediterranean, and Asia	8	\$2,210	
Inter-America and the Pacific	11	\$6,160	
Totals	40	\$30,310	

¹ Center for Strategic and International Studies. (2016, March). Tracking promises: Analyzing the impact of Feed the Future investments in Tanzania. http://csis.org/files/publication/160401_Flowers_TrackingPromises_WEB.pdf

² Projections based on Peace Corps appropriated post budget. Cost allocation calculated from Volunteers attributed to food security by sector (Agriculture 100%, Environment 75%, Health 25%, Community Economic Development 25%; Youth in Development 10%, and Education 10%)

³ The estimated FY 2017 Financial Contribution does not include funding from USAID.



Office of the United States Trade Representative Global Food Security Implementation Plan

Office of the United States Trade Representative Overview

The Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) is part of the Executive Office of the President. The head of USTR is the U.S. Trade Representative, a Cabinet member who serves as the President's principal trade advisor, negotiator, and spokesperson on trade issues. USTR leads the development and coordination of U.S. international trade, commodity, and direct investment policy and leads U.S. government trade negotiations with other countries.¹

Technical, Programmatic, and/or In-kind Contributions to the Global Food Security Strategy

Consistent with the President's Trade Agenda, USTR's 2016 Annual Performance Goals and Objectives include integrating developing economies, economies in transition, and emerging economies into the global rules-based trading system and encouraging key emerging economies to develop trade and investment policies consistent with their growing roles in the global economy, while helping other economies build their capacity to realize the full benefits of trade liberalization.²

Trade can play a role in stimulating economic growth and strengthening food security through a number of channels,³ including connecting regions with abundant and inexpensive supplies of goods to regions with a high demand for those goods as well as providing farmers with better incomes and consumers with less expensive access to safe food.⁴ The development and management of an open and transparent trade policy environment reduces the cost of doing business, improves the predictability of investment outcomes, and facilitates inclusive growth, improving food security by increasing the availability and diversity of safe food through open markets. USTR will coordinate with the interagency to identify indicators to measure outcomes.

The rules of the global trading system aim to reduce economic losses caused by policies that needlessly distort trade. In fact, the World Trade Organization (WTO) agreements developed rules for areas related to trade in agriculture including, but not limited to, agriculture support, investments, intellectual property rights and innovation, and good regulatory practices, including animal and plant health and food safety regulations. These rules require transparency in adopting measures and notification of specific commitments to the WTO. The rules are designed to promote good governance, as countries follow

¹ See <https://ustr.gov/about-us/about-ustr>

² https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/eop_fiscal_year_2016_congressional_justification_0.pdf

³ See 'U.S. Trade Preference Programs: Reducing Poverty and Hunger in Developing Nations Through Economic Growth' Report, published June 29, 2016, at <https://ustr.gov/sites/default/files/TPEA-Preferences-Report.pdf>.

⁴ International Food Policy Research Institute. <http://www.ifpri.org/topic/trade>

specific elements and principles to develop transparent, accountable, regulatory institutions which achieve food safety, public health, and other policy objectives in the least trade distortive way—allowing markets to function as effectively and efficiently as possible and promote transparent, science-based animal and plant health and food safety regulatory regimes and other trade-facilitating policies.

U.S. trade policy goals in the coming years will help support the GFSS Goal and Objectives in a number of ways. First, the United States maintains a largely open market, with roughly half of all imports permanently entering duty-free. Many of these Most Favored Nation duty-free products are produced in developing countries, including manufactured goods such as wicker goods, toys, and furniture, as well as agricultural and seafood products such as shrimp, mangoes, most coffee and tea products, cashews, coconuts, many winter-season fresh fruits and vegetables, and others. Given that the United States is the world’s largest importer of goods, this creates a large market for developing-country farm products worldwide, and provides opportunities to enhance the incomes of developing-country agricultural producers.

Second, the U.S. is a global leader in promoting the development of transparent, science-based animal and plant health and food safety regulatory systems based on international standards. USTR is involved in supporting countries as they work to strengthen their national animal and plant health and food safety regulatory frameworks, including the adoption of international standards on food safety and protecting plant and animal health. Adoption and adherence to such standards increases agricultural productivity for farmers and enhances the availability of safe food for consumers while facilitating trade through greater regulatory harmonization.

Third, USTR encourages developing country efforts to follow other transparency and good governance elements of the WTO agreements.

Fourth, U.S. trade preference programs aim to support sustainable growth and economic development through trade by providing special duty-free privileges to thousands of goods including both manufactured goods and agricultural products from developing countries meeting certain criteria. These outcomes contribute to the reduction of poverty and hunger in developing countries,⁵ which aligns with Intermediate Result 2, under Objective 1 of the strategy’s Results Framework. During FY 2016-17, USTR will pursue these objectives through a number of initiatives, including:

I. WTO Trade Initiatives

U.S. policy at the WTO is premised on the fact that trade directly contributes to development, and the United States seeks WTO outcomes that can contribute to the reduction of global poverty and hunger. As one example, full implementation of the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement has the potential to reduce global trade costs by an average of 14.3 percent, with developing country export gains projected as high as \$1.8 trillion. In addition, the Trade Facilitation Agreement directly addresses the special vulnerability of agricultural commodities to border and clearance delays in order to reduce the risks of food spoilage. Further, a vigorous work program in the WTO to strengthen implementation of existing WTO Agreements in developing countries, particularly the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Measures through the adoption of harmonized, science-based international standards,

⁵<https://ustr.gov/sites/default/files/TPEA-Preferences-Report.pdf>

can improve access to safe food worldwide. The United States is also a direct contributor to Aid for Trade and Enhanced Integrated Framework initiatives that support trade-related technical assistance.

