

EVALUATING CURRENT U.S. GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY EFFORTS AND DETERMINING FUTURE U.S. LEADERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT AND FOREIGN
ASSISTANCE, ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, AND
INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

OF THE

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE**

ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

NOVEMBER 28, 2012

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

79-798 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2013

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

BARBARA BOXER, California	RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana
ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey	BOB CORKER, Tennessee
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland	JAMES E. RISCH, Idaho
ROBERT P. CASEY, Jr., Pennsylvania	MARCO RUBIO, Florida
JIM WEBB, Virginia	JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma
JEANNE SHAHEEN, New Hampshire	JIM DEMINT, South Carolina
CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, Delaware	JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia
RICHARD J. DURBIN, Illinois	JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
TOM UDALL, New Mexico	MIKE LEE, Utah

WILLIAM C. DANVERS, *Staff Director*

KENNETH A. MYERS, JR., *Republican Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
AND FOREIGN ASSISTANCE, ECONOMIC AFFAIRS,
AND INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland *Chairman*

ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey	BOB CORKER, Tennessee
CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, Delaware	MARCO RUBIO, Florida
RICHARD J. DURBIN, Illinois	JAMES E. RISCH, Idaho
TOM UDALL, New Mexico	JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma

CONTENTS

	Page
Cardin, Hon. Benjamin L., U.S. Senator from Maryland, opening statement ...	1
Lugar, Hon. Richard G., U.S. Senator from Indiana, opening statement	3
McKenna, Tjada, Deputy Coordinator for Development for Feed the Future, Bureau for Food Security, U.S. Agency for International Development, Washington, DC	6
Prepared statement	8
Responses to questions submitted for the record by Senator Benjamin L. Cardin	61
O'Brien, Paul, vice president for Policy and Campaigns, Oxfam America, Washington, DC	33
Prepared statement	36
Shrier, Jonathan, Acting Special Representative for Global Food Security, Deputy Coordinator for Diplomacy for Feed the Future, U.S. Department of State, Washington, DC	13
Prepared statement	14
Response to question submitted for the record by Senator Benjamin L. Cardin	59
Veillette, Dr. Connie A., independent consultant, senior adviser, Global Agri- cultural Development Initiative, Chicago Council on Global Affairs, Fairfax Station, VA	48
Prepared statement	50
Walsh, Conor, Tanzania Country Director, Catholic Relief Services, Baltimore, MD	40
Prepared statement	43
ADDITIONAL MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD	
Mercy Corps, prepared statement	58

**EVALUATING CURRENT U.S. GLOBAL FOOD
SECURITY EFFORTS AND DETERMINING
FUTURE U.S. LEADERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES**

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2012

U.S. SENATE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND FOREIGN ASSISTANCE, ECONOMIC AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,

Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Cardin, Casey, and Lugar.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN,
U.S. SENATOR FROM MARYLAND**

Senator CARDIN. Good morning. Let me welcome you all to the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on International Development and Foreign Assistance, Economic Affairs and International Environmental Protection. We have to work at shortening the title of that subcommittee. [Laughter.]

Let me thank, first, Senator Kerry for allowing the subcommittee to move forward on this very important hearing dealing with global food security.

And I want to acknowledge the extraordinary work that has been done by Senator Lugar, a longtime champion on this issue, and we thank him very much for his leadership. He has been a tireless champion for the hungry, the poor, and the most vulnerable in the global community. His advocacy on this issue and so many policies that seek to change the world for the better will be sorely missed, and I want to again thank him for the work that he has done globally on this issue and the role that the United States has played.

His cochampion in the Senate has been Senator Casey, and I think Senator Casey will be joining us a little bit later on filing the Lugar-Casey Global Food Security Act. It was initially filed in 2008 and again in 2011 to promote U.S. leadership on this issue.

Last Thursday, most Americans sat down at our dinner tables with our families and enjoyed a great Thanksgiving meal, but that night, 870 million people around the world went to bed hungry and undernourished. Now, quite frankly, that is an improvement. A year ago, that number was 1 billion. So we have made progress. But global hunger remains an enormous problem. The Millennium

Development goal of halving the prevalence of undernourishment in the developing world by 2015 is within reach.

In 2009, Secretary Clinton said we have the resources to give every person in the world the tools they need to feed themselves and their children. So the question is not whether we can end hunger, it is whether we will end it.

Ending global hunger and poverty is a monumental task. Addressing the challenges posed by global food insecurity requires a multifaceted approach. It requires strengthening the strategic coordination to align the efforts of the private sector, civil society, aid recipient governments, and multilateral institutions. It requires investments in cutting-edge agricultural and sustainability technologies. It requires policy changes by developing country governments to correct land tenure and natural resource management, especially water resources. And it requires a commitment to gender integration and the development of programs to support women farmers.

The more I look at this issue, the more I start to appreciate that this is solvable, but we have to deal with the land reforms. We have to deal with gender issues. We have to deal with water management. Those matters are critically important in the developing world.

Through our Feed the Future initiatives and the G8's New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition, I believe we are making great strides in global food security.

Feed the Future focuses on small farmers, particularly women. It helps countries to develop their agricultural sectors to generate opportunities for broad-based economic growth and trade which in turn supports increased incomes and helps reduce hunger.

G8's New Alliance is an effort to leverage private sector support for agricultural development and food security and includes commitments of \$3 billion in private investments from 45 companies. But we must make sure that these investments are not at the expense of small, local businesses addressing hunger in their own community.

What we are trying to do much bigger than simply giving food to the poor and hungry. We are trying to change the economics by transforming how people farm and what people eat. Ensuring that our world's most poor and hungry have access to food is important, but as we see right here in America, access to food does not guarantee proper nutrition. Studies show that a child's entire life is shaped by whether or not they receive proper nutrition during the first 1,000 days from pregnancy to age 2. This has a profound impact on children's ability to grow, to learn, and to contribute to their society. That is why addressing undernutrition is key to both Feed the Future and the President's Global Health Initiative.

But proper nutrition is not just important to individual health. It is critical to the long-term health and success of a nation. Poor nutrition results in a less healthy and less productive workforce, hampering economic development and growth, and ultimately perpetuates the cycle of hunger and poverty for another generation.

So by investing in agriculture and nutrition, we are investing in prosperity and not just other people's prosperity but our own. In our globalized economy, if developing countries do better, we do

better. We also do better when we make smarter decisions about how to spend our critical foreign assistance dollars. After all, as USAID Administrator Shah has said, it is 8 to 10 times more expensive to feed people when they are in crisis than to help farmers feed themselves and build better resources.

As you are all aware, Mali, one of the Feed the Future focus countries is in the midst of an internal political conflict which has exacerbated a food crisis brought on by severe drought in the region. The situation in Mali highlights how the tragic convergence of conflict, climate, and economic shocks can have dire consequences on human and food security.

In regions that are prone to these challenges, such as the Horn of Africa, we must build resiliency and sustainability into our development programs. One of the ways we can do this is through Feed the Future. With world population expected to exceed 9 billion by 2050, transforming how people farm and what people eat is the only way, I believe, to ensure food security for future generations. An end to global hunger and poverty will not happen tomorrow, but if we continue to coordinate with our global partners, harness the power of the private sector, and use our development aid in the most effective and transparent way, we have a much better chance of favorable outcomes.

I look forward to hearing from the witnesses today about the successes and challenges that we face in global food security initiatives and the impact of private sector and NGO's coordination in ending the plight on the world's poor and hungry.

I will now yield to Senator Lugar for his opening comments and once again congratulate him for his leadership on this issue on behalf of the United States.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD G. LUGAR,
U.S. SENATOR FROM INDIANA**

Senator LUGAR. Well, I join the chairman in welcoming our distinguished witnesses and thank him for holding this hearing.

Our committee has given frequent attention to global food security and I have had the pleasure to work with friends who are committed to this issue, including Senator Casey, who joined me in offering the Global Food Security Act in the last Congress.

In past hearings, I have asserted that overcoming global hunger by addressing shortcomings in worldwide agricultural productivity and marketing should be one of the "starting points" for U.S. foreign policy. This sometimes surprises people given all the risks and dangers faced by our country in many regions throughout the world. But I have not advanced this concept casually.

Nothing is more elemental to human experience and development than having access to adequate and reliable sources of food. We live in a world where nearly a billion people suffer from chronic food insecurity. Tens of thousands of people die each day from causes related to malnutrition. Experts advise us that chronic hunger leads to decreased child survival, impaired cognitive and physical development, and weaker immune system function, including resistance to HIV/AIDS.

These grave humanitarian consequences are sufficient cause for us to strengthen our efforts on global food security. But we also

know that few humanitarian problems, if any, have a greater capacity to generate political instability and conflict. Hungry people are desperate people and desperation can sow the seeds of radicalism. Our diplomatic efforts to maintain peace will be far more difficult wherever food shortages contribute to extremism, conflict, or mass migration. Our hopes for economic development in poor countries will continually be frustrated if populations are unable to feed themselves.

As a farmer and a member of the Agriculture Committee for 36 years, I have followed closely developments in agriculture technology and productivity. My concern has been that despite the past advancements of the Green Revolution, agriculture productivity is not advancing fast enough to meet the needs of a world that is expected to exceed 9 billion people by 2050. Demand for food also will be intensified by increasing affluence among the enormous populations of China, India, and other emerging industrial powers. The problems of volatile energy costs, water scarcity, climate change, and more resilient pests threaten to severely limit food production in many vulnerable regions.

The global response to this threat has been insufficient. World-wide funding for agricultural assistance declined sharply after the 1980s and has not recovered despite some recent progress. The trade policies of both developed and developing countries too often have focused on protecting domestic farmers rather than creating well-functioning international markets.

My view of the importance of global food security to the United States is motivated not solely by problems we can solve, but also by the economic and foreign policy opportunities available to us. We produce more abundantly than any other country and we are on the cutting edge of research and farming techniques that could literally save hundreds of millions of people in the coming decades. Our farmers, agricultural businesses, NGOs, and research universities should be at the center of global efforts to meet burgeoning food demand.

Following the President's pledge at the 2008 G8 summit of \$3.5 billion over 3 years toward global food security, the administration established the Feed the Future Initiative. Since its inception, the program has received nearly \$1 billion annually from the Congress, and we anticipate continued budget requests at this level. Today we have an opportunity for an update on this Initiative, as well as a chance to think more comprehensively about a larger U.S. role in global food security.

I will be interested to learn from our witnesses the degree to which Feed the Future is demonstrating tangible results in reducing hunger. Is it effectively supporting smallholder farmers, especially women, by encouraging access to land, new technology, and agriculture extension services? Additionally, what market development and access opportunities are now available to these farmers, and what support are they receiving from their own governments which have partnered with the United States through Country Investment Plans? Is the initiative successfully engaging our own farmers and our agriculture research institutions to achieve greater productivity and higher yields in countries struggling with food insecurity?

I also look forward to the recommendations of our distinguished second panel on improving Feed the Future and on addressing any shortcomings. More broadly, how should the United States structure its future global food security efforts to maximize agricultural productivity and support the efforts of U.S. institutions?

I look forward to our discussion.

Senator CARDIN. Thank you, Senator Lugar. There is no question that this committee and this Congress places a strong priority on international global areas with food security. Feed the Future is a relatively new initiative that has strong support here in Congress, as you pointed out, by the amount that has been appropriated every year.

One of the most important responsibilities of this committee is oversight. We strongly support the initiative, but we want to make sure the moneys are being used most appropriately, leveraged in the best way, and I hope today's hearing will allow us to focus on ways that we can improve the U.S. involvement on global food security.

With that, let me call on our first panel. I am pleased to have with us Tjada McKenna, the Deputy Coordinator for Development for Feed the Future at USAID's Bureau for Food Security. Ms. McKenna coordinates implementation of Feed the Future across the U.S. Government, oversees its execution, and reports on results, and leads engagement with the external community to ensure that food security remains high on the development agenda.

Ms. McKenna joined USAID from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation where she served as the senior program adviser in the Agricultural Development Program. In this role, she developed grants and strategies to effectively link smallholder farmers in Africa and South Asia to markets.

Ms. McKenna earned a B.A. from Harvard College in government and an M.B.A. from Harvard Business School.

We are also joined by Jonathan Shrier, Acting Special Representative for Global Food Security and Deputy Coordinator for Diplomacy for Feed the Future at the Department of State. Mr. Shrier leads diplomatic efforts to advance the U.S. Government's global hunger and food security initiative with particular focus on major donor and strategic partner countries, as well as multilateral institutions such as G8 and G20.

Mr. Shrier previously served on the Secretary of State's policy planning staff of the National Security Council and the National Economic Council and at the U.S. States Department of Energy where he helped to design and establish the Energy and Climate Partnership of the Americas. As a Career Foreign Service officer, Mr. Shrier handled international development investment issues, in addition to energy, environment, and agricultural policy initiatives.

Mr. Shrier holds a degree from the National Defense University, University of London, London School of Economics, and Dartmouth.

We will start with Ms. McKenna.

**STATEMENT OF TJADA MCKENNA, DEPUTY COORDINATOR
FOR DEVELOPMENT FOR FEED THE FUTURE, BUREAU FOR
FOOD SECURITY, U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
WASHINGTON, DC**

Ms. MCKENNA. Thank you. Good morning, Chairman Cardin, Senator Lugar, and members of the subcommittee. Thank you for inviting me to speak with you today. It is an honor to meet with you about the U.S. Government's leadership to reduce global hunger, poverty, and undernutrition through the Feed the Future Initiative.

As the initiative's Deputy Coordinator for Development, I will be focusing on Feed the Future's development efforts, while my counterpart at the State Department, Jonathan Shrier, will address diplomacy efforts.

Recently we issued the first-ever Feed the Future progress report in which we were able to highlight advances to date in our efforts. We are proud to report that in our short life we have directly helped more than 6.6 million households to improve agricultural productivity, and we have reached nearly 2 million food producers with improved practices to support higher crop yields and increased incomes.

In addition, Feed the Future supported efforts have reached nearly 9 million children with nutrition interventions. But there is so much more to do, as you both have stated.

The U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization recently released a report estimating that there are now almost 870 million hungry people in the world, 98 percent of them living in developing countries. While these numbers have adjusted down from recent estimates, it is still 870 million too many people. With the growing population and ever fewer resources, the time to continue to act is now.

This is exactly what President Obama intended when he asked global leaders to join him in confronting global hunger and poverty at the 2009 G8 summit in L'Aquila, Italy. There President Obama pledged \$3.5 billion over 3 years to address this challenge, building upon efforts of the previous administration to secure funding for an increased focus on global agriculture particularly in Africa. This set the foundation for what eventually came to be called Feed the Future.

The U.S. Government's pledge in L'Aquila leveraged more than \$18 billion in additional support from other donors, signaling a vastly increased global commitment to significantly reduce the number of people living in extreme poverty and suffering from hunger and undernutrition. These commitments could not have come at a more important time. For more than 2 decades, funding for agriculture had been on the decline, leaving the world ill-prepared for the challenges of growing food insecurity. In 2007 and 2008, soaring food prices set the world on edge, but they also convinced global leaders that it was finally time to do things differently.

Feed the Future expands the United States impact as a political and moral force in the fight against global hunger and poverty. With a focus on smallholder farmers, particularly women, we support countries in developing their agriculture sectors as a catalyst

to generate opportunities for broad-based economic growth which can support increased incomes and help reduce hunger.

Agricultural growth is the key to reducing poverty in the developing world. Seventy-five percent of the world's poor live in rural areas in developing countries where most people's livelihoods rely on agriculture. Recent studies from the World Bank established that growth in agriculture is on average at least twice as effective in reducing poverty as growth in other sectors.

Feed the Future complements our joint commitment to providing food aid and other humanitarian assistance during times of crisis by promoting a lasting solution to hunger through a long-term commitment to agricultural growth. Feed the Future also integrates nutrition interventions to ensure that our investments lead to both improved agriculture and better health and support conflict mitigation and good governance efforts that are required to achieve the goals of reducing poverty and undernutrition.

When Feed the Future began, the President asked that we do things differently to get better results for every taxpayer dollar invested in this effort. We have taken that directive to heart and are proud of the many ways we are working toward that goal.

First, we are improving collaboration within the U.S. Government, with partner countries, with other donor countries, and with stakeholders in civil society and the private sector. It is worth noting that this is the first time we have effectively connected all U.S. Government efforts targeted at global hunger and food security. In fiscal year 2011, 5 of our 10 interagency partners reported into the Feed the Future monitoring system, enabling us to create a governmentwide picture of the results of our combined efforts that are reflected in our progress report.

Second, we are focusing on women and smallholder farmers as part of the solution and continuing to work toward equitable land rights in the areas in which we work.

Third, we are working hand in glove with our global health colleagues to better integrate our agriculture and nutrition efforts.

Fourth, we are focusing on research as a key to transforming rural agriculture economies centered on an approach that encourages sustainable and equitable management of land, water, fisheries, and other resources and takes into account the anticipated effects of climate change.

And fifth and most importantly, we are measuring results and are holding ourselves accountable through rigorous monitoring and evaluation.

Collectively, these efforts are meant to build upon the long-term resilience of communities so that they are able to adapt to and recover from the shocks and stresses and move forward with enhanced livelihoods. While we cannot prevent future shocks such as drought from occurring, we can help make them less devastating while ensuring the continuation of long-term growth.

Feed the Future faces several challenges: ensuring productive interagency and donor collaboration; more effective integration of agriculture and nutrition; and the threats posed by global climate change, to name some examples. Each of these requires considerable effort and time to succeed, and we accept that change does not come easily or quickly to any sector. We have been asked to do

things differently and we are. As time moves on, we expect to execute our development interventions even more efficiently to the benefit of millions of smallholder farmers and families worldwide.

In closing, I would like to thank the Congress for its strong support of this vital initiative and note that we greatly appreciate your continued support of our work. Feed the Future is more than an initiative. It is part of the lasting architecture of our development platform and lays the groundwork for us to be more effective, more efficient, and more successful in the work that we do. Feed the Future is bigger than any one agency or administration. It is part of our global legacy.

Thank you for inviting us to speak with you today. I welcome any questions, comments, and suggestions you may have.

[The prepared statement of Ms. McKenna follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF TJADA MCKENNA

Good morning Chairman Cardin, Ranking Member Corker, and members of the subcommittee. Thank you for inviting me to speak with you today. I am pleased and honored to be able to talk to you about the important role that the U.S. Government is playing to help reduce global hunger and poverty through the Feed the Future initiative, the challenges we face, and our progress thus far.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) recently released a report estimating that there are now approximately 870 million hungry people in the world, 98 percent of them living in developing countries. While these numbers have adjusted down from recent estimates, it is still 870 million too many. Compounding this problem, research indicates that by the year 2050, the world's population is projected to increase by 38 percent to more than 9 billion, which, combined with changing diets, will require up to a 60-percent increase in food production to feed us all. We confront these challenges in a world that has less land and fewer resources available for production.

Against this backdrop, at the 2009 G8 summit, President Obama pledged to provide at least \$3.5 billion over 3 years—between fiscal year 2010 and fiscal year 2012—to attack the root causes of global hunger and poverty through accelerated agricultural development and improved nutrition. The U.S. Government's commitment leveraged more than \$18 billion in additional support from other donors, creating the financial capacity to significantly reduce the number of people living in extreme poverty and suffering from hunger and undernutrition. This commitment to the importance of agriculture in sustainably reducing hunger and poverty could not have come at a more important time. For more than two decades, funding for agriculture had been on the decline, leaving the world ill-prepared to cope with the growing challenge of food insecurity. In 2007 and 2008, soaring prices for basic staples coupled with shortsighted policy responses, like export bans and panic buying, had set the world on edge. But it also convinced global leaders that it was finally time to do things differently.

In September 2012, the U.S. Government met President Obama's \$3.5 billion pledge. In fact, we have now obligated \$3.786 billion and disbursed \$1.134 billion against the President's pledge. And while we are proud of the United States leadership and commitment in this effort, there is still so much more to be done.

Feed the Future expands the United States impact as a political and moral force in the fight against global hunger and poverty. With a focus on smallholder farmers, particularly women, this initiative supports countries in developing their agriculture sectors as a catalyst to generate opportunities for broad-based economic growth and trade, which can support increased incomes and help reduce hunger. While we recognize the importance of providing food aid and other humanitarian assistance during crises to save lives and protect livelihoods, Feed the Future helps promote a lasting solution to hunger through a commitment to agricultural growth and other actions to prevent recurrent food crises. Feed the Future also integrates nutrition interventions to ensure that our investments lead to both improved agriculture and better health, and supports conflict mitigation and good governance efforts that are required to achieve the goals of reducing poverty and undernutrition.

When Feed the Future was launched, the President asked that we do things differently to get better results for every taxpayer dollar invested in this effort. We have taken that directive to heart, and are proud of the many ways we are working toward that goal.

Just last month, the administration released the first Feed the Future Progress Report and Scorecard, which present the progress achieved by Feed the Future from May 2009 through May 2012. The Report and Scorecard detail the strides that the initiative is making in research and development, leveraging private sector dollars, building capacity, and achieving key results to sustainably reduce hunger and poverty. The Progress Report shows that, by marshaling resources for food security and by improving the way we do development, Feed the Future aims to reduce the prevalence of poverty and the prevalence of stunted children under 5 years old by 20 percent in the geographic areas where we work.

We have already seen many successes. In fiscal year 2011 alone, Feed the Future helped 435,728 farmers in Bangladesh learn to apply deep fertilizer placement and urea briquettes, improving management practices on 244,605 hectares and leading to a 15-percent increase in rice yields. As a result, the country's Barisal division experienced its first-ever rice surplus. Globally, in fiscal year 2011 we directly benefited more than 6.6 million households, brought 2.4 million hectares of land under improved technologies or management practices, and increased investment in agricultural and rural loans by \$103 million.

COLLABORATION

We are improving coordination in many ways. Feed the Future resources are aligned with country-led priorities. Donors can achieve more effective and lasting results when they champion the development visions and efforts of partner countries' own governments and citizens. Feed the Future worked with other development partners to assist focus countries in creating and implementing their own multiyear Country Investment Plans (CIPs) for agricultural development, such as those under the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP). These plans are based on transparent and inclusive consensus-building processes, including engagement of the private sector, civil society and other stakeholders, and take into account the interests of women and other disadvantaged groups. In addition, these country-owned plans lay out priority areas, clear costing and projections of financial need, defined targets, and desired results.

Through Feed the Future, we are working hard to improve collaboration within the U.S. Government. Previous GAO reports have concluded that earlier U.S. Government efforts on food security lacked a cohesive interagency strategy. Much of Feed the Future's durability as a new model stems from the creation of an overarching whole-of-government strategy, embedded in the Feed the Future Implementation Guide, to combat food insecurity and undernutrition. Feed the Future has been successful in implementing that strategy, joining the resources and expertise of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), the U.S. Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, State and Treasury, the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), the U.S. African Development Foundation, the Peace Corps, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative. This is the first time that we have effectively connected all U.S. Government efforts targeted at global hunger and food security and underpinned our resources with rigorous systems to track performance. In fiscal year 2011, five of these agencies reported into the Feed the Future Monitoring System, enabling us to create a governmentwide picture of the results of our combined efforts.

