

DRAFT

**UN System High-Level Task Force on the
GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY CRISIS**

**OUTLINE OF PROGRESS
AGAINST THE JULY 2008
COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK
FOR ACTION (CFA)**

8 JULY 2009



**Secretariat of the UN System High Level Task Force for the
Global Food Security Crisis (HLTF)**

*Via Paolo di Dono, IFAD, 44, 00142 Rome +390654592642
Villa La Pelouse, Palais Des Nations, 1201 Geneva +41 22 917 1189
2 United Nations Plaza, New York NY 10017 +1 212 906 6692
www.un-foodsecurity.org*

High-Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis

Chair: Mr. Ban Ki-moon, United Nations Secretary-General

Vice-Chair: Mr. Jacques Diouf, Director-General, Food and Agriculture Organization

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

International Labour Organization (ILO)

International Monetary Fund (IMF)

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)

Special Adviser on Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA)

United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO)

United Nations Department of Political Affairs (DPA)

United Nations Department of Public Information (DPI)

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)

United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)

United Nations Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (OHRLLS)

World Bank (WB)

World Food Programme (WFP)

World Health Organization (WHO)

World Trade Organization (WTO)

Coordinator: Dr. David Nabarro, United Nations Assistant Secretary-General

Special thanks to members of the Senior Steering Group and the HLTF Secretariat for their efforts in support of the work of the High-Level Task Force and to the numerous agencies and organizations, NGOs, policy institutes and individuals outside the Task Force that contributed valuable knowledge and expertise to this outline.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<i>Page</i>
	PREFACE	4
I.	HELPING NATIONAL AUTHORITIES TO TACKLE FOOD INSECURITY: BRIEF OVERVIEW	5
II.	COORDINATION WITHIN THE HLTF	6
III.	IMPLEMENTING THE COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION: WHAT CAN BE LEARNT FROM PROGRESS TO DATE?	8
	ANNEXES	
	<i>1 HLTF support to national authorities for realizing the CFA outcomes</i>	<i>10</i>
	<i>2 Indicative financial figures</i>	<i>21</i>
	<i>3 HLTF Programme of Work</i>	<i>22</i>
	<i>4 Country list</i>	<i>24</i>
	<i>5 Country fiches</i>	<i>25</i>
	<i>6 Report of meeting between EC and UN/World Bank 24th April 2009</i>	<i>43</i>

PREFACE

The conditions that led to the food and energy prices spikes of 2008 can re-emerge anytime. But the situation is now more treacherous as a result of the worldwide contraction of market economies which has slashed the purchasing power of millions of people. This has increased the numbers who depend on food production and processing as a buffer in the face of repeated economic, climatic and political shocks.

Just over a year ago the Chief Executives Board established the UN System High Level Task Force (HLTF) on the Global Food Security Crisis to coordinate UN system and International Financial Institutions efforts to pursue immediate and long term goals in relation to food security. The 23 entities within the HLTF include UN Secretariat bodies; UN agencies, funds and programmes; International Financial Institutions; the World Trade Organization and the OECD. The HLTF encourage coordinated and integrated actions that are vital for realizing Millenium Development Goal 1 (reducing poverty and hunger), for promoting social and economic resilience, and for creating viable employment opportunities within communities.

The HLTF developed a Comprehensive Framework for Action (CFA) in July 2008. The CFA emphasizes that food insecurity is a serious global threat requiring a twin track approach - short term responses to protect the most vulnerable and the long-term development of sustainable food systems.

Since his appointment, BAN Ki-Moon, UN Secretary General, has advocated for greater national and international investment in global food security. He and members of the HLTF have repeatedly noted that during the last three decades there have been reductions in government funding and development assistance for food security. Yet access to food has a central role as a determinant of a population's development and economic resilience in settings where the majority of people earn their living from agriculture, livestock and fishery. Now is the time to reverse this trend with a view to ensuring food security for all.

With regard to the first track of the CFA, the HLTF call for sufficient funding to meet the assessed needs of those dependent on food assistance and safety nets. Actions approved by the Board of the World Food Programme must be given priority in order to prevent the suffering caused by starvation and malnutrition.

With regard to track two, the HLTF seek to enable smallholder farmers (especially women) to benefit from higher productivity, new technologies, opportunities for child care and better nutrition. They need better access to land, credit, irrigation, seeds, fertilizers, fodder and other essential inputs, and private sector engagement in all aspects of the food value chain. Farmers also need help, to mitigate and adapt to climate change. This calls for functioning extension services, stronger producer organizations, sustainable technologies and better integration of food production and marketing.

The HLTF are now supporting the realization of the CFA in more than 60 countries. This **outline report** has been prepared for the HLTF. It outlines the progress that has been made in relation to the CFA outcomes. A more complete report will be available in September 2009.



David Nabarro, Coordinator
High-Level Task Force for the Global Food Security Crisis
July 8th 2009

I. HELPING NATIONAL AUTHORITIES TO TACKLE FOOD INSECURITY: BRIEF OVERVIEW

The state of the food crisis: Last year, a major spike in food prices exacerbated already difficult conditions being experienced by hundreds of millions of poor people. Reports of their hardship brought the crisis to life. Today, the effects of increasing food price volatility have been intensified by the collapse of the financial, credit and housing markets, leading to a severe global economic downturn and throwing many more millions into poverty.

Challenges ahead: Global food prices are increasingly being driven by events outside the food sector: this will pose major challenges for food security in poor developing countries, where one billion people are presently chronically undernourished - roughly 100 million more than in 2008. A resumption of growth in the global economy is also likely to lead to new pressures on commodity prices, as already evidenced in petroleum markets.

HLTF and CFA: The HLTF was established so that the UN system could adopt a coordinated, consolidated and coherent approach in its responses to the food security crisis. The strategic “twin track” approach in its July 2008 **Comprehensive Framework for Action** is broad and inclusive. It spans nutrition, food systems, social protection, agriculture, markets and trade and combines short and long-term actions.

Scaling up support for National Authorities: During 2008 the HLTF scaled up support to national authorities as they responded to the crisis. They supported provision of safety nets and food assistance together with longer-term support to improve production and increase resilience of farmers in the face of price volatility and other external shocks (see Annex 1 for details):

- The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) assisted small farmers during the fall planting seasons and are supporting programmes aiming at strengthening their capacities.
- The World Food Programme (WFP) was able to raise unprecedented level of food assistance operations in countries wrecked by high food prices with perhaps the largest emergency scale up in human history reaching over 100 million people, and is now increasingly purchasing locally produced food for its operations and school feeding programmes (the "Purchase for Progress" initiative).
- The World Bank has intensified investment operations through a Global Food Crisis Response Programme (GFRP) with focus on rapidly disbursing assistance to address immediate needs through budget support, social protection programs and support to the agricultural sector: around USD 780 million (70% of approved funds) has been disbursed within a year.
- UNICEF has intensified its focus on responses to the nutritional impact of the combined food and economic crises, while the UN Development Programme (UNDP) has helped governments address the critical inter-relationships between food systems, social protection, rural development and poverty reduction; and also through coordinating agency responses in selected countries.
- OCHA decided to set aside within the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) USD 100 million to respond to the food crisis and worked on country interagency contingency plans.

- The International Monetary Fund (IMF) plugged balance of payment gaps for low income countries suffering from food price shocks and provides advice on appropriate macroeconomic policy responses.
- The HLTF Secretariat also assisted the leverage of donor funding, including support to the establishment of the EUR 1 billion EU Food Facility and is supporting country level coordination in 35 countries of the 60 HLTF focus countries (see Annexes 4, 5 and 6).

Results achieved after one year: One year into the work of the HLTF there has been intense activity by the full range of agencies working together. The approach spelt out in the CFA appears to be appreciated but still needs to be better disseminated. The options for predictable engagement by civil society, producer organizations and businesses within the policy dialogue within most countries are limited. There is a yearning by national authorities for different parts of the UN system and its partners to work in synergy on food security issues. Funding remains an issue for all stakeholders involved in the response to food insecurity. Capacity to absorb funding must also be addressed and technical assistance is critical in this regard (see Annex 2 for indicative investment figures of the HLTF members).

Sustaining intensified action in 2009 and 2010: This year has seen significant worsening of child nutrition in at least 16 countries. There is a major and continuing need for intensified action during 2009 and 2010 both as a response to the immediate needs of food insecure populations (with WFP experiencing a serious shortfall in its income for 2009) and for stimulus that can result from increased investment in agriculture.

Concerted focus on long-term issues: The HLTF must continue to work with national and regional partners to address longer-term structural and policy issues a) to avert a worsening of the crisis, and b) to meet future food security needs (exacerbated by climate change). Using the Right to Food as a starting point, there is a continuing need for joint action to tackle hunger, price volatility, dysfunctional trading systems, insufficient access to agricultural inputs and markets and lack of social protection.

II. COORDINATION WITHIN THE HLTF

Introduction: The HLTF is all about ensuring coordination between the efforts of different its members and their partners, and working to support country-owned and country-driven action. Emphasis is given to synergy of policies, action and the delivery of results. Stronger and better partnerships are encouraged, as is advocacy for sustained support to national efforts.

Programme of Work and Secretariat: The HLTF agreed a Programme of Work for the collective pursuit of the Comprehensive Framework for Action (Annex 2). It also requested a small secretariat to support HLTF agencies at country, regional and global level and encourage the effective and coordinated pursuit of CFA outcomes. The Secretariat, which started to operate in March 2009 through a central hub at IFAD in Rome, now includes six country support staff, an information manager, an officer in the office of the UN Secretary General, a network manager and a support staff. The Secretariat engages with the UN Development Group (UNDG), supports Resident Coordinators and World Bank Country Directors (and other in-country and regional focal points for coordination) and offers backing for food security work within UNDAFs, Poverty Reduction Strategies and other country owned plans and programs that are related to food security.

Concerted support to national authorities: During the last year the HLTF have worked together in support of the 62 countries most in need of help along the lines outlined in the CFA. Coordinated efforts to realize CFA outcomes are being promoted in 35 countries (*see list of countries in Annex 3*). To better address coordination challenges, the HLTF Secretariat is initiating regular dialogue with in-country staff – this has started in 9 countries (*see Annex 3*). Findings of this country-level dialogue and anticipated follow up work can be found on www.un-foodsecurity.org.