II. U. S. Free Trade Agreements

Under Free Trade Agreements such as the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA-DR) and the Agreement's Trade Capacity Building Committee, USTR works to provide technical assistance and support to trading partners (Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua) to foster increased agriculture export opportunities and promote sustainable agriculture-led economic growth. USTR is also working through the CAFTA-DR Agriculture and SPS Committees and with other agencies, including USAID and USDA, to conduct bilateral and regional technical exchanges. CAFTA-DR projects include those that assist the private sector to take advantage of the trade agreement.

III. U.S. Trade Preference Programs and Other Trade Initiatives

Through U.S. trade initiatives such as the U.S.-Central Asia Trade and Investment Framework Agreement, which includes as Members all of the former Soviet Union Central Asian states, as well as Afghanistan and Pakistan as observers, USTR seeks to strengthen institutional capacity in the areas of external trade and investment and foster greater economic cooperation among Members through regional expert training programs, visitor exchanges, and other region-centric activities.

The United States also provides duty-free treatment to eligible goods from Haiti, with special access for textiles, under the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, the Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act, Trade Act of 2002, the Haitian Hemispheric Opportunity through Partnership Encouragement Act of 2006, the Food Conservation and Energy Act of 2008, and the Haiti Economic Lift Program of 2010. The United States is Haiti's number one export destination and employs this trade relationship in support of the Haitian economy. Haiti's garment sector is key to establishing broad-based growth and development.

The United States is also promoting Nepal's economic growth through a trade preference program and trade facilitation, supporting its efforts to move up the value chain in the export of food products. Nepal needs capacity building assistance to develop food processing capabilities that meet international requirements (to include SPS measures) to enable exports and develop customs and supply chain processes that facilitate a reliable cold chain for trade.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act has been a key element of U.S. economic policy in, and engagement with, sub-Saharan Africa. The United States also works to promote and enhance the trade and investment relationship with sub-Saharan Africa through sustained engagement in a range of other initiatives, such as the U.S.-East African Community Trade and Investment Partnership, the Trade Africa Initiative, Trade and Investment Framework Agreements, and U.S. bilateral investment treaties.⁶ USTR helps to identify capacity-building work conducted by U.S. agencies for enforcement of transparent and science-based international food safety standards and regional harmonization of those standards. Through a range of capacity building initiatives, including some focused on food security such as Feed the Future,

⁶ Office of the United States Trade Representative. (2016, June). *2016 biennial report on the implementation of the African Growth and Opportunity Act*. <https://ustr.gov/about-us/policy-offices/press-office/reports-and-publications/2016/2016-biennial-report>

USAID bilateral programs, and technical assistance from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the United States is working with many African nations to improve agricultural productivity, enhance food security, meet sanitary and phytosanitary standards, improve market conditions in Africa, and improve competitiveness of African food and other agricultural products.

Organization and Structure

Multiple regional and functional offices implement USTR's food security efforts. As lead of an interagency process, USTR coordinates trade policy and efforts to increase funding for trade capacity building initiatives in support of U.S. trade agreements and initiatives.

Impact and Sustainability

USTR leads the development of trade policy and coordinates efforts to improve the effectiveness of trade-related development assistance worldwide and to increase funding for trade-related economic growth programs, including U.S. government trade capacity building programs to implement multilateral agreements and bilateral trade initiatives and U.S. government tariff preference programs administered by USTR, such as the Generalized System of Preferences, African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Caribbean Basin Initiative, the Haitian Hemispheric Opportunity through Partnership Encouragement Act, and the Haiti Economic Lift Program Act.⁷

These agreements and programs have been a valuable and effective part of America's development of trade relations with the beneficiary countries. They have helped promote economic growth through trade, and in doing so made a contribution to the larger effort to alleviate poverty and reduce hunger in the developing world. They are likely to retain this valuable role through the next decade for many beneficiary countries, particularly the least-developed countries.⁸

Resources Requested and Budget Table

USTR conducts the activities identified in the narrative as principal trade advisor, negotiator, and spokesperson on trade issues for the United States, as USTR leads U.S. trade negotiations and oversees the development and coordination of U.S. international trade, commodity, and direct investment policy. Funding is not directly assigned to strategy implementation from our appropriated funds for FY 2017.

⁷ <https://ustr.gov/issue-areas/trade-development>

⁸ <https://ustr.gov/sites/default/files/TPEA-Preferences-Report.pdf>



U.S. African Development Foundation (USADF) Global Food Security Implementation Plan

U.S. African Development Foundation Overview

The U.S. African Development Foundation (USADF) is the only foreign affairs agency working solely in Africa, directing grants to African-owned and Africa-led community groups at the grassroots level to unlock community constraints to poverty reduction. Over 70 percent of USADF's projects are focused on the full agriculture value chain of sourcing, processing, increasing nutrition and dietary diversity, creating jobs, and generating income by supporting agriculture opportunities for smallholder farmers, agricultural cooperatives, associations, and community groups. USADF complements, collaborates, and extends Feed the Future's reach by working directly with the most vulnerable and marginalized African farmers and communities. USADF manages approximately 20 country offices across the continent led by native Africans.

Technical, Programmatic, and/or In-kind Contributions to the Global Food Security Strategy

USADF is successfully programming grants directly to African farm cooperatives and groups. Our approach invests in African-led solutions to remove constraints to increased productivity and job creation, expanding access to food and reducing poverty. The average USADF grant is \$180,000, but USADF's reach and impact is measurable because these funds are direct with standardized organizational training and financial management built into our agreements.

