



Alliance for Global Food Security www.globalfoodsecurity.info

Alliance to End Hunger www.alliancetoendhunger.org

Bread for the World www.bread.org

CARE www.care.org

Catholic Relief Services www.crs.org

Christian Children's Fund www.christianchildrensfund.org

Christian Reformed World Relief Committee www.cwrc.org

Church World Service www.churchworldservice.org

Concern Worldwide www.concernusa.org

Congressional Hunger Center www.hungercenter.org

Episcopal Relief and Development www.er-d.org

Feed the Children www.feedthechildren.org

Food for the Hungry www.fh.org

Friends of the World Food Program www.friendsofwfp.org

Global Child Nutrition Foundation www.gcnf.org

The Humpty Dumpty Institute www.thehdi.org

LIFE for Relief and Development www.lifeusa.org

MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger www.mazon.org

Mercy Corps www.mercycorps.org

Oxfam America www.oxfamamerica.org

Partnership to Cut Hunger and Poverty in Africa www.africanhunger.org

PATH www.path.org

Project Concern International www.projectconcern.org

RESULTS www.results.org

Save the Children www.savethechildren.org

United Methodist Committee on Relief www.umcor.org

US Coalition for Child Survival www.child-survival.org

U.S. Fund for UNICEF www.unicefusa.org

Women Thrive Worldwide www.womensedge.org

World Vision www.worldvision.org



**ROADMAP TO
END GLOBAL HUNGER**

photo credits:

WFP-Alejandro Chicheri, WFP-Gerald Bourke, WFP-Emilia Casella, WFP-Rein Skullerud, WFP-Peter Smerdon, WFP-Jorge Gamboa, WFP-Anne-Karine Brodeur, WFP-AK Kimoto, WFP-Tony Banbury, WFP-Alexander Joe, WFP-Jim Holmes, WFP-Mikael Bjerrum, WFP-Shehzad Noorani, WFP-Helen Kudrich, WFP-Riccardo Gangale, WFP-Mario Di Bari, WFP-Sabrina Quezada



A ROADMAP FOR U.S. LEADERSHIP TO END GLOBAL HUNGER

Our broad-based coalition of non-governmental organizations, advocacy groups and religious organizations calls on the new Administration and Congress to work together with governments and citizens all over the world to reach the established international goal of cutting global hunger in half by 2015.¹ Effectively addressing both the chronic and acute aspects of hunger will require that the U.S. provide carefully balanced

support for a range of programs to meet emergency, intermediate and long-term needs.²

The international community has made progress towards this goal over the past four decades, bringing the overall proportion of the world's hungry down to 17% from 37% in the 1960s. The United States has provided global leadership in achieving this success. However, the absolute number of hungry people continues to rise. To

lead our partners in a global effort to achieve food security for all the world's people and prevent a reversal of past progress, the U.S. will need to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy that effectively integrates all existing programs, carefully balances short- and long-term responses, and adequately funds programs that have proven successful in preventing and alleviating global hunger.

Why the U.S. should prioritize efforts to end hunger

The U.S. can provide global leadership in generating the needed political will to effectively address this problem. There are compelling reasons why reducing hunger should be elevated within the U.S. agenda:

For moral and humanitarian reasons: Because a well-fed world is a just world

Although enough food is produced globally to feed all people, there are currently 963 million people suffering from hunger, with another 2 billion people malnourished.³ Hunger and malnutrition have disproportionate impacts on the most vulnerable populations: in poor countries maternal and child undernutrition is the

cause of over a third of all deaths of children under five, roughly 3.5 million preventable deaths each year.⁴ In a world where we have the knowledge and enough food to prevent human starvation and malnutrition, it is a moral outrage that we have not yet produced the level of political will required to end world hunger.

For economic reasons: Because a well-fed world is a productive world

Hunger and malnutrition cause impaired learning, poor health outcomes and decreased earning potential, seriously affecting economic possibilities for billions of people worldwide.⁵ The global cost of child undernutrition to national and economic development is estimated at \$20 to \$30 billion per year. Multiplied over the life span of today's undernourished children, this amounts to up to one trillion dollars in lost productivity and income.⁶ In addition, the rapid rise in food prices

has led many of the world's poorest people to sell off productive assets in order to feed their families, threatening to create a downward spiral into poverty for an estimated 100 million people.⁷ In an economically interdependent world, continued hunger threatens global development by limiting productivity and purchasing power in countries all over the world that are valued trading partners for the U.S..





For security reasons: Because a well-fed world is a safer world

Since the beginning of 2008, over thirty countries have experienced unrest or riots linked to higher food prices.⁹ In a world where weak and failing states present challenges within and beyond national borders, political stability has become a core goal for U.S. foreign policy. Political

consequences of severe hunger are among the main threats to national security in such weak and fragile states. Taking bold steps to end world hunger is thus imperative for encouraging increased stability and addressing vital U.S. national security interests.