Coordination within regional entities: the HLTF members have agreed to align their support with regional entities in Africa such as the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). They also participate in the dialogue with African authorities on the implementation and evolution of this framework. The HLTF are working with CAADP on ways to enrich African institutions and networks as they address food insecurity, and support regional integration as well as the round table process and compact development. When compacts have been developed and signed the HLTF help countries to locate resources for their national plans. The HLTF also participate actively in the implementation of the regional agricultural policy (ECOWAP) adopted by ECOWAS by sharing analysis and studies as well as early information on intended projects. The HLTF is joining the efforts of the Secretary-General's Millennium Development Goals Africa Steering Group, a consortium of eight major multilaterals, to follow through on existing commitments to support development in Africa.

Coordination with civil society and business: The HLTF engage with civil society groups and businesses in policy dialogue, programme development and implementation through partnering. They do this at national, regional and global levels. The Rome Committee on Food Security is being reformed and seems likely to emerge as a global reference point for partnerships on food security and nutrition. Within countries, the HLTF seek to revitalize and strengthen existing partnerships so as to encourage open dialogue and synergy of action. Partnerships that include all stakeholders are essential elements of effective coordination.

Coordination – especially at country level – is valued by donors: In September 2008 officials from the European Commission (EC) made available to the UN system, the World Bank and some regional organizations one billion Euros in emergency assistance to reduce the immediate impacts of this crisis on vulnerable populations. The Commission's focus is on: (a) safety nets to ensure the well-being of populations vulnerable to effects of the crisis, and (b) boosts to food production and marketing among smallholder farmers. Funds are to be applied to existing projects that address these needs and could be scaled up in order to absorb and make good use of additional funds as well as to new, quick disbursing beneficiary country identified initiatives. The HLTF Secretariat formed a bridge between the UN agencies, the World Bank and other interested parties (including the European institutions). Annex 4 offers examples of country fiches that were developed for this occasion. These fiches are regularly updated and can be used for other similar initiatives. Annex 5 provides an EC summary of the collaboration and the lessons learned from this experience.

Coordination of Multilateral Financing for Food Security: The HLTF have agreed – where possible - to coordinate multilateral financial investments in food security at the country level in developing countries (with a particular emphasis on smallholder agriculture systems). This coordination builds on functioning national and regional coordination procedures. Building on experience with the EC initiative, the HLTF are developing a Financial Coordination Mechanism (FCM) to coordinate both existing assistance and new contributions. Using data provided by individual agencies, the HLTF Secretariat is also tracking donor investments at country level.

III. IMPLEMENTING THE COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION: WHAT CAN BE LEARNT FROM PROGRESS TO DATE?

Introduction: The CFA serves many purposes. First – bridging humanitarian and development agendas through reflecting each organization’s comparative advantage and knowledge. Second – serving as a manifesto that embraces the full range of policies and actions already underway in response to the food challenge, and to support the achievement of critical MDGs that are especially threatened under current circumstances. Third – sustaining a consensus on the current food crisis by laying out actions needed to meet immediate needs of vulnerable populations and to build longer-term resilience. However, the CFA does not set out to offer a solution to all the problems of food insecurity, let alone the inter-related challenges such as population growth, climate change, resource scarcity and energy dilemmas. The actions suggested are neither exhaustive nor exclusive.

One year on it is clear that more emphasis should be given to issues related to the food security dimensions of the right to food, of agricultural trade and of employment.

The Right to Food: The UN Secretary General identified the Right to Food as a third track of the CFA at the Madrid High Level Conference on Food Security in January 2009. He and others in the HLTF emphasized the need to cover both production and all aspects of the food system from a rights perspective. This means special attention to processing, distribution/marketing, and the consumption of safe food. The Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food is working relentlessly towards this goal and the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) has recently joined the HLTF.

The food trade: Local, regional and international trade is a key component of solutions to food insecurity. The financing of the food trade and access to trade credits is essential to facilitate cross border movement of products. The elimination of distorting subsidies is key to establishing a fair trading environment for poor countries. The World Trade Organization (WTO) and the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) are providing a platform for discussion and action. Export restrictions and extraordinary taxes are particularly detrimental when it comes to humanitarian food aid. Despite a decrease in the number of countries applying these measures, they remain in place in some and continue negatively to affect WFP's ability to procure humanitarian food. These market instabilities increase transport costs and lengthen delivery times.

Employment: Decent work is a key element of food security. The creation of jobs, occupational safety nets and health, entrepreneurship, child labor and gender issues all need attention in conjunction with The International Labour Organization (ILO). Indeed ILO is now a member of the HLTF and ready to mobilize its network of employers’ and workers’ organizations at international and national level.

Country-level experiences: Efforts to implement action for food security in country reveal the following:

1. **Hunger is a political liability for national governments.** Hunger caused food riots in 2008 and will contribute to discontent and frustration as long as it persists. As a greater number of people become uncertain about their access to food in the face of climate change they will increasingly expect to be protected by their governments, and they may not always appreciate the protection strategies that are offered.

2. **A comprehensive response is essential** both to immediate and long term challenges, with priority on investment in food systems and infrastructure that support smallholder production and markets, backed with fair trading systems that respond to the interests of poor people and secure access to food for the most vulnerable through well-designed, fiscally sustainable safety nets.
3. **The response should be generated from within communities** (and – ideally – led by them). This means investing in the empowerment of communities affected by uncertainty and at risk of food insecurity. It means providing support to local, regional and central governments and facilitating their links with community organizations and the private sector. The response should link urgent life-saving needs with long term remedies for the structural causes of food insecurity.
4. **Multi-stakeholder partnerships are a vital platform for resilience**, confidence building and empowerment. Most food in developing countries is produced by poor farmers. Because of uncertainty in energy markets, and lack of clarity as to when global economic growth will resume, these farmers cannot be confident year-on-year that they will be able to meet the costs of their inputs in the next growing season with resources they currently own. Smallholders are the engine for recovery during the recession. The goal is to increase their resilience and productivity, especially at a time when remittances to developing countries are being reduced. To this end they must be linked effectively to sources of finance and technology and to markets.
5. **Extra Funds are Needed:** More financial resources, and capacity to absorb them, are urgently required. Today, the amount of ODA that is dedicated to agriculture is one third of the amount provided in the 70's. This trend must be corrected so as to send the right political message and provide incentives for governments to allocate a greater part of their budget to food security. The capacity of national governments to improve access to financial requirements was bolstered by UN agencies' will to advocate for increasing emergency funding from major donors. Despite these efforts, many countries in the three regions most affected, namely Africa, Asia and Latin America, remain in critical need of funding. The initiatives being taken forward by the EC, and announced by Spain and the US are extremely welcome and have the potential for a significant impact.
6. **Interconnections:** Major global issues are interconnected. Climate change will impact food price volatility: increases in the frequency and severity of extreme weather and climate-driven water scarcity have already affected food prices. The current economic downturn triggered by the financial crisis is deeply affecting developing countries. Weakening export markets due to recession, declines in prices of agricultural commodities, falls in direct foreign investment and remittances, all threaten to undermine the hard won gains in reducing poverty and hunger achieved in recent years.

ANNEX 1: HLTF SUPPORT FOR NATIONAL AUTHORITIES AS THEY REALIZE THE CFA OUTCOMES

Global information and monitoring systems

CFA suggested actions:

- *Establish better coordination of information systems*
 - *Carry-out comprehensive assessments and monitoring*
 - *Undertake impact analysis*
- *Conduct health and nutrition assessments*
- *Analyze policy options and programmatic approaches*
- *Review contingency plans and early warning systems*

FAO: has developed ICT tools to improve linkages among knowledge institutions and producers at the country level. This includes the development and maintenance of databases and information platforms to facilitate access to technical information in agriculture, including the open access PRICETOOL worldwide commodity price database. FAO is also monitoring country responses to the food crisis.

IFAD: has provided a grant (US\$0.2 million) to ICARDA to analysis existing research on food security in Arab region and provide recommendations for policies and investment to boost food security in Arab countries. IFAD has also provided a grant to FAO (0.175 million) for fieldwork on the impact of rising food prices on farming communities in Egypt, Syria , Jordan , Yemen and Morocco.

OCHA: the InterAgency Standing Committee Early Warning-Early Action (IASC EW-EA) Report, “consumer food prices” was considered as one of the global review which issued the warning that “the cumulative effect of increased food prices since the early 2008 has been a heightened burden on households and communities which are especially vulnerable to economic shocks. High consumer food prices are likely to interact with seasonal and climatologic phenomena, extending hunger seasons and worsening food security in areas threatened by drought”. IASC EW-EA Report also issued alert on region/country specific food situations, such as continuing drought and food insecurity in Ethiopia and the Greater Horn of Africa (Nov. 08 – Feb. 09 issue) and drought and negative 2009 crop prospects in the Horn of Africa combined with high consumer food prices (Mar. – Jun. 09 issue).

Contingency Planning: Among the 32 vulnerable/food insecure countries, 29 have InterAgency- Contingency Plans (IA-CP) in place (91%), and 23 of them have updated/initiated IA-CP during 08-09 (72%).

Region	No. of countries with food insecurity	No. of countries with CP in place	Per cent	No. of countries updated CP during 08-09	Per cent
Central & East Africa	10	10	100%	6	60%
South Africa	8	7	87.5%	6	75%
West Africa	6	5	83%	4	67%
Latin America	2	2	100%	2	100%
Middle East	3	3	100%	3	100%
Asia Pacific	3	2	67%	2	67%
Global	32	29	91%	23	72%

UNDP: works to strengthen statistical capacity, especially those related to measuring poverty, in many countries, which includes national capacities to monitor and assess the impact of shocks such as that due to high food prices.

UNICEF: 28 country offices supported evidence gathering by governments on the impact of the food crisis on children, either through specific surveys or rapid assessments, or through the strengthening of national nutritional surveillance systems. Results include indications that child malnutrition is increasing in a number of countries either at national or sub-national level, with acute malnutrition in urban areas a growing problem. Conversely, there are signs of improving nutritional status in a number of other countries based on long-term. Late in 2008, UNICEF allocated US\$3 million to 15 countries to collect evidence on the impact of the food crisis at national and sub-national level (Algeria, Belize, Brazil, China, El Salvador, Georgia, Guatemala, Iraq, Jamaica, Kyrgyzstan, Nicaragua, Pacific Islands, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Senegal).