Feed the Future is showing that interagency partnerships can work and be successful. As the initiative's Deputy Coordinator for Development, I work closely with my counterpart at the State Department, Deputy Coordinator for Diplomacy Jonathan Shrier, to ensure that all of the agencies involved are integrated into the initiative via a cohesive, coordinated strategy both here in Washington and on the ground in Feed the Future focus countries. For example, with over half of its total investment portfolio supporting food security, MCC's experience has helped guide Feed the Future's program design, particularly on land tenure and property rights, infrastructure, monitoring and evaluation, and gender integration. MCC and USAID are working closely to complement and build on each other's food security investments. In Ghana, for example, USAID will support three MCC-funded post-harvest Agribusiness Centers, benefiting about 3,000 farmers. And in Senegal, USAID will support MCC's investment in irrigated agriculture and roads by promoting value chains, soil management, access to credit, post-harvest facilities, capacity-training, quality standards, and marketing in the same geographical areas.

We know that neither the U.S. Government nor partner governments can do this work alone. Civil society organizations in donor and partner countries bring a wealth of ideas, energy, and resources to the fight against global food insecurity and undernutrition and are critical to the success of Feed the Future. Their work complements the work of governments, multilateral organizations, and the private sec-

tor—including program implementation, product delivery, advocacy, education, and even funding. We value our close relationship with these partners. This relationship was highlighted by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, who recently announced at a Feed the Future event that InterAction, an alliance of 198 U.S.-based organizations, has pledged more than \$1 billion of private, nongovernmental funds over the next 3 years to improve food security and nutrition worldwide. We look forward to working with them on key food security issues.

Likewise, the importance of the private sector’s role in food security cannot be overemphasized. The private sector brings the necessary investment and needed technology for countries, communities, and citizens to create opportunities for new businesses, stronger farms, and more vibrant markets. Our strategic alliances with the private sector align their core business interests with our development objectives. These “win-win” partnerships advance the impact of sustainable development and foster private sector-led growth in emerging markets, critical to reducing poverty, fighting hunger, and improving nutrition. The U.S. Government will further its partnership with the private sector through participation in the G8’s New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition, which has already mobilized more than \$3.5 billion in new private sector commitments from more than 70 African and international firms looking to expand their agriculture-related business across Africa. The U.S. Government will also mobilize private sector investments through its contribution to the World Bank-housed Global Agriculture and Food Security Program’s Private Sector Window, which offers loans, equity capital, and advisory services.

A FOCUS ON WOMEN AND SMALLHOLDER FARMERS

In addition to improving coordination within and across sectors, Feed the Future is doing development differently by integrating important cross-cutting issues in all of our work, for example, by focusing on women as part of the solution. Women play a vital role in advancing agricultural development and food security. They participate in all aspects of rural life—in paid employment, trade and marketing, as well as in tending crops and animals, collecting water and wood for fuel, and caring for family members. Yet women have less access than men to land, financing, production inputs, technical assistance, and other resources that could help them become better producers and providers for their families. The FAO estimates that if women had the same access to productive resources as men, they could increase farm yields by 20 to 30 percent, translating to enough food to feed an additional 150 million people. To better empower women agricultural producers to reach their full potential, Feed the Future promotes women’s leadership in agriculture, fosters policy changes that increase women’s land ownership, and strengthens their access to financial services. Through the initiative, female farmers are encouraged to adopt new agricultural technology aimed at increasing productivity and reducing unpaid work. To measure how well our investments are tracking against this ambitious goal, Feed the Future, in collaboration with the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative of Oxford University, launched the Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index in early 2012. The index is the first tool to measure women’s growing role in decision-making about agricultural production; their growing ownership of land, livestock, and other resources; their leadership in the community; and their control of time and income.

We also continue working toward equal, nondiscriminatory and secure land rights in the areas in which we work. Across the developing world, farmers, particularly smallholders, face challenges securing their rights to land and other natural resources. This may limit their ability to keep others off their land; limit their incentives to improve land or adopt new technologies; limit their ability to leverage resources most effectively; and hinder development of shared usage arrangements, for example, between herders and farmers. Around the world, weak land governance systems contribute to political, social, and economic instability. By formalizing the rights of land and resource users and by making land governance systems and institutions more accountable, accessible, and transparent, positive incentives to conserve resources and put them to productive and sustainable use will be created. Under Feed the Future, we encourage governments and private sector investors to recognize and respect the legitimate rights of individuals, communities, and legal entities, whether held formally or through custom, to manage, benefit from the use of, and trade rights to land and other resources. Formalizing these rights will foster a more secure and stable enabling environment to support economic growth and improved agricultural productivity. The United States has played a leading role on international negotiations for political instruments to promote sound resource governance policies; notably, a USAID official served as the international chair of the

negotiations at the FAO's Committee for World Food Security for the Voluntary Guidelines for Responsible Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests. The United States is also a leading voice in the development of the Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment.

HIGHLIGHTING NUTRITION

The Feed the Future initiative also actively integrates nutrition and agriculture interventions. Studies show that strong nutrition early in life contributes to human and economic capacity through improved learning and productivity, and contributes to a robust, capable workforce. Strong nutrition—particularly during the 1,000-day window from pregnancy to a child's second birthday—contributes to economic growth and poverty reduction. Strong nutrition also promotes gender equality and opportunities for women and girls, lessens susceptibility to other deadly diseases, and is critical to national prosperity, stability, and security. Feed the Future supports food value chains that have high nutritional benefits and works with families to improve not only agricultural productivity and income, but also dietary diversity. We are also working hand-in-glove with our global health teams to identify and strengthen linkages between agriculture and nutrition. On a programmatic level, we are implementing both Feed the Future and global health activities in the same geographic zones to maximize results. In fiscal year 2011, 8.8 million children under 5 were reached by Feed the Future-supported nutrition programs.

We continue to work to improve and increase our impact in this area. During a high-level meeting on the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement at the U.N. General Assembly this year, USAID Administrator Rajiv Shah announced that the agency needed to do more to ensure that the principles and programmatic priorities of SUN are fully integrated across all relevant USAID-supported programs in the 14 countries where SUN, Feed the Future, and global health efforts overlap: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Nepal, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia.

UTILIZING NEW TECHNOLOGY AND RESEARCH

Feed the Future is also focusing on research as a key to transforming rural agriculture economies. We cannot expect to increase global food production by 2050 without the development of new technologies and practices to produce more with fewer inputs. In May 2011, the U.S. Government released a new Feed the Future research strategy informed by a consultative, multistakeholder process led by USAID, in close collaboration with USDA and university partners. As part of the new strategy, Feed the Future has better aligned all U.S. Government agency research programs to improve resource efficiency and generated new relationships with the private sector. In one major push, USAID and USDA are working together on high-impact research to combat wheat rust, a major threat to wheat production worldwide, and aflatoxin, a toxic fungus that infects many crops and causes illness.

We are moving research results from the laboratory to the field. In fiscal year 2011 alone, Feed the Future helped 1.8 million food producers to adopt improved technologies or management practices that can lead to more resilient crops, higher yields, and increased incomes.

This research strategy takes into account the critical challenge that climate change poses to food production around the world. As carbon dioxide concentrations rise, global temperatures are increasing, precipitation patterns are changing, and ocean acidification is on the rise. These changes are already affecting agriculture and food security directly. Feed the Future is working in concert with the U.S. Global Climate Change Initiative to develop strategies and undertake research to help food producers both reduce greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to climate change so that food security can be increased despite changing climate patterns.

Feed the Future strategies are designed not only to accelerate agriculture-led growth and reduce undernutrition, but also to encourage sustainable management of land, water, fisheries, and other resources. Poor land use and agricultural practices are common factors that increase the vulnerability of developing countries to global threats such as water scarcity and pandemic disease. A core focus of the Feed the Future research agenda is sustainable intensification, the concept of producing more agricultural output from the same area of land while reducing negative environmental consequences. Feed the Future integrates environmental concerns into our investments and builds the capacity of partner countries to take advantage of opportunities in effective resource management and proactive adaptation to environmental challenges. Climate-smart agriculture practices like conservation agriculture and agroforestry enable the capture and storage of water and nutrients in soil to support plant growth and conserve soil. For example, Feed the Future is leveraging

resources to better inventory and track land resources for agriculture and is building capacities with host governments and other partners to geospatially map land cover and land use for integrated management of watersheds.

We are working to ensure that these great strides achieved in research are sustainable. To do that, it is critical that we work to develop the next generation of agricultural leaders. Through Feed the Future's Borlaug 21st Century Leadership Program, the U.S. is helping to train individuals and strengthen developing country public and private institutions, enabling them to take advantage of scientific and technological breakthroughs to promote innovation across the agricultural sector. The program will provide short-term training to over 2,500 students, researchers and agricultural leaders; provide fellowships and mentoring to nearly 1,000 agricultural researchers; provide full fellowships to 75 M.S. or Ph.D. students; and improve more than 60 institutions in Africa, which will in turn affect over 250,000 students.

BUILDING RESILIENCE AND SUSTAINABILITY

Collectively, these efforts are all meant to help build up the long-term resilience of communities so that they are able to adapt to and recover from shocks and stresses and move forward with enhanced livelihoods. A recent DFID study showed for every \$1 spent on resilience, \$2.80 of benefits is gained through avoided aid and animal losses. By supporting stronger markets, better infrastructure, and new technologies, Feed the Future will help build resilience and equip communities with the tools, the knowledge, and the enabling environment to thrive in times of prosperity, and to overcome difficulties in times of hardship. With clear lessons learned from our response in the Horn of Africa drought last year, as an agency USAID is doing business differently to build resilience among vulnerable communities in the Horn and elsewhere to ensure continued growth by bringing our relief and development teams together for joint assessments of local needs. USAID's Bureau for Food Security, which leads Feed the Future, is working closely with the USAID Food for Peace program and the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance to integrate resilience programming to help communities better prepare for, respond to, and bounce back from crises when they do occur. While we cannot prevent future shocks from occurring, we can help make them less devastating while ensuring the continuation of long-term growth.

HOLDING OURSELVES ACCOUNTABLE

Finally, Feed the Future is doing things differently by measuring results and holding ourselves accountable through rigorous monitoring and evaluation. To do this, we have created the Feed the Future Results Framework, which establishes the goals and objectives of the initiative, linking standard performance indicators to desired results. In addition, the Feed the Future Monitoring System collects information on the Results Framework's baselines, targets and results.

Following MCC's model of conducting rigorous analysis during project design, USAID has adopted cost-benefit analysis to help improve resource allocation, quantify the expected benefits of our interventions on households, and identify better monitoring and evaluation indicators. We are also committed to implementing impact evaluations to capture what a particular project or program has achieved, test causal linkages, and determine to what extent outcomes link to particular interventions. USAID is planning to conduct over 30 impact evaluations of Feed the Future investments in agriculture, nutrition, and food security. And we have developed a Feed the Future Scorecard document to hold ourselves publicly accountable to doing business differently. In the scorecard, we have identified eight strategic areas of performance critical to meeting our global food security targets. Each strategic area has specific goal statements describing what we intend to improve as we deliver development aid, and each statement has associated measures and milestones to be met by 2015. We share the responsibility of meeting these targets with our partner countries and external stakeholders, and we plan to update the scorecard at least annually.

As an initiative, Feed the Future faces many challenges: ensuring productive interagency and donor collaboration; more effective integration of agriculture and nutrition; and the threats posed by global climate change, to name a few. While we acknowledge that all of our work in these areas may not have been seamless or perfect up to this point, we also accept that change does not come easily—or quickly—to any sector. We have been asked to “do things differently,” and we are. As time moves on, we expect to execute our development interventions even more efficiently, through the learning processes we have instituted, to ultimately help the many millions of individuals who still go to bed hungry each night. That is our goal, and we continue to work toward it with diligence and creativity.

In closing, we would like to thank the Congress for its strong support of this vital initiative. Feed the Future is more than an initiative; it is part of the lasting architecture of our development platform and lays the groundwork for us to be more effective, more efficient, and more successful in the work that we do. Feed the Future is bigger than any one agency or administration—it is part of our global legacy.

Thank you for inviting me to speak with you today, and I welcome your guidance, comments and any questions you might have.

Senator CARDIN. Thank you very much for your testimony and for your service.

Mr. Shrier.

STATEMENT OF JONATHAN SHRIER, ACTING SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY, DEPUTY COORDINATOR FOR DIPLOMACY FOR FEED THE FUTURE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. SHRIER. Thank you. Good morning, Chairman Cardin, Senator Lugar, and members of the subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you about U.S. diplomatic efforts to combat world hunger and undernutrition.

As my USAID counterpart has emphasized, global food security is high on the international agenda. President Obama and Secretary Clinton have prioritized the issue for humanitarian, economic, and national security reasons. Our food security diplomacy facilitates the work of multiple U.S. agencies and ensures that leaders around the world stay focused on the fight against hunger and undernutrition.

In Feed the Future focus countries, we help promote policy change and keep food security priorities high on national agendas. For example, when the worst drought in 60 years struck the Horn of Africa last year, Secretary Clinton contacted the leaders of Ethiopia and Kenya to press for specific policy shifts that could help ensure lasting food security even as we extended emergency assistance. We also worked with Tanzania to establish a nutrition-specific line in its national budget to ensure more effective coordination of the country's national nutrition strategy across agencies.

We work with strategic partner countries like Brazil, India, and South Africa to leverage their food security expertise to benefit Feed the Future focus countries. For example, in Mozambique we are partnering with Brazil to help farmers grow more vegetables, improve post-harvest handling, and support research, and we are doing this in cooperation with a major United States university. We recently announced new agreements with Brazil to extend our collaboration to Haiti and Honduras.

We also understand that to end world hunger, we need the collective efforts of governments, donors, international organizations, businesses, and in particular, civil society. Through our diplomatic efforts, we foster collaboration with civil society at home and abroad to help achieve Feed the Future's food security and nutrition goals.

In 2010, during the U.N. General Assembly meetings, Secretary Clinton launched the 1,000 Days partnership which helps mobilize governments, civil society, and private sector actors to promote action to improve nutrition in the 1,000 days from pregnancy to a child's second birthday.

In 2011, Secretary Clinton focused her energy on spotlighting the role of women in agriculture.

And this year in September 2012, as a result of our outreach efforts, Secretary Clinton was able to announce a \$1 billion pledge of private, nongovernmental funds for food security investments by members of InterAction, an alliance of U.S.-based NGOs. Five InterAction members alone pledged more than \$900 million toward the goal, including Catholic Relief Services, World Vision, Heifer International, Save the Children, and ChildFund International.

U.S. leadership on the L'Aquila Food Security Initiative, known as AFSI, has also helped advance food security goals. Thanks to congressional support, the United States has been able to meet the \$3.5 billion pledge for AFSI that President Obama made in 2009. This bolsters the resolve of other donors to meet their own financial pledges and maintain strong support for global food security. Under the U.S. chairmanship of AFSI in 2012, donors agreed to report more detailed information than ever before on their food security investments in individual developing countries.

Our diplomacy also plays a leading role in the U.N. Committee on World Food Security negotiations, working through the U.S. mission to the U.N. agencies in Rome, the United States guided the committee's process to develop and adopt voluntary guidelines on land tenure which also helps to address natural resources constraints and natural resource management. Now we are turning our attention to the follow-on effort to develop voluntary principles on responsible agricultural investment.

Food security remains a priority for the Obama administration. Feed the Future is one of the premier examples of development diplomacy as envisioned in the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review. Working together across the whole of the U.S. Government with other governments and throughout the international community, we are determined to make significant progress toward ending hunger and undernutrition in our lifetimes.

Thank you for congressional support for our food security efforts.

I look forward to taking your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Shrier follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JONATHAN SHRIER

Good morning, Chairman Cardin, Ranking Member Corker, and members of the subcommittee. It is an honor to appear before this subcommittee to testify about the U.S. Government's efforts to help end world hunger and improve food security and nutrition around the globe.

President Obama and Secretary Clinton have prioritized food security on the U.S. global agenda for humanitarian, economic, and national security reasons.

As USAID's testimony notes, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) estimates that one in eight people worldwide—almost 870 million people—suffer from chronic hunger. By 2050, population growth and changing food demands will require up to a 60-percent increase in agricultural production, according to the FAO.

Our best traditions of compassion compel us to act to help end hunger and undernutrition. Because we can help, we must help—that is our moral imperative. But ending hunger and undernutrition is also in our national security and economic interests.

As we witnessed in 2008, spikes in food and energy prices threw tens of millions of vulnerable people in the developing world back into poverty. High and volatile food prices in 2008 touched off demonstrations in dozens of countries, contributing to political unrest. We can see how preventing food insecurity becomes a matter of national security.

President Obama and Secretary Clinton have been strong advocates for food security, making the case for increased investments in agriculture and nutrition because they can have immediate and long-term impacts in the lives of children, help move people out of poverty, create stronger communities and open new markets. Our economy's future growth will depend on growth in the rest of the world. Many of our future customers will live in markets outside of our borders, including in emerging economies and low-income countries that have been particularly vulnerable to economic shocks.

The 2009 G8 summit in L'Aquila, Italy, was a pivotal moment for hunger and poverty reduction. There, President Obama rallied Presidents and Prime Ministers as well as leaders of key international and regional organizations to join together to reverse a three-decade decline in investment in agricultural development and launch the L'Aquila Food Security Initiative (AFSI). This initiative was designed to attack the root causes of global hunger through accelerated agricultural development and improved nutrition.

In keeping with the global L'Aquila Food Security Initiative, President Obama launched the U.S. Government's Feed the Future initiative, and he asked that we do things differently to get better results for every taxpayer dollar we are investing. This means that countries develop their own plans for food security, increase their own funding for agriculture, and are accountable for sound plans and actions. It means taking a comprehensive approach that focuses on how countries can increase their own production, marketing, and nutrition programs, so they can help prevent recurrent food crises and do not have to rely on food aid in the future; focusing on women as a key part of the solution; integrating natural resource constraints into our plans; and measuring results.

To achieve these goals, Feed the Future leverages the capacity and expertise of different agencies across the U.S. Government, including the U.S. Department of State; the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID); the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Treasury; the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC); the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative; the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and others. Working in close coordination with my USAID colleague, Deputy Coordinator for Development Tjada McKenna, I act as the Deputy Coordinator for Diplomacy for Feed the Future.

ROLE OF DIPLOMACY IN IMPLEMENTATION OF FEED THE FUTURE AND OTHER FOOD SECURITY INITIATIVES

U.S. food security diplomacy actively supports the work of multiple U.S. Government agencies to advance our global food security agenda and further our Feed the Future priorities. We do this through policy coordination among major donors, strategic partners, and multilateral organizations, ensuring that food security and nutrition remains high on bilateral and global policy agendas. Through our engagement with the G8, G20, U.N. agencies, and other economic cooperation platforms, such as APEC and Summit of the Americas, we help ensure that leaders stay focused on the fight against hunger and undernutrition.

U.S. leadership in the L'Aquila Food Security Initiative, focusing on sound food security policy, innovation, and reliable metrics, has helped advance the initiative's goals. Our ability to fulfill the U.S. financial pledge on schedule by obligating \$3.786 billion over 3 years promotes confidence among other donors to meet their own financial pledges and maintain strong financial support for global food security, shouldering responsibility along with us. As of May 2012, 4 of the 13 AFSI donors had fully disbursed their AFSI pledges, and we expect to announce further donor progress at the end of the AFSI pledge period later this year. Under the U.S. chairmanship of the AFSI followup group in 2012, AFSI donors agreed to provide in-depth information on how they are investing their food security assistance at the individual country level. These detailed materials were published in May and represent a significant advance for transparency and accountability.

The United States has worked closely with G20 countries, the World Bank, and other multilateral organizations and civil society organizations to establish the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP), a multidonor trust fund to help millions of poor farmers grow more and earn more so they can lift themselves out of hunger and poverty.

In 2½ years of operation, GAFSP has attracted pledges of nearly \$1.3 billion from nine development partners to help support the food security strategies of low-income countries. GAFSP's Steering Committee, which includes civil society and developing country representatives, has also allocated \$658 million to support 18 countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. GAFSP financing will help boost the incomes of approximately 8 million smallholder farmers and their families by increasing farm pro-

ductivity, linking smallholder farmers to markets, and helping farmers to mitigate the risks that they face. In Sierra Leone, for example, GAFSP financing has underwritten the delivery of improved extension services to farmers to help them boost yields in key staple crops. GAFSP has also financed the rehabilitation of 250 kilometers of rural roads in Togo to better connect farmers to local markets and has provided 18,000 farmers with better access to improved seed varieties and fertilizer. The United States is currently working with other donors—including the Gates Foundation and several other development partners—to replenish this successful fund.

The United States also plays a leading role in the U.N. Committee on World Food Security negotiations. Over the past 2 years, working through the U.S. Mission to the U.N. Agencies in Rome and in collaboration with USAID and MCC, we guided the committee's consultative process to develop Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries, and Forestry in the Context of National Food Security that were approved in May 2012. Now, we are turning our attention to the follow-on consultative process aimed at developing voluntary, non-binding principles on responsible agricultural investment.

We work with strategic partner countries—Brazil, India, and South Africa—to leverage the expertise and influence of government, the private sector, and civil society partners in these countries in order to collaborate to improve food security in Feed the Future focus countries. For example, we are partnering with Brazil in Mozambique to help farmers increase the productivity of their vegetable crops, improve post-harvest packing, storage and processing, and support research on food technology innovation. We also recently announced new agreements with Brazil to work together in Haiti to improve land use and promote conventional and biofortified crops and in Honduras to increase agriculture productivity, decrease malnutrition, and promote renewable energy.

At the national level with individual Feed the Future focus countries, we help promote policy changes and keep food security priorities high on national agendas. For example, when the worst drought in 60 years struck the Horn of Africa, Secretary Clinton contacted the leaders of Ethiopia and Kenya to press for specific policy shifts that could help assure lasting food security even as we extended emergency assistance. The administration worked with Tanzania to establish a nutrition-specific line in its national budget to ensure effective coordination and implementation of the country's national nutrition strategy. We have helped countries like Guatemala, Uganda, and Mozambique to introduce new measures to improve financial accountability and strengthen their countries' commitment to nutrition.

We understand that to end world hunger we need the collective efforts of governments, donors, institutions, businesses, and, in particular, civil society. As Secretary Clinton highlighted in her remarks on the margins of the U.N. General Assembly this year, "Civil society organizations are crucial to our success, both in the public and private sector; they have longstanding relationships in communities and valuable technical expertise, and they work every single day on their commitment to try to make this world a better place for all of us." Through our diplomatic efforts we engage and facilitate collaboration with civil society at home and abroad to help achieve Feed the Future's food and nutrition security goals.