U.S. commitments to ending world hunger

Over the last several decades, the U.S. has repeatedly committed to the goal of ending world hunger. In 1974, at the World Food Conference, the U.S. joined other governments in establishing an international goal of ending hunger within ten years. At the UN Millennium Summit in 2004, 189 UN member states – including the U.S. – and 23 international organizations agreed to the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the first of which includes cutting global hunger in half by 2015. This commitment was reaffirmed at the 2002 World Food Summit. At the 2008 UN High Level Conference on World Food Security,

the U.S. again joined other nations in agreeing upon short- and long-term actions needed to make progress towards eradicating hunger.

Despite these repeated U.S. and international commitments, we are currently not on target to achieve the goal of cutting global hunger in half by 2015. In fact, over the course of 2008 we have witnessed a “global food crisis” that has increased the total number of hungry people in the world to almost a billion.



WORLD HUNGER AND THE “GLOBAL FOOD CRISIS”

The “global food crisis” has been provoked, in part, by rapidly rising prices that have eroded the purchasing power of poor people, many of whom already spend most of their income on food, causing a significant increase in food insecurity across the globe. By March of 2008, global food prices were 75% higher than they had been in 2005. Regardless of current price volatility, many experts are predicting a long-term upward trend in commodity prices. In addition to price volatility, the current global financial and economic crisis is compounding the seriousness of the “food

crisis” as trade flows slow, unemployment rises, remittances drop and investment dries up. The economic crisis severely reduces the purchasing power of the world’s poorest, who already spent up to 80% of their income on food. The combined effects of price rises and income declines have resulted in an increase in the number of hungry people by 115 million in the last two years. For poor people whose incomes have been reduced or not kept up with inflation, this has meant declining access to food, reduced nutritional intake, exhaustion of their limited savings and liquidation

of productive assets, increased debt, lower school attendance and deferred expenditures on health and other necessities. These developments are especially harmful to women and their children.

While the current food crisis has captured the attention of policy-makers, media, and the public, the impacts of rapidly rising food prices are just one element of chronic and widespread global hunger. Even before the “global food crisis” hit in 2008, hunger plagued roughly 850 million of the world’s poorest people, and was growing at a rate of 4 million per year. The trend towards exacerbation of chronic hunger is not new, and in recent years economic shocks, natural disasters, and changes in climatic conditions have only compounded the systemic problems that contribute to global hunger. To meet these challenges, experts have emphasized the growing need to build increasingly effective programs that are able to accomplish more with available resources.





Proposed U.S. Government actions to alleviate global hunger

A series of studies, including a 2008 report by the Government Accountability Office (GAO), have emphasized the need to enhance the effectiveness of U.S. policies and programs focused on addressing global hunger. In their study, the GAO recommended increased coordination and integration of U.S. programs and policies and development of a comprehensive strategy that ensures support is balanced between short-term emergency and longer-term development needs.

While the U.S. cannot be expected to shoulder the majority of global investments in ending hunger, the U.S. can and should lead the international community by taking immediate steps to make existing

U.S. Government programs more effective by increasing funding for these programs. The following principles should guide U.S. efforts to ensure that policies and programs are coordinated, effective, sustainable, flexible, accountable, and based in broader multi-lateral efforts,

- **Comprehensive:** The U.S. should develop a comprehensive strategy that integrates policies and programs. Because U.S. programs to address hunger are currently spread over many agencies, a strong mandate to integrate these efforts requires White House leadership.
- **Balanced and Flexible:** In order to maximize the effectiveness of U.S. efforts to reduce hunger, interventions should be carefully

balanced and flexible to meet emergency needs while also increasing U.S. investments in longer-term programs to guarantee increased global food security, particularly for the most poor and vulnerable, especially women and children. The response to emergency needs should allow for the most appropriate food assistance efforts (whether commodity- or cash- based) according to the specific conditions of each emergency. Longer-term programs should increase the productivity of agricultural systems, strengthen and expand nutrition programs, and reinforce safety nets worldwide, and thus build resilient families and communities. Investments



should also contribute to lessening the negative impacts of climate change on the world's poorest people.

- Sustainable: In order for U.S. hunger reduction efforts to be affordable and sustainable, they should focus on building the capacity of people and governments around the world to continuously increase their own ability to feed themselves, while supporting needed safety nets for the most vulnerable. The best solutions will be based upon strengthening livelihoods and increasing resilience needed to reduce the impact of hunger-related shocks by allowing for the flexible use of a broader “toolbox” of programs that can be adapted to meet needs in each country.
- Accountable: To assure accountability and improve

program effectiveness, the U.S. should develop clear targets, benchmarks and indicators of success, including gender analysis, to monitor implementation of the comprehensive strategy. Part of the overall U.S. investment should be applied to developing monitoring and evaluation systems required to measure and improve program impacts.