WFP: Vulnerability analysis and mapping, one of WFP's core strengths, was particularly important in the response to the food crisis and natural disasters. The number of these assessments increased by 80 percent and WFP has widened the net of assessment data, factoring in economic impact, food security issues, nutrition analyses and urban populations. In 2008 and 2009, WFP conducted more than 40 assessments on the impact of higher food prices on the food security of households, some of them based on secondary data analysis, others based on new collection of data. Prior to launching field assessments, WFP conducted a global analysis to identify countries likely to be vulnerable to increased food and fuel prices. On this basis, assessments were conducted in the most vulnerable countries including : Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Colombia, Cote d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Occupied Palestinian Territories, Pakistan, Peru, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Senegal, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Uganda, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

World Bank: has launched the Development IMPact Evaluation (DIME) initiative, a Bank-wide collaborative effort involving thematic networks, regional units and the research group under the guidance of the World Bank's Chief Economist. It is oriented toward:

- Increasing the number of World Bank-supported impact evaluations, particularly in strategic areas and themes;
- Increasing the ability of staff to design and carry out such evaluations in close collaboration with government agencies in developing countries; and
- Building a process of systematic learning on effective development interventions based on lessons learned from completed evaluations.

A key aspect of the initiative is to organize clusters of impact evaluations of priority interventions in a coordinated fashion across countries in different regions of the world. One of them "Aadapt" is a thematic impact evaluation umbrella focusing on agriculture and rural development projects in the Africa region. In May 2009, a workshop with delegates from all around Africa (150 attendees) was organized to discuss possible impact evaluations to be undertaken.

In addition, to measure the degree to which IDA is helping countries grow and reduce poverty and inform donors about the effectiveness of their contributions, the Bank introduced a Results Measurement System (RMS) for measuring IDA results in 2002 which was enhanced in 2005. The RMS is designed to show aggregated results across IDA countries. It reflects the priorities and processes of national poverty-reduction strategies, assesses IDA's contribution to development results and is linked to the Millennium Development Goal framework. As of July 1, 2009, the Bank is adopting standardized indicators to be used in IDA-supported investment operations. The objective is to improve the Bank's ability to better capture, aggregate, and report on the results achieved through IDA's support. This information will complement more detailed project-specific results data, as well as country and sector results data. It will also provide context for the qualitative stories that will enrich understanding of IDA's impact.

OBJECTIVE 1:**Improve access to food and nutrition and take immediate steps to increase food availability**

CFA outcomes	Actions undertaken
<p>1.1: Emergency food assistance, nutrition interventions and safety nets enhanced and made more accessible</p> <p><i>CFA suggested actions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Emergency needs met</i> • <i>Protect basic consumption needs of the poor</i> • <i>Scale-up nutritional support</i> • <i>Support mgt of undernutrition</i> • <i>Promote school feeding</i> • <i>Adjust pensions and other existing social protection programs</i> • <i>Allow free flow of assistance</i> • <i>Explore establishing humanitarian food reserves</i> 	<p>WFP: scaled up its activities in 2008 to meet the urgent requests of nations hit by soaring food prices, food scarcity and food riots, with perhaps the largest emergency scale up in human history reaching over 100 million people, and mobilising over US\$5.1 billion. In particular, WFP has undertaken specific activities in 26 countries, reaching 31 million beneficiaries. These activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of school-feeding projects to an additional 7.4 million beneficiaries (children and their family members) in 13 countries. The largest activities are carried out in Bangladesh, Haiti, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal and Tajikistan. • Supplementary rations of nutritious food, to nearly 2 million malnourished children, pregnant and lactating women, other vulnerable groups and their families. The largest caseloads are in Bangladesh, Haiti, Guinea and Yemen. • Expansion of safety nets to protect livelihoods while investing in human capital in 13 countries, including food-for-work projects to over 6 million beneficiaries (Ethiopia, Nepal, Pakistan and Senegal). • Provision of food assistance in urban and semi-urban areas where food has become unaffordable and civil unrest is a concern in 19 countries. • Innovative voucher programmes and cash transfers aiming to enable about 1.3 million people to access food through the market (in 9 countries). • Provision of a targeted food rations to vulnerable groups. The food security of about 10.5 million beneficiaries has been improved in 17 countries. <p>Regarding humanitarian food reserves, WFP, in response to the request of some interested countries, explored such an option by contributing to a research on the operation and performance of existing public food reserves in Ethiopia, Indonesia and elsewhere. This research is being conducted with a view to developing a comprehensive “checklist” of practical questions that can help governments determine whether a new public food reserve would make a cost-effective contribution to national food security. It will also consider how best to integrate public stocks into broader national food security systems.</p> <p>OCHA: by 1 December 2008, the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) reserve for the food crisis allocated US\$100 million to support 87 projects in 26 countries. Over 50 percent of this funding (\$51.8 million) was allocated to the food sector. Another 25 percent (\$25.3 million) was allocated to the nutrition, health, and water and sanitation sectors. These projects aimed to support the enhancement and accessibility of emergency food assistance, nutrition interventions, and safety nets for the most vulnerable affected by the crisis in the short and longer-term.</p> <p>UNDP: assisted countries to analyse the diets of the poor using data from household income and expenditure surveys, and followed this up with advisory services to governments in establishing social protection programmes (e.g. in Palau, Tuvalu, Solomon Islands and other Pacific Island States). In Bangladesh, community based alternative livelihood support initiatives promoted innovative agriculture and homestead vegetable gardening to promote food security for the vulnerable people. In the face of natural disasters that exacerbated vulnerabilities induced by the crisis (such as cyclone Nargis in Myanmar, and floods in the</p>

	<p>Terai districts of Nepal), UNDP has worked with other partners to assess the impact and ensure that the affected receive assistance in appropriate forms.</p> <p>UNICEF: allocated, in mid-2008, an additional US\$50 million from its own resources to 42 countries with high malnutrition prevalence. The goal was to support Governments to scale up nutrition and associated health programmes, and also to improve the evidence on the nutrition situation and to initiate policy support in introducing and expanding social protection systems. Of the 42 UNICEF country offices, 34 supported the scaling up of nutrition programmes based on on-going collaboration with the Governments and NGO partners. A specific impetus has been given to the community-based treatment of children with severe and moderate acute malnutrition, with ready-to-use food made available with this allocation and UNICEF regular funding to treat around 1.5 million children. 24 of these countries responded with vitamin A supplementation and national de-worming campaigns, through child health days or weeks. Nine countries also increased water, sanitation and hygiene interventions, critical to enhancing nutrition security.</p> <p>42 UNICEF countries: Afghanistan, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Cote d’Ivoire, Djibouti, DPR Korea, DR Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Indonesia, Kenya, Lao PDR, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Togo, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe).</p> <p>Late in 2008, UNICEF also allocated an additional US\$2 million to 3 countries for scaling up nutrition programmes (Comoros, Guyana, Tajikistan).</p> <p>World Bank: Investment operations under the Global Food Crisis Response program (GFRP) for social protection and nutrition totalling US\$195 million have been approved in 19 countries and expected to reach at least 7.2 million beneficiaries for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School feeding programmes in Liberia, Central African Republic, Togo, Guinea-Bissau. • Safety nets programmes in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Senegal, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Southern Sudan, Madagascar, Tanzania, Kyrgyz Republic, West Bank and Gaza, Yemen, Ethiopia, Nepal, Moldova. • Supplementary rations and nutrition programmes in Moldova, Tajikistan, Senegal, Kyrgyz Republic.
<p>1.2: Smallholder farmer food production boosted</p> <p><i>CFA suggested actions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide productivity enhancing safety nets • Rehabilitate rural and agricultural infrastructure • Reduce post-harvest crop losses and improve village level stocks • Remove artificial constraints to domestic trade • Improve animal health services 	<p>FAO: responded to the food crisis of 2008 by :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immediately deploying 74 input based technical cooperation programs through FAO funding to provide a catalytic effect for incremental program funding • Mobilizing US\$378 million of donor resources for smallholder farmer support programs in 96 countries including seed, tools, irrigation and fertilizer input programs, training and local capacity building • Deploying, and participating in, 58 interagency country assessment missions leading to the development of national food security action plans <p>IFAD: supported, as of April 2008, governments to provide an immediate boost to agricultural production, enabling poor farmers to access essential inputs such as seeds and fertilizer to prepare for the cropping season and to establish a basis for sustained increases in production. IFAD earmarked US\$200 million from existing loans and grants for programmes in Haiti, Nicaragua, Honduras, Benin, Yemen, Mauritania, Kenya and Mozambique.</p> <p>OCHA: In 2008, CERF allocated over US\$20 million of the total US\$100 million to FAO projects for boosting food production. Funding went to Burkina Faso, Burundi, CDI, Djibouti,</p>

	<p>Haiti, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritania, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tanzania, Togo, Yemen, and Eritrea.</p> <p>UNDP: has worked with partners to maintain and rehabilitate agricultural infrastructure (e.g. mini silos to reduce post-harvest losses in collaboration with FAO in Timor Leste), to implement safety nets (e.g in Bangladesh, in collaboration with the EC) and to establish community seed banks (e.g. in especially vulnerable districts in Nepal).</p> <p>WFP: provided food and nutrition assistance to smallholders and their families, which constitute half of WFP's beneficiaries in Africa. WFP's food for work activities strengthen the resilience of rural communities and create assets for farmland protection and water irrigation. WFP is also working to reduce post-harvest crop losses by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serving as a principal buyer for staple food crops stored through warehouse receipt systems (Uganda). • Helping, in partnership with NGOs and donor governments, to improve village level stocks by working to set up as many as 175 new community granaries a year in Cameroon (and across the Sahel). • Playing a critical part in establishing and ensuring the efficient operation of new community granaries and cereal banks by contributing initial stocks, building modern storage facilities and providing technical assistance to stakeholders through local NGOs (management is under the leadership of women) • Serving as the lead agency (coordinating secretariat and co-managing funds with the government) in a multi-partner (donors, government and other UN agencies) national grain reserve system operating in Mali. The system is partnering with private sector food suppliers and local communities and using existing food security and food market information systems. <p>World Bank: Investment operations under GFRP for smallholder agriculture totalling US\$521 million have been approved in 14 countries and expected to reach at least 5 million beneficiaries for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture Inputs: Kyrgyz Republic, Togo, Ethiopia, Benin, Kenya, Somalia, Tajikistan, Niger, Guinea, Tanzania, Nicaragua, Nepal, Laos, Liberia, Central African Republic, Guinea Bissau, Southern Sudan. • Small scale irrigation: Afghanistan, Tanzania, Somalia, Nepal.
<p>1.3: Trade and tax policy adjusted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review trade and taxation policy options • Use strategic grain reserves to lower prices • Avoid generalized food subsidies • Minimize use of export restrictions • Reduce restrictions on use of stocks • Reduce import tariffs • Improve efficiency of trade facilitation • Temporarily reduce VAT and other taxes 	<p>IMF: Early in the crisis (May 2008), the IMF's Fiscal Affairs Department examined some of the immediate policy responses of governments to the food price increases and assessed the advantages and disadvantages from a macroeconomic perspective of various possible responses in the area of taxes and tariffs, subsidies (both general and targeted), transfer programs, and other policies (such as agricultural input subsidies, wage controls and subsidies and pensions policies). The conclusion was that the appropriate response would depend on the nature of the price increase and the range of policy instruments available to the government to mitigate the impact on low-income households—increases expected to be long-lasting should be passed through to households and the adverse impact on poor households addressed through well-targeted direct transfers. This general advice has informed the policy discussions of IMF staff with individual country governments on the appropriate policy response to the crisis. In broad terms, the IMF's policy advice on the food and fuel crisis has been to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accommodate cyclical fiscal deteriorations caused by the price surges, and • Continue strengthening social safety nets to mitigate the adverse impacts on the poor and vulnerable, in particular <p>The IMF advocates easing food export restrictions where imposed to improve market supply conditions.</p>