For example, in 2010, Secretary Clinton launched the 1,000 Days partnership, which is helping mobilize governments, civil society, and the private sector to promote action to improve nutrition in the 1,000 days from pregnancy to a child's second birthday. The partnership helps disseminate research information and the latest innovations in nutrition and best practices. With financial support from the Gates Foundation and Walmart and in collaboration with the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition and InterAction, we facilitated the establishment of an organization to promote the 1,000 Days message and support the U.N.'s Scaling Up Nutrition movement. Thanks to these efforts, more and more stakeholders are prioritizing nutrition interventions during the critical 1,000 days when adequate nutrition has the greatest lifelong impact on a child's health, ability to grow, learn, and contribute to the prosperity of her family, her community, and her country.

Our diplomatic and development efforts have also focused on spotlighting the role of women in agriculture. Women make up the majority of the agricultural workforce in many developing countries, but they often earn less because they do not have rights to land, access to finance, natural resources, and the best inputs needed for production. Research shows that when women's incomes increase, their families are more financially secure, eat more nutritional food, and are less hungry and undernourished. Women are more likely to invest their earnings in the health, education, and nutrition of their children. Feed the Future is funding innovative approaches for promoting gender equality in agriculture and land use and to integrate gender into agricultural development and food security programs.

In September 2012, as a result of our outreach efforts, Secretary Clinton announced a \$1 billion pledge of private, nongovernment funds for food security from InterAction, an alliance of 198 U.S.-based NGOs. Five of its member organizations together pledged to contribute more than \$900 million toward the total, namely Catholic Relief Services, World Vision, Heifer International, Save the Children, and ChildFund International. We look forward to deepening coordination of our efforts with civil society partners to achieve greater impact and scale in our food security and nutrition efforts.

Progress in the Feed the Future effort continues. Diplomacy played a key role in negotiating with G8 partners in particular in developing and launching the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition, announced by President Obama in May 2012. The New Alliance is a shared commitment to achieve sustained and inclusive agricultural growth and raise 50 million people in sub-Saharan Africa out of poverty over the next 10 years by aligning the commitments of Africa's leadership to drive effective country plans and policies for food security; the commitments of private sector partners to increase investments where the conditions are right; and the commitments of the G8 to expand Africa's potential for rapid and sustainable agricultural growth.

Food security remains a policy priority for the Obama administration. For us at the State Department, Feed the Future is one of the premier examples of development diplomacy as envisioned in the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review. The State Department works closely with USAID to align diplomatic and development goals, develop the Feed the Future budget, and continue support for the work of our partners in advancing our global food security agenda. Working together across the whole of the U.S. Government, with other governments, and throughout the international community, we are determined to make significant progress toward ending hunger and undernutrition in our lifetimes.

Senator CARDIN. Again, thank you for your testimony and for your service.

We have been joined by Senator Casey, and as I mentioned earlier, we thanked Senator Casey, working with Senator Lugar, for his leadership on the Global Food Security Act. It is nice to have you with us.

There is no question that President Obama and Secretary Clinton have made this issue a very high priority, and that is clear in policies here in the United States. It is also clear to the international community.

I tell you, though, it is somewhat disappointing that we have not been able to name the coordinator for Feed the Future, and there has been a frequent turnover in the position of deputy coordinator. And it seems to me that for the stability of the agency, these positions need to be filled, and it is a concern to us that they have not. I know that the two of you cannot address that directly, but it has to make it more challenging when one position is not filled and the other has frequent turnover.

Ms. McKenna, you mentioned the fact that there was the progress report that identified much of the positive progress that has been made in Feed the Future, but it did not identify the challenges. It seems to me that we could spend a lot of time complimenting ourselves on the progress that we have made and we have made progress. But what is important is to focus on where we can make more progress, the challenges that we have, where do we need to put our resources, where do we need to put our priorities, where do you need congressional attention. So I want to give you an opportunity to share with this committee the challenges that you see in Feed the Future and where we can be of greatest help in trying to make sure that we can achieve as much as we can and leverage the resources as greatly as we can.

Ms. MCKENNA. Thank you, Senator Cardin.

In the progress report, we identify our success to date, but we also had a section entitled “How FTF Has Evolved” which talks about what we are learning and what is ahead. And I think in that section is where we try to distill some of the key challenges that we have been facing.

A key focus of our energy has been on monitoring and evaluation and being able to talk about the results of our work. In the course of doing that, we have also needed to set targets and how many people we are going to reach and where our money is going to go. So some of the evolutions that we have made include revising—our initial estimates were just based strictly on cost, by unit costs, what we knew about what it takes for a unit cost to bring a farmer out of poverty. Since then, we have been able to refine that, and now we have refined our targets to be that we want to reduce poverty by 20 percent in the areas that we work, what we call our “zones of influence,” and also reduce undernutrition in those areas by 20 percent. And so what we have learned is we want to be more effectively targeting the poorest populations, focused on lifting them out of poverty, and working with that subsegment and looking at M&E specifically with that population. And so that is one of the adjustments we have made.

We also recognize that we need to go deeper to making sure that in the field that we are working closely with civil society and that they are more effectively integrated into our work. So we talked about that and have renewed our focus on working with both U.S.-based NGOs as well as local civil society organizations and will deepen that commitment.

We also look forward to deepening our work in natural resource management and coordinating our efforts on climate change as well.

I think without authorization, we have really been able to still set a very strong foundation for Feed the Future in terms of developing a Feed the Future guide, a strategy, a whole-of-government coordination strategy that will really stand the test of time. But, obviously, there is always more we can do to improve our efforts at coordination and to have more agencies reporting in to our whole-of-government Feed the Future monitoring system.

Senator CARDIN. I think there is great interest here on the coordination issues. It is not only among the NGO community that you have mentioned, from which you have gotten substantial support, but how is that coordinated and leveraged between the governmental sector. It is also coordination within our own agencies with the humanitarian aid and emergency food aid programs that we have, how well are they coordinated with Feed the Future as to making sure that we are again using the resources in the most effective way to leverage, as much as we possibly can. Can you just elaborate a little bit more as to what steps you are taking to coordinate these stakeholders?

Ms. MCKENNA. Yes. In fact, right after our testimony today from 1 to 5 p.m., Jonathan and I are leading an interagency offsite to actually spend more time talking about where we can go deeper in these efforts.

One of the areas that we started that we really started to make significant progress on starting last year is in one of the areas that

you mentioned, which is coordinating the food aid assistance with our longer term agricultural development work. “Resilience” is kind of the code name that we have for all those efforts, and it has been a major focus of our energy this year, focusing on crises in the Sahel and also in the Horn of Africa.

There have been a couple of quick wins that we have been able to do in that area that we will continue to build on. One is we put crisis modifiers into our longer term growth programs. So when our forecast is showing us that a severe weather event is likely to occur in an area or something else that would put more people in poverty, we are able to take our emergency assistance funding, put it into our longer term Feed the Future funding to specifically address those populations and to add in resilience work there.

Another example of how we have blended the economic growth with the communities that are likely to receive food aid as an example of our work in Ethiopia where we are working with commercial abattoirs. A lot of the pastoral communities in those areas—that pastoralism is a way of life, but by promoting commercial abattoirs and making them available in the areas where those pastoralists tend to migrate, we have also now provided economic opportunities for those farmers. So we are starting to address it. We will get deeper in food aid.

And across agencies, we are also working to identify which pieces really fit into Feed the Future, making sure they are reporting into the monitoring system, and making sure those efforts are coordinated at the ground in the same geographic areas.

Senator CARDIN. Tomorrow there will be a hearing in the Environment and Public Works Committee on Hurricane Sandy, and I will be talking about resilience. I think resiliency is very important in Feed the Future as to what steps we are taking to deal with the realities of the circumstances. As we pointed out, extreme weather conditions are having an incredible impact on food security, and we have to build that into our programs to make sure that we recognize the realities of what is happening globally if we are going to be successful long range in our efforts.

Mr. Shrier, let me just get you involved here on the gender issue. To me, the No. 1 issue in dealing with the long-term sustainability is to deal with farmers, women, and the treatment of the developing world on land reform and the manner in which they treat women that are providing most of the labor in agriculture today. Can you just share with us—I know Secretary Clinton has been active in this regard—but how that is being integrated into the food security issues?

Mr. SHRIER. Absolutely. Thank you for that question, Senator Cardin.

So you are right. In many developing countries, women do make up the majority of the agricultural workforce. In several sub-Saharan African countries, it is as high as 60 or 70 percent of the agricultural labor. But the challenge is that in many of these countries, women do not have equal access to the best inputs, the best improved seeds, fertilizers, access to resources such as land or financing. And research has demonstrated that if that access were equalized, you could see increases in productivity of 20 to 30

percent, and if you globalized that, that could amount to well over 100 million additional mouths being fed.

So this is something that we have to focus on, and that is why it is integrated throughout our Feed the Future work in the programs that we have got designed country by country. It is also an area where we are looking for better ideas, and so last year, Secretary Clinton and Administrator Rajiv Shah from USAID launched a new intensified research effort to attract the best innovations for improving the role of women in agriculture and improving policies and other techniques to improve gender treatment and gender equality in areas ranging from productivity technologies to land access and land tenure, as you mentioned.

Senator CARDIN. I would just urge us to put as much of a spotlight on this as possible. I think it is important that the international community knows that this is an issue that the United States is going to maintain a continued interest in.

Senator Lugar.

Senator LUGAR. Ms. McKenna, a key component of the Feed the Future program is the partnerships that the United States has with each of the 19 focus countries through the negotiation of Country Investment Plans. I would like to ask you, first of all, how did we determine which 19 countries we would deal with? I understand plans have now been formulated with all 19 after considerable negotiation. But describe, if you will, the challenges of those negotiations as well as challenges that remain really after we believe we have something on paper with each of the 19.

Ms. MCKENNA. Thank you.

We spent a lot of time in the early life of the initiative focusing on that because we felt like it would lead to better results. And so we are really proud of our work working with 19 focus countries.

As you know, focus countries are where we really have committed to deep levels of investment with those governments. And we chose those 19 countries based on a few factors. One was the level of need, so looking at absolute levels of hunger and poverty in those countries. The other is how agricultural growth really would provide economic stimulus in those countries as often indicated by percent of those populations that rely on agriculture. The third factor that is most important was our opportunity for partnership with those countries because we did see this as deep partnership, and we looked at the country investment plan process as a part of developing that process.

Africa really took the lead in this area through their CAADP, their Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program, which set continental standards for how investment plans should be developed in terms of consulting with local society, civil society, private sector, other actors. And we worked closely with governments to make sure those happened.

What we have done with our funding to provide the proper incentives to help that happen was we really have focused our funding in specific areas of the country where we believe we can have the greatest impact, as well as on specific value chains and activities. And I have made that clear and made sure that almost all of our funding is focused on those few things instead of providing out too thin.

We use evidence-based and results-based ways to evaluate how we are doing in those countries every year which includes how the country is following up on its commitments to support this with their own budgets, policy changes that they are making. For example, one of the things that we need to evaluate now is Mali. Senator Cardin mentioned some of the instability in Mali right now and how it affects it. So we will undergo a process to review them as a focus country, determine what to do with those resources. So there is a constant look at where we are in that country and a constant view of this as a partnership where both sides need to keep their sides of the agreement.

Senator LUGAR. Are those negotiations or agreements a matter of public record? Are there press accounts in the countries of our work, as well as the decisions made by their leadership?

Ms. MCKENNA. Yes. In developing the country investment plans, part of the requirement for that is that there are public sessions on what those plans are and public consultations. And there has been great media fanfare in all of those activities.

In addition, as we go forward executing our work, we make sure that the public understands exactly where we are working, what we have committed to working in. Our Web site—feedthefuture.gov—goes into that extensively, but we also take every opportunity in-country to reach out to stakeholders and to continue to remind them of what our priorities have been and how we have been working with the government and other actors to fulfill them.

Senator LUGAR. Let me switch for a moment to the research component of Feed the Future, which is approximately \$120 million annually. I understand that a large focus of this includes research on new seeds that may be more productive generally, as well as under varying climatic conditions.

Now, are genetically modified organisms a part of the research agenda for Feed the Future? If so, how are GMO's being received in Feed the Future countries?

Ms. MCKENNA. Part of our job is to really bring the best of what the American people and the American public have to offer to our work, and research and our innovations in science and technology are a key part of that. Our research agenda is really focused on looking forward toward sustainable intensification of production, looking at the effects of climate change, and anticipating what the needs of populations will be and leveraging what we have done in the United States, as well as our research abroad.

We view genetically modified crops and biotechnology as part of a tool kit of solutions that can provide better—for example, increased resistance to drought or climate change activities or better yields or reduced use of certain pesticides and chemicals in production. So we encourage the governments in the countries that we work with to look at the range of things in their tool kits which would include biotechnology products and to make their own decisions about what is appropriate for their country. But we certainly support that research and we certainly believe it is part of a tool kit that a country and that farmers, in particular, need to thrive going forward.

Senator LUGAR. I raise the question because specifically I have had debates over it with German parliamentarians or even in Ukraine in which they have stoutly affirmed no GMO. Furthermore, they will not accept crops from Africa that have any trace of GMO. The influence there has been profound. So we are not simply talking about something that is a little bit of research here or there. If we are really serious about yields and about a large change for the single woman farmer dealing with bad seed and bad fertilizer and bad transportation, this is why I asked the question.

And I hope that there has been acceptance in these 19 countries. Has there been resistance? Are they contaminated by the European influence or anybody else?

Ms. MCKENNA. So I would like to assure you we support both the research but we also support the building of institutions that can understand those activities that can develop the proper regulatory environments to welcome those products in and that can also help to inform the public on the right things. Of course, you will always have opponents who make their voices heard in those countries, but we believe that our approach of providing the countries and the scientific institutions in those countries with information and providing that information also to smallholder farmers are one of the key antidotes to those other outside pressures that those countries face.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator CARDIN. Senator Casey.

Senator CASEY. Thank you so much, Senator Cardin. I want to thank you for calling this hearing and for highlighting this issue, the issue of food security. We do not talk about it enough in the Senate, and I am grateful that you are demonstrating continued leadership on this issue.

And, Senator Lugar, it has been great to work with you on these issues over at least the time I have been here, 6 years now. We are going to miss your voice in the Senate, but I know that voice will not be quiet. I think if people in both parties can agree on one thing—and there are maybe more than one. A few things we all agree on, but I think it is a commitment that we need to make on an issue like this that can be bipartisan. And you provide us with that inspiration, and your work in this area and your public service will continue to inspire us. So we hope when you think we are not paying enough attention, that you knock on our door and remind us. But we are looking forward to working with you in your next chapter and are just so grateful for the work you have done.

I wanted to emphasize—or I should say maybe just to focus for a moment on the private sector aspects. I know it was covered in the testimony. This is an era of our history where often if it is a government-only approach to an issue or a challenge or a priority, there is a segment of society, I guess, that would denigrate that, that if it is government that is doing it, somehow it is not going to meet the objectives we all hope for. I think that is unfair. And I have worked in two levels of government, State government and the Federal Government. So I take umbrage with that. But I do not think we should ever miss an opportunity to have partnerships

where the private sector can work with any level of government or nonprofit organization.

So this is one area where I think, as good as the work is by the Federal Government, the State Department, USAID, any other part of our Government, I think it is good to have private sector involvement. And I know from the testimony that that was highlighted with regard to the New Alliance, the \$3 billion in private investment from 45 companies. So that is good news and we should encourage that and support that.

I guess some questions have been raised about what that means in the real world of getting the job done on the food security objectives we have here. One concern that has been raised is that civil society groups in various countries would be excluded, and I want to have you comment on that.

But also one question that we have is what assurances are there that donors and governments in Feed the Future countries will sustain that investment in smallholder agriculture. So if you can focus on that.

And then finally with regard to the U.S. and G8 donors, how do we ensure that the New Alliance will ensure civil society organizations, farmers' groups, women's groups, small cooperatives, small and medium-sized enterprises that they will all be included or integrated within the overall strategy?

So I think the two or three questions I set forth apply to both of our witnesses, but maybe, Ms. McKenna, if you want to start to address it.

Ms. MCKENNA. Certainly. I have been privileged to be able to put a lot of my energy into some of the private sector outreach components, so I am really happy to talk about that.

The private sector that is interested in working in these areas, both international private sector, but also local private sector—for them, these are long-term commitments. When you talk to them, there is a universal recognition. We need to be good corporate citizens. We need the smallholders to develop to be future customers of ours, but to also be great suppliers. So I think our intrinsic interests are all aligned. They may speak different languages. The private sector may not speak in the same language as the civil society or government, but part of our job has been to translate and to bring those communities together and we have happily done that particularly through the New Alliance.

The first step in that is really providing transparency in what is going on. I think in the examples that we have seen as being harmful or not in people's best interest are things that are not done in a transparent manner. So by having the New Alliance really focus on companies and letters of intent, we have brought those interests and intents to light, made that transparent, but also have fostered a public dialogue between those companies, the governments, and also helping them to connect to the farmers in the communities in which they want to serve.

Each of the private companies that work with us agreed to work around the spirit and the principles of responsible agricultural investment. They have all come to us with questions on how to do that and how to work with that. And I think part of our work as donors is helping them to understand what that means and

providing our development expertise with their innovation and investment that they want to bring to those areas.

We also have encouraged countries to set up structures where they can interact effectively with the private sector, as well as civil society and smallholders and others in those conversations. Examples of that are Ethiopia has created an agricultural transformation agency that is working across its government sectors but also is responsible for bringing other stakeholders into the conversation. And Tanzania has a southern agricultural growth corridor, and they have an ownership group that is actually kind of coowned with government, local farmer organizations, and others to bring that together. So that is the kind of work that we are encouraging.

In terms of civil society, we absolutely want to include them. And I think what we are doing and the work we are focused on is making sure that they are included at the local level on the ground. We do a lot of consultation in Washington. We have required it of our missions to do more of that local consultation, and we are looking at ways to create handbooks or best practices for them to do even better jobs of that going forward. But the goal is to make sure all voices are heard and that these things are done in a transparent, open manner, and then that is what we continue to work toward.

The New Alliance itself—a lot of what we have done with the New Alliance—we have really tried to drive it down to the local level because that is really the best way to get to small farmer organizations, to local society and that. So we have country cooperation frameworks where governments have laid out on paper what their policy changes would be. Private sector companies, through the form of their LOI's, talk about what commitments they want to make, and then donors actually have articulated what commitments they want to make. And by making that all public in these cooperation framework documents, we are asking everyone to hold us accountable for what we say in those documents for each of those sectors. So I think the focus really is on transparency, accountability, and developing mechanisms on the ground for those conversations to continue to happen.

Senator CASEY. I know I am out of time for this round, but maybe we can get back to it in the next round.

Senator CARDIN. Well, thank you.

I want to observe that I think one of the most significant hearings this full committee has ever had is when we had Bill Gates and Bill Clinton before us. Their testimony was incredible about the ability of the NGO community to deal with humanitarian issues. I remember the questioning dealing with how they handle corruption in a country and when it becomes difficult to get the aid to the people, what is their policy. And their policy was pretty clear. They will not be there. If the aid cannot get to the people, they are not going to feed the corruption of local officials.

Senator Lugar and I have joined together on a transparency initiative to make sure that the wealth of a country goes to its people and does not to feed corruption.

What steps are you all taking to make sure that we are not advancing corrupt regimes by giving them the resources, to make sure that the funds, in fact, are getting to the people? And are we

prepared to leave a country if we cannot effectively help the people?

Mr. SHRIER. Thank you, Senator Cardin. Perhaps I will say a few words and then invite my USAID colleague to add.

So corruption is a great challenge in economic growth and development.

Senator CARDIN. I am looking at the list of countries, and some of them have real challenges as far as governance is concerned.

Mr. SHRIER. Right, and so one of the considerations when we were selecting countries for the focus country list in Feed the Future was the ability of the government in that country to work with us as a partner to deliver results. Not every government on the list is perfect. There is room for growth, to be sure. But we certainly considered these issues and designed our programs based on that consideration so that in many places we do work through implementing partners instead of, or in addition to, government agencies. Implementing partners can be local organizations or local firms that provide these sorts of services. And so we can thereby be better assured that the money we deliver is producing real results. And over time, we also work with these governments through other programs beyond the Feed the Future effort itself to improve the control of corruption.

There is a significant U.S. effort governmentwide on anticorruption, which we could provide you further information on.

Senator CARDIN. I would welcome that.

I understand we want to be engaged in these countries. We want to take steps to make sure that the aid gets to the people, but if you reach a point where that is not possible, are you prepared to leave?

Mr. SHRIER. So you cited, Senator Cardin, the example of Mali where we have essentially put our operation on hold while the situation is so unsettled. So that is an example of us looking at reality and making an adjustment as a result.

Ms. MCKENNA. May I add that we are particularly focused on their governance and their policy work in agriculture. And so part of our funding—a lot of it is directly with smallholders, but there is always part of it that was working with local systems or local institutions that would be in charge of executing some of those programs and building their capacity to make sure that things happen correctly. Before we work through any local systems, we also have a whole audit and measurement process to make sure that those local systems can effectively use that money, have systems for monitoring and control of those funds. And so we are very cognizant of that and make sure that our efforts in agriculture and food security either are working through other implementing partners or that we are building and strengthening and monitoring the government systems or the local systems that would handle those funds.

Senator CARDIN. We fully understand the more that we can get prosperity in a country, the better chance we have of good governance. If you do not have good governance, it is hard to get the prosperity to the people. It is a circular problem. We understand that and we have got to enter someplace.

But I just urge you to follow the leadership of Congress here on transparency. We have got to be very open as to the circumstances

in the countries we are operating in, and if we cannot effectively get aid, we have to be prepared to leave rather than to help finance a corrupt regime. Obviously, we have humanitarian concerns. We want to make sure we move forward with humanitarian concerns, but we want to make sure that these systematic changes that are made are going to lead to good governance and we cannot be party to helping to finance corrupt regimes.

Senator LUGAR.

Senator LUGAR. I noted in the Feed the Future publications a map of the 19 countries, which is very helpful in identifying precisely what we are talking about today. And these countries, just for the benefit of everyone in the room, are not only in Africa but in Latin America and in Asia so that there is quite a cross-section of different kinds of governments and backgrounds.

Even more interesting was the progress scorecard in which you cited accountability. You have really tried to put something down on paper. And it will be very interesting to watch the development of those figures and the projections, the hopes really for the 2012 fiscal year as compared to the 2011 which you have.

I am curious as to what kind of extension programs are being developed. Clearly that component of education, research, the reaching out in a practical way might offer some continuity to these trends and attract young people, middle-aged people, whoever, to really take on something beyond the planting function and the maintaining of existence. What can you report about those sorts of programs?

Ms. MCKENNA. Well, we know from our experience here in the United States that extension networks are very important, and part of our work in Feed the Future with getting technologies to smallholders, obviously extension remains important in that work.

We have a multifaceted, multipronged approach to extension in-country. One, we work very hard to leverage U.S. universities and our own U.S. knowledge and that. So there are a lot of programs that we do both at USAID but also with USDA and others where we are connecting those universities and institutions to extension services in countries.

Senator LUGAR. Have you been able to identify specific universities in some of your literature and which countries or with whom?

Ms. MCKENNA. Yes. We can make that available and send you a report on that. But we have extensive partnerships with U.S. universities, and extension is one of those areas where the common thread that you will see across many of those partnerships.