Africa is changing, and USADF is on the frontier, supporting African solutions to create pathways to prosperity. We are working with African communities in fragile and post-conflict areas throughout the Sahel, empowering ethnic and religious minorities, improving the lives of at-risk youth and women, and creating opportunities for those often left behind, including the disabled. Bringing the voice of the African farmer and those underserved populations to the Feed the Future field and Washington discussions is one of the key items on which USADF prides itself. USADF represents the voice of:

- **Smallholder Farmers** are the backbone of economic activity on the Continent, contributing more than half of its gross domestic product (GDP) and comprising nearly 70 percent of its labor force. They face enormous challenges in securing land rights; accessing agriculture technology, farm inputs, and capital; and entering functioning markets.
- **Youth** between 15 and 30 years represent a population across Africa that USADF is targeting because of the need for jobs and entrepreneurship opportunities for upwards of 200 million youth.
- **Women and Girls** often bear the brunt of extreme poverty. They face challenges in education, property rights, and economic opportunity. They are often victims of violence and cultural discrimination. Given the right opportunities, women entrepreneurs can lead the way out of poverty for themselves, their children, and their communities.

- **Recovering and Nomadic Communities** are populations facing hardships created by external factors, from conflict to natural disasters. These communities are eager to restore normal life and work hard to achieve economic independence once opportunities are presented.
- **Capacity Building** is critical to help smallholder farmers overcome the enormous challenges they face, such as securing land rights; accessing agriculture technology, farm inputs, and capital; and entering functioning markets, and enable them to increase their productivity and spur job creation. USADF provides a specialized project design and capacity building activities are individualized for every project we fund. Our all-African USADF Technical Partner teams transform grassroots communities project ideas into a more detailed grant application and project proposal guiding each grantee group through the design process with special consideration toward the project’s needs, priorities, and proposed solutions. To support the groups own management of this process, USADF Technical Partner teams provide work planning and training in governance, procurement, and financial management—specifically bookkeeping to develop greater transparency and accountability and monitoring and evaluation. Together these efforts help the groups develop a more profitable, professional, and stronger enterprise orientation to their agricultural efforts. Only when the design is complete and the supporting documents are approved do the Technical Partners then take part in representing the applicant during the USADF Washington final compliance review and grant authorization processes. The approved application then becomes a formal grant agreement document and federal funds needed to support the project budget are obligated. Documentation includes a market assessment, technical assessment, and environmental assessment; financial reporting and accountability assessments; and various other legal due diligence documents. This process of transferring the skills of project design, development, and implementation to each grantee is the model of true capacity building and ownership.
- **Addressing fragility** is at the core of USADF’s mission to serve African communities that are the most fragile, vulnerable, and underserved. The demand for the Agency is increasing as a greater number of insecure communities are hearing of its work. The growing insecurity reaches into several areas, including geographic areas that are risky, conflict-prone, drought-torn, reliant upon food aid, and extremely energy-impooverished. USADF supports a range of targeted agriculture programming from desert riverbed farming with nomads in Mali and pastoralists in Lake Turkana, Kenya to working with the disabled on husbandry in Benin and horticulture with religious minorities in Zanzibar. In Liberia, USADF works diligently on agriculture projects in some of the most Ebola-stricken areas. Many of our grantees were indirectly impacted as a result of the local and national government shut downs, delaying some projects for months. However, we are now successfully implementing agriculture programming and working with our interagency colleagues to expand our programming in Guinea with poor farmers due to the lack of income generation for many vulnerable communities.

Organization and Structure

- **Country-driven, African-led development** – USADF’s model relies on Africans serving as the centerpiece of our programming, strategies, and success. USADF country offices across the continent are led by an African Country Program Coordinator and an African Technical Partner team native to each of the respective countries. Of the 19 current Feed the Future focus countries, USADF reports into the Feed the Future Monitoring System on eight (Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia) of the 12 African Feed the Future countries, and satellite

programming in Ethiopia related to food security and energy poverty. USADF works at the intervention level where many of the investments made at the grassroots level help to inform the local, state, and country government strategy.

- USADF reports on each country's total agriculture programming, not the Feed the Future-specific value chains or targeted regions. Based on the call in the GFSA to establish and deepen linkages with other Federal departments and agencies, USADF intends to strengthen partnerships with USAID's mission teams to synchronize trainings for efficiency in cost and time. Additionally, USADF's current data collection is not based on household data and will be strengthened by using USAID support in the field as it relates to the collection of this and other baseline data. The majority of USADF grants focus on assisting producer groups achieve both Objective 1 (Inclusive and sustainable agricultural-led economic growth) and Objective 2 (Strengthen resilience among people and systems).

Impact and Sustainability

- USADF impacts over 1,500,000 people in underserved communities. Its innovative grants program promotes African-originated solutions and is implemented through a network of local development service providers. All USADF grants include specific objectives, activities, and inputs to help producer groups develop stronger internal organization capabilities and better enterprise business practices. These skills, combined with improved agricultural production improvements, help move the groups toward more consistent profitability and sustainable operations.
- USADF grants are helping grassroots communities overcome the challenges of hunger and extreme poverty by managing an overall portfolio of \$113 million in new local economic activities that produce stable jobs and better incomes. People use this increased income to access more food, make improvements to their housing, and provide greater educational opportunities and basic healthcare for their children. Increases in agriculture productivity, improved yields, and cash crops translate to less food aid dependence and a transition from resilience to food secure communities. In addition, by supporting the construction of agricultural infrastructure, USADF is increasing access to local and regional markets for smallholder farmers, cooperatives, and entrepreneurs. For example:
 - USADF promotes market-led approaches to reducing poverty, hunger, and malnutrition, such as by promoting private sector investment by working with African cooperatives and associations on building the infrastructure to source, process, and market products locally and regionally. USADF has internally restructured our grant portfolio to support resilience and growth groups for the targeted objectives of ensuring resilient local communities and building their capacity to grow their businesses beyond the community.
 - USADF's capacity building programs are individualized and integrate a range of basic literacy and finance (bookkeeping) into advanced processing and training techniques to further various value chains and advance climate smart agricultural approaches.
 - To ensure all programs are achieving impact, USADF uses rigorous monitoring and evaluation techniques—including internal audits on all projects over \$100,000—as well as rigorous benchmarks prior to disbursement of each grant, measurement of impact-level indicators in target areas, and required monitoring for every activity during and up to two years after the project's completion.
 - USADF projects often prioritize nutrition and diversifying the uses of various agricultural products. For example, some projects support fisheries and innovative ways of using fish