- Multi-lateral: In order to encourage all donor and aid recipient countries to contribute their appropriate share towards achieving this goal, the U.S. should aim to employ the full range of diplomatic resources available to encourage and incentivize other countries across the world to meet their commitments and obligations. The U.S. should also coordinate

action through existing multilateral institutions such as the UN system, World Bank and others. A strong multilateral U.S. strategy increases the likelihood that other countries will contribute their fair share to the global effort to alleviate hunger.

For U.S. hunger reduction efforts and investments to bear fruit, the U.S. will need to demonstrate strong political will at all levels. Both the Administration and the Congress should utilize the skills and expertise of all agencies and departments that implement U.S. hunger programs to reach policy goals. To this end, our three main recommendations are intended to promote coordination and integration of efforts at each of these levels.



1.

CREATION OF A WHITE HOUSE OFFICE ON GLOBAL HUNGER, AND APPOINTMENT OF A GLOBAL HUNGER COORDINATOR TO LEAD THE EFFORTS OF THIS OFFICE.

Despite the broad range of U.S. policies and programs related to ending global hunger, there is no single overall accountable official nor a comprehensive strategy that effectively integrates these activities. Adequate integration will help to address gaps and shortfalls in programs, eliminate duplication of efforts, and allow for more adequate evaluation, oversight and accountability.

UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF THE PRESIDENT, THE WHITE HOUSE GLOBAL HUNGER COORDINATOR WOULD:

- Ensure that efforts to reduce global hunger and increase food security are priorities of the U.S. Government.
 - Assess all existing authorities and mechanisms available within the U.S. government to address global hunger to identify shortfalls in the scope of these programs and help to ensure adequate, sustained, and predictable funding.
 - Engage all relevant agencies and departments in a process to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to address global hunger that integrates all of these agencies and departments.
 - Establish consensus on indicators to measure progress against specific targets, and ensure adequate monitoring and evaluation.
 - Report to Congress on the implementation of the comprehensive strategy.
 - Ensure that addressing hunger is prioritized not only in development programs, but also in U.S. diplomatic and trade relations. This includes ensuring that food security issues are incorporated into the activities and agenda of the USTR.
 - Ensure that the U.S. Government coordinates with other donor governments and international institutions, particularly through key positions like the U.S. Ambassador to the Rome-based food agencies, and other U.S. representatives throughout the UN system.
 - Ensure consultation with all relevant public, private and civil society groups engaged in U.S. efforts to end hunger in developing, implementing and monitoring the comprehensive strategy.
 - Promote public awareness of the importance of addressing hunger and U.S. Government efforts to achieve the first Millennium Development Goal of cutting global hunger in half by 2015.
- Because hunger is interconnected to all other aspects of global development, we recognize that the same coordination problems that hamper U.S. efforts to alleviate hunger also affect all other U.S. global development programs. We hope this next year will bring much needed modernization and elevation of global development and humanitarian response within our government. In this regard, the White House Office on Global Hunger should eventually be moved to a prominent position in a newly empowered development structure, and pave the way for much needed integration of all U.S. government efforts to achieve the eight Millennium Development Goals.



2.

REBIRTH OF THE CONGRESSIONAL SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER

Because funding, programs and jurisdiction for addressing hunger are divided among many Congressional Committees, inadequate emphasis is often given to addressing global hunger in a comprehensive way. The restoration of the Select Committee – with new provisions to make this Committee bicameral – would help to address this issue. For example, during the late 1980s and early 1990s, the House Select Committee on Hunger examined global hunger issues ranging from relief efforts in Africa and the humanitarian crisis in Armenia to severe drought in Southern Africa. These efforts led to increased resources for microfinance, Women in Development, and other crucial programs.⁹

A BICAMERAL CONGRESSIONAL SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER WOULD:

- Examine issues relevant to the development, implementation and monitoring of the comprehensive strategy on global hunger through holding hearings and reviewing reports provided by the White House Special Coordinator for Global Hunger.
 - Conduct investigations to examine the effectiveness of U.S. programs to address global hunger.
 - Monitor the development and implementation of the comprehensive strategy to end global hunger.
- Just as the White House Office would integrate the programs, activities and policies of the numerous Executive Branch agencies and offices charged with implementing hunger alleviation programs, the Select Committee on Hunger would promote coordination across the multiple committees with legislative authority over global hunger issues.



3.

DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO ALLEVIATE WORLD HUNGER

To succeed at the goal of halving world hunger by 2015, the U.S. should develop a comprehensive strategy to integrate the hunger-related policies and programs of the many agencies and departments currently involved in these efforts. This comprehensive plan should focus on hunger, while also recognizing that poverty and other issues are closely related. U.S. programs to eliminate global hunger should be adequately funded without decreasing support for other essential development programs, such as health and education, that aim to alleviate poverty or to achieve the other Millennium Development Goals. The U.S. Strategy to fight hunger and promote food security should be part of a National Strategy for Global Development that articulates both the U.S. theory of and mission for development, sets broad guidelines for U.S. development programs, and articulates how development policy will be coordinated with other policies governing trade, immigration, and other key issues. Robust funding for these poverty-focused development programs is important to realizing progress against hunger. Sufficient investment should be dedicated to increasing U.S. civilian capacity needed for relevant U.S. agencies (including USAID and USDA) to effectively provide leadership to U.S. efforts to alleviate hunger through increasing the staff dedicated to managing these programs.