[The submitted written report from USAID follows:]

UNIVERSITIES THAT WE WORK WITH

Aquaculture & Fisheries CRSP

Oregon State University (Lead University): Global
 Purdue University: Ghana; Kenya; Tanzania
 Virginia Tech: Ghana; Kenya; Tanzania
 Auburn University: Uganda, South Africa
 Alabama A&M University: Uganda
 University of Georgia: Uganda, South Africa
 University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff: Tanzania
 University of Rhode Island: Vietnam, Cambodia
 University of Connecticut–Avery Point: Vietnam, Cambodia
 University of Hawaii–Hilo: Nicaragua, Mexico

Louisiana State University: Nicaragua, Mexico
 University of Michigan: Nepal, Bangladesh, Vietnam, China
 University of Arizona: Mexico, Guyana, Indonesia
 Texas Tech University: Mexico
 North Carolina State University: Philippines, Indonesia

Dry Grain Pulses CRSP

Cornell University: Kenya
 Iowa State University: Uganda, Rwanda, Tanzania
 Kansas State University: Zambia
 Michigan State University (Lead University): Angola, Mozambique, Honduras, Ecuador, Rwanda, Tanzania
 Penn State University: Malawi; Mozambique; Honduras; Tanzania
 Texas A&M University: Kenya; Zambia; South Africa
 University of California–Riverside: Senegal; Burkina Faso; Angola
 University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign: Burkina Faso; Niger; Nigeria
 University of Puerto Rico: Honduras; Angola; Haiti

Horticulture CRSP

Cornell University: Bangladesh; India
 Michigan State University: Benin; Kenya, India, Nepal, Sri Lanka
 Ohio State University: Bolivia; Chile; Ecuador; Guatemala; Honduras; Peru, Nicaragua, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda
 Purdue University: Kenya; Tanzania; Zambia
 Tennessee State University: Cambodia; Thailand; Vietnam
 University of California–Davis (Lead University): Bangladesh; Cambodia, Vietnam, Kenya; Nepal; Rwanda; Tanzania; Uganda, Benin, Gabon, Ghana, Democratic Republic of the Congo
 University of Hawaii–Manoa: Cambodia; Vietnam
 University of Wisconsin–Madison: El Salvador; Guatemala; Honduras; Nicaragua

Integrated Pest Management CRSP

Clemson University: Indonesia; Philippines; Cambodia
 Michigan State University: Tajikistan
 Ohio State University: Global; Kenya; Uganda; Tanzania
 Penn State University: Bangladesh; India; Nepal
 Virginia State University: Kenya; Tanzania; Uganda; Ethiopia
 Virginia Tech (Lead University)

Adapting Livestock Systems to Climate Change CRSP

Arizona State University: Nepal
 Colorado State University (Lead University): Kenya
 Emory University: Kenya; Ethiopia
 Princeton University: Kenya
 South Dakota State University: Mali, Senegal
 Syracuse University: Senegal
 Texas A&M University: Mali
 University of California–Davis: Tanzania
 University of Florida: Niger; Tanzania
 University of Georgia: Mali
 University of Louisiana–Lafayette: Nepal
 Utah State University: Nepal

Peanut CRSP

Auburn University: Ghana
 Cornell University: Haiti
 New Mexico State University: Uganda; Kenya
 North Carolina State University: Ghana, Burkina Faso
 Purdue University: Brazil
 Texas A&M University: Ghana; Mali; Burkina Faso
 University of Alabama: Ghana
 University of Connecticut: Uganda; Kenya
 University of Florida: Bolivia, Ghana, Mali, Burkina Faso, Guyana, Haiti
 University of Georgia (Lead University): Uganda; Ghana; Mali; Burkina Faso, Kenya
 Virginia Tech: Uganda; Kenya

Sorghum, Millet and Other Grains (INTSORMIL)

Kansas State University: Botswana; El Salvador; Mali; Nicaragua; Nigeria; Senegal, Ghana, Burkina Faso, Niger, Kenya, South Africa, Tanzania

Ohio State University: Tanzania; Zambia

Purdue University: Botswana; Burkina Faso; Mali; Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania

Texas A&M University: Costa Rica; El Salvador; Guatemala; Haiti; Honduras; Nicaragua; Panama, South Africa

University of Nebraska–Lincoln (Lead University): Ethiopia; Mozambique; Tanzania; Uganda, Zambia

West Texas A&M University: Botswana; Mali; Mozambique; Niger; South Africa

Sustainable Agriculture & Natural Resource Management CRSP

Kansas State University: Ghana; Mali

North Carolina A&T State University: Cambodia; Philippines

Penn State University: Bolivia, Ecuador

University of Hawaii–Manoa: India; Nepal

University of Denver: Bolivia, Ecuador

University of Tennessee: Lesotho; Mozambique

University of Wyoming: Uganda; Kenya

Virginia Tech (Lead University): Ecuador, Bolivia, Haiti

Nutrition CRSP

Tufts University (Lead University): Nepal, Uganda, Malawi

Harvard University: Nepal, Uganda

Johns Hopkins University

We have also been looking at the use of information technology and looking at kind of mobile-based extension or other Internet-enabled extension where you can provide other types of services to smallholders like market-based information or climate or weather. And we recently launched another Information and Communications Technology, ICT, and extension challenge.

We also have a farmer-to-farmer program which we have had for quite a while. It connects U.S. farmers directly on the ground to farmers.

Also, Peace Corps is one of our partner agencies in Feed the Future, and those provide great front-line resources for both nutrition education as well as agricultural education. And we have supported them to increase the number of agriculture volunteers directly supporting Feed the Future.

Senator LUGAR. In testimony we have had before this committee from the Gates Foundation, they emphasize, in addition to all we have talked about thus far, the whole problem of transportation; transportation both of crops once the farm gets beyond merely sustaining a single family and markets, at least some way in which there might be some change in the economic circumstances of the farmer if the produce can get to a market and money can get back to the producer in the process of all of this.

Are these areas that you are also looking at? Are they a part of the Feed the Future program?

Ms. MCKENNA. Yes. Very similar to the Gates Foundation, we really try to look across the whole value chain, and looking at things around post-harvest storage and value addition are critical parts of that. There are two examples we can give of that, and one of them brings in the private sector.

We have a partnership between PepsiCo, the World Food Programme, and USAID and the Government of Ethiopia where they are taking chickpea, which is a local crop which is highly used in that diet, and they have created a higher value-added opportunity

for that in creating a chickpea smush for chickpeas as a food aid product. And so they are working with local processors that are in the rural communities to provide markets for those chickpeas so that the farmers—to kind of alleviate some of the transport issues. But it also provides better research and technology to those farmers because they have to use better varieties of chickpeas, and with the value addition, they can get better prices and more local markets for those. So that is one example.

Another piece of work that we have is with General Mills and a program they have started called Partners in Food Solutions where they have brought together expertise from other companies and created a volunteer technical advisory force that really works with processors in rural communities to help them improve the efficiency so that they can buy more crops. But they also work to help them improve storage practices, storage warehouses, and other pieces like that.

We also have university partnerships, for example, with Purdue where they have a chickpea storage, these triple bag storage products that then can be used in rural communities.

So we really are very focused on that side of the value chain. It is easier to talk about the smallholders, but the smallholders need the transport exactly like you said and post-harvest storage and other things and we look to address that.

Senator LUGAR. I appreciate your mentioning Purdue because we have had strong ties there in that outreach. So you are most thoughtful. [Laughter.]

Mr. Shrier, before you try to respond to this, let me just add one further question while I have some time here and that is the non-emergency programs are a part of Feed the Future. Describe what these are and what sort of progress is being made in the so-called nonemergency area.

Ms. MCKENNA. So a lot of our work on Feed the Future builds on prior work. Prior to Feed the Future, we always had the non-emergency food aid program through our Food for Peace Division. We took lessons learned from those programs. For instance, in Mozambique, some of those programs are working with cashew farmers to provide higher value crops for more vulnerable areas. There also has been work with risk insurance for more vulnerable areas that are prone to disasters.

Senator LUGAR. Like Indiana this year in the drought.

Ms. MCKENNA. Yes, exactly.

So Feed the Future has really built upon and expanded that work and those lessons. So we look at that nonemergency portfolio as very complementary and a key partner of ours in our work.

Senator LUGAR. Mr. Shrier, did you have a comment?

Mr. SHRIER. Yes. I just wanted to say, Senator Lugar, that in addition to the issues of transportation and market linkages that Ms. McKenna mentioned, we also do work on trade and promoting trade liberalization and trade facilitation in Feed the Future regions. And so our regional strategies, in particular, work at helping countries to remove border checks and other barriers to trade, to improve the standardization of standards and regulations across countries in a given region so that interregional trade can expand,

as well as international trade more broadly. So that is another key to the challenge of food security.

Senator LUGAR. It is just critically important. The balancing of trade in food by the international trading system is a major factor in hunger, and I am delighted you are working on it.

Thank you.

Senator CARDIN. Senator Casey.

Senator CASEY. Thanks very much.

I wanted to return to an issue that Senator Cardin raised initially with regard to women and in these countries where it is particularly difficult to put in place strategies to allow them to be more a part of the effort to get the results that we want. In particular—and you may have addressed this in your testimony. I just wanted to press on this a little bit. The Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index. If you could just, A, describe what that index is and, B, highlight for us the use of that to date so far as kind of a measuring tool.

Ms. MCKENNA. We are very proud of that index. We developed it in cooperation with Oxford University, their human poverty lab, and the International Food Policy Research Institute, IFPRI.

So the Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index is the first of its kind and it is to really measure changes in women’s empowerment in the agriculture sector. And so it really looks at, I believe, five factors that are critical to that. One is women’s role in household decisionmaking around agricultural production, women’s access to productive capital like loans and lands. One of the things we have seen in the past is as soon as a crop becomes more profitable or a cash crop, it becomes the man’s crop, no longer a woman’s crop. So making sure that women still have control of that and are able to be the ones who are the signatories on loans and land decisions is quite important.

Adequacy of women’s income to feed their families. So that is women controlling the income once it comes in the household which has been an issue in the past.

Women’s access to leadership roles in the community. When I managed grants at the Gates Foundation, I would notice—in the early days before we got better at this, we would notice that when you looked at all the farmer members that are signed up for your project, it was all the men, but yet it was all the women out in the field doing the work. So basic things like making sure—but if those women’s names were not on the rolls as the member, they were not getting the checks and the income from that activity.

So the index looks at those and women’s labor and time allocations. I think one of the errors of the past is that we did not—we introduced new technologies, but it was the women in the field that had to do that work. So you have to really be sensitive that you are introducing technologies and applications that are actually decreasing the amount of time that they have to spend in the field more than increasing it.

So the Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index really takes all those dimensions into consideration and disaggregates the data. So going forward, we are launching it in all of our Feed the Future focus countries and our zones of influence, and going forward, we will be able to look at that and say, OK, our work is doing well

on this aspect of the indicator, but there are still issues with women's access to land or loan. How do we improve that? So I think it will allow for much more productive targeting and much more effective work going forward.

We have had a lot of inquiries from other organizations as to how they can actually be a part of the index and how they can adapt it. So IFAD, the U.N. Rome organization, International Fund for Agricultural Development, has looked into how they use it and a few other organizations are working with us to see how they can also incorporate the index into their activities.

Senator CASEY. I mean, do you have examples that you have employed to describe the impact of this kind of an index or the utilization of it?

Ms. MCKENNA. When we launched the index, some of the early pilots showed some interesting learnings. I think, for example, in Bangladesh, they noticed there was one part of the index where in the areas where we were working, that number was not right. I believe it was around the women's access to productive capital, but I would have to get back to you to validate that. That then, by even just the pilot studies that we have launched in some of our locations, has allowed us to do some better targeting and program development in those areas. And I think we will have more examples like that going forward that we will be able to speak to and refer to in our work.

[The written information supplied by USAID follows:]

One of the most advantageous benefits of the Index is that it can serve as a diagnostic tool to help us better understand the most binding constraints that are impeding women's engagement in the agriculture sector and, perhaps the growth of the agriculture sector itself. Due to the fact that 10 different indicators are collected to calculate the Index, it offers the ability to look across a number of areas and identify which are most hindering equality and empowerment.

USAID/Bangladesh was able to employ the WEAI after they conducted their full baseline, which included the Index. Overall, they found the greatest constraints for gender equality and women's empowerment were: (1) lack of control over use of income; (2) little control over productive resources; and (3) weak leadership in the community. Although much of the programming had already been designed by the time the mission got the results of the WEAI, they were able to look back at some of the components of programs they had planned and see how they would affect those three constraints. While they have not made drastic revisions to programs based on the WEAI, they have been able to expand or make use of project components that will address those constraints. They also used the information to inform the design of one project set to start in FY 2013 that works with women raising poultry and links them with inputs and resources to better engage in the poultry value chain.

Senator CASEY. Mr. Shrier, this is a broader question. Maybe you could particularize it for this issue or for any issue. But the broad question is this. Sometimes it is in the testimony. Sometimes we ask about it; sometimes we do not. But one of the purposes of having hearings like this is for you to tell us what you hope Congress would do to make—not to make your life easier necessarily—that is probably impossible—but to put in place legislative strategies that would further the goals of Feed the Future.

Now, I realize that sometimes the best thing for the Congress to do is to provide resources as best we can and to get out of the way and let these programs develop on their own. But is there anything legislatively that you would hope that we would be able to do in the next year or so in addition to the obvious questions of dollars

and appropriations, but just any kind of legislative piece that would be helpful? I know that is kind of broad and you can certainly amplify it through a written response.

Mr. SHRIER. Thank you, Senator Casey, for that question and that offer.

I guess what I would say as an initial response—and I think we may want to get back to you with a more complete written response. But the world committed at the L'Aquila summit to respond with the scale and urgency needed to achieve sustainable global food security. That is not going to be something that is accomplished in 3 years or 5 years or 10 years. It is accomplishable in our lifetimes, but it will take a sustained effort and that requires sustained resources certainly but also sustained attention. And so the work of this committee and of Congress more generally in keeping the issue of food security high on the U.S. agenda has been important to our diplomatic efforts to keep the world focused on this challenge. So we have moved from the days when food security and agricultural development was something that was discussed in technical meetings or by specialized ministries to a world where this is the stuff of Presidents and Prime Ministers' meetings, of summits in the G8, the G20, and through the major institutions of the international system. So having the backing that we have already had from Congress over the years will continue to be crucial to that effort.

Senator CASEY. So keep it as a front burner issue.

Mr. SHRIER. Absolutely.

Senator CASEY. Thank you.

Mr. SHRIER. Thank you.

Senator CARDIN. I think that was a very important point. Thank you, Senator Casey, for raising that.

Let me thank our panelists. Thank you again for your service. We will now move to the second panel.

Without objection, I am going to include in the record a statement made by Mercy Corp.

Senator CARDIN. Our second panel includes our private sector stakeholders. We are pleased to have Paul O'Brien who is vice president for policy and campaigns of Oxfam America where he oversees the policy and advocacy work, including teams focused on agriculture and climate change, aid effectiveness, extractive industries, humanitarian response, and U.S. regional programs.

Prior to joining Oxfam, Mr. O'Brien lived in Afghanistan for 5 years where he worked in the Office of the President and the Ministry of Finance as an advisor on aid coordination, development planning, and policy reform. Prior to that, he worked for CARE International as the Afghanistan advocacy coordinator and African policy advisor.

He is the cofounder of the Legal Resources Foundation in Kenya and founder of the Human Rights Research and Advocacy Consortium in Afghanistan.

Mr. O'Brien has his law degree from Harvard Law School and has published on humanitarian policy, human rights, and emerging trends in development. Welcome.

Conor Walsh is the Tanzania Country Director for Catholic Relief Services. I always like to have Catholic Relief Services present

since they are a strong presence in my own State of Maryland in Baltimore.

In Tanzania, Mr. Walsh leads a team of more than 90 staff and oversees a wide array of relief and development programs which ultimately benefit close to 400,000 Tanzanians. Since joining CRS, Mr. Walsh has served in a number of posts, including Angola, Haiti, Honduras, and Nicaragua. He has extensive experience overseeing programs in food security, agroenterprise, health, emergency assistance, and human rights.

Mr. Walsh holds a master's degree in international development from Columbia University.

Connie Veillette is the independent consultant and senior adviser to the Chicago Council on Global Affairs' Global Agricultural Development Initiative. Working in the area of international development for more than 20 years, Dr. Veillette served as a specialist in foreign assistance at the Congressional Research Service for 5 years. As a staff member of this committee working for Senator Lugar, she led the committee's report, "Global Food Insecurity: Perspectives from the Field," which served as the basis for the Lugar-Casey Global Food Security Act introduced in the 111th Congress.

As an independent consultant currently working with the Chicago Council on Global Affairs, she continues to follow and evaluate the work of the U.S. Government in the field of global food security and would be available to address the effectiveness of Feed the Future initiatives, including its research component.

It is a pleasure to have all three of you present. As you have heard from the first panel, this has been a high priority of the administration and a high priority of Congress. It is critically important that we work together with the private sector. We welcome your observations as to how well the program is working to carry out its goals and whether it could be more effective.

With that, let me first call on Mr. O'Brien.

STATEMENT OF PAUL O'BRIEN, VICE PRESIDENT FOR POLICY AND CAMPAIGNS, OXFAM AMERICA, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you, Senator Cardin and Senator Lugar, both for this hearing and for your ongoing leadership on the issue.

We are, as Oxfam working in 90 countries, big supporters of Feed the Future for many of the reasons discussed today. Particularly the focus on agriculture and as a flagship for how the United States ought to be doing development in the world, we think it is defining the rules across the board.

You, Senator, asked us to have a robust discussion around challenges, and I would like to offer three challenges that I think Feed the Future is going to be facing in the years to come and on which your leadership will be critical and on which we hope to see the administration lead also. Those challenges speak generally to the tensions between Congress' responsibility to track tax dollars while also embracing the idea that local leaders must lead. I would like to speak to that. The challenge of recognizing the role of the private sector without leaving them to an unregulated free-for-all, and the challenge of tackling climate change not just as a technical problem but as a political issue.

So on the first threat or challenge, the development community woke up some time ago—I would loosely say 10 years ago—to the reality that we—collectively as donors, as NGOs—are not collectively going to be capable of lifting 870 million people out of hunger or any significant number. In the end of the day, that challenge will ultimately fall to the institutions on the ground, the governments, the private sector actors, and the communities that must engage this issue themselves. That is old news, but it presents a set of challenges for us as a development community and in the Rome Principles, we see those challenges articulated.

We know that if we want those countries to lead, those communities, those private sectors, we must invest with and through them. We must challenge them on the outcomes, not on inputs. We must give them long-term challenges to succeed. And that is something on which Feed the Future has been both courageous, articulate, and insightful.

But across the U.S. Government that raises a particular tension because we are asking you as Congress to authorize and the administration to spend tax dollars through other institutions. Many in my community think that we are going too far in supporting local leadership and that ultimately we are going to see some of those moneys wasted because, as you pointed out, we face corruption and sometimes a lack of capacity in the countries where we have decided to invest.

We went out and surveyed how the United States is doing in its effort to invest more through local institutions, and here is what we found. There has been a real change in the conversation between local stakeholders, local governments but sometimes civil society and the United States. They feel that we are listening better, talking more, engaging more. However, when we asked them, Are you seeing an increased ability to influence U.S. Government funding and how it is spent? two-thirds said not that much over the 5 years that we asked, meaning we are listening better, they are feeling better informed about what the United States is doing, but still a significant proportion of them feel they do not exercise enough influence in directing our assistance.

So while many in our community and I think some Members of Congress will say we may be going too far in putting local institutions, local governments, local communities in charge of their own development, our sense is we have not yet gone far enough, but Feed the Future is on exactly the right track by trying to do that. USAID is on exactly the right track with USAID Forward.

And just on your question of corruption, Senator, I would like to say as you well know, the challenge we all have to crack that circle you talked about is that in each of the 19 countries, there are corrupt individuals who have no real interest in reducing hunger in their own countries, but there are also reformers and leaders in government and civil society who want to get political legitimacy, who want to prove both to the international community and their own people that they are willing to take this fight on. And if we can parse out the societies and find out where the corruption is and is not and strengthen the reformers and the moderates and those more committed to the governance you talked about, we can actually crack that circle. So that is all I will say on that.

On the second question which is the role of the private sector, I think we all for the same reasons, resource constraints and the breadth of the challenge, recognize that the private sector is profoundly important in moving forward our efforts to address food insecurity. And we think Feed the Future has been very strong on that and we embrace the New Alliance. But, of course, we all recognize that the way this is going to work effectively for people in poverty is the way we regulate the private sector. And one concern that I wanted to bring to your attention there that we think Feed the Future could be a leader on: land.

Over the last 10 years, there has basically been a land free-for-all globally, 227 million hectares sold off to investors, often leading to women, children, and men being thrown off their land without adequate compensation or consultation. What can we do, what can Feed the Future do, what can USAID do to incentivize the right regulatory regime to get this under control before too many smallholder farmers get removed from their land?

The FAO has put out a set of guidelines, voluntary guidelines, on land tenure. We think if Feed the Future explicitly embraced and funded efforts to adopt those guidelines by governments, by others, they could move the discussion on land tenure significantly forward and get some better regulation around what we see as a land free-for-all. The New Alliance—we think it is going in the right direction, but let us remember these are large corporations who have different interests at heart. So while they think about what they want more broadly, which is higher profits and better production of food to meet the needs of their shareholders, which is their legitimate interest, can we get them to align what they are doing transparently—and we embrace that idea—with the needs of smallholder farmers on the ground? And that is the tension there. What can we get the New Alliance companies to say about embracing the importance of smallholder farmers and the role of the Rome Principles, which is not clearly aligned with the way the companies have been talking about it. So those would be our proposals for cracking that challenge on Feed the Future.

Finally, climate change. It is great to hear that we are now having a robust discussion not about whether it is a problem but how we resolve it. And none too soon. We think that since 1980, corn production has reduced by 5 percent globally as a consequence of climate change, meaning the impact of climate change has been about 5 percent of production. In southern Africa because of climate change, we expect corn may be—there may be 30 percent less corn as a consequence of climate change in southern Africa. Big numbers.

It is good to see Feed the Future focus and invest in the technologies that we are going to need, better and more improved seeds, better water management. But we all know that technologies are probably going to be insufficient to tackle what is happening with our weather. We are going to need political commitments to and institutions that are explicitly capacitated and committed to addressing climate change. So we would be looking to see Feed the Future be more explicit not just about the technological dimensions and challenges of climate change but also the political and institutional challenges of getting countries to accept that they are going

to be having to adapt their agricultural economies to climate change over the next few decades.

So thank you very much for your time on those issues.

[The prepared statement of Mr. O'Brien follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PAUL O'BRIEN

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and Ranking Member Corker for holding this hearing on the Feed the Future Initiative. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to testify before this subcommittee. This is an important moment to provide oversight to the Feed the Future Initiative and the administration's approach to addressing global hunger.