for producing highly nutritious fishmeal for pregnant women and children. By facilitating African ingenuity and innovation for products that support positive nutrition outcomes, USADF advances the 1,000 Days targets for scaling up the 10 proven nutrition interventions highlighted in the 2013 Lancet Series on Maternal and Child Nutrition. Because these interventions have the most impact in the first 1,000 days of life, USADF will target its nutrition interventions on pregnant and lactating women and children under two.

- o USADF will continue to strengthen its interagency ties in the field and in Washington in order to advance the voices of African farmers in promotion of value chains and countries that have not been identified as Feed the Future target countries. This dialogue allows for country ownership and the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) process to filter into the overall U.S. agriculture objective of achieving maximum impact and long-term agriculture sustainability globally.

USADF funding represents the FY 2017 request levels as described in the FY 2017 USADF CBJ. Please see the CBJ for further details please see <http://www.usadf.gov/cbj/>

Resources Requested and Budget Table

U.S. African Development Foundation	Estimated FY17 Financial Contribution (\$000s)	Narrative Explanation
U.S. African Development Foundation	\$21,000	USADF’s Feed the Future Request



U.S. Geological Survey

Global Food Security Implementation Plan

U.S. Geological Survey Overview

The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) contributes to the Global Food Security Strategy in its role as a long-standing implementing partner of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). Activities include integration of agro-climatological information into Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET) guidance for effective response to emergency food security needs, as well as contributions to resilience initiatives in West and East Africa. By characterizing agro-climatological conditions, land use, and resource conservation practices in the past, present, and future, USGS constructs the evidence base necessary to accurately describe potential and realized risks posed by climate variability and climate change. Without such an evidence base, climate-smart approaches to increase sustainable productivity and improve proactive risk reduction cannot be implemented. USGS work supports all three Objectives of the Global Food Security Strategy Results Framework.

Technical, Programmatic, and/or In-kind Contributions to the Global Food Security Strategy

- Under a series of interagency agreements with USAID's Office of Food for Peace (FPP), USGS has supported FEWS NET since the 1980s by applying its expertise with satellite remote sensing, modeling, and geospatial methods to characterize climate variability and climate change in countries with sparse and late reporting surface instrument networks.
- USGS assists FEWS NET food security analysts in the interpretation of the agro-climatological significance of anomalous climatic events so that potential impacts can be factored into food security assessments and scenario development.
- USGS engages local experts to serve as full time FEWS NET regional and country scientists alongside their counterpart FEWS NET food security analysts in countries where FEWS NET has a presence. These scientists are able to give close, custom support in the use of observational and forecast products. They can also reach back to colleagues at science centers and universities in the U.S.
- FEWS NET regional and country scientists routinely organize workshops and training sessions for their counterparts in national ministries of agriculture and meteorological services. These activities build and update national capacity to use FEWS NET agro-climatological monitoring data and software tools.
- USGS leads a monthly review of seasonal climate forecasts, in partnership with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, for the development of the agro-climatological working assumptions necessary to project food security conditions eight months ahead in FEWS NET countries.

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

Organization and Structure

- The USGS Earth Resources Observation and Science Center in South Dakota leads FEWS NET agro-climatology activities, under an interagency agreement with FFP. A USGS cooperative agreement with the University of California, Santa Barbara brings in the expertise of the Climate Hazards Group there and makes possible the engagement of FEWS NET regional and country scientists. The USGS Earth Resources Observation and Science Center integrates important FEWS NET scientific and technical contributions by the NOAA Climate Prediction Center in College Park, Maryland; the NOAA Physical Sciences Division in Boulder, Colorado; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, Maryland; and the University of Maryland. NOAA and NASA have their own interagency agreements with FFP for FEWS NET support.
- The USAID East Africa Regional Program engages USGS support for PREPARED using the FFP interagency agreement.
- The USAID West Africa Regional Program engages USGS support for RISE using an interagency agreement that is separate from the one FFP has for FEWS NET.

Impact and Sustainability

- To promote impact and sustainability of its agro-climatological activities in FEWS NET countries, USGS (in partnership with the University of California, Santa Barbara) leverages its network of regional and country scientists, as well as a unique suite of software tools and web mapping services, to expand national and regional climate services in food insecure areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. USGS helps national meteorological services and other partner institutions improve their agro-climatological forecasting and monitoring capabilities. This empowers these nations to better anticipate and mitigate weather-driven shocks to the food system.
- USGS FEWS NET capabilities ally with efforts of the USAID-NASA SERVIR program to build the capacity of regional institutions in Africa and Asia to use earth observations and geospatial methods to monitor agro-climatological conditions in support of food security assessments.

- USGS builds climate baselines and identifies hot spots of change to be used with vulnerability index mapping to construct future scenarios, develop adaptation options, and inform climate change policy decisions made by East African Community member states.
- USGS provides RISE with geographic data on the land use, land cover, vegetation, soils, topography, land productivity, and general patterns of soil, water, and conservation practices by assembling best available data and producing new thematic maps to provide valuable information on these themes. The results provide an evidence base for selection of priority local administrative units within the RISE focus zones and to begin the process of targeting specific areas for scaling up best practices going forward.