3.A.

ELEMENTS OF A COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY

A balanced U.S. approach to ending hunger would provide adequate funding to implement a comprehensive strategy based on balanced and flexible use of a broad “toolbox” of program activities. An adequate strategy would address impacts of both transitory and chronic hunger, requiring simultaneous support of specific programs aimed at addressing and combating the root causes of hunger. While the required “toolbox” of programs can be grouped into four distinct categories, some of the specific programs mentioned may fall into more than one of the categories:

EMERGENCY RESPONSE AND MANAGEMENT

Emergency programs provide direct support to the world’s most vulnerable populations in times of need, whether provoked by natural disaster, conflict, or acute economic difficulties. These programs seek to save lives through the direct provision of food assistance to vulnerable households or through approaches that improve access to existing food such as local and regional purchase, cash for work, and conditional cash transfer programs (vouchers). As one

component of U.S. emergency response, commodity-based food assistance can be structured to allow for flexibility in targeting those most in need as well as providing optimal micronutrient content for beneficiaries. In areas with high rates of morbidity and malnutrition, emergency health and nutrition programs aim to treat malnutrition through the provision of supplementary and therapeutic foods, therapeutic care and other essential health

services. Also included are preventive programs like disaster risk reduction and mitigation, early warning systems, and climate change adaptation programs. U.S. emergency response programs should also support logistics and delivery system improvements that strengthen the civilian capacity of the international community to reach vulnerable, difficult to access hungry people.¹⁰



SAFETY NETS, SOCIAL PROTECTION AND DISASTER RISK REDUCTION

Safety nets, social protection, and disaster risk reduction programs are designed to limit or mitigate the impact of shocks on vulnerable populations and reduce the need for emergency interventions. Safety nets provide resources such as food, cash/vouchers or other livelihood inputs to protect lives, livelihoods, and productive assets, especially among chronically or temporarily food- insecure families. Safety nets may be required on a seasonal basis, simply to cover temporary shortages in food availability at the household level. In a crisis, school feeding/

food for education can help households to ensure that everyone consumes an adequate diet – whether at home or at school – when food shortages exist. Government to government technical assistance can increase the capacity of developing country governments to provide social protection services, such as pensions, targeted insurance, and grants for children and the disabled. These social support services prevent highly vulnerable populations such as young children, the elderly, the disabled, and female-headed households

from falling into hunger, which may lead to selling off productive assets. In disaster-prone areas, disaster risk reduction programs build resilience within the community through training and awareness building, infrastructure enhancement, and/or early warning systems. Evidence shows that the impact of shocks, including the loss of life and productive assets, can be substantially reduced when communities are given the appropriate resources and information to manage risk.

NUTRITION PROGRAMS

Nutrition programs aim to ensure that people have adequate access to the required calories and nutrients needed to live healthy lives. Nutrition programs include direct nutritional support for mothers and children through proven interventions including the promotion of exclusive breastfeeding followed by improved complementary feeding practices, micronutrient supplementation and fortification, hygiene and sanitation, and timely treatment of malnutrition. Comprehensive nutrition for children before the age of 24 months is especially critical to avert the possibility of stunting and irreversible

damage. Adding child interaction and stimulation during feeding (e.g., parents and caregivers interacting, talking, making eye contact, and engaging the child in eating as a positive experience) is integral to effective and efficient nutrition programming, and results immediately in faster and sustained weight gain as well as improved cognition over the long term. Since the health of mothers, newborns, and children is seriously undermined by food insecurity, it is critical that increased resources be made available to ensure that families have access to basic health services (e.g., immunizations and improved case management of pneumonia and diarrhea) and

nutrition interventions. Resources from cash for work, conditional cash transfers (vouchers) and technical assistance programs – including government to government technical assistance – contribute to building stronger nutrition programs. School feeding/food for education programs, including an essential package of complementary health and nutrition interventions, can help address the nutritional needs of children. Food and nutrition support to those living with HIV/AIDS and other vulnerable populations is another component of a comprehensive nutritional program.