Oxfam America is an international relief and development agency committed to developing lasting solutions to poverty, hunger, and social injustice. We are part of a confederation of 17 Oxfam affiliates working in more than 90 countries around the globe. We are also a campaigning organization meaning that through policy engagement and advocacy, we tackle the root causes of hunger and poverty in order to help people create an environment in which they can claim and exercise their rights.

On the issue of agriculture and food security, Oxfam's GROW campaign is active in the United States and more than 40 other countries to build a more fair global food system where everyone has enough to eat always.

In the United States, Oxfam America's work to promote a more equitable and just food system spans a broad number of issues from addressing policies that drive food price volatility such as biofuels mandates and commodity speculation to promoting positive public and private investments in the agriculture sector to meet the needs of small-scale food producers. We are also undertaking research and policy analysis on the Feed the Future Initiative aimed at strengthening U.S. foreign assistance programs focused on agriculture, food security, and adaptation to climate change.

Our view is that the Feed the Future Initiative marks an important shift for the U.S. Government—and USAID in particular—in terms of how it works and the emphasis it accords to the critical issue of agriculture. Food insecurity is a major global challenge and the Feed the Future Initiative, if sustained, can contribute to lasting reductions in poverty and hunger. I will highlight three areas—civil society engagement; integration of climate change adaptation and natural resource management into Feed the Future country investments; and promotion of strong and secure land tenure and property rights systems—that we feel are crucial areas where the Feed the Future Initiative shows promise, but where work remains to be done.

I. SUPPORT FOR THE FEED THE FUTURE INITIATIVE

We strongly support the efforts made by the current administration to bring renewed focus and attention to agriculture and food security. After achieving significant increases in agricultural productivity during the 1960s and 1970s, official development assistance to agriculture exhibited a steady decline for more than two decades from the mid-1980s to the first half of this decade. In 1986, agriculture made up almost 10 percent of total official development assistance globally. By 2006, that share had shrunk to less than 2 percent. The sudden and dramatic price spike in 2008 has led to a significant reinvigoration in aid to this sector. Importantly, it is not only donors that have returned to focus on agriculture. In 2003 African countries agreed, in what is known as the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Program (CAADP), to a target of allocating 10 percent of government budgets to agriculture.

For the vast majority of the more than 870 million people around the world who suffer from hunger, food and agriculture production is a key livelihoods strategy. Most of these food producers are women who struggle with unequal access to resources to grow enough food to feed their families and earn enough money to pay for basic necessities. Investing in agriculture is thus an important strategy to reach people living in poverty. In doing so, public and private investments in agriculture, when appropriately designed and targeted can be a driver of pro-poor economic growth and development. GDP growth generated by agriculture is at least twice as effective in reducing poverty as growth generated by other sectors.

In reflecting on early outcomes achieved since the Feed the Future Initiative was announced, it is important to recognize first and foremost that the true impact of the investments being made now in agriculture and food security will take years to be fully realized. The process of energizing rural economies, spurring agriculture development and sustainably reducing hunger cannot be achieved over night or over the course of only one growing season. They will take years to be fully realized.

One of the most important lessons to take from the Feed the Future Progress Report is that the quick wins are possible, but translating positive outputs into long-term positive outcomes in terms of higher incomes and improved food security and nutrition is a much longer process. We urge Congress to find creative solutions to ensure that the framework for poverty reduction developed in the Feed the Future Initiative, specifically the emphasis on supporting small-scale food producers, is sustained in this and future administrations.

II. CHANGING HOW USAID WORKS

Consistent with Principles agreed upon at the G8 summit in 2009, the Feed the Future Initiative seeks to change the way U.S. foreign assistance operates and the way the U.S. Government delivers aid. The Rome Principles as they are known commit G8 donors to better alignment with country strategies, deeper engagement with civil society actors, improved coordination and collaboration with other development actors and stakeholders and a sustained and holistic approach that addresses both short- and long-term challenges to hunger.

A practical and important outcome of the U.S. commitment to the Rome Principles is an emphasis on aligning resources and programs provided by the U.S. Government with the priorities and strategies developed by national governments. In African countries, this means ensuring investments align with country agriculture investment strategies (CAADP plans in Africa). Placing greater control of development objectives, strategies and resources with developing country governments, when responsibly done, is an important step toward bolstering country ownership of the development process.

To further bolster this process and to ensure Feed the Future programs are responsive to the needs of small-scale producers, the U.S. has committed to greater consultation and engagement with in-country stakeholders including, and from our perspective importantly, civil society—especially farmer-based organizations and associations representing the needs and interests of women food producers.

Oxfam research suggests that the emphasis on consultation is being taken seriously and that as a result missions in focus countries are changing the way they do business. To examine this issue, Oxfam has undertaken research in seven countries, where researchers interviewed nearly 250 development stakeholders to ask two questions:

- How is the U.S. Government implementing new foreign aid reform initiatives to improve aid delivery?
- What effects have these changes created in their early stages of implementation among the different development stakeholders in countries?

What we found is a significant improvement in the way the United States engages with civil society and other stakeholders. Whereas 4 years ago meetings with the representatives of the U.S. Government may have been hard to come by, 77 percent of our surveyed stakeholders say that now they are meeting with officials more frequently. And 74 percent of respondents told us that the quality of the interactions is better.

When done right, these interactions can lead to better outcomes and more mutually beneficial results. But it is clear from our research that although there is an improvement in the quantity and quality of interactions between U.S. officials and in-country stakeholders, it is not yet translating into changing the types or focus of U.S. investments. In our survey, 65 percent of local stakeholders felt their influence over what the U.S. funds has either decreased or not changed at all over the past 4 to 5 years. Consultation and engagement thus remains a work in progress.

The potential for improvement is strong, not just because USAID is taking the Rome Principles seriously, but also because other reforms within the agency have embraced many of these same principles and ideas and are turning them into improved practice at the mission level. In this regard, it is important to highlight one effort—implementation and procurement reform (IPR)—which is encouraging the agency to link more with local actors, learn from their experience, offer support that can build their capacity and create partnerships for lasting solutions to hunger and poverty.

Implementation and procurement reform aims to place a greater share of USAID's investments directly with country governments, local businesses, and local organizations. In so doing, this increased engagement can strengthen the capacity of governments as well as local civil society and businesses while also increasing the breadth and depth of U.S. partnerships. Greater competition created through IPR can drive innovation and results and ensure the most efficient and effective use of government resources. In this way, IPR is helping to take the concept of consultation and build on it to create true partnerships.

Oxfam applauds the commitment to country ownership and partnership embraced by the Feed the Future Initiative and IPR. Specific benchmarks and indicators should be developed and monitoring and reporting on local partnerships should be incorporated into the Feed the Future Progress Scorecard. Doing so will promote greater accountability and sustainability of this initiative.

III. RENEWING FOCUS ON CLIMATE ADAPTATION AND NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

As the experience of extreme droughts in both East and West Africa have demonstrated, climate change compounded by natural resource degradation, poses a key challenge and is the basis of a substantial portion of the risk farmers around the world face. Information contained in the Feed the Future Guide indicates a clear recognition of the importance of addressing these challenges. The Guide observes that the sustainability and resilience of agriculture production depends on a “large-scale systems approach to environmental and natural resource management” including addressing climate change.

Assisting small-scale food producers adapt to climate change and better manage natural resources is essential to the long-term success of the Feed the Future Initiative and efforts to promote sustainable development. As the lead implementing agency for both Feed the Future and the Climate Change Initiative, USAID can do more to ensure climate change and natural resource management (NRM) considerations are fully mainstreamed into agriculture development programs.

Without efforts to help farmers adapt to climate change, current levels of agriculture productivity will decline as extreme weather events such as droughts and floods increase, dry seasons become longer and hotter and rainfall patterns become increasingly erratic, affecting rain-fed agriculture production. Projected impacts of climate change on crop yields, which in the tropics and subtropics could fall 10–20 percent by 2050, could leave an additional 25 million children undernourished by 2050 in developing countries. The long-term decline in productivity will be punctuated by catastrophic crop losses caused by extreme weather events. This summer’s historic drought affecting the Midwest, for example, is expected to reduce the U.S. corn harvest by 20 percent on a yield-per-acre basis.

For food producers, climate adaptation requires developing the tools and knowledge and building the capacity to address current hazards and manage risk and uncertainty associated with weather. Much of the focus of current efforts within FTF to address natural resource management and climate change, especially as highlighted in the Progress Report, is on identifying appropriate technical solutions such as improved seed varieties and better water management techniques. But there is also a need to implement programs that address power dynamics that shape access to natural resources essential for smallholder agriculture. People living in poverty, women especially, lack equal access to natural resources or decisionmaking power regarding their use. Women produce over half the world’s food yet own less than 10 percent of the land. It is estimated that if women had equal access to resources (natural and otherwise), they could increase on-farm yields by 20 to 30 percent.

USAID can improve upon current Feed the Future activities by providing more regular training and technical support to mission staff to enable them to more systematically integrate consideration of the socioeconomic dynamics that shape climate change vulnerability and resilience into project planning and monitoring. Such an approach would reemphasize the focus on the particular challenges women face not just as food producers but also as consumers and potential stewards of natural resources.

The expected impact of climate change is compounded by the fragile and deteriorating natural resource base, which in many countries is resulting in diminished water resources, depleted soils and reduced forests among other environmental pressures. In Africa alone, 650 million people are dependent on rain-fed agriculture in fragile environments that are vulnerable to water scarcity and environmental degradation. Without sustained attention to address this challenge, the goals of Feed the Future are not achievable.

Better guidance and training for missions can help to address this challenge and can also help USAID to better manage the synergies and tradeoffs between improved yields and productivity, on the one hand, and the integrity of the ecosystems on which successful farming depends, on the other. Complementary information to guide decisionmaking can be developed through the use of continuous monitoring and learning. Better monitoring and evaluation systems need to be put in place that can be used to attribute outcomes to specific interventions and investments in order to capture a more comprehensive understanding of how investments to address natural resource management and climate change adaptation are impacting environmental sustainability,

IV. MAKING PRIVATE SECTOR INVESTMENTS WORK FOR SMALLHOLDERS

Agriculture represents one of the best opportunities for the estimated 1.5 to 2 billion people currently living in rural food producing households to sustainably escape hunger and poverty. Small-scale food producers themselves are the most significant source of investment in agriculture in most developing countries. Supporting the development of policies and investments to benefit small-scale producers as entrepreneurs is critical. Too often, however, small-scale producers are not considered to be investors at all, and policies promulgated in developing countries marginalize them or create incentives geared to supporting commercial level investments that can compete with or displace small-scale producers. This is a critical set of issues that Feed the Future must address.

As Oxfam has documented, not all investments in agriculture have positive outcomes for people living in poverty. With regard to large-scale land acquisitions, for example, Oxfam and many other organizations have raised concerns that the recent wave of investments in land in developing countries has included many instances of dispossession, deception, violations of human rights and destruction of livelihoods. In a recent Oxfam report, “Land and Power: The Growing Scandal Surrounding the New Wave of Investments in Land,” we documented five cases of land grabs that have hindered not helped development and poverty reduction. And this is just the tip of the iceberg. The Land Matrix Partnership has documented deals completed or under development amounting to nearly 49 million hectares of land since 2000, mainly by international investors, with most occurring in recent years. Our report and subsequent work on the problem of “land grabs” has sought to highlight the need for measures—norms, standards, and protections—to defend the rights of people living in poverty.

I highlight this issue for two reasons. First, Feed the Future will be less successful if attention is not paid to the importance of land rights—security of tenure, access to and control over land—in development outcomes. This is especially important for women, who often face legal and social barriers to controlling the land they farm. In an analysis of Feed the Future in Guatemala conducted by Oxfam, one of findings was that the impact of the initiative is partially limited by the fact that investments are not addressing structural issues including highly unequal access to land. This finding is underscored by World Bank analysis from 73 countries which found that countries which start with a more equitable distribution of land have economic growth rates two to three times higher than those with initially higher inequality.

Second, in a number of ways the U.S. has taken an active role both in addressing land issues and in the promotion of private investment in agriculture. Much of this work is positive, but in other areas, Oxfam has raised concerns with the administration.

Let me be clear: private investments—especially those made by national companies based in developing countries, small- and medium-sized enterprises, and small-scale producers themselves—can, and should be, promoted in the development process as the primary engine of sustainable job creation and broad-based economic growth. There is a need to increase investment that not only promotes agriculture in a way that “does no harm,” but in a way that “does more good.” What must be achieved through positive agricultural investment is inclusive economic growth, environmental sustainability and long-term poverty reduction. And such investments need not include taking direct control over land.

It is worth highlighting that the U.S. has provided significant recent leadership to improve the environment for the effective governance of land tenure, and in so doing lay the foundation for responsible agriculture investment. Over the past few years, the U.S. support has been instrumental in the development of a landmark set of guidelines and best practices to assist countries in protecting and promoting land rights. “The Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Tenure of Land, Forests, Fisheries in the Context of National Food Security” can serve as an important set of benchmarks and standards to guide national law, policy, and practice by governments and investors. U.S. Government staff chaired the negotiations, which have been lauded as highly inclusive and participatory. The result of this process is broad support for the Voluntary Guidelines which were adopted at the Committee on World Food Security earlier this year.

Now that the Voluntary Guidelines have been finalized, the next step is for countries to review existing laws and policies and take any necessary steps to ensure coherence. To do this, U.S. agencies’ development portfolios—whether they are part of Feed the Future or not—should review their own policies to ensure they meet the standards set out by the Voluntary Guidelines.

This is especially important for agencies and offices with investment or lending portfolios, such as the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the Export/Import Bank. This process should also ensure application of the Voluntary Guidelines to companies and investors that do business with these agencies.

The other step the United States can take is to support implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines, through bilateral foreign assistance as well as by providing funding to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, which is leading support for the implementation effort. Early piloting experience, which will include building technical resources and capacity-building at the country level, is a crucial step toward building a body of knowledge about how to effectively utilize the Voluntary Guidelines as a tool for improving the enabling environment in which tenure rights' holders have better, more secure access to land and natural resources.

The Voluntary Guidelines figure prominently in another initiative tied to Feed the Future and launched earlier this year at the G8. The New Alliance is an effort to link donors, developing countries, and private sector actors in new partnerships to contribute to a goal of lifting 50 million people out of poverty. At this point six countries—Ethiopia, Ghana, Tanzania, Mozambique, Cote D'Ivoire, and Burkina Faso—and more than 80 companies have joined the New Alliance. In forming each partnership Cooperative Framework Agreements have been developed, which include specific policy commitments by developing country governments, target funding levels for public sector investments by G8 countries and investment targets by companies seeking new market opportunities in African agriculture. Each Cooperative Framework Agreement includes a specific endorsement of the Voluntary Guidelines.

Oxfam welcomes the endorsement of the Voluntary Guidelines in the New Alliance, but has raised a number of other concerns regarding this initiative. For example, G8 leaders have indicated that commitments made as part of the New Alliance will be consistent with existing agriculture investment plans and have reiterated that the Rome Principles such as consultation and civil society engagement apply as well. In practice, the application of these principles has been weak. Not only does this threaten the credibility of this initiative, it threatens to undermine the trust built up over the last several years between USAID, governments and stakeholders.

Compounding this concern, available information regarding the nature of investments proposed by companies demonstrates a mixed commitment to targeting small-scale producers. It is crucial that in promoting private sector investments, the New Alliance and Feed the Future more generally, prioritize integration of and support and protections for small-scale producers.

We urge Congress to use its oversight authority to ensure the New Alliance is developed in a manner that is coherent with the public sector investments supported through the Feed the Future Initiative. The U.S. Government must ensure a balanced approach to hunger and poverty reduction, encouraging and supporting both public and private investments in the agriculture sector. Small-scale producers must remain at the center of this effort.

I thank the committee for the opportunity to share Oxfam's views and I am happy to answer questions you may have.

Senator CARDIN. Thank you for your testimony.

Mr. Walsh.

**STATEMENT OF CONOR WALSH, TANZANIA COUNTRY
DIRECTOR, CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES, BALTIMORE, MD**

Mr. WALSH. Thank you very much, Chairman Cardin and Senator Lugar. Thank you for this opportunity to address the subcommittee and to participate in this important hearing on U.S. global food security efforts.

As you noted, I am here today to represent Catholic Relief Services. We were established by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops and we are the international relief and development agency of the U.S. Catholic Church. On behalf of CRS, we appreciate the opportunity to provide our assessment of Feed the Future.

CRS supports Feed the Future and we recognize the historic nature of this initiative. We support the country ownership model Feed the Future seeks to achieve and the whole-of-government approach it is using to marshal U.S. resources.

We also commend the administration for rallying G8 donors to support the country development plans of the Feed the Future focus countries.

I would also like to add that the Feed the Future team in Tanzania has done a fine job in executing this comprehensive and integrated approach to development. The Feed the Future staff there are highly experienced development professionals who are genuinely committed to building the country's agricultural sector and bolstering its food security.

Having said that, we do believe that Feed the Future as a whole can be strengthened in three ways. No. 1, it can sharpen its focus on poor farmers. No. 2, it should balance the funding instruments that are used to deliver its assistance. And No. 3, it can improve the degree and the quality of participation by civil society in its design and its implementation.

Turning to the first point, in Tanzania CRS is actually a partner in Feed the Future. We are implementing a subcontract that focuses on poor and vulnerable groups. These groups tend to be smallholder farmers who operate on a subsistence level, and our work helps to prepare them for the market by building their assets and their skills.

Taken overall, however, Feed the Future in Tanzania has not really focused very much on the vulnerable groups. Instead, the bulk of Feed the Future resources have gone to regions of the country that are relatively better off, and within these regions substantial resources have gone to farmers who are already involved in commercial production. While such investments are called for by the Tanzanian Government's national agricultural investment plan, which Feed the Future supports, we are concerned that focusing only on areas prioritized by the plan risks marginalization of the more vulnerable.

Some of the work being carried out under Feed the Future has great potential to improve smallholder farmers' ability to farm profitably and to improve the livelihoods of the poor. This work includes trade policy reform, rural infrastructure, food processing, nutrition work, and research on seed and plant varieties. Care has to be taken to ensure that improvements in these areas reach the poor.

More importantly, though, we feel strongly that there should be more Feed the Future projects in Tanzania and in other Feed the Future countries that work directly with smallholder farmers and other vulnerable groups and in particular with women. These projects should focus on building their skills and their capacity to be self-sufficient. From our perspective, the measure of success in tackling hunger is tied directly to whether smallholder farmers are producing more food, are earning more income, are able to provide a healthy diet for themselves and their children, can maintain and build up productive assets like farm tools and livestock, and whether they can afford to keep their children in school. These are the indicators that matter in the fight against hunger and they should be at the top of Feed the Future's objectives.

My second point relates to the funding mechanisms that are used to implement Feed the Future programs. Feed the Future programs are implemented either through contracts or through cooper-

ative agreements. Private volunteer organizations like CRS mostly undertake cooperative agreements as opposed to contracts for a variety of reasons that are discussed in more detail in my written testimony. I would like to take this opportunity to highlight just one of those points.

Cooperative agreements give organizations more flexibility in the way programs are designed and implemented. It allows organizations like CRS to leverage private donor funding, and it helps us incorporate our experience into program design. More importantly, though, the flexibility that is inherent in cooperative agreements better allows us to respond to realities on the ground and to adjust strategies as conditions change. There is perhaps a general assumption that contract mechanisms allow the donor to achieve desired results within a shorter timeframe and at lower cost, and this may be true if you are building a bridge or constructing a highway. But our experience has shown that the path to development cannot be neatly designed like a blueprint for a construction project. Development consists of changing behaviors, attitudes, practices, and relationships within groups of society. This is a fluid process and implementation, therefore, must be adaptable and cooperative agreements are far better suited for this purpose.

The reason I bring this up is because our observations suggest that in many Feed the Future countries, USAID has relied heavily on contracts to achieve development goals. While this is not as true for Tanzania, the country that I am coming from, it is a common occurrence across a number of Feed the Future countries. The practice has discouraged PVOs like CRS from contributing as implementers of the Feed the Future program. In doing so, Feed the Future has not had the full benefit of the substantial experience the PVO community brings to implementing highly successful food security programs. If Feed the Future is serious about having a lasting impact and reducing hunger, there should be a better mix, a better balance of contracts and cooperative agreements across all Feed the Future countries.

My third and final point relates to the input in Feed the Future program design and country development plans in the field. We believe that in general Feed the Future feedback mechanisms need to be strengthened to ensure that the program can take advantage of knowledge and capacities that were built in other food security programs.

My experience in Tanzania regarding input mechanisms is mixed. On the positive side, CRS participated, along with several other dozen NGOs and other stakeholders, in a feedback session to validate and review the Feed the Future strategy, and the mission also engaged at times with a number of civil society groups to obtain input and advice, including the Agricultural and Non-State Actors Forum which represents a number of smallholder farmers. All of this is positive.

However, we feel a more regular mechanism for obtaining feedback should be put in place. This could take the shape of an advisory council or just holding regular meetings with civil society groups, including local and international NGOs, faith-based groups, and other stakeholders, to discuss the country implementation plan, the investment plan, and to identify best practices and scale

up successful efforts. USAID could also undertake a mapping exercise of previous projects in Feed the Future countries to build on those experiences. What is important is that PVOs, local NGOs, and others have a means to communicate their experience and knowledge to Feed the Future and that planners make every effort to incorporate and/or learn from the information provided.

In conclusion, Chairman Cardin, thank you again for this opportunity to present testimony before the committee, and I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Walsh follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CONOR WALSH

I would like to thank Chairman Cardin and Ranking Member Corker for calling this important hearing on U.S. Global Food Security Efforts, with a focus on the Feed the Future Initiative. I am Conor Walsh and am here today to represent Catholic Relief Services (CRS). I have been with CRS for 17 years, and currently serve as the Country Representative for Tanzania. On behalf of the organization, we appreciate the opportunity to provide our assessment of U.S. Global antihunger efforts, and in particular Feed the Future.

ABOUT CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES

Catholic Relief Services is the relief and development agency of the U.S. Catholic Church. CRS was originally formed by U.S. Catholic Bishops during World War II to aid in the resettlement of war refugees in Europe. Today, our work focuses on aiding the poor overseas, using the gospel of Jesus Christ as our mandate. The Church's social teaching informs the work of CRS and guides us to aid the poorest people in the poorest places, without regard to race, creed, or nationality.

The Catholic Church has broad and deep experience combating poverty and hunger around the world and CRS has direct experience as an implementer of U.S. foreign assistance programs. The U.S. Bishops and CRS have close ties to the Church in developing countries, and CRS often partners with institutions of the local Catholic Church to implement programs. By partnering with Church institutions, CRS is often afforded the opportunity to work with communities inaccessible to the local government or other actors.

CRS presently operates in almost 100 countries and serves about 100 million people annually. Our programs address food security, agriculture, HIV and AIDS treatment, health, education, civil society capacity-building, emergency relief, and peace-building. In addition to partnering with Church institutions, CRS works with a variety of other partners to implement our programming, including other Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs), U.S. and foreign-based non-governmental organizations (NGOs), local and national governments, international organizations like the World Food Programme, and national and local nonprofit organizations in the countries and regions where we work.

CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICE'S RESPONSE TO GLOBAL FOOD INSECURITY

Improving food security for the poor and most vulnerable overseas has long been a major priority of CRS. We use a variety of funding sources for this work, both public and private.

Historically, most U.S. Government funding for food security has been in the form of food aid. As a result, food aid is the largest portion of CRS' public funding for development and emergency food security programs. We receive funding from sources like the Food for Peace nonemergency account administered by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID),¹ as well as U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) McGovern-Dole Food for Education and Food for Progress programs, which allows CRS to conduct a wide range of agriculture and food security initiatives. These include helping smallholder farmers boost agricultural yields, introduce new crop varieties, establish value chains, and train farmers in necessary skill sets to become profitable and engaged in formal markets. CRS food security programming also includes village run savings and loan associations, which link to our agroenterprise activities. Additionally, CRS has long engaged in mother and

¹ Food for Peace is also referred to as Title II, or Title II of P.L. 480. Food for Peace Funding is split between emergency food relief, and nonemergency programs that fund development food assistance activities.

child nutrition programs that provide nutritious foods and educate mothers in better health and nutrition practices for their children.

In addition to public donor funding, CRS raises substantial private funds which we dedicate to food security programs. We regularly leverage these private resources with public donor funding. Every year during Lent, CRS conducts a program called “Rice Bowl” in Catholic parishes and with other partners across the U.S. to educate Catholics about global hunger and generate funds for food security projects. In a new program called “Helping Hands,” CRS collaborates with Stop Hunger Now, a private food aid organization, to conduct food packing events that provide food for the most vulnerable abroad. And recently, through leadership from InterAction,² U.S. PVOs have pledged a combined \$1 billion in private funding over the next 3 years to food security programming, with CRS making up \$150 million of this pledge.

CRS presently operates in 17 of the 20 Feed the Future countries, and in 8 of these countries—Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Malawi, Mali, Tanzania, and Zambia—we implement major food security programs.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS CONCERNING FEED THE FUTURE

CRS supports the Feed the Future Initiative. Prior to the Obama administration, the vast majority of U.S. foreign assistance efforts directed to food security were funded through U.S. food aid programs. While these programs were and continue to be a critical part of U.S. foreign assistance, they were never funded commensurate to the level of need. Now, through the President’s comprehensive approach to eradicating global hunger, Feed the Future, coupled with existing U.S. food aid programs, we have begun to see more attention to, and more appropriate levels of funding for, food security programming.

The administration has promoted Feed the Future as a “whole of government” initiative to provide a country-led, comprehensive approach to improving food security. We understand the enormity of this challenge. A truly comprehensive approach requires a wide range of stakeholders including the global donor community through the G8 and G20 processes, as well as multilateral organizations, regional governing and economic communities, recipient countries, beneficiaries, and aid implementers. The whole of government vision requires pulling together new and existing programs and funding mechanisms to achieve common food security objectives. Appreciating these challenges, we offer the following thoughts on specific aspects of Feed the Future from the perspective of our field offices and provide suggestions for how to strengthen its impact on the world’s most vulnerable communities. These suggestions deal with (1) the focus of Feed the Future programming, (2) the funding instruments used by Feed the Future, and (3) the ability of organizations like CRS to provide input and advice on the implementation of the Feed the Future Initiative.

THE FOCUS OF FEED THE FUTURE

As indicated in its October 2012 Progress Report, the Feed the Future Initiative intends to reduce global hunger largely through increased agriculture-driven economic growth for smallholder farmers and resilience programs for populations at risk of food crises. These are laudable goals that CRS fully supports because we also believe the key to tackling global hunger is to increase food security for the poorest people in the poorest countries. In Feed the Future countries, some smallholder farmers need direct assistance to boost agriculture production and additional skills to connect them to market-driven, value chain development efforts. However, we are concerned that some Feed the Future efforts risk placing too little emphasis on smallholder farmers and other vulnerable groups.

Possibly driven by pressures to show results quickly and demonstrate the impact of scarce development funds, some Feed the Future investments appear focused on improving the capacity of existing commercial agriculture producers, sometimes at the expense of addressing the needs of smallholder farmers and other vulnerable populations. Commercial producers often already have access to assets and credit, and sit at the higher end of value chains to produce significant quantities for local consumption and export. They already consistently sell products of reliable quality in attractive packaging, meeting domestic, regional, and international certification standards. While CRS supports efforts to build a strong commercial agriculture sector in the developing world, building the capacity of existing and relatively successful commercial agricultural producers will not necessarily improve the lives of the poorest, who are the most food insecure. Support must be delivered equitably across

² InterAction is an alliance of U.S.-based international nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) focusing on overseas disaster relief and development.

all segments of the agricultural sector—big, medium, and small—and opportunities must be made for smaller producers to work on an equitable basis with the other parts of the agricultural value chain. Otherwise, the food produced will have little impact on food security, especially if it is for export, is not distributed well within a country, or remains too expensive for the poor to buy. As examples, we have observed Feed the Future programming that is biased toward medium- and large-scale producers, instead of smallholder farmers, in Tanzania and Guatemala.

In Tanzania, CRS is a subcontractor to ACDI/VOCA under the “NAFAKA” contract. Our work within this project is directly linked to vulnerable groups, but overall is a very small part of the Feed the Future programming in Tanzania. The bulk of Feed the Future resources have gone to agricultural producers targeted by Tanzania’s national agricultural investment plan, the Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania (SAGCOT). SAGCOT seeks to concentrate public, donor, and private sector investments in a corridor spanning the country’s center, starting from its western border with Zambia and stretching across to Dar es Salaam. These regions targeted by SAGCOT already are relatively better off economically compared to other parts of the country, and beneficiaries within this corridor are relatively wealthier farmers, some of whom are already involved in large-scale commercial production. We have raised concerns with the USAID mission that not enough attention is being placed on smallholder farmers, the bulk of whom are in northern areas of the country. The mission has been sympathetic to these concerns and is beginning to place more emphasis on addressing the needs of vulnerable groups. However, we feel there continues to be a bias in favor of wealthier areas and farmers because of a development approach that assumes that benefits reaped by larger producers will eventually cascade down to smallholder farmers and vulnerable groups—which is a problematic assumption. We fear that if the benefits of Feed the Future continue to be spread unevenly in Tanzania, the results will ultimately exacerbate rather than alleviate income disparities, thus contributing to political instability.

In Guatemala, Feed the Future is focused on three main goals: (1) market-led, value-chain agricultural development, (2) strengthening the health care sector, and (3) prevention and treatment of undernutrition. All three Feed the Future components are aligned toward complementary goals and target the same regions of the country. CRS currently operates in Guatemala implementing a 6-year Food for Peace development food assistance program that contributes to these goals by supporting nutrition interventions for mothers and children under 2, and by linking farmers at the bottom tier of producers into the Feed the Future supported value chain programming. But we see that the value chain, market-led agricultural development efforts have focused mainly on improving the capacity of the better-off, commercial agricultural producers in these areas to produce for and connect to national and international markets. While we ultimately expect to graduate 700 farm families into the Feed the Future value chain program, there are still over 20,000 smallholder farmers in these regions that we are not working with, and who could also benefit if Feed the Future provided them the necessary support.

Feed the Future must do more to directly address food insecurity of the poor at the same time it works to strengthen existing commercial agricultural producers. In particular, Feed the Future can and should do more to target smallholder farmers who make up lower level producers. These farmers have little access to credit, own small parcels of land or work land in a communal fashion, produce primarily for themselves and for local consumption, and use less mechanization, less certified seed, and less fertilizer in their agricultural production. From our perspective, the measure of success in tackling hunger is whether smallholder farmers are producing more food, are earning more income, have better access to credit, are able to provide a healthy diet for themselves and their children, can maintain and build up productive assets like farm tools and livestock, and whether they can afford to keep their children in school.

BALANCING OF FUNDING INSTRUMENTS

As a whole of government initiative, Feed the Future brings together funding from traditional food aid programs, as well as the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP), nutrition funding within the Global Health Initiative, and other specialized programs, to achieve a common set of goals. However, Feed the Future’s core funding comes out of the Development Assistance account within USAID and is administered by the Bureau of Food Security (BFS). As reported in the 2012 Feed the Future Progress report, this core funding will be a little over \$950 million in FY 2012.

We believe Feed the Future programs have largely been awarded as contracts, as opposed to cooperative agreements. We began tracking funding mechanisms used by BFS in 2011 using information available on www.usaspending.gov and www.foreignassistance.gov. Our findings showed that there was about a 2-to-1 ratio, in terms of dollars, going into contracts over cooperative agreements. We attempted to repeat this analysis for 2012, however we learned from USAID that not all data concerning Feed the Future funding is publicly available, thus skewing our results for 2012. Nevertheless, our offices in Feed the Future countries have reported to us their experiences. From this, we understand that Feed the Future funding in Zambia and Tanzania has balanced contracts and cooperative agreements. In contrast, funding in other Feed the Future countries, like Ghana and Uganda, has been mostly in the form of contracts.

The distinction between contracts and cooperative agreements is an important one. When faith-based groups like CRS undertake U.S. funded foreign assistance projects, the awards are generally in the form of cooperative agreements. There are a few main reasons behind this:

- First, we seek funding based not by the potential profit to be made via government contracts, but instead by the number of people we can help to live better, more dignified lives. This conscious choice is reflected in our accounting systems as well as our project management structures, which are aligned with the regulations and requirements of cooperative agreements.
- Second, cooperative agreements generally entail a contribution to the program funding by the implementing organization—in our case, we are able to leverage substantial private donor funding to compliment the resources provided by USAID.
- Third, cooperative agreements give both USAID and implementing organizations more flexibility in the way programs are designed and implemented. This flexibility allows funding recipients to contribute their considerable expertise to program design, to better respond to realities on the ground, to adjust strategies as conditions change, and to operate in ways that do not impede on our core principles or violate tenets of our founding faiths.
- Fourth, the award terms and governing regulations of cooperative agreements allow for meaningful engagement and mutual ownership of program goals and results by local partner organizations and host communities, who are primary stakeholders of capacity-building organizations such as CRS, and whose empowerment is a prominent goal of USAID FORWARD.
- Last, there is a general assumption that contract mechanisms allow the donor to achieve desired results within a short period of time and according to precise specifications, designs, and cost estimates. However, our experience has shown that the most lasting impacts are achieved through development interventions that are long-term and painstakingly implemented through multiyear investments in physical resources as well as human capital that build the skills and capacity of beneficiaries and local partners. Fighting poverty is not like building a bridge or a school, but rather consists of a process aimed at changing behaviors, power relationships and distribution of resources, building the capacities of local organizations and communities for lasting change.

As noted earlier, CRS currently has a Feed the Future subcontract in Tanzania, and we also are implementing a Feed the Future cooperative agreement in Zambia and work as a subrecipient to CARE for a cooperative agreement in Ethiopia. Nevertheless, the heavy reliance on contracts by Feed the Future has greatly discouraged PVOs from contributing as implementers of Feed the Future programming. This is regrettable because these organizations have much to offer Feed the Future countries. U.S. PVOs have deep experience in implementing highly successful antihunger programs, and in many cases within the Feed the Future target countries. PVOs have been working directly in poor communities on food security programming for years, giving them on the ground relationships and networks that can be leveraged to further program goals. PVOs tend to collaborate with each other, both in program implementation and in after program learning, allowing our community to identify and perfect models that move very poor people up the economic ladder. In fact, there is a rich body of demonstrated success within the PVO community that can easily be scaled up and incorporated into the larger Feed the Future country-led approach. As just one example, CRS has recently completed the Global Development Alliance program “ACORDAR” in Nicaragua, where we worked with smallholder farmers to build their entrepreneurial skills, increase food production, and help them engage in formal markets, thereby bringing them to the next level of market-readiness and commercial farming. Through a balance in funding instruments, Feed the Future could do more to harness this expertise that PVOs offer.

INPUT IN PROGRAM DESIGN AND COUNTRY DEVELOPMENT PLANS

In addition to contributing to Feed the Future as an implementer, CRS and other nonprofit organizations have also attempted to share our experiences and expertise by providing input into Feed the Future planning and program design.

CRS began engaging with the current administration on food security when the Obama transition team started conducting outreach sessions. We have often participated in Feed the Future meetings here in Washington, DC, with the administration. USAID–Washington, USDA, and the State Department should be complimented for their outreach efforts and open door policy. We would also like to voice our appreciation for their efforts to develop Feed the Future progress indicators across implementing agencies. This is difficult, but very important work, as it creates a truly results-based framework and standardizes it across assistance programs. In the field, CRS has had more varied success engaging those charged with Feed the Future implementation.

In Zambia, our office has indicated that the USAID mission has been very good at engaging U.S. PVOs and local NGOs in both Feed the Future strategy development, and bringing their input into the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) discussions regarding Zambia.³

In Tanzania, CRS, and several dozen NGOs and other stakeholders participated in a feedback session with consultants hired to design and validate the Feed the Future strategy. It was unclear how the input provided was used. Participants called attention to the need to include smallholder and vulnerable farmers in actions specifically designed to address their needs, and to the complexities of promoting nutritional and agricultural productivity objectives under one strategy. CRS subsequently organized a meeting for local NGOs and international PVOs with the USAID Feed the Future team which was a very helpful opportunity to learn more about the Feed the Future plan, but by then the program had been fully designed and most of the grants and contracts awarded. While the Feed the Future team seemed genuinely interested in engaging with civil society actors, including vulnerable groups, it also appeared they were uncertain how to achieve this. No continuous consultations or mechanisms for obtaining such feedback are in place, except for biannual partners meetings which do not lend themselves to open dialogue and discussion since they are generally formal presentations from the various contractors and grantees as opposed to discussion opportunities.

In Kenya, we took the initiative to assemble a group of U.S.-based PVOs and Kenyan NGO partners to engage USAID and the Government of Kenya on food security. We were united in seeking greater input into Feed the Future planning and the wider country-led approach. This effort, however, has not reaped any significant changes that we can see.

In Ghana, the U.S. Alliance to End Hunger used funding from a private grant to assemble U.S. PVOs (including CRS) and Ghanaian NGOs to engage the Government of Ghana and USAID and give input on Feed the Future implementation. CRS also organized a stakeholder meeting with several food security focused groups, farmers organizations, and other local NGOs to review actions on Ghana's country plan. These efforts have resulted in constructive dialogue, but more dialogue and learning needs to occur. For instance, while Food for Peace activities are no longer funded in Ghana, there is a wealth of information from past Food for Peace programming, that should be gathered and institutionalized for lessons learned. Such experience can certainly inform and improve Feed the Future programming in other countries.

In general, our experiences in the field tell us that most Feed the Future countries do not regularly seek input from either U.S.-based PVOs who have implemented food security programming for many years, or from local NGOs that have both a stake in the development of their country, and something to offer to further this goal. In the instances where we have organized our communities to provide such information, we have seen, at best, mixed acceptance of our advice.

We feel that Feed the Future's lack of engagement with PVOs and local organizations to seek their input represents another missed opportunity for Feed the Future to meet its goals by building on the successes of past programs PVOs have implemented. Several Feed the Future countries either currently receive, or have in the recent past received, food aid funding directed at assisting smallholder farmers and other vulnerable populations. As noted above, PVOs have a tremendous amount of

³Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) is an entity of the African Union, and consists of African countries that have pledged at least 10 percent of their annual budgets to agricultural investments. CAADP has played a significant role in facilitating the writing of country development plans used to guide Feed the Future funding.

experience implementing these programs, and have both lessons learned and best practices that can be scaled up to great effect. We believe, however, the sharing of this information must be done in a more systematic and regular way.

We recommend that Feed the Future establish a permanent and effective mechanism for U.S.-based PVOs and local NGOs to communicate their experience and knowledge to Feed the Future, and that Feed the Future planners make every effort to adopt, incorporate, and learn from the information we provide. While we have in mind a mechanism for ongoing dialogue to achieve this, we also recommend USAID undertake a mapping exercise of recent food security interventions in Feed the Future countries. This will help Feed the Future identify what has been done to date, and could very well lead to the adoption of lessons learned and best practices that were achieved by past programs.

CONCLUSION

Chairman Cardin, Ranking Member Corker, thank you again for this opportunity to present testimony before the subcommittee. I hope the observations and assessments we have provided concerning Feed the Future prove useful to you as you provide oversight of the initiative. To summarize the main points we covered:

- We support Feed the Future's efforts to develop commercial agriculture sectors, but believe that additional emphasis must be placed more on directly helping smallholder farmers and other vulnerable populations;
- Feed the Future should work to better balance the mix of contracts and cooperative agreements, so that organizations like CRS, which have experience implementing food security programs, can better bring their experiences and resources to Feed the Future efforts; and
- Feed the Future must more systematically and regularly capture input from U.S.-based PVOs and local NGOs, to effectively utilize these experiences to inform Feed the Future planning.

As you continue your oversight of U.S. Food Security efforts and of the Feed the Future Initiative, we hope you will continue to look to CRS to offer ongoing assessments of USAID programs. Feed the Future is a welcomed departure from the past as it seeks to address the complexities of global hunger through a comprehensive approach that brings all stakeholders into the process. It is our conviction that U.S.-based PVOs and other civil society stakeholders should and will play a key role in that process.

Senator CARDIN. Thank you very much for your testimony.
Dr. Veillette.

STATEMENT OF DR. CONNIE A. VEILLETTE, INDEPENDENT CONSULTANT, SENIOR ADVISER, GLOBAL AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE, CHICAGO COUNCIL ON GLOBAL AFFAIRS, FAIRFAX STATION, VA

Dr. VEILLETTE. Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today and thank you for the attention that the subcommittee is bringing to this important issue.

I join my colleagues in this panel in arguing for a more concerted effort in achieving global food security. The Obama administration deserves much credit for prioritizing this issue in its Feed the Future initiative and its leadership at G8 and G20 meetings.

The challenge of achieving food security for the approximately 870 million people who live with chronic hunger has thankfully enjoyed bipartisan support, beginning with the Bush administration's initiative to end hunger in Africa and increases in development assistance for agriculture that began in 2008. The Lugar-Casey global food security bill also had bipartisan support in the Senate.

As we have heard today, the Feed the Future initiative seeks to increase productivity and incomes among some of the poorest and least productive populations in Africa, Central America, and South Asia. While this is necessary, it may not be sufficient given antici-

pated global trends. I would like to identify three trends that will put incredible pressure on farmers around the world going forward and then comment on how Feed the Future can help address these trends.

I would also like to alert you that there will be a forthcoming report from the Chicago Council on Global Affairs that will discuss these trends in more detail and that will be made available to the committee in early December.

First, the global population is projected to increase by 28 percent, reaching 9 billion people by 2050. The Food and Agriculture Organization estimates that cereal production will need to increase by 60 percent to keep pace with that demand. Increasing the productivity of the least productive, largely smallholders in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, is an important component, but they alone will not be able to feed the world. All farmers in every part of the world will need to grow more to meet that demand.

Second, wealthier populations demand a more protein-rich diet. We anticipate that populations will become more prosperous in the decades ahead. Because the livestock industry is a cereal-intense one, this suggests that demand for feed grains will increase commensurately.

Third, climate change and weather variability will result in productivity losses in many of the current bread baskets of the world. Whether one believes climate change is manmade or a naturally occurring cycle, it still requires adaptation, new seeds that are drought and heat resistant, more efficient use of farm inputs and water resources, and techniques that protect the environment while not contributing further to greenhouse gas emissions.

These three trends, population growth, changing diets, and climate change, suggest that the current call for a 60-percent increase in production may be a best-case scenario. Farmers will need to produce more on existing cultivated land and do it more efficiently, something that has been called resilient intensification.

These challenges are not for the United States to solve alone, but American farmers and businesses benefit from a more prosperous global system. To address these challenges, we must prioritize science and be more supportive of a greater role for the private sector and increase trade flows. The scope of U.S. food security programs needs to be widened accordingly.

The United States is no longer the global leader in agriculture-related science, research, and development, but is being outpaced by countries such as Brazil, China, and India. Earlier investments made American farmers some of the most productive in the world. The benefits of the Green Revolution allowed productivity to triple even as the world's population doubled. Research investments made in the United States with the land grant universities in the lead benefit American farmers and consumers and also have spill-over effects globally.

U.S. assistance to build the capacity of foreign universities and research facilities has also dropped off, meaning that U.S. scientists lack partners in developing countries to tackle such issues as plant disease and pests that cross national borders with increasing frequency.

The private sector is increasingly investing in developing countries as they seek new markets and suppliers, but businesses avoid areas that lack a governance framework that protects property rights, as we have discussed earlier, and that allows for rampant corruption.

Local businesses are also less likely to expand or create new ventures in areas where financing and infrastructure are lacking. Agriculture can help create vibrant rural economies, but businesses that support or benefit from agriculture need some degree of confidence that their investments will produce a return.

Likewise, trade barriers both globally and regionally need to be lowered. Cross-border trade is burdened with corrupt or untrained officials, outdated regulations, or poor infrastructures in many developing countries.

Additionally, differing standards and approval processes for the importation of improved seed, for example, mean that African farmers often are unable to access the inputs that would make them more productive.

The challenge of feeding 9 billion people has not been a focal point of Feed the Future. However, its scope will need to be broadened if we want to prevent more people from falling into poverty from recurring bouts of price volatility if food supply is not able to keep pace with growing demand. And while the administration has recently recognized the role of the private sector and trade, there is a lot more work that needs to be done to fully develop and integrate these aspects into a U.S. food security program.

I appreciate this opportunity to testify. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Veillette follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. CONNIE A. VEILLETTE

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today on global food security. I would also like to thank the subcommittee for their ongoing attention to this issue.

I join my colleagues on this panel in arguing for a more concerted effort in achieving global food security. The Obama administration deserves much credit for prioritizing this issue in its Feed the Future initiative and its leadership at G8 and G20 meetings. The challenge of achieving food security for the approximately 870 million people who live with chronic hunger has thankfully enjoyed bipartisan support beginning with the Bush administration's initiative to End Hunger in Africa and increases in development assistance for agriculture that began in 2008. The Lugar-Casey Global Food Security bill also had bipartisan support in the Senate.

As we have heard here today, the Feed the Future initiative seeks to increase productivity and incomes among some of the poorest and least productive populations in Africa, Central America, and South Asia. While this focus is necessary, it may not be sufficient given anticipated global trends.

I would like to identify three trends that will put incredible pressure on farmers around the world. Then, I will comment on how Feed the Future can help to address these trends. A forthcoming report from the Chicago Council on Global Affairs will elaborate on these trends and possible solutions, and will be shared with the subcommittee in early December.

First, the global population is projected to increase by 28 percent, reaching 9 billion people by 2050. While this projection may seem like a time too distant in the future to have much urgency, the long lag time in bringing new technologies on line demands that attention be given now to increasing productivity. For example the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) estimates that cereal production will need to increase by 60 percent by 2050 to keep pace with demand. Especially disconcerting, global annual productivity has stagnated since the 1980s with some exceptions in China, India and Brazil.