	<p><u>WTO:</u> The early completion of the Doha Development Agenda remains critical. It would significantly reduce subsidies, particularly in developed countries, improve market access conditions and enhance trade facilitation, thus improving incentives in many countries for more efficient, viable agriculture and hence bolstering food security. Efforts are underway with a view to achieving significant progress in the autumn.</p> <p><u>World Bank:</u> Development policy operations under GFRP totalling \$30.5 million have been approved in 5 countries (Djibouti: prices of rice, sugar, cooking oil, wheat flour and powder milk reduced by 9%; Madagascar: support for temporary elimination of the VAT on rice; Burundi: support for suspension of custom duties and domestic transaction taxes on 13 basic food item; Sierra Leone: support for partially compensating for the lost revenues resulting from reduced tariffs on food and fuel imports; Guinea: budget support to compensate for the lost revenues resulting from temporary customs duty reductions for rice imports).</p> <p><u>FAO:</u> developed a Guide for immediate country level action that reviews various policies and actions that are available to respond to the food security crisis, highlighting the advantages and disadvantages of various approaches and instruments.</p>
<p>1.4: Macro-economic implications managed</p> <p><i>CFA suggested actions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Hold down core inflation and inflation expectations</i> • <i>Assess the impact on the balance of payments</i> • <i>Mobilize external support to finance additional food imports</i> • <i>Ensure adequate levels of foreign exchange reserves</i> • <i>Cost all fiscal measures in response to food crisis</i> 	<p><u>IMF:</u> assessed in two papers (June and Sept. 2008) the balance of payments impact of the food and fuel price crisis, and the fiscal costs of the measures taken by governments in response (see www.imf.org/external/np/pp/eng/2008/091908.pdf and www.imf.org/external/np/pp/eng/2008/063008.pdf). For 43 PRGF-eligible (i.e. low-income) net food importers with available data, the rise in their food bill was 0.8 percent of their GDP as of July 2008 (US.\$7.2 billion or 0.3 months of imports). Since 2006, the total median fiscal cost of food tax reductions in 92 countries in response to the crisis was estimated at 0.1 percent of GDP, while the median fiscal cost of food subsidy increases (in 29 countries) was 0.2 percent of GDP. The IMF augmented loans under existing PRGF arrangements with 11 countries (totalling some US\$200 million at current exchange rates) and provided financing under the amended Exogenous Shocks Facility to a further five countries (totalling some US\$315 million). Four new PRGF arrangements were put in place to help countries deal with the impact of the twin food and fuel crises, for a total commitment of roughly US\$100 million. All these arrangements and augmentations provided support to countries' reserve positions that had been severely affected by the increase in fuel and food prices. Inflation targets in IMF-supported programs in low-income countries were also substantially relaxed during 2008 as world food and fuel prices rose, and fiscal targets were loosened in almost 80 percent of African program countries, to accommodate the fiscal costs of responding to the crises.</p> <p><u>UNDP:</u> at the request of countries and in collaboration with partners, has worked to assess the macro-economic impacts of the crisis, and to present policy options to the governments (e.g. Maldives, Pakistan).</p> <p><u>World Bank:</u> Development policy operations under GFRP totalling US\$385 million have been approved in 7 countries (Haiti: to help maintain macroeconomic and social stability by ensuring availability of resources for the Government to continue to provide critical social and infrastructure services; Rwanda: to help fill a financing gap for bulk fertilizer purchase and support the development of private sector-friendly auction and voucher distribution schemes; Bangladesh: providing the Government with needed fiscal space to absorb the pressure from the expansion of food-based safety nets, building up of food stocks and helping mitigate the impact of food price increases; Mozambique: to help financing the implementation of the</p>

	Government's Food Production Action Plan (FPAP); Mali: to help the Government to maintain macroeconomic stability and provide the authorities with additional fiscal space to protect key interventions while responding to the food crisis, and; the Philippines: to provide fiscal space for strengthening social protection and safety nets to protect poor and vulnerable households and to help finance higher than foreseen food-crisis-related expenditures; Honduras: supporting the Government maintain macroeconomic stability and persevere in the Financial Sector Development Policy Credit's development objectives while implementing its food crisis response program).
--	---

OBJECTIVE 2:

Strengthen food and nutrition security in the longer run by addressing the underlying factors

CFA outcomes	Actions undertaken
<p>2.1: Social protection systems expanded</p> <p><i>CFA suggested actions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Strengthen capacity to design and implement social protection policies and programs</i> • <i>Move towards more efficient programs</i> • <i>Identify alternatives to unconditional assistance</i> • <i>Improve the quality and diversity of foods</i> 	<p><u>WFP:</u> carried out expansion of safety nets in 13 countries to protect livelihoods while investing in human capital. This includes food-for-work projects to over 6 million beneficiaries, mainly in Ethiopia, Nepal, Pakistan and Senegal. WFP also carried out expansion of school-feeding projects for an additional 7.4 million beneficiaries (children and their family members) in 13 countries in order to provide basic nutrition and encourage poor families to keep their children in school, rather than removing them to earn immediate income. The largest activities are in Bangladesh, Haiti, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal and Tajikistan. WFP introduced and expanded the use of new nutritious and enriched products in its feeding programmes.</p> <p><u>UNICEF:</u> engaged with national partners in 55 countries on social protection initiatives as part of its regular programme of activities. UNICEF engagement includes supporting governments in sustaining and scaling up pilot projects or existing programmes, providing technical guidance and funding for monitoring and evaluation. Specific programmes include cash transfers, non-cash transfers and social services and other interventions for high risk populations. As a response to the food crisis, 5 country offices (in Angola, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Mali, Malawi) supported specific actions in building national or local capacities in social protection, principally cash transfers to vulnerable households.</p> <p><u>UNDP:</u> works (with partners such as UNICEF, the World Bank, WFP and Action Aid) to improve national capacities to design and manage effective safety nets. In many countries (e.g. Pakistan, Bangladesh, Timor Leste, Paraguay) these improvements have focused on better targeting so as to effectively reach the most vulnerable.</p> <p><u>World Bank:</u> in addition to the GFRP, a further 31 projects have been approved in 26 countries with loans, credits and grants totalling US\$3.06 billion in fiscal year 2009. These include lending for food-related social themes such as: (i) social safety nets, including conditional and unconditional cash transfer programs and food -for-work programs; (ii) social risk mitigation including income support for the elderly and other vulnerable groups; and (iii) nutrition and food security activities such as targeting food supplementation to malnourished women and children and programs to reduce micronutrient malnutrition. The Bank has launched a Rapid Social Response (RSR) facility to prioritize funding for priority social protection efforts. A major focus of this funding will be to build required social protect systems in country. The World Bank is also engaged in a series of knowledge management initiatives to promote more efficient responses to the triple wave of crises (food, fuel, and finance):</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Book Launch Events to mark the publications of two seminal publications on safety nets including “For Protection and Promotion” and “Conditional Cash Transfers: Reducing Present and Future Poverty”; • South-South Learning Forum to exchange knowledge on social protection in response to the triple wave of global economic crisis (include 250 policy makers and parctitionaers from national governments, donors, civil society and academia). • A Global Expert Team on Social Safety Nets to ensure that the best expertise (internal and external) is available and deployed quickly and flexibly to the right problem; • Guidance papers on human development responses to food and fuel crises and a joint WFP publication on “Rethinking School Feeding”. • Enhanced schedule of briefings and advisory services mainained to assist clients in responding effectively to the crisis.
<p>2.2: Smallholder farmer food production growth sustained</p> <p><i>CFA suggested actions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Improve the enabling policy framework</i> • <i>Stimulate Public/private investment in agriculture</i> • <i>Ensure secure access to and better management of natural resources, including land, water and biodiversity</i> • <i>Invest in agricultural research</i> • <i>Improve rural infrastructure</i> • <i>Ensure sustained access to competitive, transparent and private-sector-led markets</i> • <i>Support development of producer orgs</i> • <i>Strengthen access of smallholders and other food chain actors to financial and risk management instruments</i> 	<p>FAO: conducted an analysis of joint actions that it could undertake with CGIAR and GFAR to develop food and nutrition security, including the access of poor farmers to technical information and services. FAO has also prioritized key areas for determining future investments needed for agricultural development (including agricultural research and extension). It is collaborating with the World Bank and CGIAR to undertake detailed country analysis for future investments in research and extension and has provided assistance to developing countries to strengthen research and extension systems and their capacities to support smallholders farmers (in, among others, DRC, Egypt, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Pakistan, Senegal, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania and Uganda). FAO is supporting countries in the development of policies, strategies and programmes for agricultural development and food security and for capacity building in agriculture and food security.</p> <p>IFAD: has historically provided a significant portion of its financing towards longer-term sustainable growth in the agricultural sector. Between September 2008 and April 2009, about 56% of IFAD approved financing for an amount of US\$ 355. 6 million targeted towards activities in support of increased agricultural production. Of the 37 countries for which financing were approved, about half were in sub-Saharan Africa (Afghanistan; Albania; Benin; Belize ;Bosnia &Herz. ; Burkina Faso; Burundi;Cameroon;China; Congo ;Congo DR; Costa Rica ; Dominican rep.;Ethiopia; Ghana; Guatemala; India; Indonesia; Kenya; Kyrgyzstan; Laos; Madagascar; Mali; Moldova; Mozambique; Nicaragua;Niger;Philippines; Rwanda; Senegal; Sudan; Swaziland; Tajikistan; Tanzania; Venezuela; Vietnam; Yemen). The financing will mainly be used to support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sustainable systems to access credit (US\$ 71 million) • input supply and marketing (US\$ 64 million) • agricultural technology and development (US\$ 53 million) • natural resource management (US\$ 49 million) • infrastructure development, including irrigation schemes (US\$ 39 million) • animal production (US\$ 39 million) <p>IFAD also obtained additional grant financing for an amount of Euro 30 million from the EC Food Facility for new programmes in Burundi and Philippines and for expanding ongoing programmes in Madagascar and Mozambique. The keyr activities of these programmes aim amongst others at improved seed quality, sustainable food production and improved micro- finance services for on-farm investment.</p> <p>UNDP: is strengthening the legal empowerment of the poor, and securing their access to land, water and other resources (e.g. the Pacific region, Bangladesh). In Africa, UNDP is facilitating the dissemination of NERICA (an improved variety of rice) by supporting the participatory adoption of this by small holder farmers in several countries (e.g. Burkina Faso). It has also supported the formation of producer groups (e.g. in Nepal and Bangladesh) and introduced new technology, including provision of agricultural price information through the internet, micro-finance and</p>

contract marketing in pilots. Coordination between Government departments for the desired impact has also been supported. In many countries (e.g. Pakistan), UNDP is working with local communities to improve land and water management and rehabilitate degraded land, especially among small farmers, as well as to help train extension workers.