MARKET-BASED AGRICULTURE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

U.S. programs to alleviate hunger have traditionally underemphasized longer-term agricultural development programs, despite the fact that the majority of hungry people live in rural areas, and many are smallholder farmers who have traditionally suffered from a lack of investment in the credit, infrastructure, and technical assistance programs that would allow them to increase their agricultural productivity and income. Investment in agricultural programs is one of the best ways to guarantee that families around the world can reliably feed themselves, thus ensuring sustainability. Programs in this area ensure that small-scale farmers, especially women farmers, can sustain and increase their production through a broad range of interventions, including enabling access to quality inputs, services and capital required for producers to benefit from markets. Linkages to private, stable supplier networks, as well as to appropriate financial services – including microcredit, credit, savings and insurance products – will be key strategies within these programs. Knowledge,

skills and capacities in use of both resource-sound production practices and market systems would result from research, technical assistance and training (through government-to-government, land-grant university, and farmer-to-farmer mechanisms) and through technology transfer. Programs should also support stable land tenure arrangements for small-scale producers. It is estimated that 70% of smallholder farmers in sub-Saharan Africa, and 60% globally, are women. Therefore it is critical to ensure gender equity and integration in the design, implementation and evaluation of programs designed to boost agricultural production, and to invest in women farmers who generally suffer from lack of land rights and access to credit.

In addition, the U.S. should collaborate with other governments throughout the world to develop agricultural infrastructure – everything from roads to storage and processing facilities – thereby ensuring farm products can be cost-effectively sold locally, regionally,

nationally and internationally. Developing countries could also benefit from U.S. programs to provide technical assistance on trade and regulatory issues. When negotiating trade agreements, USTR and other agencies should ensure that appropriate strategies are implemented to mitigate negative impacts on vulnerable economic sectors or populations. Trade liberalization can contribute to poverty reduction, but the relationship is complicated and case-specific. A successful completion of the Doha Round of global trade negotiations must include tangible benefits for hungry and poor families in rural areas of developing countries. Trade relations should aim to stimulate agricultural production in the developing world by providing increased access to markets in OECD countries and by promoting trade preference programs with authorization periods that are long enough to encourage investment.



3.B. RESOURCES REQUIRED TO SUPPORT A U.S. COMMITMENT TO ALLEVIATING HUNGER: 2010-2014

U.S. funding for global hunger programs has been spread across a number of accounts that are funded through various congressional appropriations, including foreign operations and agriculture. In the past several years, an increasing share of U.S. international emergency relief and development activities have been funded through supplemental appropriations legislation. This strongly limits the ability of U.S. agencies engaged in programs to address global hunger to coordinate their work and to make effective and efficient long-term investments. We recommend that resources required to implement the comprehensive strategy be provided through the regular appropriations process, with supplemental funding legislation focused more directly on emergencies or other unanticipated needs.

The following are some of the U.S. accounts that are currently key sources of support for addressing global hunger:

- Core humanitarian and development accounts: Child Survival and Maternal Health, Development Assistance, International Disaster Assistance, Migration and Refugee Assistance, Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance, International Organizations and Programs.
- Agricultural appropriations accounts: PL-480, McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition, Food for Progress, the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust.
- Other key accounts: Economic Support Funds, Millennium Challenge Corporation, PEPFAR.

As the above list demonstrates, funding to address global hunger is currently under the jurisdiction of various Congressional appropriations subcommittees, spread across many accounts

and managed by multiple agencies. While this should not prevent programs managed by one agency from complementing those managed by others, in practice the different funding streams and related operations are rarely combined at the field level to strengthen the overall effectiveness of U.S. interventions. For example, it has proven difficult to combine programs that distribute U.S. agricultural commodities funded through PL-480 with complementary cash-based programs that could increase the effectiveness and efficiency of these efforts.

The following chart is intended to highlight the level of funding recommended to permit a comprehensive reshaping of U.S. contributions towards meeting the first Millennium Development Goal to halve hunger by 2015. To reach this goal and sustain progress, the U.S. will need to ensure coordination of all efforts through development of a comprehensive plan and through increasing resources required to implement

the plan effectively. Because it will be essential to build in flexibility to utilize a combination of cash and commodity resources, this may require some rebalancing of funding among the agencies currently contributing to hunger alleviation efforts. Increasing focus on the effectiveness of programs will also be needed to ensure that all programs funded by the U.S. are achieving maximum impact.

In this light, the chart is provided to foster further discussion and consideration by the Administration and Congress. Information on potential accounts is provided as a guide to highlight currently authorized ways to channel much-needed funding, with the overall objective of streamlining funding while allowing for flexibility. A stronger mandate should also be provided to those agencies managing different funding streams to work together in designing complementary activities to improve overall impact of U.S. programs.

- 1 The First Millennium Development Goal is broken into three sub-goals: 1c sets forth the goal of reducing by half the proportion of people who suffer from hunger as measured by the prevalence of underweight children under five years of age as measured by UNICEF and WHO, and the proportion of the population below the minimum level of dietary energy consumption as measured by the FAO.
- 2 To adequately alleviate hunger, a broad range of economic, physical, productive and livelihood issues must be addressed from the macro level down to the household level. Attention must be given to nutrition and to building broad food security that guarantees that food is available, that people can access sufficient food and nutrition, and that people can physically utilize the nutritional content of food.
- 3 "Number of hungry people rises to 963 million." December 2008. Food and Agriculture Organization: Rome, Italy. <http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/8836/icode/>.
- 4 "The Lancet's Series on Maternal and Child Undernutrition." Executive Summary. January 2008, pp. 1-12. http://www.globalnutritionseries.org/sites/default/files/dc_london/Executive%20Summary%20--%20English%204.16.08.pdf.