Resources Requested and Budget Table

	Estimated FY 2017 Financial Contribution (\$000s)	Narrative Explanation
FEWS NET	\$3,357	Funds provided by USAID Office of Food for Peace
PREPARED	\$500	Funds provided by USAID East Africa Regional Mission
RISE	\$110	Funds provided by USAID West Africa Regional Mission
SERVIR	\$32	Funds provided by NASA SERVIR
TOTAL	\$4,281	

*No USGS-appropriated funds support the Global Food Security Strategy

Annex 2. Index of Global Food Security Act Strategy Requirements

Section of Global Food Security Act	Section and page of this strategy
<p>Section 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY OBJECTIVES; SENSE OF CONGRESS. (a) Statement Of Policy Objectives.—It is in the national interest of the United States to promote global food security, resilience, and nutrition, consistent with national food security investment plans, which is reinforced through programs, activities, and initiatives that—</p>	
<p>(1) place food insecure countries on a path toward self-sufficiency and economic freedom through the coordination of United States foreign assistance programs;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal and Objectives of the Strategy (p. 7) • Sustainability (p. 42)
<p>(2) accelerate inclusive, agricultural-led economic growth that reduces global poverty, hunger, and malnutrition, particularly among women and children;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1 (p. 12)
<p>(3) increase the productivity, incomes, and livelihoods of small-scale producers, especially women, by working across agricultural value chains, enhancing local capacity to manage agricultural resources effectively and expanding producer access to local and international markets;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal and Objectives of the Strategy (p. 7) • Objective 1 (p. 12)
<p>(4) build resilience to food shocks among vulnerable populations and households while reducing reliance upon emergency food assistance;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2 (p.17) • Complementary Results (Effective responses to emergency food security needs) (p. 33)
<p>(5) create an enabling environment for agricultural growth and investment, including through the promotion of secure and transparent property rights;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1 (p. 12) • Cross-cutting IR 5 (p. 29) • Land, marine, and resource tenure (p. 31)
<p>(6) improve the nutritional status of women and children, with a focus on reducing child stunting, including through the promotion of highly nutritious foods, diet diversification, and nutritional behaviors that improve maternal and child health;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 3 (p. 19)
<p>(7) demonstrably meet, align with and leverage broader United States strategies and investments in trade, economic growth, national security, science and technology, agriculture research and extension, maternal and child health, nutrition, and water, sanitation, and hygiene;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whole-of-Government Coordination (p. 38) • Science, Technology, and Innovation (p. 46) • Annex 3 (p. 108)
<p>(8) continue to strengthen partnerships between United States-based universities, including land-grant colleges, and universities and institutions in target countries and communities that build agricultural capacity; and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-cutting IR 6 (p. 31) • Partnerships (p. 43) • Science, Technology, and Innovation (p. 46)

<p>(9) ensure the effective use of United States taxpayer dollars to further these objectives.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Global Context (p. 1) • Partnerships (p. 43) • Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (p. 49)
<p>Section 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY OBJECTIVES; SENSE OF CONGRESS. (b) Sense Of Congress.—It is the sense of the Congress that the President, in providing assistance to implement the Global Food Security Strategy, should—</p>	
<p>(1) coordinate, through a whole-of-government approach, the efforts of relevant Federal departments and agencies to implement the Global Food Security Strategy;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whole-of-Government Coordination (p. 38) • Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (p. 49) • Annex 1 (p. 57)
<p>(2) seek to fully utilize the unique capabilities of each relevant Federal department and agency while collaborating with and leveraging the contributions of other key stakeholders; and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnerships (p. 43) • Annex 1 (p. 57)
<p>(3) utilize open and streamlined solicitations to allow for the participation of a wide range of implementing partners through the most appropriate procurement mechanisms, which may include grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other instruments as necessary and appropriate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnerships (p. 43)
<p>Section 5 COMPREHENSIVE GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY STRATEGY. (a) Strategy.—The President shall coordinate the development and implementation of a United States whole-of-government strategy to accomplish the policy objectives set forth in section 3(a), which shall—</p>	
<p>(1) set specific and measurable goals, benchmarks, timetables, performance metrics, and monitoring and evaluation plans that reflect international best practices relating to transparency, accountability, food and nutrition security, and agriculture-led economic growth, consistent with the policy objectives described in section 3(a);</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (p. 49)
<p>(2) establish clear and transparent selection criteria for target countries, communities, regions, and intended beneficiaries of assistance;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeting Approach (p. 35)
<p>(3) describe the methodology and criteria for the selection of target countries;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeting Approach (p. 35)
<p>(4) support and be aligned with country-owned agriculture, nutrition, and food security policy and investment plans developed with input from key stakeholders, as appropriate;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country and Local Ownership (p. 41) • Partnerships (p. 43)
<p>(5) support inclusive agricultural value chain development, with small-scale producers, especially women, gaining greater access to the inputs, skills, resource management capacity, networking, bargaining power, financing, and market linkages needed to sustain their long-term economic prosperity;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1 (p. 12) • Cross-cutting IR 1 (p. 23) • Cross-cutting IR 3 (p. 27) • Cross-cutting IR 6 (p. 31) • Sustainability (p. 42)