WFP: significantly increased, in 2008, food purchases from developing countries to US\$1.1 billion, thereby helping to break the cycle of hunger. Through its innovative pilot programme “Purchase for Progress” (P4P), WFP is linking to existing supply side interventions and investments in the agricultural sector aimed at boosting smallholders' agricultural production and yields. The aim is to add value to existing supply side interventions and efforts such as the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) initiative, by providing a secure market for smallholder farmers' produce, while increasing their capacities in marketing, post-harvest handling, quality control and commodity storage together with Partners. The goal is to ensure that WFP's significant local procurement of food assistance contributes to long-term solutions to the hunger challenge. P4P will be piloted in 21 countries over a five year period (2009-2013) in Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Afghanistan and Laos.

World Bank: In addition to the GFRP, 42 IBRD/IDA agriculture and related rural development projects have been approved in 29 countries with loans, credits and grants totalling \$2.9 billion in fiscal year 2009. Bank assistance includes support for: market oriented smallholder agriculture in Angola; transforming and improving the performance of agricultural technology systems, empowering stakeholders and promoting the development of agribusiness in Kenya; improving participatory operation and maintenance and routine rehabilitation of irrigation systems in the Philippines; land registration in the Kyrgyz Republic; technical assistance, capacity-building activities, and direct investments that contribute to long-term improvements in agricultural productivity, competitiveness and market access in Argentina; ground water and soil conservation in Yemen, and; increasing aggregate value added in selected commodity value chains in Nepal. In addition, IFC committed \$1.4 billion along the agribusiness supply chain as of May 31, 2009, matching the commitment volume in FY08. Cumulative investments in Africa reached \$122 million for distribution and storage, grain milling, plantation rehabilitation, and trade finance. In May 2009, IFC committed a record \$197 million to support the expansion of agricultural production, food processing, access to rural and trade finance in IDA and middle income countries.

- **Policy advice:** The Bank is engaged in policy dialogue with more than 40 countries to help them address the food crisis. The instruments used include: rapid country diagnostics, high-level dialogue and public communications, and in-depth analytical work. Bank staff are also assessing the food security and trade implications of the crisis at the country and regional level. In addition, the World Bank delivered 25 economic and sector work (ESW) products and 17 technical assistance (TA) products related to agriculture and related rural development in fiscal year 2009 at a cost of \$11 million. ESW included: analysis of food security through trade in Sub-Saharan Africa; a review of agricultural policies in Kenya; analysis of agriculture value-chains in Zambia; a study of grain trading in Russia; a study of the livestock sector in Mongolia as well as in India, and; a study covering climate change and agriculture in Bangladesh. TA included: agricultural risk management in Sub-Saharan African, Latin America and the Caribbean and East Asia and the Pacific regions; agriculture sector strategy formulation in Madagascar; preparation of a food safety action plan in Ghana; disaster response in Papua New Guinea; irrigation and water resource management in China; an agriculture sector review in Tunisia; agricultural competitiveness in Afghanistan, and the revitalization of agriculture in Nepal.
- **Risk management instruments:** Since June 2008, the World Bank has been able to offer

intermediation services on index-based weather derivatives (Malawi). The weather hedging product is a complement to the broad range of catastrophe financing solutions to help countries plan proactive responses to natural disasters. The Bank is also providing support for integrating national level agricultural risk management strategies into new country operations in Morocco, Malawi, Mozambique, Haiti, Belize, Grenada, and Jamaica. At the meso and micro levels, the Bank is supporting weather index insurance initiatives in Thailand, Bangladesh, Nicaragua, Senegal, Burkina Faso, Kenya, Jamaica, and Malawi. The World Bank and the IFC are also working together to complete a feasibility study on a crop insurance pilot for maize small farmers in Indonesia. In addition, the IFC is has created a Global Index Insurance Facility (GIIF) which will support agricultural insurance in developing countries. A Sourcebook is being prepared to draw lessons from on-going experiences with weather index insurance in agriculture and to provide guidance to practitioners inside and beyond the World Bank Group. In addition, the Global Program and Partnerships (GPP) on Agriculture Insurance for Vulnerability Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation aims to reduce vulnerability of small and medium agricultural producers in the Latin America and Caribbean Region to adverse systemic weather events. The work will be done in partnership with the Ministries of Agriculture and with the Inter-American Federation of Insurance Companies (FIDES). Specifically, the program will focus on the delivery models that make weather index instruments an effective and affordable tool for the most vulnerable populations at the micro- (weather insurance for smallholder farmers), meso- (portfolio hedge for rural finance institutions that lend to the rural poor), and macro-levels (weather insurance or weather-indexed contingent credit line for governments, social funds, safety net institutions).

- **Public-Private Partnership:** The Agriculture Finance Support Facility, a collaboration between World Bank and Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, will support the replication or scaling-up of profitable rural finance business models and the generation of knowledge and learning about these models. Specifically, the facility will: (i) provide financial and non-financial support to replicate or scale up business models that profitably provide financial services to smallholder farmers and rural entrepreneurs; and, (ii) generate knowledge, disseminate it and facilitating learning about profitable rural finance business models. In addition, the Bank will continue support for the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), which mobilizes cutting-edge science to reduce hunger and poverty, improve human nutrition and health, and protect the environment.
- **Natural resource management:** The World Bank is also involved in the Communities, Conservation and Markets program, a collaboration between the Katoomba Group, Ecoagriculture Partners and the World Bank. The program aims at developing strategies for significantly increasing agriculture and food output and incomes in developing countries and that also achieve local, national and global biodiversity conservation goals. It seeks to enable leaders in the development of markets and payments for ecosystem services to achieve significant new financing for conservation that also contribute to poverty reduction and local livelihoods.

The World Bank Group has formulated and begun implementing a dual-pronged response to the growing phenomenon of large-scale land acquisition and agro-enterprise investment in developing countries: this includes (i) dialogue with client governments and the Bank's regions to define principles, provide guidance to client governments, and assess the magnitude of ongoing trends; and (ii) linking this to the definition of issues, best practices, analytical tools, guidelines and eventually actual codes of practice for governments and conduct for investors in land-extensive agriculture. These activities are meant to assist Bank staff, client governments, other donors, and the major categories of investors to identify and manage key issues and risks associated with land-extensive agro-enterprise investment. The group is also working on a publication titled "Large Scale Land Acquisition for Agriculture and Natural Resource Based Use" which is also expected to inform the debate on biofuel development.

<p>2.3: International food markets improved</p> <p><i>CFA suggested actions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce/eliminate agricultural trade distortions in higher income countries • Rapidly complete the Doha Round of trade negotiations consistent with development focus • Implement ‘Aid for Trade’ • Strengthen oversight markets to limit speculation • Build capacity for markets to better meet needs of lower income countries • Support regional or global stocks sharing 	<p><u>World Bank:</u> The Trade Standards Practitioners Network (TSPN) is a community of practice at the World Bank promoting the adoption of improved social, environmental, and food safety standards in developing countries, and committed to sharing learning and experience associated with supporting those efforts. Through research, policy dialogues, application of improved benchmarking and evaluation tools and the use of a standards information clearinghouse, the TSPN will provide a platform for identifying and replicating better practices in development assistance related to standards management. Expected outcomes include: (i) greater consensus on a critical set of lessons learned and good practices from development assistance in this field, (ii) the development of specific plans to have these lessons concretely applied in the emerging programs of network members and in Bank operations, and (iii) a well functioning standards website portal that is actively used for research, experience sharing and e-dialogues.</p> <p><u>WTO:</u> There is now major political focus on completing the DDA and accordingly work in Geneva has intensified. On a related item, the Annual Global Review of Aid for Trade has just been completed, with significant new pledges being made. At the same time the Global Trade Liquidity Programme, to boost trade finance, was launched.</p> <p><u>WFP:</u> is preparing to launch work with ECOWAS (Economic Community of West African States) to assess the utility, feasibility and viability of coordinating existing public food stocks maintained by individual West African countries and establishing an appropriate regional food reserve system. Such a system could include a combination of physical stocks linked to the region’s own production, as well as cash reserves and institutional arrangements to encourage public-private sector cooperation. The assessment will consider ways a well-managed and visible regional system of stockholding could promote food security and ways to strengthen the management of existing national reserves and make better use of local, national and regional disaster preparedness systems.</p>
<p>2.4: International biofuel consensus developed</p> <p><i>CFA suggested actions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare a common reference framework • Develop biofuel guidelines and safeguard measures • Re-assess biofuel targets, subsidies and tariffs • Facilitate private investments in biofuel production • Promote R&D, knowledge exchange and capacity building 	<p><u>FAO:</u> is actively contributing to the establishment of a common reference framework for biofuels as a partner in the Global Bioenergy Partnership (GBEP) which is developing policy-relevant sustainability criteria for all bioenergy pathways, and in the Round Table on Sustainable Biofuels which is working towards a sustainability standard for liquid biofuel projects by the end of 2009.</p> <p><u>IFAD:</u> has provided grants for an amount of US\$1.1 million to support policy makers and other stakeholders in the Phillipines, China and Pakistan (among others) to put together a coherent set of policies on bio fuel development based on a systematic and rigorous assessment of the effects of biofuel development on food security , poverty and the environment.</p> <p><u>World Bank:</u> has recently published a paper on “Bioenergy Development: Issues and Impacts for Poverty and Natural Resource Management”. This paper gives an overview of bioenergy developments and examines the main issues and possible socioeconomic implications of these developments and their potential impacts on land use and the environment, especially with respect to forests. This paper has been circulated to the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development and is expected to promote knowledge exchange on biofuel development.</p>

ANNEX 2: INDICATIVE FINANCIAL FIGURES

The figures below will be completed and more detailed by September 2009 with results of a complete survey of all the HLTF member agencies and donors.