Hunger Roadmap Recommended Funding Levels Over Five Years

	FY08 estimate	Funding (in millions) / year			
		2010	2011	2012	2013
Emergency Response and Management	1,982	2,680	3,150	3,620	4,090
Commodity-based Food Assistance Programs					
Title II - PL-480	1,716	1,800	1,900	2,000	2,100
Cash-based Food Assistance Programs					
Programs to fund flexible program options (based on local needs) through food assistance, including local and regional purchase options, vouchers, market access and related emergency programming (IDA) (08-09 supplemental funding)	200	800	1,150	1,500	1,850
Early Warning/Disaster Reduction/ Vulnerability Analysis and Monitoring					
Programs to reduce negative impacts of disasters (IDA)	66	80	100	120	140

- 5 Longitudinal studies have shown that undernutrition for children under two impacts brain development, educational attainment, developmental potential, and earnings, and that those consequences are passed on to the next generation. See Ibid.
- 6 *Global Framework for Action of the Ending Child Hunger and Undernutrition Initiative*. October 9, 2006. World Food Programme: Rome, Italy, pp. 3-4. <http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/resources/wfp111813.pdf>.
- 7 Ivanic, Maros and Martin, Will. "Implications of Higher Food Prices for Poverty in Low-Income Countries." Policy Research Working Paper 4594. April 2008. The World Bank: Washington, DC, p. 23. http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/IW3P/IB/2008/04/16/000158349_20080416103709/Rendered/PDF/wps4594.pdf.
- 8 Natsios, Andrew and Doley, Kelly. "The Coming Food Coups." *The Washington Quarterly*. v. 32, n. 1, January 2009. http://www.twq.com/09winter/docs/09jan_natsiosdoley.pdf.
- 9 The Mickey Leland Library and Museum Website, "Mickey Leland Biography," <http://www.mickeyleland.org/biography.html>.
- 10 "FOREIGN ASSISTANCE: Various Challenges Impede the Efficiency and Effectiveness of U.S. Food Aid." Report Number GAO-07-560. April 2007. Government Accountability Office: Washington, DC. <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d07560.pdf>.

Total		
2014	17,700	
4,160	17,700	The suggested funding levels will allow the U.S. to support our share of the global burden to reach at least 100 million of the world's most vulnerable people who require life-saving food aid. The balance between food aid through direct provision of commodities and food aid through cash-based programs gradually shifts to reach parity. This is the minimum recommendation of the CSIS report on the global food crisis, and is expected to increase the efficiency of U.S. investments (see "FOREIGN ASSISTANCE: Various Challenges Impede the Efficiency and Effectiveness of U.S. Food Aid." Government Accountability Office, April 2007), allowing programs to serve more vulnerable people by year five. While it is anticipated that the overall level of emergency resources required will decline as the result of investments to address the root causes of hunger, in the short-term global price volatility, financial crisis, and natural disasters will continue exacerbating emergency needs.
2,000	9,800	Due to the dramatic impacts of the global food and financial crises, we have suggested a steady, but slight, increase in funding for Title II - PL-480 funding for emergency programs from year 1 to year 5. By year 5, Title II - PL-480 funding is recommended at slightly above the average level of funding provided by the U.S. from FY 03 through FY 07. The U.S. has traditionally provided roughly 40% of the world's total food aid, and maintaining this level of commitment to Title II PL-480 as part of a comprehensive U.S. strategy would ensure the U.S. continues to lead the world in providing food in times of acute shortage.
2,000	7,300	While commodities are an appropriate response in some emergency settings, U.S. programs should aim for increased flexibility through greater reliance on cash-based emergency assistance that can be easily adapted to suit immediate needs and market conditions. Where market conditions permit, regional and local purchase or voucher programs may allow for more rapid provision of food while also stimulating local markets. Where market conditions are not appropriate for local purchase programs, cash-based assistance can be combined with U.S. commodities, as appropriate, to enhance the effectiveness of the intervention. Cash should also support the logistical requirements of the humanitarian response.
160	600	Up to 10% of the IDA account should be set aside for these activities, as the cost of prevention programs is much less than the cost of disaster response. This will enhance the efficiency of U.S. disaster-related programs and contribute to increased food security. Increasingly, the trend among international donors has been to incorporate disaster risk reduction activities into all development program activities. The U.S. agency managing this funding should be given a strong mandate to utilize it to complement and strengthen other USG investments. In order to best target assistance and to track progress against hunger alleviation objectives, investments are also needed in systems to identify the most vulnerable populations and to monitor the impacts of programs on reducing hunger.