Increasing the productivity of the least productive—largely smallholders in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia—is an important first step to reducing poverty and

hunger, but these farmers will not be able to feed the world. All farmers in every part of the world will need to grow more to meet that demand.

Second, wealthier populations demand a more protein-rich diet, as has been demonstrated in emerging economies. We anticipate that populations will become more prosperous in the decades ahead. Because the livestock industry is a cereal-intense one, demand for feed grain is likewise expected to increase.

Third, climate change and weather variability will result in productivity losses in many of the current breadbaskets of the world. Whether one believes climate change is man-made or a naturally occurring cycle, it still requires adaptation—new seeds that are drought and heat resistant, more efficient use of farm inputs and water resources, and techniques that protect the environment while not contributing to greenhouse gas emissions. The effects of global warming are projected to significantly reduce agricultural productivity by as much as 16 percent by 2080, and by as much as 28 percent in Africa.

These three trends—population growth, changing diets, and climate change—suggest that current calls for a 60-percent increase in production may be a best-case scenario.

If we are unable or unwilling to overcome these three challenges, the world may become politically, economically, and ecologically more unstable. There is a link between rising food prices, the global economy, and political unrest. If supply does not keep pace with demand, high food prices will push millions more into poverty. As food takes up a larger portion of consumers' budgets, there are less discretionary funds left for other necessities. Sharp increases in food prices have added fuel to the fire among populations that may already be suffering from unrepresentative or unresponsive governments.

From an environmental perspective, agriculture both suffers from, and contributes to, climate change, producing between 15 and 25 percent of greenhouse gas emissions. Farmers of all sizes will need to adopt new approaches and techniques. With limits on the availability of arable land and continuing pressures on water resources, farmers will need to produce more on existing cultivated land and do it more efficiently, something that has been called resilient intensification.

These challenges require that the global agriculture system, one in which evidence shows is becoming increasingly fragile, must be seen as one system with interrelated parts rather than as a zero-sum scenario. These are not problems that the United States can, or should, solve on its own, but American farmers and businesses would benefit from a more prosperous global system.

Investing in agriculture has been shown to reduce poverty by increasing family incomes and revitalizing rural economies in developing countries. It results in more affordable food for both rural and urban consumers. Focusing on women farmers has been shown to improve the health and productivity of their children.

For these investments to be effective, the United States must prioritize science, research, and development, and be supportive of a greater role for the private sector and increased trade flows. These areas are all ones in which the United States has comparative advantages, but the scope of U.S. food security programs needs to be widened accordingly.

The United States was once the global leader in science and agriculture-related research and development, but it is no longer. Those earlier investments made American farmers some of the most productive in the world. The benefits of the Green Revolution since the 1960s allowed productivity to triple even as the world's population doubled. But since the 1980s, investments in the agricultural sciences have fallen with the United States being overtaken by China, Brazil, and India. Research investments made in the United States, with the land grant universities in the lead, benefit American farmers and consumers, and also have spillover effects globally. There are roles for both advanced breeding techniques—GM technologies—as well as traditional breeding for improved seed varieties. Much progress needs to be made in standardizing evidenced-based approval processes for all types of scientific advances.

U.S. assistance to build the capacity of foreign universities and research facilities has also dropped off, meaning that U.S. scientists lack partners in developing countries to tackle such issues as plant disease and pests that cross national borders with increasing frequency. The spread of disease and pests, and issues of food safety take on greater importance given their rapid transmission around the world. Increased opportunities for exchanges of students and faculty between U.S. and foreign educational institutions would greatly aid the caliber and effectiveness of research efforts.

The private sector is increasingly investing in global agriculture as businesses seek new markets and suppliers. But, businesses avoid investments in areas that lack a governance framework that protects property rights or that allows rampant

corruption. The World Bank's Doing Business index lists just seven African countries above the median suggesting the necessity of focusing on the factors that will contribute to business expansion and job creation.

Local businesses are also less likely to expand or create new ventures in areas where financing and infrastructure are lacking. Agriculture can help create vibrant rural economies, but businesses that support or benefit from agricultural investments need some degree of confidence that their investments will produce a return.

U.S. food security and development strategies should more fully integrate market analysis to identify barriers to investment. Current strategies by the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the Partnership for Growth model, while requiring analysis to identify obstacles to economic growth, are often lacking the perspective of local and international business that could be helpful in facilitating greater private investment.

Likewise, trade barriers—both globally and regionally—need to be lowered. It is often easier to export to Europe than to a neighboring African country because cross-border trade is burdened with corrupt or untrained officials, outdated regulations, or poor infrastructure that impedes the flow of commodities. The World Bank estimates that just 5 percent of grain or cereal imports to African countries originates from the continent.

Additionally, differing standards and approval processes for the importation of improved seed, for example, mean that African farmers often do not have access to inputs that would make them more productive. Further, in a world that is more susceptible to weather variability, commodities need to more easily move from surplus-producing regions to those suffering shortages. The goal should be to eliminate the need for food aid except in cases of disaster, but this requires a strong global trading system.

The challenge of feeding 9 billion people has not been a focal point of Feed the Future. However, its scope will need to be broadened if we want to prevent more people from falling into poverty if food supply does not keep pace with growing demand. And while the administration has recently recognized the role of the private sector and trade, there is a lot more work that needs to be done to fully develop and integrate these aspects into a U.S. food security program.

Feeding a growing world and eliminating hunger are daunting challenges. During this period of budget austerity, targeted investments in science, research, and development can be catalytic drivers that also have domestic benefits. Additionally, supporting business and facilitating trade can be accomplished through policy reforms and do not require large budgetary resources.

Senator CARDIN. Well, let me thank all three of you.

There seems to be a common theme here that you are all very supportive of the programs that we have and the resources we are making available, but each of you believes we could do things a lot better. And that was, I think, the point of our questioning in the first round, that there is strong support in Congress on both sides of the aisle to deal with global food security. These initiatives, we believe, are extremely important, but we do believe we can do things better.

Mr. O'Brien, I was particularly impressed by your original observation that we are listening better but we are not acting. We hear the different concerns. I am curious as to whether you believe that also applies to Government listening to the nongovernmental sector.

Mr. Walsh, you mentioned a very important point in Tanzania about focusing on perhaps the easier issues and not the more vulnerable people, which is consistent with the local plan but may not be in the best interest of the goals of our programs.

So are we running against a traditional bureaucratic problem of turf or is it more of a political problem of how we want to make sure that accountability is maintained? Can you sort of give us your best judgment as to where you think the major obstacles are to advance the causes that each one of you have laid out which is more empowerment locally, dealing with priorities on research,

dealing with the more vulnerable people? Where do you think is the easiest way for us? What are the areas that we need to work on to be able to achieve those objectives?

Mr. O'Brien, you may start.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you, Senator.

Let me come at it this way. Is the Government listening to the nongovernmental sector? Yes, but the nongovernmental sector's blessing and curse is that we have a wide diversity of opinions on what ought to be the right direction of things.

And I think at some level the key challenge for us on Feed the Future is where is the future of development going to have to be to tackle the challenges of tomorrow. We believe at Oxfam that Feed the Future and leaders such as yourself are making exactly the right call by saying it is not about us anymore. It is about taking some risks to invest in the local institutions that are going to drive solutions in the long term.

Of course, we would love to do nothing other than measure inputs and outputs on a 1-year-to-year basis and make sure we controlled every single dollar because then we could report back to the American people on exactly what has happened to their money. But what we have found from decades of development is that being that risk averse is not delivering the long-term food security and array of other solutions we need across the development spectrum. So we have to take some risks.

The important thing to do is to be very smart about those risks when you are dealing with corrupt environments where some actors are going to work well with the dollars you give them and others are not, and we are going to need very thoughtful leadership in Congress to say in the end of the day we need to have exit strategies from these environments. For that to happen, we need leaders to lead, and they cannot lead if we do not trust them to lead. So we are going to have to make some calls in that regard. We cannot protect every dollar the way we would like to if all we cared about was finding out where it went.

Senator CARDIN. Mr. Walsh.

Mr. WALSH. If I may, I guess I would say there are two issues at play that explain why the focus on the poor might be lost in Tanzania and in other countries. I think, on the one hand, there might an assumption that by boosting food production, ultimately it is going to benefit the entire country sort of as a side effect, and that is a problematic assumption. I think that it is necessary to look beyond the raw figures of how many tons of maize are harvested. You have to see who is doing the planting, who is doing the harvesting, and who is selling it, where is it going. I think that there is a strong possibility that the food will be exported and that the vulnerable will be kept out of that altogether. So it is important to keep the focus on the role that the smallholders play in the entire production and value chain.

On the other hand, there is a lot of pressure that the missions are under to show the results in the short term. We think that the congressional oversight is correct, but they also, I think, are under pressure to show that the Feed the Future initiative is paying dividends in the short term. And that is also something that I think we need to manage and keep in mind that the benefits do take

time to cascade down to all of the levels of the pyramid, if you will, and by exerting too much pressure and demanding too many quick results, we again risk losing focus on the longer term benefits that food security will ultimately pay but that take time to develop.

Senator CARDIN. Dr. Veillette.

Dr. VEILLETTE. Let me say that I think a major impediment is one that we do not still know the full effects and that is climate change. We are pretty sure it is happening. I do not care really the need to identify why, but we need to be able to adapt to it. What we do not know is what is the full effect going to be. We anticipate that hot areas are going to get hotter, that wet areas are going to get wetter, that it is going to hurt those countries that are most vulnerable right now to chronic hunger, that crops are going to move north. We are going to see a change in the pattern of where we grow crops and when we grow them. Corn farmers in the Midwest are planting corn a full month earlier than they did even 4 years ago to avoid the onset of very hot weather.

So because of that, we need to take into account not just the science of dealing with climate change but also trade. Going forward, having an open trading system is going to be more important than ever because we are going to have to move areas that are producing a surplus in food to those that have the deficit. And as that system gets more and more gummed up, we are going to continue to see price volatility and we have got to be able to smooth that out.

Senator CARDIN. Let me just make an observation. I think the points you raise are very important points. It makes it easier for us if we have ways of judging the activities and governance of a country. That is why EITI was an important initiative dealing with extractive industries. It was not as strong as a lot of us would like, but it was a unified way that we could judge progress being made in a country in dealing with a specific issue that was a large source of funding for corrupt governments. We in the United States have strengthened that with Senator Lugar's help with the transparency initiatives that we have been able to do on the extractive industries through their stock listings. All of that, I think, helps us give confidence.

We need the same thing in agriculture. The index we were talking about earlier as it relates to women is an important factor so that we can judge progress being made. And when we have those factors, it takes pressure off the specific program accountability issues which can interfere with other goals that you all have mentioned.

Dr. Veillette, I could not agree with you more on resiliency and adaptation. We absolutely need to deal with that. We also need to deal with climate change. I think we need policies that can really help us in dealing with the food security issues that you have mentioned. I think your comments are extremely helpful and I thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. Lugar.

Senator LUGAR. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the panel has been terrific in trying to illustrate that we all start with the humanitarian idea of feeding the world and we describe the population now and cite 2050 and 9 billion people and a deficiency

of 870 million and so forth presently. But then it becomes more difficult after our idealism is expressed. Now, Feed the Future tries to deal with 19 countries, not all of the countries of the world.

We have some of the problems that have been expressed today in the United States. We are a very productive nation, but fortunately through our food stamp program and school lunches and various other activities, we try to meet the needs of 20 million to 30 million Americans. It is not the lack of food in the country but the problems of poverty and distribution and income. These are difficult problems even for ourselves with whatever transparency we have.

Now, we try to translate this in the Feed the Future Initiative to 19 countries, set up agreements, some degree of transparency. But having said that, the facts are that there are other players. I think, Mr. Walsh, in your testimony you mention—as well as did you, Mr. O'Brien—the purchase of land, 227 million hectares and so forth, but then even within specific countries perhaps land-owners or corporations or investors, consolidate and leave the single farmer or the poor farmer out of the process. If this occurs even in national scope, which we did not get into with the first panel, but it is very clear that China, for example, has taken hold of land either by purchase or rental in African countries, maybe elsewhere, millions of acres or hectares and is shipping the food back to China. It is a situation in which that government has said we have got a big problem, and we do not have enough land, or we are not producing enough here.

I was surprised that the Chinese were farming in Russia in border areas with the permission of the Russians, an unusual predicament strategically in the history of the world. But, nevertheless, first things first. I guess the payment has been sufficient to come in there and take it out. That is the same, as far as the Chinese are concerned, with coal and with other mineral resources.

So even as we are trying to think about equities, we also have world politics and countries that have their own situations.

Now, beyond that and this situation of trying to think about how the single farmer or the small farmer deals with this, the facts are that in our country consolidation of land proceeds, and this enhances productivity. For example, to take a local situation in Indiana, many young farmers coming out of Purdue University do not have enough money to buy a great deal of farmland, but they do need maybe 2,000 acres to farm to make use of the best machinery that we now have available to amortize those situations. So they rent from people who are by and large elderly folks or some not living in the State anymore. Eventually they make money, and they buy land and so forth. But it is a situation in which—these are tradeoffs. On the one hand, the use of the machinery, the planting, fertilizer, all this type of thing goes much better with the bigger machinery, but it takes a lot of acreage and bigger farms and consolidation. Where this leaves the small farmer is hard to tell.

As we draw criteria for the 19 countries in Feed the Future, we look at our own situation, and it is one in which I think Mr. Walsh has stressed the equities of how the poor are managed right along with the efficiencies of this thing. But these are extremely difficult

tradeoffs getting back to the overall idea of the population rising, and we need 50 or 60 percent more of this or that.

Then Dr. Veillette, as well as some of us, emphasized the climate change problem. Now, here my experience as a farmer this year was that my corn crop was almost wiped out. I was not unique in Indiana. That was true of several other States adjoining us and out into the Midwest. We had crop insurance, a governmental situation in which we bought the maximum amount to begin with, thank goodness, so that at least there is some return from that land.

But we are talking about the small farmer facing not only the formidable problems I have already expressed but climate change and wipeout and no crop insurance. You really are up against it because this is not a governmental problem anymore. It is a global problem, and it is one in which we have really got to do something about climate change. The international efforts to do this in any systemic way certainly are lacking.

Now, I pose all of this to you to ask what can we reasonably anticipate from Feed the Future given this global set of problems? Is it good government? Well, that is a part of it. The extension programs, some education. But at the same time, I am amazed that they are hoping maybe for 20 percent increases in some of their goals, not 100 percent, and this is from a pretty low base. That is why I am hoping there is some realism as to what Feed the Future can do as we have criteria here in the Congress trying to evaluate them.

Does anyone want to hazard an opinion about any of the above? We covered a lot of territory.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Sure. I am sure we all would like to say a brief word because they were great questions, Senator. Two brief points from me.

Oxfam has invested in microinsurance programs in the horn in Africa which are weather indexed. We think they are working. And we are working with Ethiopian insurance companies because it has got to make business sense over the long term. But you have got to have the right regulatory regime for that national level insured to feel confident that this is a future business proposition for them that is going to be viable once the aid money diminishes. And so again, it is about creating that institutional infrastructure.

On the land question, I would suggest that Feed the Future would do well to learn lessons from the work that you have led on the EITI. In the end of the day, if we can get better regulation of land transactions with more transparency, more consultation, better governance, and ideas around what kind of regulatory regime is going to manage it—none of us want to end investments in land. Farmers want to be able to sell their land, but we want responsible investments. And some of the work that you have done, I think, has broken new ground on how this can work not just for extractive industries but for resources like land where the end result is—and what we most care about—these smallholder farmers that are getting removed from their land get adequately compensated and consulted in the transactions.

Mr. WALSH. Maybe I can take this opportunity to mention something that I did not have a chance to cover in my testimony, and it has to do with climate change. I think that is absolutely a vital

and critical issue that Feed the Future needs to place far more at the center of its overall strategy than it currently has because it is such a cross-cutting issue and because it requires such a comprehensive approach. The good thing about Feed the Future is that it is integrated and that it does allow for so many different aspects of food security to be addressed, whether it is nutrition, whether it is policy, whether it has to do with the production of new and more resilient crops.

Climate change, however, is getting sidelined, I believe, in Tanzania and I think in other Feed the Future countries as well. Yes, it is cross-cutting. So it is in there. The assumption seems to be it is in there somewhere, but it is not really being funded and it is not really being addressed in as central a way as it needs to be. I am talking about activities that need to be funded such as soil conservation and conservation farming which contribute to the resilience of farmers, as well as possibly mitigation of climate change.

These are activities that are not new. They are not something that we need to completely invent from scratch. I think some of the technologies exist now that simply need to be rolled out more and that small farmers have a very good opportunity to participate in. But it is not currently an activity that is stand-alone or a significantly funded activity in Feed the Future, and I think that needs to be bolstered with funding as well as in the strategy itself.

Dr. VEILLETTE. I think it would be reasonable for Feed the Future to put a greater focus on the type of governance issues that would provide a better environment for businesses to be able to grow and invest. And I am not just talking about international or U.S. businesses but those local businesses that can revitalize rural economies. Part of that is policy reforms, regulatory modernization, anticorruption issues.

Related to that is the issue about land grabs. Land titling and land tenure is not very strong in many of these countries. However, there has been a study done that in countries where there is strong land titling and land tenure, there have been the least amount of these large land deals. So obviously that is a key component to tamping that down.

And then I also would reemphasize that there is a global governance issue. It is not just the governance of the countries that we are dealing with, but it is our trade regimes. It is how we can bring about some better harmonization and standardization in how we treat food safety issues, how we treat the approval process for advances in science and technology.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator CARDIN. Well, again, let me thank our witnesses. This will not be the last of our interest in overseeing how this program is working. It is a major part of our international development assistance, and it is a major concern of the U.S. Senate. So this will be a continuing interest and we will be continuing to follow up and asking your help in trying to evaluate how we can do a better job on global food security for many reasons.

Thank you all very much.

Senator CARDIN. And with that, the subcommittee will stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:57 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MERCY CORPS

Mercy Corps greatly appreciates Chairman Cardin's and Ranking Member Corker's decision to hold this important hearing focusing on global food security. Mercy Corps currently works in 44 countries providing development and humanitarian assistance, and the obstacles that vulnerable populations face in accessing adequate food are consistent challenge across most of the places that we work. In places as diverse as Mali, Yemen, Haiti, Kyrgyzstan, and many others, we work with communities to improve their productivity, access to nutritious food, and resilience to shocks. We appreciate the U.S. Government's renewed commitment to improving agriculture development, which is often the backbone of economies in the poorest countries in the world. We would like to take this opportunity to highlight successful agriculture development programs and encourage Congress and the administration to take specific steps to solidify important development reforms and gains.

FEED THE FUTURE SUCCESS: TITLE II NON-EMERGENCY PROGRAMMING

One of the cornerstones of Feed the Future (FtF), and one of the great success stories of U.S. Government food assistance programs, is Title II "non-emergency" programs, which work to prevent and alleviate the kinds of food emergencies that require the majority of Title II food aid. These multiyear programs authorized by the farm bill and appropriated through agriculture appropriations bills help the poor become more resistant to shocks, ultimately reducing the need for emergency food assistance, particularly in areas that see cyclical or recurring food emergencies such as the Horn of Africa and the Sahel.

Title II non-emergency programs fill the gap between emergency relief programming and development assistance, and so are a vital step in helping communities transition from being food insecure to improving long-term agriculture development and becoming self-sufficient. For example, Mercy Corps implemented a non-emergency Title II program in Northern Uganda that supported families displaced by the Lord's Resistance Army conflict to rebuild their farms and livelihoods upon their return from displacement camps. This multiyear program provided the flexibility to support families and help them recover from crisis, while at the same time helped them to build a strong foundation for their long-term economic development, reducing the need for families to be dependent on emergency assistance.

The funding mechanism for Title II non-emergency has been a source of controversy at times because it shares a funding stream with Title II emergency funds, and because non-emergency programs rely in part on "monetizing"—or re-selling—U.S. food commodities to finance program activities. Mercy Corps believes that increased use of the "Community Development Fund" mechanism within Feed the Future provides an important way to address both concerns. The administration has already begun using CDF cash resources, in a limited way, in place of monetization within some Title II programs. This both give USAID greater flexibility to scale up emergency response without undercutting non-emergency resource levels, and reduces reliance on monetization to fund program activities. This approach should be expanded in coming years.

LOCAL AND REGIONAL PROCUREMENT

Among the best tools available to the U.S. Government to provide urgently needed food assistance to respond to crisis is Local and Regional Procurement (LRP). We strongly support this important type of programming under Title II and believe it should be robustly funded. With support from USAID and USDA, Mercy Corps has used LRP approaches to deliver life-saving food assistance to over 1 million people and strengthened markets in 11 countries in Africa, Asia, South America, the Caribbean, and the Middle East through local and regional procurement programs. The 2008 farm bill increased support for LRP, authorizing a pilot program to implement and study LRP activities in both emergency and non-emergency settings.

Rigorous research by GAO and Cornell University show that LRP delivers food assistance quickly, effectively, and efficiently while also helping to protect and rebuild resilient market systems. Research of the LRP pilot showed savings in both

money (50 percent savings for unprocessed grain and some pulses) and time (an increase of 62 percent in timeliness), adding an important and versatile tool which can be used to reach people in need. Section 3207 of the Senate farm bill makes permanent the authority for LRP projects at USDA at an annual authorized level of \$40 million. We encourage Congress to permanently authorize LRP at the Senate level in the farm bill and for this subcommittee to examine ways in which this authority can be expanded.

FEED THE FUTURE-REACHING THE MOST VULNERABLE

We appreciate the U.S. Government's "Whole of Government Approach" to Agriculture and would like to encourage Congress and the administration to look closely at funding under this initiative to ensure that it adequately focuses on the needs of those most vulnerable smallholder farmers, especially women farmers. Recently USAID published a FtF Progress Report showing the collective progress of the administration's food security initiatives. We commend this important first step and recommend Congress and the administration continue to partner on FtF to improve transparency and accountability through expanding the FtF Progress Report to show account specific (i.e., DA, MCC Title II) results that highlight how FtF programs are reaching intended beneficiaries and in particular, vulnerable populations.

HOW CAN CONGRESS FURTHER ADDRESS GLOBAL FOOD INSECURITY?

Congress can do its part to support the Feed the Future Initiative by:

- Passing a farm bill that reauthorizes Title II non-emergency assistance, supporting reforms to international food aid that allows for greater use of cash, especially the use of Local and Regional Procurement;
- Supporting the Senate SFOPS levels for FtF in FY 2013;
- Support the Community Development Fund provision in the FY 2013 Senate SFOPS bill that allows for Development Assistance funds to be used toward the Safebox authorization level; and,
- Require a supplemental report to the recent FtF progress report, which shows results disaggregated by FtF account, and require account and country specific disaggregated reporting in any future progress report.
- Require appropriate environmental indicators of USAID agricultural investments to be monitored and reported in any future FtF progress report.

Chairman Cardin and Ranking Member Corker, thank you again for holding this important hearing and your continued work and partnering with the administration, we know that FtF can help address food insecurity, one of the greatest needs of this century.