Funds mobilized from own resources in response to the crisis (from June 2008):

FAO:	US\$ 36, 680,543
IFAD:	US\$ 200,000,000
IMF:	US\$ 615,000,000
UNICEF:	US\$ 55,000,000
World Bank:	US\$ 2,000,000,000

Funds received for responding to the crisis (from June 2008):

WFP:	US\$ 5,100,000,000
FAO:	US\$ 311,000,000
IFAD:	US\$ 41,790,000
UNICEF:	US\$ 77,800,000
UNDP:	US\$ 31,481,000
World Bank:	US\$ 200,000,000
OCHA-CERF:	US\$ 177,570,000

OCHA- CAP and Flash Appeals 2008*:

<i>Agriculture</i>	US\$ 140,000,000
<i>Food</i>	US\$ 1,136,000,000
<i>Health</i>	US\$ 178,000,000
<i>Water and Sanitation</i>	US\$ 124,000,000

OCHA- CAP and Flash Appeals 2009*:

<i>Agriculture</i>	US\$ 144,000,000
<i>Food</i>	US\$ 2,555,000,000
<i>Health</i>	US\$ 317,000,000
<i>Water and Sanitation</i>	US\$ 157,000,000

** The CAP and Flash Appeals are humanitarian appeals and figures include also requirements for activities not linked to the food crisis. However, in lieu of more complete information, they may be taken as a proxy for worldwide food crisis response.*

ANNEX 3: The HLTF Programme of Work

Respond to the Global Food Security Crisis:

1. Supporting effective action in countries.
2. Advocating for funds needed for urgent action and long term investment
3. Inspiring a broad engagement by multiple stakeholders.
4. Improving accountability of the international system.

1 Supporting realization of CFA outcomes in countries:

HLTF members will respond both to country needs, and requests from national authorities,

- a. Providing prioritized and coordinated policy support and technical assistance (focusing on the full range of outcomes in the CFA),
- b. Working together to help strengthen capacity and mobilize funds for the pursuit of agreed national priorities, in conjunction with relevant national, regional and global bodies
- c. Building on work already initiated in as many as 60 countries, intensively in 27 countries, in support of the EC 1 billion Euro initiative;
- d. Stimulating systematic links between knowledge, policies and investments, and encouraging the best use of existing and emerging research capabilities

2 Advocating for funds needed for urgent action and long term investment

HLTF members will work in ways that encourage investor confidence:

- a. Focusing together on priority issues needing urgent action within the next six months (such as urgent responses to needs for food assistance and social safety nets, plus agricultural inputs and market access for smallholder farmers in coming planting seasons);
- b. Intensifying advocacy for an urgent increase in investments for longer term resilience through systems to sustain improvements in smallholder agricultural productivity and markets and for social protection;
- c. By ensuring high level political attention to overall needs for food security and responses to date;
- d. By ensuring better coordination of financial support for food security that inspires confidence and galvanizes additional private and public investments for the CFA outcomes.

3 Inspiring a broader engagement:

HLTF members will encourage the full involvement of hundreds of stakeholders in a concerted movement for food security

- a. by disseminating elements of the Comprehensive Framework for Action and encouraging wide-ranging debate on its contents at local, national and international level (through face to face meetings and the www):
- b. By building and sustaining links with stakeholders within civil society (farmers associations, producer organizations, social protection groups and cooperatives), with regional and international NGOs and with private entities
- c. By providing support for the processes (conversations, debate and convergence) to establish a global Partnership for Food Security with its aim of a sustained reduction in world hunger

- 4 Ensuring accountability: HLTF members will assess achievements, review progress, demonstrate results, and adjust activities that are sub-optimal
 - a. By mapping issues, tracking progress, synthesizing data, information sharing and reporting:
 - b. By engaging with other groups involved in monitoring progress (right-to-food trackers, nutrition surveillance initiatives, and other intergovernmental, private sector, NGO and research-based tracking)
 - c. By contributing to the Annual Report that is to be prepared by the Secretary General in the light of the December 2008 General Assembly resolution on Food Security

ANNEX 4:

COUNTRY LIST

The following 62 countries are considered to be within the scope of HLTF primary focus. Of these, 35 countries are targeted for promotion of intensive and coordinated responses to realize CFA outcomes. These are marked with an asterisk(*). Highlighted are the countries in which the HLTF Secretariat already carried out his visit (see more on www.un-foodsecurity.org).

<p>*Afghanistan *Bangladesh *Benin *Bhutan *Burkina Faso Bolivia *Burundi Cameroon *CAR *Cambodia Cote d'Ivoire Comoros *Djibouti Dominican Republic DRC Egypt</p>	<p>*Eritrea *Ethiopia Gambia Ghana Guatemala *Guinea *Guinea Bissau *Haiti *Honduras Jamaica Jordan *Kenya *Kyrgyzstan N Korea *Laos Lesotho</p>	<p>*Liberia *Madagascar *Malawi *Mali *Mauritania Mongolia *Mozambique Myanmar *Nepal Nicaragua *Niger *Pakistan Philippines *Rwanda Sao Tome Senegal</p>	<p>*Sierra Leone Somalia Sri Lanka Swaziland *Tajikistan *Tanzania *Timor-Leste *Togo Uganda Uzbekistan West Bank Gaza Strip *Yemen Zambia *Zimbabwe</p>
--	--	--	--

ANNEX 5:

COUNTRY FICHES:
ASSISYING WITH COORDINATED MOBILIZATION OF RESOURCES
Below are SIX examples of the 62 country fiches prepared on behalf of the HLTF by its Secretariat

BURKINA FASO	
Situation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Population: 13.3 million (2006 census) ▪ GNI: USD 430/capita (2007, WB) ▪ ODA: USD 411.84 million (2007 Source: OECD) ▪ Inflation rate: 2008 Price of imported rice + 80%, maize + 82%, sorghum + 46%, meat + 30%, oil + 60%. 2009: Locally produced and imported cereal prices are higher than their level in 2008 (imported rice+40%, maize +22%), and than their average level between 2003 and 2008 (sorghum+29%, imported rice +58%) (SONAGESS) ▪ % of food insecure people: more than 38% of households struggled to satisfying their food needs in 2007 (national household survey) ▪ Production: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Import: rice, wheat, vegetable oils, milk ○ Export: ground nuts, shea nuts, sesame, sorghum, millet, maize, rice, livestock, cotton <p>Food insecurity sources: 2008-09 harvest good, but prices for domestic and imported commodities (especially rice) very high; economic slowdown. Several demonstrations in Feb. 2008 in different towns, but relatively calm now.</p> <p>Right to food: Government integrated the right to food in national strategies against malnutrition and food security</p>
Affected Population	<p>Affected Population: : Up to 80% of urban population in the most vulnerable neighborhoods of Ouagadougou and Bobo Dioulasso. For urban households, the share of expenditure for food is now beyond 75%. Urban households reduced food consumption, increased number of children in feeding centers plus increased street begging observed; decline in school attendance.</p> <p>Poor food consumption: 90% of children under five have anaemia (2007 WFP), 38% of children under 5 are under weight</p> <p>Severe food access problems:..acute undernutrition at 18.6% (2007 WFP)</p>
Most vulnerable	<p>Most Vulnerable: Female-headed households, pregnant and lactating women, children under five, casual labourers, petty traders, construction labourers, service workers and artisans, returnees</p>
Main population needs	<p>Agriculture:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access to agricultural and veterinary inputs (seeds, fertilisers, credit...) and materials ▪ Improve marketisation of local products and flows between areas ▪ Promote and support peri-urban agricultural actiities ▪ Hydraulic infrastructures rehabilitation ▪ Improved storage to reduce post-harvest losses <p>Elements for strategic response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Augmentation and reorientation of agriculture</i> ▪ <i>Improve security of land tenure</i> ▪ <i>Control surface water through dams</i> <p><i>Local processing of agricultural production</i></p> <p>Safety nets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strengthen and support the national social policy and develop a social security system ▪ Provision of health services and essential non-food items to destitute households ▪ Targeted free food distributions to the poorest

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provision of food vouchers ▪ Strengthen acute and chronic malnutrition programs and the free screening of malnutrition in vulnerable neighborhoods, ▪ Strengthen school feeding.
Government responses to the situation	<p>Government actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Formulation of an Emergency Plan for Food and Nutrition Security (2008) with main objective to increase the food production through seeds and fertilizers subsidies. ▪ 52 billions FCFA (74 millions USD) dedicated to fund this emergency plan in 2008 (State budget + partners' contributions). ▪ 13,25% of national budget was dedicated to agricultural sector in 2008. <p>Safety nets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Food distributions to the most vulnerable ▪ Safety net approach integrated in DSRP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Assistance alimentaire aux groupes vulnérables, Assistance alimentaire dans les écoles primaires, Distribution alimentaire ciblée pour les ménages urbains et ruraux le plus démunis, coupons subventionnés (vouchers), food-for-work. <p>Market interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lifting custom duties and VAT for the basic imported food commodities (rice, milk, salt) and fertilizers; ▪ Subsidized sale of locally produced cereals; ▪ Unofficial export ban for cereals (2008). ▪ Negotiations between State and local traders to limit food prices
International Community responses	<p>WB: Support for provision of seeds, fertilizers, and other agricultural inputs. (Est. resource needs : USD 10 million)</p> <p>FAO: Emergency Coordination Unit in place. Ongoing projects intend to increase productive capacity of farmers and food availability in the country and to assist farmer families at risk of malnutrition with high a proportion of vulnerable women (USD 9.4 million)</p> <p>IFAD: Small-scale Irrigation and Water Management Project (PIGEPE) . To increase rice production: make available resources to increase land development activities under small-scale irrigation and water management project. (April 2009)</p> <p>Rural Business Development Services Programme (PASPRU) (amount of USD 15.0 million refers to IFAD planned financing) (total: USD 26.4 million plus USD 9 if scaled up)</p> <p>IMF: Augmentation of access under the existing PRGF arrangement equivalent to some US\$ 14 million in response to the food (and fuel) price shocks (January 2008).</p> <p>WFP: Food vouchers distribution in Ouagadougou and Bobo Dioulasso (30.000 households, funded by France and Saudi Arabia), and nutrition activities. WFP beneficiaries have doubled in 2008 (700.000 beneficiaries in 2008)</p> <p>EC food facility: 18,7 millions euros are dedicated to a FAO project in support of food production.</p> <p>UNICEF: nutrition activities have been scaled up (from USD 1.2 million in 2006 to more than USD 7 millions in 2008), mainly with emergency funds</p> <p>Technical and financial partners (UN system, AfDB, WB, bilaterals) in Burkina Faso provided support to food production (42 billions FCFA / ~ USD 60 millions) and to safety nets (26 billions FCFA / ~ USD 37 millions) to cope with high food prices. About 60% of this amount was disbursed in november 2008.</p>
Support potential by HLTF members:	<p>WFP: The WFP Purchase for Progress initiative will support small-scale farmers' productive capacity and access to local purchase and market opportunities, and improve agriculture supply from high producing areas to areas impacted by food insecurity. Purchase for progress and land rehabilitation FFA measures estimated needs are USD 10 million</p> <p>UNDP: Expansion of Successful Poverty Reduction and Women's Empowerment Model in West Africa to establish sustainable, replicable rural agro-enterprises in West Africa to raise incomes of rural smallholder farmers, particularly women.</p>
Commitments/pledges/ investment from international community:	<p>WB : a new project is under elaboration to improve producers' capacity to increase production and to ensure year-round availability of cereals and livestock products in rural areas. Agricultural productivity and food security project (1) improvement in food production and accessibility, (2) post-harvest loss reduction and agricultural market coordination, (3) institutional development and capacity building. USD 40 millions. To be presented to the board in October 2009.</p>