Global Climate Change Adaptation					
Hunger Roadmap Recommended Funding Levels Over Five Years					
	FY08 estimate	Funding (in millions) / year			
		2010	2011	2012	2013
Safety Nets	375	810	1,040	1,270	1,500
Non-Emergency Food Aid / Food for Development					
Programs for targeted distribution of food to address chronic hunger (Title II - PL-480)	375	400	425	450	475
Cash-based Programs to Build Social and Productive Safety Nets					
Programs to address chronic hunger and strengthen safety nets for vulnerable people, including training and technical assistance activities carried out by PVOs (DA)		400	600	800	1,000
Technical Assistance and Training					
Government-to-government technical assistance (USDA, USAID, other relevant agencies)		10	15	20	25

		Climate Change Adaptation programs will be an important component of U.S. efforts to end hunger. Current legislative initiatives, including a proposed \$20 million contribution to the LDC fund of the GEF and an emissions permit scheme to generate roughly \$1 billion a year starting in 2012, should be supported. Because global cost estimates to address the costs of climate change are currently under development, we have not included financial figures in this chart.
Total		
2014		
1,730	6,350	We have recommended significant increases in U.S. funding for the development of safety net programs, as the world's hungry are also the poorest and most vulnerable populations. Many are very young, elderly, sick, or for other reasons unable to support themselves. The focus of these interventions is on helping governments throughout the world increase their own capacity to provide security to the most vulnerable populations. As such, this funding is viewed as an investment in self help initiatives with the ultimate goal of self reliance on the national level.
500	2,250	The chronically hungry also require food aid interventions as a safety net and to support broader food security objectives. The suggested funding levels are based upon the most recent authorization numbers in the Farm Bill for PL 480, title II food for development. These developmental food programs are expected to allow for an increased number of countries and populations to be reached.
1,200	4,000	Programs that address risk reduction, social protection, and a wide range of activities related to hunger are currently managed in association with commodity based programs under Food for Peace within USAID. The provision of cash resources through USAID is designed to provide social safety net and social protection implementors with increased flexibility, which will enable the U.S. to maximize both efficiency and reach. These programs (commodity and cash) should be given a mandate for coordination that encourages the combination of different funding streams to maximize effectiveness of U.S. efforts. This recommended level of funding should allow for development of safety net programs to serve the chronically vulnerable, as well as for expansion of productive safety net programs modeled on the Ethiopia Productive Safety Nets Program.
30	100	U.S. Government technical assistance can allow career staff to undertake activities to bolster the effectiveness of U.S. global programs to alleviate hunger through the creation or strengthening of national and local government structures to assist the most vulnerable populations. These funds will allow U.S. social service agency experts to provide short- and long-term technical assistance to national, district and local government counterparts to share U.S. experiences with our domestic WIC, Food Stamp, government school feeding, and other social protection programs.

Hunger Roadmap Recommended Funding Levels Over Five Years

	FY08 estimate	Funding (in millions) / year			
		2010	2011	2012	2013
Nutrition Programs	728	1,310	2,015	2,820	3,025
Maternal and Child Programs					
Program support for nutrition activities identified in comprehensive strategy (CSMH)	450	900	1,200	1,600	1,600
School Feeding/Food for Education Programs					
Program to provide food and complementary activities for vulnerable children (McGovern-Dole Program) (FY09 est. in column 1)	184	400	800	1,200	1,400
Nutrition Programs for Other Vulnerable Populations					
Nutrition programs supporting mothers, orphans, vulnerable children and other vulnerable individuals infected with, and affected by, HIV/AIDS (PEPFAR)	94				
Technical Assistance and Training					
Government-to-government technical assistance (USDA, USAID, other relevant agencies)		10	15	20	25

Total		
2014	Total	
3,230	12,400	We have recommended significant increases in U.S. funding for nutrition programs. Good nutrition is required to support cognitive development and good health, making it one of the main foundations for economic and social development worldwide. Because nutrition funding is integrated within many other sources of USG funds, it has been particularly difficult to provide a sound estimate of historic U.S. funding levels. More adequate accounting mechanisms are required to accurately reflect the portion of health and other activities financed by the U.S. that are devoted directly to nutrition programs.
1,600	6,900	The global community now saves over 5 million children per year through child survival interventions. An additional \$5 billion per year could save the lives of another 6 million children in 42 countries, where 90% of child deaths occur. The recommended funding levels reflect the authorization amounts included in the Global Child Survival Act and gradually increase to \$1.6 billion per year, which is the estimated U.S. responsibility (one third of the total GDP of OECD). Based on UNICEF and WHO analysis, a package of child survival interventions costs \$44 per year and \$220 to deliver basic care per child for 5 years. This package includes breastfeeding support, oral rehydration therapy, essential newborn care, and vitamin and mineral supplementation.
1,600	5,400	There are 130 million school-age children in the world's poorest countries who are undernourished and would be eligible for school feeding programs. The cost of feeding a child for one year through a school feeding program is \$50 (based on 25 cents a day for 200 school days). To reach all eligible children, a total of \$6.5 billion would be required. The funding levels suggested would allow the U.S. to move from reaching 6.2% of eligible children in year 1 to reaching roughly 25% of eligible children by year 5. Increased funding will also support complementary activities (such as deworming, micronutrient supplementation, nutrition education, and take-home rations) which can enhance the nutritional effectiveness of these programs. Program resources are also authorized to reach preschool-age children, which include the most vulnerable in the 0-2 age range.
		The level of PEPFAR resources for nutrition programs should be determined based on the needs of those being served by the overall program. The reauthorization of the PEPFAR legislation requires the Office of Global AIDS Coordinator to support the nutritional needs of those affected by HIV/AIDS. Although the PEPFAR funding levels are not set forth in this document, it is anticipated that the nutritional needs of this target population will be adequately funded through PEPFAR.
30	100	U.S. Government technical assistance to allow career staff in domestic nutrition programs to provide technical assistance to ensure foreign government counterparts in the developing world can improve national nutrition programs, including micronutrient fortification programs as well as research, education, and outreach programs.