<p>(6) support improvement of the nutritional status of women and children, particularly during the critical first 1,000-day window until a child reaches 2 years of age and with a focus on reducing child stunting, through nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive programs, including related water, sanitation, and hygiene programs;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 3 (p. 19)
<p>(7) facilitate communication and collaboration, as appropriate, among local stakeholders in support of a multi-sectoral approach to food and nutrition security, to include analysis of the multiple underlying causes of malnutrition, including lack of access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 3 (p. 19) • Country and Local Ownership (p. 41)
<p>(8) support the long-term success of programs by building the capacity of local organizations and institutions in target countries and communities;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-cutting IR 5 (p. 29) • Cross-cutting IR 6 (p. 31) • Country and Local Ownership (p. 41) • Sustainability (p. 42)
<p>(9) integrate resilience and nutrition strategies into food security programs, such that chronically vulnerable populations are better able to build safety nets, secure livelihoods, access markets, and access opportunities for longer-term economic growth;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2 (p. 17) • Objective 3 (p. 19)
<p>(10) develop community and producer resilience to natural disasters, emergencies, and natural occurrences that adversely impact agricultural yield;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2 (p. 18)
<p>(11) harness science, technology, and innovation, including the research and extension activities supported by relevant Federal Departments and agencies and Feed the Future Innovation Labs, or any successor entities;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science, Technology, and Innovation (p. 46) • Annex 3 (p. 108)
<p>(12) integrate agricultural development activities among food insecure populations living in proximity to designated national parks or wildlife areas into wildlife conservation efforts, as necessary and appropriate;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-cutting IR 2 (p. 25)
<p>(13) leverage resources and expertise through partnerships with the private sector, farm organizations, cooperatives, civil society, faith-based organizations, and agricultural research and academic institutions;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country and Local Ownership (p. 41) • Partnerships (p. 43)
<p>(14) strengthen and expand collaboration between United States universities, including public, private, and land-grant universities, with higher education institutions in target countries to increase their effectiveness and relevance to promote agricultural development and innovation through the creation of human capital, innovation, and cutting edge science in the agricultural sector;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-cutting IR 6 (p. 31) • Partnerships (p. 43) • Science, Technology, and Innovation (p. 46)
<p>(15) seek to ensure that target countries and communities respect and promote land tenure rights of local communities, particularly those of women and small-scale producers;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-cutting IR 3 (p. 27) • Cross-cutting IR 5 (p. 29) • Land, marine, and resource tenure (p. 31)
<p>(16) include criteria and methodologies for graduating target countries and communities from assistance provided to implement the Global Food Security Strategy as such countries and communities meet the progress benchmarks identified pursuant to section 8(b)(4); and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeting Approach (p. 35)

<p>(17) demonstrably support the United States national security and economic interest in the countries where assistance is being provided.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Global Context (p. 1) • Annex 3 (p. 108)
<p>Section 5 COMPREHENSIVE GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY STRATEGY. (b) Coordination.—The President shall coordinate, through a whole-of-government approach, the efforts of relevant Federal departments and agencies in the implementation of the Global Food Security Strategy by—</p>	
<p>(1) establishing monitoring and evaluation systems, coherence, and coordination across relevant Federal departments and agencies;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (p. 49)
<p>(2) establishing linkages with other initiatives and strategies of relevant Federal departments and agencies; and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complementary results (p. 32) • Annex 3 (p. 108)
<p>(3) establishing platforms for regular consultation and collaboration with key stakeholders and the appropriate congressional committees.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whole-of-Government Coordination (p. 38)

Annex 3. Leveraging Other U.S. Government Strategies and Investments

The Global Food Security Strategy demonstrably meets, aligns with, and leverages the following *complementary* U.S. Government strategies, initiatives, and investments, especially in trade; economic growth; national security; science and technology; agriculture research and extension; maternal and child health; nutrition; and water, sanitation, and hygiene. This list is primarily comprised of complementary investments and does not include any investments that are included in the agency-specific implementation plans in Annex 1, nor does it include all *policies* relevant to the strategy.

Strategy or Investment	Linkage with the Global Food Security Strategy
Biodiversity Conservation Programs	Biodiversity is the foundation upon which healthy ecosystems are built. These ecosystems provide a number of key goods and services that support agriculture and food security such as soil formation, nutrient cycling, clean water, wild fisheries and other wild foods. This strategy recognizes the importance of biodiversity as the underpinning of healthy ecosystems upon which agriculture and food security rely and incorporates wild fisheries and ecosystem health into its holistic food security approach.
Global Climate Change Initiative	Through the Global Climate Change Initiative (GCCCI) and other climate-related U.S. Government programs, the United States integrates climate change considerations into relevant foreign assistance to foster low-carbon growth, promote sustainable and resilient societies, and reduce emissions from deforestation and land degradation. The Climate Change and Development Strategy (2012-2018) lays out USAID's strategy under the GCCCI to enable countries to accelerate their transition to climate-resilient, low emission sustainable economic development through: 1) dedicated climate change programming to address adaptation and mitigation, and 2) integration of climate change within other core development programs. Since the launch of the GCCCI, Executive Order 13677 on Climate Resilient International Development strengthened the U.S. Government's commitment to addressing climate change in all international development assistance. This strategy recognizes the need to integrate climate change adaptation and mitigation into food security programming.
Power Africa	Power Africa brings together technical and legal experts, the private sector, and governments from around the world to work in partnership to increase the number of people with access to power. Access to power is vital to facilitating inclusive agricultural-led economic growth (Objective 1 of this strategy) by helping small scale producers increase their productivity and improve efficiency throughout the value chain.