Comment	<p>The RC coordinated the UNsystem response to food insecurity in 2008. The joint advocacy of the UN system led to the introduction of a special attention paid to safety nets and social protection in the DSRP. However, due to the lack of dedicated focal point, the UN resident coordinator cannot maintain an engagement with this initiative.</p> <p>There is neither partnership nor institution covering the full scope of food security. Nevertheless, sector coordination groups (food emergency, agriculture, nutrition), involving the Government and its financial and technical partners (multi and bilaterals) need to be reinforced with full participation of all partners. Harmonization of projects and programs still has to be enhanced.</p> <p>Burkina Faso is involved in agricultural and food security programs of ECOWAS. The CAADP round-table would be organized in September.</p>
----------------	---

CAMBODIA

Situation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Population: 14.5 million ▪ GNI: US\$ 7,858 million (late 2008) ▪ ODA: Approx US\$ 450 million in 2008 (expected to decline in 2009 as a result of the economic downturn) ▪ Inflation rate: 10% (Some 8% of this was food price inflation in December; it has since declined). ▪ % of food insecure people: more than 12% (2+ million people) ▪ Production: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Imports: Milled rice is (re-)imported ○ Exports: Rice, maize, vegetables, cashews, tapioca <p>Food insecurity sources: Poor people were badly affected by price rises, and prices are still 50 percent higher than at January 2008 (although they are declining, making it difficult for farmers to pay off debts and raising fears that urban workers returning to the countryside will not find work in the agricultural sector).</p> <p>The economic downturn is taking a severe toll, with an estimated 300,000 additional people falling into poverty as a result of a drop in remittances, layoffs in the garment industry and mining, and fall-off in tourism. Food stocks remain at historically low levels (the supply response to high prices was less than robust) and transport costs are high. The transport network is uneven constraining the ability to get rice to some pockets in the country.</p> <p>Agriculture is considered both an engine of growth for the country, a principal means of poverty reduction, and the main social safety net available to people who lose jobs both in the cities and returning from abroad. The influx of people back to rural areas is raising the likelihood of conflict and land acquisition. The influx is not expected to automatically raise production. Reduced remittances will put particular pressure on rural households.</p>
Affected population	<p>An additional one million people likely to become food insecure in 2009 compared with 2007, potentially rising to over 2.8 million people¹. There will be backward trends in nutrition. Downward pressure on commodity prices will impact cash crop growers, particularly those who increased their borrowings during the food price crisis. Cassava has already decreased from 300 riel per kilo to 100 riel. The price of rubber and coffee has halved. These trends will increase vulnerability in rural areas. Further vulnerabilities could arise from potential reduced development assistance.</p> <p>One-third of Cambodia's people live below the national poverty line of \$0.50 a day.</p>
Most vulnerable	<p>Most vulnerable: Poor rural areas – Tonle Sap and plains regions. Farmers with less than 0.5 hectares (some one-quarter of rural households). 83 percent of farmers are net food consumers. Urban poor, fixed salary workers, landless or land poor, people living with HIV/AIDS and other chronic illnesses, families with more children and elderly to care for, female-headed households. Children: acute malnutrition in poor urban children increased to 16 percent last year and is higher today as a result of the economic downturn</p>
Main needs:	<p>Agriculture:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Boost production of rice, vegetables, meat and fish on smallholder farms ▪ Expand and improve community based irrigation ▪ Expand and improve the credit system to support loans for crops ▪ Improve storage to prevent significant post-harvest losses ▪ Improve market linkages, notably transportation and market information <p>Safety nets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improve targeting of food aid ▪ Expand and make more effective social safety net programs, especially for informal workers

<p>Government response:</p>	<p>In September, 2008, the Government established a multi-ministeral Food Emergency Working Group to coordinate assistance to vulnerable households and smallholder farmers.</p> <p>Safety nets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Salary increase for civil servants. ▪ School feeding program; supplementary food/nutrition program for mothers/children ▪ Food-for-work programs <p>Market interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ban on rice exports in March 2008, quickly recinded. ▪ Action to increase Government rice stock. ▪ Subsidized rice released onto some Phnom Penh markets. ▪ In order to develop agriculture, the Governmet has reduced the tariff rate to zero and has made the State responsible for value-added tax on raw materials and agricultural production equipment, an amount of import and excise tax equivalent to about US\$8 million. <p>Agriculture:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased grain storage; ▪ Increased irrigation for second rice crop; ▪ Improving access to inputs; ▪ Promoting credit to the agricultural and other productive sectors (decreasing reserve requirements from 16 to 12%) ▪ Working to reduce post-harvest losses ▪ In 2008, the Rural Development Bank provided special financing of US\$12 million to private rice millers to buy ricefor local supply and signed a US\$18 million contract to continue this work in 2009.
<p>UN Country Team response</p>	<p>The UNCT has fashioned its response to the food and economic crisis around the priority areas presented in the UNDAF 2006 – 2010. The UN recognizes that its comparative advantage is in human development. The UN Country team’s objective is to focus on mitigating the impact of the duel food and economic crisis on the most vulnerable groups. In this regard, the UN is doing the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focusing on scaling up current programing 2. Considering new targeted programs including those that require coordinated approaches across sectors 3. Integrating and strengthening surveillance mechanisms and information management systems 4. Supporting the development of an integrated long-term social safety net program, which would include increased Government investment 5. Responding to demands for advocacy <p>As of May, 2009, the UNCT’s more specific plans with regard to food security included the following:</p> <p><u>Immediate</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Working more closely with International financial institutions (IFIs) to discuss risks in prioritization of large scale infrastructure projects ▪ Scaling up existing social safety nets including food-related programs such as food for work, school feeding programs, food for HIV and TB victims and Mother and Child Health Programs. ▪ Improving joint monitoring systems by leading a more integrated approach, including an adjustment of the activities of those working in the field to ensure a prioritization for monitoring to pick up a fall in food security and therefore a more accurate identification of vulnerabilities in food security ▪ Engaging in small infrastructure projects for rural workers to reduce pressure on land related activities. ▪ Supporting the government in its efforts to provide training and employment opportunities for jobless workers in rural areas (both long-term residents and migrant returnees). Particular areas for focus are productive agricultural skills and micro and agri-business self-employment skills. <p><u>Medium-term</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supporting the agenda for economic land concessions to support an increase in agricultural productivity and raise family income ▪ Linking development issues to land rights issues, land tenure and human rights and advocate for more equitable land distribution in the context of land reform ▪ Developing a joint strategy on nutrition ▪ Integrating issues of food safety into programatic response: agribusiness; nutrition; sanitary and phytosanitary analysis. Link to trade potential of agricultural products.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Undertaking joint analysis of information systems (working out how to finance) that will support pooling of survey results, relevant data and analysis to build integrated information management system <p><u>Long-term</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increasing opportunities for small to medium enterprises (SME) to make use of productive land (economic land concessions) utilizing skilled labor. ▪ Increasing capacity to capitalize on rice value added (export value)
<p>Support by HLTF members:</p>	<p>WB: In addition to a renewed commitment to scale-up regular lending program for agriculture, the Bank has provided emergency operations support (US\$13 million) for (a) the provision of production inputs to the most vulnerable farm households (to provide a production “boost”), and (b) policy and program formulation assistance, namely funding for: i) market intelligence support; ii) the Government’s Food Security Support Program; iii) water sector and irrigation development and iv) the Government’s agriculture and water research and extension program. The Bank and Government are also proposing the development of a community-driven smallholder project which would be jointly financed with IFAD in collaboration with FAO and WFP.</p> <p>IFAD: Rural Livelihoods Improvement Project in Kratie, Preah Vihear and Ratanakiri (US\$11m, approved in 2007); Tonle Sap Smallholders Project in preparation (US\$8m)</p> <p>WFP: Through the Protracted Relief and Rehabilitation Operation, WFP is attending to 1 million food-insecure people, mostly in rural areas. The majority of the activities are food-for-work schemes such as the construction or rehabilitation of roads, ponds and irrigation canals. Both short and medium-term are being addressed by the program “Assisting People in Crisis”. In addition, a limited amount of resources are allocated to relief food distributions, food-for-education, food-for-training, food-for-work and support to people living with HIV and tuberculosis. These activities are being carried out in conjunction with a small-scale development project, Support to Maternal and Child Health which addresses the nutritional needs of pregnant and lactating women, as well as young children between 6-24 months.</p> <p>FAO: US\$11m (forthcoming) support through the EC Food Facility for small-scale irrigation, small animal raising, aquaculture, etc.</p> <p>UNICEF: Many projects are scaling up to serve additional communities. Production of iodized salt has ramped up in the past two years. A child rights training programme serving 130 locales has been adopted by the Ministry of the Interior. UNICEF’s Child-Friendly Schools initiative, which improves learning outcomes, has been extended to more than 500 schools.</p>
<p>Commitment/pledges/investment from international community:</p>	<p>ADB: Emergency food assistance project. (US\$ 35 million + Government US\$ 5 million. Total: US\$ 40 million)</p> <p>UNDP: Food security and climate change adaptation: local food security through adapted technologies (US\$ 600,000); Water resource development, good agricultural practices (US\$ 2.8 million); Small grants programme for smallholders, women’s groups, renewable energy</p> <p>Bi-lateral donors: Acceleration of support for agriculture on the part of Germany, France, Australia and Japan</p> <p>EC: US\$6 million in support of NGOs through the Food Facility</p>
<p>Comment</p>	<p>In terms of coordination, the UN directly feeds into coordinated dialogue with the RGC in cooperation with development partners through the Cambodian Development Cooperation Forum and participation in the informal development partner task force involving WB, ADB, IMF and the EU. The UNCT is managing a number of coordination tools to support a coordinated development partner response including the monthly publishing of the ‘Crisis Impact Watch’ providing updated socio-economic facts and figures, a matrix of programme responses, rapid assessments and analysis.</p>