Hunger Roadmap Recommended Funding Levels Over Five Years

	FY08 estimate	Funding (in millions) / year			
		2010	2011	2012	2013
Market-based Agricultural and Infrastructure Development	911	1,530	1,955	2,690	3,425
Agricultural and Infrastructure Development Programs					
Programs to support agriculture, markets, and infrastructure programs described in comprehensive strategy, including technical assistance and training activities carried out by PVOs and through farmer-to-farmer programs (DA, with farmer-to-farmer through PL-480)	350	750	1,000	1,500	2,000
Agriculture and Infrastructure programs developed in partnership with MCC compact countries (MCC)	561	560	600	700	800
Agricultural Research and Education					
Support for established international research institutions like CGIAR, CRISP, and NIFA		100	125	150	175
Fund to promote higher education to improve agricultural productivity (DA)		100	200	300	400
Technical Assistance and Training					
Government-to-government technical assistance (USDA, USAID, other relevant agencies)		20	30	40	50
Coordination of U.S. Development and Diplomatic Programs		30	30	30	30
White House Coordinator / Office on Global Hunger					
Comprehensive strategy development, implementation and monitoring		10	10	10	10
Building Targeted Technical Assistance into Free Trade Agreements					
Trade Transition Mitigation Fund (USTR)		20	20	20	20
TOTAL	3,996	6,360	8,190	10,430	12,070

	Total	
2014		
4,160	13,760	U.S. funding for agricultural development has traditionally comprised a small percentage of overall U.S. assistance. Investment in agricultural development efforts will substantially increase food security, contribute to sustainability of U.S. efforts, and reduce the need for emergency assistance over time. By year 5, it is recommended that the total U.S. investment in agricultural development reach parity with emergency funding, reflecting the expectation that more resilient agricultural systems will be less prone to shocks that require emergency response.
2,500	7,750	This is the level of financing included in Lugar-Casey legislation. Emphasis should be placed on improving the lives of low income agricultural producers and others involved in the agriculture sector – especially women – through more inclusive policy reforms and programs that move smallholder farmers into the formal economic sector, including a focus on value chains and staple crops.
900	3,560	MCC investments should continue to fully support efforts by compact-eligible countries to seek support for agricultural and other activities. Support for agricultural production including improved irrigation, land tenure, watershed management, agribusiness development and rural infrastructure through MCC compacts, ensuring that a significant portion of funding be devoted to creating pathways for smallholder farmers to enter the formal economic sector as well as policies that help increase smallholder productivity of staple crops. These funding estimates are based on past MCC spending on agriculture, and are meant to support MCC's country-driven compact mechanism.
200	750	These funds are intended to encourage agricultural research that serves smallholder farmers and that has tangible impact on reducing hunger. These funding levels are consistent with the recommendations from the Chicago Council and the Lugar-Casey legislation.
500	1,500	This financing would support the HECTARE program at levels included in Lugar-Casey legislation.
60	200	Increased funding will allow career staff to provide technical assistance to developing country governments including support for development of land tenure systems, strengthening legal environments for agricultural credit and government systems that carry out programs that reach farmers and agribusinesses of all income levels.
30	150	
10	50	Support to allow the White House Office and Special Coordinator to carry out their coordination/integration role. A significant portion of this funding should be utilized to develop and to track clear benchmarks and indicators of effectiveness, as well as to evaluate the effectiveness of the comprehensive strategy at meeting the first Millennium Development Goal.
20	100	Support to allow the USTR to develop programs to mitigate negative impacts of trade agreements on specific sectors on a short-term basis. The short-term USTR programs should be effectively linked with longer term U.S. development assistance efforts, as this fund is meant to provide a short-term bridge to account for the delays caused by the regular U.S. budget approval process.
13,310	50,360	