RESPONSE OF ACTING SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE JONATHAN SHRIER TO QUESTION
SUBMITTED BY SENATOR BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

Question. Which agencies and programs of the United Nations, particularly the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and World Food Programme (WFP), are critical partners in U.S. efforts to improve food security? How are Feed the Future and other U.S.-led initiatives partnering with the U.N. and other international humanitarian organizations to reduce hunger and poverty?

Answer. The U.S. Government works closely with U.N. agencies as a member and partner to help advance global food security goals and align food security activities under the donor principles adopted at the U.N.'s World Summit on Food Security in Rome in 2009. This alignment is reflected in the Feed the Future Presidential initiative, which emphasizes country ownership; fosters strategic coordination among donors, governments, multilateral organizations and the private sector; addresses the root causes of hunger and poverty; and through our diplomatic engagement supports efforts to increase the effectiveness of U.N. institutions and encourage donor accountability.

As a leading member on the Executive Boards of the World Food Programme (WFP), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and the international Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the United States is helping to shape the priorities, policies, and approaches of these organizations so they are aligned with donor principles and Feed the Future's approach.

The U.S. Government also plays a leading role in high-level negotiations related to food security, including the post-2015 Millennium Development Goals process and the U.N. Committee on World Food Security. In October 2011, for instance, a U.S. official was elected as vice chair of the committee, and another U.S. official served as the international chair of the committee's consultative process to develop Vol-

untary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries, and Forestry in the Context of National Food Security that were approved in May 2012. The U.S. Government is also preparing to participate in the follow-on consultative process aimed at developing voluntary, nonbinding principles on responsible agricultural investment and will provide technical assistance to the country chairing that 2-year process.

The United States has been a strong supporter of the work of the U.N. High Level Task Force on Global Food Security established by Secretary General Ban Ki-moon to strengthen coherence among U.N. agencies in confronting the challenges of global hunger, food insecurity, and undernutrition. For example, Secretary of State Clinton launched the 1,000 Days partnership in 2010 to mobilize action by governments, private sector firms, and civil society organization in support of the Scaling Up Nutrition movement established by Secretary General Ban.

The FAO, the World Food Programme (WFP) and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) have vast experience and expertise to tap. The leaders of these agencies have all expressed support for the G8 New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition, for example, and the President of IFAD serves on the leadership group established to oversee the New Alliance. These agencies have committed to coordinating and aligning their investments in support of compacts and investment plans for the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP). These compacts and plans define evidence-based agricultural and food security roadmaps for achieving the Millennium Development Goal of halving poverty and hunger, and provide country-specific frameworks for all new and ongoing investment in agriculture and food security. Similar national strategies are also in design or in place in Asia and Latin America to ensure efficiency and greatest impact at the country and regional level.

FAO, WFP, and IFAD have also been strong partners in supporting the work of the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP), the multidonor trust fund housed at the World Bank. These U.N. agencies are part of the steering committee of the Public Sector Window of GAFSP, which mobilizes and consolidates grant funding that is additional to current programs in order to help support strategic country-led and regional programs that are the result of country and regional consultations.

More broadly, the FAO has well-developed technical and normative capabilities, which can assist food insecure countries develop policy and technical responses to their food security and nutrition gaps. The United States works with the FAO to harness its scientific and technical expertise to combat plant and animal pests and pathogens that impact agricultural productivity and small farmer income. We also work with FAO to promote ways to link poor farmers to markets through the provision of improved seeds and inputs, technical expertise, assistance in meeting international standards, and market information. We are working with FAO through the G8 and G20 to build in mechanisms to monitor and respond to volatility in food prices. The G20 has launched the Agricultural Market Information System (AMIS) and the Rapid Response Forum, which allow policymakers to track food production data from around the world and create a forum to share information and formulate policy responses in the event of global food crises. The United States, represented by a USDA official, is currently chairing the G20 AMIS effort, which is housed at the FAO.

The United States is the largest donor to the WFP in the form of in-kind food aid and cash-based assistance to respond to crises around the world. The WFP also has experience in market development through local and regional purchases that can be leveraged by implementers of similar programs. Work with WFP is not only focused on saving lives but increasingly also on building household and community resilience to better withstand future shocks. For example, a unique, trilateral partnership between PepsiCo, USAID, and the WFP provides a nutritionally fortified feeding product while helping to build long-term economic stability for smallholder chickpea farmers in Ethiopia by involving them directly in PepsiCo's supply chain.

In addition to the U.N. system, the United States has also worked to advance food security and nutrition objectives through the international organizations involved in agricultural research, notably the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR); the multilateral development institutions, and global and regional policy platforms such as the G8, the G20, and APEC. All of these multilateral institutions extend U.S. influence and impact far beyond what could be accomplished through U.S. efforts alone, making them critical partners in the fight against hunger and undernutrition.

RESPONSES OF TJADA MCKENNA TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

NUTRITION—INTEGRATION OF FEED THE FUTURE AND GHI

Question. Feed the Future and GHI report that their joint efforts have led to reductions in the share of underweight and stunted children in 18 countries.

- Please describe the distinct nutrition-related activities by GHI and Feed the Future and how these efforts are coordinated at each stage (planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation)?

Answer. Nutrition is the key point of intersection between food security and health and improving nutrition is a high-level objective of both the Global Health and the Feed the Future Initiatives. USAID provides global technical leadership assistance to priority countries in both initiatives to facilitate the planning, introduction, and scale-up of high-impact nutrition activities. USAID's nutrition portfolio is integrated across multiple initiatives and funding streams. Integrated programing is essential to address the immediate causes of child undernutrition—food and nutrient intake and health, and the underlying causes—such as access to food, maternal and child care practices, water/sanitation, and health services. The high level of integration makes sense programmatically, but makes reporting more complex. Feed the Future works with the Global Health Initiative to ensure that USG nutrition investments have maximum impact on our target populations. Through both initiatives, we implement nutrition strategies that are based on country-specific needs and opportunities. We build the capacity of health systems to screen and treat undernutrition and use local food products to do so. We leverage existing community workers—both health workers and agriculture extension workers—to deliver nutrition education at a local level. We also empower women in both initiatives by increasing access to new farming skills, agricultural inputs, health knowledge, and quality health services as a way of reducing poverty and improving their and their children's health and well-being.

Investments include expanding the evidence base for nutrition to guide policy product development, and strengthen nutrition programs; building capacity to design, implement, and report on food and nutrition programs and strengthen coordination and integration; and introducing or expanding comprehensive evidence-based packages of interventions to prevent and treat undernutrition. These packages of interventions include social and behavior change communication to improve nutrition practices, diet diversification, and delivery of nutrition services including nutrient supplementation and management of acute malnutrition.

Given the close linkages between agriculture and nutrition, we are implementing Feed the Future and Global Health activities in a highly coordinated manner in order to maximize results. A great example is Nepal, where we are working with Save the Children and several local partners to improve the nutritional status of women and children under 2 years of age in 25 districts by focusing on health behaviors, dietary quality, dietary diversity, health services, and coordination. Another great example is Ghana, where USAID is supporting the integration of community management of acute malnutrition (CMAM) into the Ghana Health Service. CMAM is proven to reduce mortality from severe acute malnutrition to under 5 percent. In addition, it allows 80 percent of children to be treated in their homes. USAID is also supporting innovative approaches in local production of ready-to-use foods.

For Feed the Future, we have developed and rolled out a comprehensive results framework that focuses our efforts across the global initiative on two top-line results: reducing poverty and undernutrition. We have a range of activities that feed into this, but the results framework is a critical innovation to align our programs and demonstrate how they contribute to our top-line goals. USAID nutrition reporting for Feed the Future and the Global Health Initiative use many of the same indicators, such as the prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age and the prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age, and prevalence of underweight women. These are collected in the Feed the Future Monitoring System (FTFMS) for review by both the Global Health Initiative and Feed the Future.

TITLE II NON-EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMMING

Question. Title II nonemergency programs are a unique type of development program that have had wide ranging successes in the developing world, including improving livelihoods for smallholders, mitigating stunting of children and supporting local markets function more efficiently. What lessons learned is USAID taking from successful Title II nonemergency programs and incorporating into USAID development programming?

Answer. Feed the Future coordinates closely with USAID's Office of Food for Peace (FFP), which manages the programming of Title II nonemergency resources. In general, Title II nonemergency food aid programs are community-based programs targeted to very poor or extremely poor households—"the poorest of the poor." Many of these households depend on agriculture for livelihoods—either from farming their own land or working on someone else's land. However, despite this focus on agriculture, these households are often unable to meet their family's basic food and nonfood needs for 12 months of the year. Constraints, such as limited land size and labor availability, reliance on less productive technologies and practices, and poor access to markets and inputs, make it very difficult for these communities and households to break out of poverty. Title II nonemergency programs work at a local level providing a safety net for these extremely vulnerable households and have a proven success record in many underserved communities around the world.

Many Feed the Future programs focus on value chains and aim to address constraints to agricultural productivity both within targeted geographic areas and, in terms of policy, at a national level. For example, if a lack of access to fertilizer and improved seed is a significant constraint to productivity, Feed the Future engages the host government and other interested partners to identify key challenges and develop solutions. These could include creating a regulatory framework to allow for greater private sector participation in seeds markets or developing a network of agrodealers that can provide improved seed and fertilizer to farmer groups. Post-harvest loss is another good example. While Title II nonemergency programs often work at the household level to reduce post-harvest loss and improve food safety through better drying and storage technologies, Feed the Future programming targets the next level up—working with the private sector and farmer groups to develop regional initiatives, such as creating a warehouse receipts program capable of serving thousands of communities so that we can have impact in reducing poverty at a significant scale.

There is inherent complementarity in these programs—with Title II non-emergency programs providing assistance to acutely vulnerable populations and Feed the Future assisting communities at scale to participate in commercial agriculture in order to escape poverty over the long term. The USAID Bureau for Food Security, which supports the implementation of Feed the Future, and the USAID Food for Peace Office are working to ensure the complementarity of their respective programs.

Feed the Future has learned much from FFP's decades of experience and has adopted a number of strategies from FFP, including an expanded focus on the resilience of vulnerable communities to the shocks that exacerbate food insecurity. For example, in order to combat the recent crises in the Horn of Africa and the Sahel, Feed the Future programs include both longer term investments like increasing the commercial availability of climate-resilient crops and reducing trade and transport barriers, as well as direct funding for Community Development Funds (CDFs). CDFs play a catalytic role in bridging humanitarian and development assistance. CDF investments fund community-based interventions aimed at increasing the economic and nutritional resilience of the rural poor and accelerating their participation in economic growth, while simultaneously freeing up more Title II resources for emergency needs. The FY 2012 and FY 2013 Feed the Future requests expand this effort. These programs bridge humanitarian and development objectives through expanded support for productive rural safety nets, livelihood diversification, micro-finance and savings, and other programs that reduce vulnerability to short-term production, income, and market disruptions. As part of the Horn of Africa and Sahel Joint Planning Cells, Feed the Future will reduce vulnerability to food insecurity in the Horn of Africa and the Sahel by fully integrating long-term economic development assistance with short-term emergency relief and harnessing science and technology to help populations adapt to increasingly erratic production seasons.

Feed the Future has also learned from FFP that it must focus on the importance of women and women's nutrition in combating food insecurity. Feed the Future works to ensure that women have access to increased incomes to improve family diets; that agriculture delivers more nutritious food, not just productivity gains; and that we build preventative approaches to break the cycle of undernutrition that contributes to poverty.

In addition, some of the indicators of success we monitor include the prevalence of underweight women and the recently launched Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) to measure changes in women's empowerment in the agriculture sector. The index is being used in Feed the Future focus countries and is being incorporated in all Feed the Future population-based baseline surveys. Another pilot program launched in FY 2012 was the Evidence and Data for Gender Equality (U.N. EDGE) Initiative, a new partnership between the U.S. Government

and the U.N. that seeks to accelerate existing efforts to generate comparable gender indicators on health, education, employment, entrepreneurship, and asset ownership.

Finally, Feed the Future has learned from FFP that micronutrients, not just an overall availability of food, must be a part of food assistance. A number of Feed the Future programs fund the research of vitamin-rich crop varieties that provide needed vitamin A, zinc, and iron. For example, Feed the Future's Harvest Plus program field-tested vitamin A-rich orange-flesh sweet potato (OFSP) and iron- and zinc-rich beans in Uganda. In Rwanda, five new iron-rich bean varieties were released. Children and women are the main beneficiaries of these new bean varieties, which will provide up to 30 percent of their daily iron needs.

LEVERAGING U.S. NGOS' COMMITMENT AND EXPERTISE

Question. At the U.N. General Assembly, U.S.-based nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), led by Interaction, pledged more than \$1 billion of private, nongovernmental funds over the next 3 years to improve food security and nutrition worldwide.

- What are USAID and the State Department doing to partner with U.S. NGOs to ensure coordination of effort and leveraging their expertise in international agricultural development?

Answer. We know that sustainable development goals cannot be achieved by our efforts alone. As President Obama, Secretary Clinton, USAID Administrator Shah, and other leaders have stated, for our development efforts to be successful, we must work across sectors and across borders. The more these efforts are coordinated, the greater impact they will have.

The \$1 billion pledge of private, nongovernmental funds over 3 years reflects the importance that U.S.-based civil society organizations attach to food security and the crucial role they play in the effort to end world hunger. U.S. and partner government efforts can be multiplied by NGOs' contributions and expertise. We will continue to work with InterAction and their member organizations as they work to meet this commitment and we will all work to align our efforts behind shared, country-led objectives.

Our NGO partners have been helpful advocates and conveners, bringing together governments, the private sector, and other civil society organizations in unique partnerships to further our collective progress against global food insecurity and undernutrition. For example, in 2010, Secretary Clinton and leaders from Ireland, the United Nations, and many other NGOs launched the 1,000 Days partnership in 2010 to mobilize governments, civil society, and the private sector to improve nutrition in the critical 1,000 day window of opportunity from pregnancy through a child's second birthday.

NGOs serve as implementing partners in many Feed the Future programs. NGOs also help to advance food security objectives as a result of their local ties. They are able to reach communities that can be challenging to access and understand local needs on the ground; this expertise helps to ensure programs are tailored to specific communities and can achieve maximum impact. In Senegal, for example, in collaboration with local partners, Feed the Future is engaging over 350 community nutrition volunteers who teach families to prepare nutritious meals and practice good hygiene. This program helps farmers improve agricultural practices in over 80 community demonstration gardens. By identifying locally grown, nutritious foods, these workers are helping reduce micronutrient deficiencies in children in over 350 villages.

Valuable feedback from our NGO partners has been a key consideration in the evolution of Feed the Future including in the design of approaches and interventions. With this in mind, we have focused on the importance of gender equality in addition to the need for expanded opportunities for women and girls; increased our strategic focus and programming on climate resilient agricultural development; increased program integration between nutrition and agriculture; expanded financial inclusion programming (e.g., microcredit), especially for women and the very poor; and deepened our focus on water issues through the expansion of small-scale water management technologies, promotion of water-use efficiency and drought tolerance of major cereal crops, and support to several of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research centers located around the world.

In addition, Feed the Future focus country investment plans, which are country-led multiyear investment plans for food security, were formed in consultation with civil society. This has helped ensure that each country investment plan represents a national, comprehensive strategy for significantly reducing hunger and poverty and improving food security in a particular country.

We are committed to ongoing engagement with local and international NGOs as we strive to achieve Feed the Future's key objectives: to reduce poverty and under-nutrition. Feed the Future interagency partners are developing an action plan to strengthen engagement with NGOs and civil society organizations. This plan will encourage broad-based dialogue; foster creation of new partnerships among donors, the private sector, and partner governments; and promote best practices.

POST HARVEST LOSS

Question. Post-harvest loss and commodity spoilage are significant challenges in the harsh climates of the developing world.

- What efforts are currently underway to mitigate post-harvest losses by providing materials and technical assistance related to improved storage?
- Are concerns about commodity losses a driver of FTF policy, and to what extent do the economic impacts of those losses affect FTF decisions with respect to resource allocation and budget planning?
- Is USAID working with any specific project, or with any NGO or private sector company that focuses on safe storage techniques, and if so, what is the nature of the engagement and are the results proving to be positive in terms of loss mitigation and improved ability to bring products to market?

Answer. Addressing the challenges posed by post-harvest loss and spoilage is critical to fighting food insecurity. According to a recent World Bank/FAO report, “[t]he value of postharvest grain losses in sub-Saharan Africa [are estimated] at around \$4 billion a year. . . . This lost food could meet the minimum annual food requirements of at least 48 million people.”¹ Feed the Future programming targets post-harvest loss in its focus countries in a number of ways, across agricultural value chains prioritized by the beneficiary governments and as part of the Feed the Future multiyear strategies.

At the household level, Feed the Future programs work on improved drying and household storage methods to help families avoid losses post-harvest. This work is coordinated with Food for Peace programs. At the community level, Feed the Future works on mobilizing private finance by providing credit guarantees, which support the development of small and medium agroenterprises that focus on storage, transport, and food processing. Feed the Future programming also works with the private sector and farmer groups to develop regional initiatives like warehouse receipts programs capable of serving thousands of communities with storage access and confident proof of ownership when they store their crops.

Under Feed the Future, USAID also works with interagency partners to address post-harvest loss issues. In Ghana, USAID supports three MCC-funded post-harvest Agribusiness Centers, benefiting about 3,000 farmers. In Senegal, USAID supports MCC's investment in irrigated agriculture and roads in the Senegal River Valley and the Southern Forest Zone by promoting value chains, soil management, access to credit, post-harvest facilities, capacity training, quality standards, and marketing in those same areas.

Addressing post-harvest losses was a frequently identified strategic focus in all of our Feed the Future focus countries' multiyear strategies and implementation plans. These strategies form the basis of initial program planning and budget allocation of Feed the Future funding. Post-harvest loss is also prominently featured in our focus countries' Country Investment Plan (CIPs), which are country-led multiyear investment plans for food security efforts formed with input from the NGO community, other donors, and the private sector.

The Feed the Future research agenda also focuses on mitigating post-harvest losses. Our efforts to increase legume productivity, for example, include the development of disease- and stress-tolerant, high-yielding varieties of protein-rich legumes. They also emphasize improved market linkages, post-harvest processing, and integration of legumes into major farming systems to improve household nutrition and incomes, especially for women.

For example, with our assistance, in Maguiguane, Mozambique, the Ministry of Agriculture is helping farmers improve post-harvest packing, storage, and processing of their produce through a new vegetable processing and distribution center, which benefits 480 farmers. Techniques, models, and knowledge learned from this processing and distribution center are provided to Mozambique's national agricultural research institute (IIAM). Meanwhile, the Support Program for Economic and Enterprise Development (SPEED) program works on policy changes that promote transportation, port modernization, and electrical infrastructure.

¹ http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTARD/Resources/MissingFoods10_web.pdf.

In another example, Feed the Future is investing in projects specifically targeted at post-harvest handling and storage issues in Rwanda. In Rwanda post-harvest losses for beans and maize are currently estimated to be as high as 30 percent. In FY 2011, Rwanda's Post-harvest Handling and Storage (PHHS) project, implemented by NGOs Carana and ACDI/VOCA, leveraged \$387,000 in private sector funds to support the establishment of post-harvest handling and storage centers. Through the project, a 3,000 ton storage facility will impact more than 10,000 smallholder farmers. During the same period, 59 producer unions, trade/business associations, and community-based organizations received direct assistance from the PHHS project. As a result, a majority of participant farmers reported receiving better prices for their products due to increases in quality and not one of the more than 22,000 farmers trained in post-harvest handling practices reported produce rejected by buyers.

Safe storage and infrastructure issues in many of our focus countries will remain serious issues for some time to come, but we are committed to continue working on them as a means to create sustainable food security, increased health outcomes, and poverty reduction.

PROGRESS REPORT DATA

Question. Although respecting Feed the Future's whole of government approach, it would be valuable to see the progress of the USAID Development Assistance funds for Feed the Future separated from other accounts, such as MCC and title II nonemergency. It would also be helpful to publish country specific results. This would help make a better case to Congress and the American taxpayer for funding allocations, and clarify how each account is being used allowing for data to be shared so different programs can learn cost saving measures from each other.

- Is disaggregated Feed the Future data publicly available for the different accounts that contribute to Feed the Future? If yes, where can it be found?
- If there is no disaggregated Feed the Future data publicly available, would USAID consider publishing a supplemental report to the progress report showing disaggregated results for each account?
- Once disaggregated by account, would USAID consider publishing country specific results to see progress in each Feed the Future country?
- While we would appreciate USAID publishing these supplementals as soon as possible, in the long term, and consistent with USAID's aid transparency initiative, this data would ideally be publically available for third parties to analyze. Will USAID be providing more specific project level funding and results data to AIData2.0 or the Foreign Assistance Dashboard?

Answer. The Feed the Future Monitoring System (FTFMS) was created to compile results from several agencies and includes comprehensive indicators for Feed the Future that are being used by the five U.S. Government agencies that are supporting Feed the Future activities. The U.S. Agency for International Development, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Millennium Challenge Corporation, the Global Agriculture & Food Security Program, and the International Fund for Agricultural Development reported in FY 2011. As a whole of government initiative, each agency contributes its expertise to support the initiative's mission; some agencies work on implementation and others collaborate on policy and technical issues. All aspects of the initiative are vital to its success; however, much of the data in the FTFMS focuses solely on the implementation side of the initiative, and does not reflect the policy or technical contributions. As a result, the information in its disaggregated form would not reflect the full contribution of all partner agencies. Feed the Future-wide results do appear in the Feed the Future Progress Reports.

However, USAID is using this rigorous and specific system to hold itself and its partners accountable for real impact and results and has reallocated budgetary resources in line with this evidence. We are adding U.S. African Development Foundation and more comprehensive Peace Corps results in FY 2012. FTFMS tracks the 57 FTF indicators, including the eight Whole-of-Government indicators reported on by at least two agencies (see chart, Annex 1). The whole-of-government indicators have been developed or adapted based on consultations with all agency partners.

While the Feed the Future Progress Report strives to give a picture of the aggregate of our work, it does not provide country-by-country results. We are currently in the process of receiving and reviewing the data for FY 2012 for each country. Once that process is complete and the information is cleared internally, we will update our Feed the Future Country Snapshots, which have previously been made available to interested Members of Congress and their staff. We will forward these updated snapshots to you as well when they are completed. (Please see Annex 2 for last year's submission.)

Finally, AIData2.0 and the Foreign Assistance Dashboard are currently not able to present project-level data for Feed the Future. We do maintain and update a variety of outlets that help offer more frequent updates, such as www.feedthefuture.gov, social media platforms, and a monthly newsletter. In addition, we are currently funding 20 independent impact evaluations of our work around the world. Individual missions plan to fund another 15–20 independent impact evaluations which will be conducted by third parties.

[EDITOR'S NOTE.—Annex 1 could not be duplicated in the printed hearing but will be maintained in the permanent record of the committee. It can also be viewed at <http://www.feedthefuture.gov/resource/summary-chart-feed-future-indicators>.

Annex 2 was too voluminous to include in the printed hearing. It will be maintained in the permanent record of the committee.]