Strategy or Investment	Linkage with the Global Food Security Strategy
<p>Presidential Initiative on Combating Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated (IUU) Fishing and Seafood Fraud</p>	<p>In 2015, the Presidential Task Force on Combating IUU Fishing and Seafood Fraud released an Action Plan consisting of 15 “recommendations for the implementation of a comprehensive framework of integrated programs to combat IUU fishing and seafood fraud that emphasizes areas of greatest need.” The Action Plan articulates a path for the U.S. Government to improve the traceability of seafood supply chains and to assist foreign nations in building capacities to combat illegal fishing and strengthen the management of wild fisheries. Implementation of the Action Plan aims to safeguard global fisheries and their contribution to food security, nutrition, livelihoods, and national security. This strategy recognizes the importance of wild fisheries to food security and complements ongoing efforts by the U.S. Government by supporting improved wild fisheries management.</p>
<p>Presidential Policy Directive Six - Global Development</p>	<p>The directive recognizes that development is vital to U.S. national security and is a strategic, economic, and moral imperative for the United States. It calls for the elevation of development as a core pillar of American power and charts a course for development, diplomacy, and defense to mutually reinforce and complement one another in an integrated comprehensive approach to national security. It provides clear policy guidance to all U.S. Government agencies and enumerates our core development objectives. The directive emphasizes food security through the Feed the Future initiative, one of three presidential development initiatives.</p>
<p>Trade Africa</p>	<p>The Presidential Trade Africa initiative seeks to increase internal and intra-regional African trade and enhance economic ties between the U.S. and African markets. Trade Africa builds on the benefits of a duty-free market under the African Growth and Opportunity Act. U.S. Government global food security and Trade Africa programs jointly fund the Trade Hubs in Africa, which help deliver on shared goals of expanding and improving market access and trade opportunities.</p>
<p>Trade Capacity Building Programs</p>	<p>The U.S. Government’s trade capacity building programs help developing countries to strengthen economic policies, remove trade barriers, and build well-functioning economic, political, and legal institutions. As a result, trade capacity building programs help promote economic growth, reduce poverty, and sustain support for trade liberalization, all essential to achieving the goals of this strategy. In the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, Congress recognized the important role of trade capacity building in addressing the complexity of trade agreements by instructing the Administration to provide technical assistance on a range of issues including “customs and trade facilitation, sanitary and phytosanitary measures, technical barriers to trade, intellectual property rights, labor, and the environment,” which will help with the achievement of Objective 1 of this strategy.</p>
<p>U.S. Department of Labor International Labor Affairs Bureau (ILAB) Programs</p>	<p>International Labor Affairs Bureau (ILAB) Programs work to combat child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking through research, policy engagement, and technical cooperation to advance the elimination of these worker rights abuses. ILAB produces reports on the incidence and nature of child and forced labor and efforts underway to address these problems, supporting food security efforts to reduce child labor. ILAB also assists in the development and implementation of U.S. Government policy, and engages strategically with governments, business, labor, and civil society groups to implement models that work to reduce exploitive labor practices. The Department also funds projects using an integrated approach that helps children attend school and supports economic opportunities for adults so that families do not need to rely on their children's labor to meet basic needs.</p>

Strategy or Investment	Linkage with the Global Food Security Strategy
U.S. Global Development Policy	The U.S. Government has made clear that sustainable development is a long-term proposition, and progress depends importantly on the choices of political leaders and the quality of institutions in developing countries. Where leaders govern responsibly, set in place good policies, and make investments conducive to development, sustainable outcomes can be achieved. Where those conditions are absent, it is difficult to engineer sustained progress, no matter how good our intentions or the extent of our engagement. The policy emphasizes food security as a key driver of sustainable economic growth.
U.S. Global Strategy to Empower Adolescent Girls	The U.S. Global Strategy to Empower Adolescent Girls recognizes the specific needs of adolescent girls that are too frequently left unmet and unacknowledged. It points to the importance of including adolescent girls in development investments as beneficiaries and as participants in designing programs and achieving development outcomes. The U.S. Government implements the strategy by mainstreaming and integrating issues that impact adolescent girls across sectors. Through the strategy, the U.S. Government puts girls at the center of development and furthers efforts to integrate adolescent girls into development work across sectors. This strategy recognizes the importance of increasing and ensuring the access to adequate nutrition and access to skills and resources that lead to economic empowerment such as in the agriculture sector.
U.S. Government Global Health Initiative (GHI)	GHI is the U.S. Government’s approach to improving health in developing countries. This strategy will contribute to the health and nutrition targets of GHI including a reduction of child undernutrition by 30 percent across “assisted food-insecure countries.” GHI programs, including the U.S. President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), the President's Malaria Initiative (PMI), and investments in neglected tropical diseases will support the prevention and treatment of infectious diseases, nutrition management of infectious diseases, and strengthening of health systems, which are critical to achieving this strategy’s nutrition goals.
U.S. Government Global Nutrition Coordination Plan (2016-2021)	The U.S. Government Global Nutrition Coordination Plan will help deliver on the nutrition objective of this strategy by strengthening the impact of the many diverse nutrition investments across the U.S. Government through better communication, collaboration, and linking research to program implementation. Through coordination mechanisms, the U.S. Government will maximize its support to country-led programs; continue its global leadership and partnerships; and generate, share, and apply knowledge and evidence in the nutrition sector in order to accelerate progress toward shared nutrition goals. Consistent with the U.S. Government Nutrition Coordination Plan, we will leverage resources across sectors through this strategy to deliver on improved nutrition outcomes for vulnerable populations, especially women and children in developing countries.
U.S. National Security Strategy	The U.S. National Security Strategy emphasizes U.S. leadership in promoting food security, enhancing resilience, modernizing rural agriculture, reducing the vulnerability of the poor, and eliminating preventable child and maternal deaths as we drive progress toward an AIDS-free generation.

Strategy or Investment	Linkage with the Global Food Security Strategy
U.S. Strategy on Religious Leader and Faith Community Engagement	The U.S. Strategy on Religious Leader and Faith Community Engagement encourages the U.S. Government to develop and deepen relationships with religious leaders and faith communities as part of a broader effort to reach out to a diverse set of civil society actors. This strategy commits to leveraging the resources and expertise of faith-based organizations through partnership, given their vital role promoting sustainable development.
U.S. Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-based Violence Globally	The U.S. Government recognizes gender-based violence (GBV) as a devastating development problem that significantly interferes with the enjoyment of human rights and hinders the ability of all individuals to fully participate in and contribute to their families and communities and for societies to thrive—economically, politically, and socially. The overarching goal of GBV Strategy is to strengthen and marshal the U.S. expertise and capacity for the prevention of GBV, protection from GBV, and increased accountability to end impunity for GBV. The Strategy calls for: 1) Institutionalized coordination of GBV efforts; 2) Integration of GBV efforts into existing U.S. Government work; 3) Collection, analysis, and use data and research; and 4) Expansion of U.S. Government programming that addresses GBV. This strategy recognizes the negative impact of GBV on its goals, including the effect of GBV on women’s productivity along the agricultural value chain, as well as the potential to address GBV as part of its programs.
USAID Anticorruption Strategy	Corruption—the abuse of entrusted authority for private gain—remains a tremendous obstacle to political, social, and economic development, and efforts to reduce it need to be more fully integrated into USAID programs across all sectors. Corruption affects food security by widening the gap between rich and poor, deterring investment, and distorting markets. To combat corruption, our work will promote transparency and mutual accountability through more effective governance and institutions, a more reliable and predictable investment climate, and increased civil society and private sector engagement in local, national, and international decision-making and policy dialogues related to the agricultural sector.
USAID Development Credit Authority (DCA) - Partial Loan Guarantees	The U.S. Government implements Development Credit Authority (DCA) guarantees at USAID that reduce risk to generate additional lending to underserved markets and sectors. The DCA partial credit guarantee is designed to demonstrate the long-term commercial viability of lending in developing markets. One of the largest components of the USAID DCA portfolio is in support of Feed the Future and agriculture. The guarantee has been an important instrument to de-risk and mobilize private capital into agriculture, food security, and nutrition. DCA can be and has been used in strategic and creative ways to support financial inclusion across the agriculture value chain (e.g., municipal finance, insurance, leasing, trade, capital market development, savings, etc.).
USAID Education Programs	USAID education investments focus on improving reading skills in primary schools; strengthening higher education and workforce development programs; expanding access to education in regions witnessing crisis and conflict; and fostering innovation in education. These investments are vital to achieving the nutrition goals of the strategy given that a mother’s education is associated with better health and nutrition of her children. High-quality education also translates into research, product development, and a more vibrant agricultural innovation, which, in turn, drives productivity gains, economic growth, new market creation, and employment.

Strategy or Investment	Linkage with the Global Food Security Strategy
USAID Food for Peace Strategy (forthcoming)	This fall, Food for Peace (FFP) will publish a new ten-year strategy, which provides a programming framework for food assistance capturing the best of what FFP currently does, but challenging FFP and its partners to strive for greater impact, efficiency, and sustainability. There is clear alignment between this strategy and the new FFP strategy, particularly through FFP's \$350 million development food assistance portfolio. These programs, which are implemented as part of the U.S. Government's food security portfolio, already provide a platform for the U.S. Government's integrated resilience efforts. This strategy will also leverage FFP's Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET) mechanism to support evidence-based forecasting and analysis of the drivers of acute and chronic food insecurity. Finally, FFP implements the Emergency Food Security Program, envisioned as a strategic, complementary contribution to the overarching goal of this strategy.
USAID Land Tenure and Resource Management Programs	USAID works to improve land and resource governance and strengthen property rights for all members of society, especially women, by leveraging its expertise in law, economics, geospatial analytics, natural resource management, impact evaluations, and urban planning. This strategy recognizes the importance of land and marine tenure and governance and aims to integrate land, marine, and resource governance into food security policies, strategies, and programs.
USAID Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy (2014-2025)	The USAID Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy aims to improve nutrition to save lives, build resilience, increase economic productivity, and advance development. This strategy supports these goals through integrating nutrition into agricultural development projects and elevating the importance of progress towards its nutrition targets, including reduction of child stunting. Investments outlined in the USAID Nutrition Strategy will help deliver on the nutrition goals of this strategy.
USAID Strategy on Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance	The USAID Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance Strategy provides a framework to support the establishment and consolidation of inclusive and accountable democracies to advance freedom, dignity, and development. Support for democracy, human rights, and governance is vital to the pursuit of freedom and national security and is essential to achieve the Agency's and the United States Government's broader social and economic development goals.
USAID Water and Development Strategy (2013-2018)	The goal of USAID's Water and Development Strategy is to save lives and advance development through improvements in water supply, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) programs and through sound management and use of water for food security. This strategy highlights the importance of WASH for improvements in nutrition and calls for increased coordination of WASH and food security activities. In addition, the Strategy recognizes that sustainably and productively managing water for agriculture is critical to food security, improving livelihoods, and increasing resilience to changes in climate and variability.

Strategy or Investment	Linkage with the Global Food Security Strategy
<p>USDA’s Domestic Science, Technology, and Technical Assistance Programs</p>	<p>USDA supports many domestically-focused research, economics and statistics, voluntary technology transfer, technical assistance, extension, and information and teaching programs in which the knowledge and technology that is being developed and applied is frequently relevant to this strategy. For example, work in climate variability, nutrition, food safety and quality, animal and crop production and protection, and forestry and natural resources management will generally address many of the strategy’s priorities. USDA’s science and technology programs are intended to promote advances in U.S. food, agriculture, and forestry. However, USDA’s intra- and extra-mural research is frequently leveraged and improved by international partnerships or engagement in projects and proposals and enhances USDA’s voluntary technology transfer mission as well.</p>
<p>Young African Leaders Initiative</p>	<p>The Young African Leaders Initiative is a signature U.S. Government effort to support young African leaders as they spur growth and prosperity, strengthen democratic governance, and enhance peace and security across Africa. Young African Leaders Initiative will train a new generation of leaders in agriculture and health to improve food security and food security investments while empowering youth, as aligned with the goals of the Initiative.</p>