ETHIOPIA

Situation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Population: 79 million ▪ GNI: 17,565 million (2007) ▪ ODA: USD 1, 242 billion (2007) ▪ Inflation rate: Overall 30%, food price inflation +30% ▪ % of food insecure people: 15%; high reliance on food aid operations. ▪ Dependence on cereals: 12% ▪ Production: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Import: wheat, other cereals ○ Export: cereals, pulses, coffee, oilseed, sugarcane, potatoes, cattle, sheep, goats
Affected Population:	<p>Some 10 percent of Ethiopia's population have for a long time been considered chronically food insecure (the 2008 crisis added another 6 million people). Economic growth of 8-13 percent annually for the last five years has led to a decline in the poverty headcount from 45 percent in 2000 to an estimated 39 percent before last year. Agriculture, which contributes 45 percent of GDP, and for which 65 percent of the population depend on their income, accounts for a large percentage of growth. However, this has not eliminated pervasive food insecurity and severe vulnerability to shocks. Despite robust growth, high inflation has eroded gains in reducing poverty, and continued shocks can be expected to do the same</p>
Most Vulnerable:	<p>Rural populations, including pastoralists, in remote areas: While the number of food vulnerability hotspot <i>woredas</i> under priority 1 in the country has decreased by 30 percent, from 216 in 2008 to 151 (March), some 4.9 million people continue to require emergency food aid (6 million people continue to be covered by the overall humanitarian response). Children: An estimated 75,000 children are affected by severe acute malnutrition</p>
Main needs:	<p>Agriculture: food aid, seed and (especially) fertilizer, livestock support Safety nets: school feeding, cash for work</p>
Government response:	<p>The government has adjusted domestic fuel prices back up, introduced measures to alleviate the adverse impact of high food prices, and is tightening monetary and fiscal policies. The authorities intend to take advantage of the reversal of the commodity price shock to rebuild foreign exchange reserves.</p> <p>In response to high food prices in particular, the government imported 300,000 tons of wheat (for the equivalent of more than 3 percent of domestic crop production) and distributed it to low-income families, mostly in urban areas, and flour mills at import cost—which was well below domestic prices at the time. The government is prepared to carry out additional such operations if necessary. Valued added tax, turnover tax, and surtaxes on some food items have been removed. The government has also raised the cash transfer in its safety net programs from 6 to 10 birr per day.</p> <p>On fiscal and monetary tightening, the government is curtailing domestic borrowing, postponing all investment spending and is ready to cut lower priority spending, particularly that which does not affect the poor. According to the IMF, authorities' revised budget targets general government domestic borrowing of zero in 2008/09—it was 2.7 percent of GDP in 2007/08.</p> <p>The Protective Social Safety Net Program (PSNP) is the pillar of government efforts to protect the most vulnerable. Established in 2005, it reflects a shift from food aid to cash transfers as an essential part of the government's strategy. The government decided that an alternative to food aid was needed to support the consumption needs of chronic, predictably food-insecure households and to address some of the major underlying causes of food insecurity. The PSNP replaced the emergency humanitarian appeal system as the chief instrument for assisting initially 5 million chronically food-insecure people in rural Ethiopia. It was scaled up to currently reach some 7.3 million people. The PSNP provides cash and in-kind resources to chronically food insecure households, largely via labor intensive public works. The focus of the public works program is on soil and water conservation</p>

	activities, developed within an integrated watershed management planning framework
International Community (including HLTF) responses	<p>While donors have committed US\$772 million in assistance related to the food crisis since March 2008 (UN) , the amount of food resources obtained by both the government and donors last year could not cover nation-wide emergency food requirements. According to UNDP, only 60 percent of the total food requirement for 2008 was secured from donor sources. The total relief food requirements for 2008 stood at 845,296 mt: 684,450 mt of cereals; 20,534 mt of oil; 68,445 mt of pulse and 71,867 mt of blended food of which, approximately 508,657 mt valued at approximately \$439,479,650, was met through the appeal process. The government used some carryover stocks from 2007 and purchased wheat to supplement the food dispatched by official and humanitarian agencies.</p> <p>As of March WFP faced a total shortfall of 372,867mt of food resources amounting to US\$ 314 million. WFP's 2009 inputs to the National Relief Program - 80 percent of the overall requirement – are short 278,000 mt, valued at US\$ 232 million. WFP inputs to the Productive Safety Net Program are short 53,329 mt, valued at US\$46.1 million. And Targeted Supplementary Food is short of 34,209 mt, amounting to US\$29.6 million</p> <p>In addition to food and other humanitarian assistance, a consortium of donors is strongly supporting the government's PSNP program, which represents one of the largest social protection initiatives in Africa. This includes the World Bank's APL II Project and EC support, CIDA, DFID, IrishAID, RNE, SIDA USAID, and WFP. Together they have committed cash and in-kind resources valued at around US\$1.2 billion during the current phase of the program from 2007-2009. However, with the agreement of partners, in 2008 program resources already pledged for the 2009 PSNP were drawn down on an accelerated basis and as a result there is a residual financing gap for the PSNP in 2009 of some US\$25 million.</p> <p>The government and development partners have started a design process for the next phase of the PSNP which will have improved linkages to the broader food security program and other relevant government services in rural areas, all with a view to creating an integrated package of services that will provide a sustainable path to graduation for chronically food insecure households.</p> <p>Beyond food assistance and the PSNP, the most significant intervention last year was support for the government's importation of fertilizer which is being used for the upcoming plating season. Both the World Bank and African Development Bank have large fertilizer support projects (US\$250 million and US\$60 million, respectively) that seek to increase the likelihood that crop production in 2009-210 will remain at or near the growth trends of recent years. Fertilizer demand from farmers appears to be high and priority is given to high potential growth areas, suggesting that the purchased fertilizer is likely to stimulate agriculture growth. Given the emergency, the World Bank felt there was not sufficient time in the fertilizer operation to consider developing efficient private sector marketing systems around these operations. This, however, will be addressed in the new agricultural growth strategy and the Bank's related agricultural development project.</p> <p>IFAD has new and on-going interventions valued at some US\$75. These include a new Community-based Integrated Natural Resources Management Project; the Participatory Small-scale Irrigation Development Programme; the Agricultural Marketing Improvement Programme; and the Rural Financial Intermediation Programme</p> <p>Other, longer-term interventions include strengthening existing agricultural programs and enhancing the focus on agricultural growth., In recent years the agricultural extension system has been significantly strengthened, and now consists of about 70,000 extension workers throughout the country. Extension workers interact with farmers through a network of farmer training centers and cooperatives at the local level. Cooperatives provide their members with training and other services, including marketing of inputs and outputs. Also, the government with support from other partners such as FAO, GTZ, and USAID has launched new initiatives to boost crop production through improved seeds, including through seed distribution and production of breeder, pre-basic, basic and certified seeds, as well as multiplication of seeds at the community level. At present only about 3 percent of the seeds used in the country are of an improved variety which will constrain the supply response sought through recent fertilizer purchases.</p> <p>Unicef's contributions to food security have also been significant. Almost half a million malnourished children and 260,000 pregnant and lactating women received supplementary feeding. UNICEF also brought safe drinking water, sanitary latrines, hygiene education and/or water-purification products to nearly a million people. And in the last few years, more than half a million people – more</p>

	<p>than half of them women and children – have voluntarily resettled as part of an ambitious government program to move a total of 2.2 million people out of food-insecure areas.</p>
<p>Comment</p>	<p>While some response actions could be considered ad-hoc, there has been good coordination around the principal safety net instrument, the Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP) which provides an example for proposed coordination in other areas, including support for the emerging agricultural growth strategy</p> <p>There is insufficient coherence and linkage between humanitarian affairs, food security, agricultural development, and regulatory, macro-economic and trade policy. To strengthen these links, greater technical capacity is needed among development partners on macro-economic policy as it relates to agriculture and food security.</p> <p>There is a growing interest among donors, supported by other development partners and independent experts, to focus – with the government - on longer-term structural and policy issues which could, when pursued, prevent, or at least mitigate the severity, of emergencies. Development partners are seeking ways to agree on a strengthened, concerted approach to better work with the government on issues of private sector involvement in the rural economy.</p> <p>While the agricultural growth agenda is receiving new impetus with the development of a new strategy and investment framework, some in government, and several development partners feel there is a need to give further emphasis to investments in high-growth areas (much of the recent investments have been in irretrievably degraded lands) and to focus increasingly on off-farm opportunities.</p> <p>Donor cooperation and coordination is seen to have been adequate given the scope of the crisis, but there are lingering disputes among agencies, including over whether there is too much emphasis on the long-term at the expense of saving lives now. There is also a desire on the part of some donors, and in particular some HLTF agencies, for a clearer articulation of responsibilities, based on comparative advantage.</p>

HAITI

Situation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Population: 9.6 million (2007) (<i>WB</i>) ▪ GNI: USD 5,03 billion (2007) (<i>WB</i>); <i>GNI per capita US\$ 520</i> ▪ ODA: USD 434.32 million (2007 <i>Source: OECD</i>) ▪ Inflation rate: +16.5% per annum (April 2008); food: +20.8% per annum (April 2008) ▪ % of food insecure people: 30% (increased to about 35% during the peak of the 2008 crisis) ▪ Production: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Import: 52% of its food including food aid (50% of dairy, 75% of cereals (rice and wheat), 100% of sugar and oil) ▪ Export: coffee, mangoes, sugarcane, cocoa <p>Food insecurity sources: Structural causes of food insecurity include widespread poverty, unemployment (70% according to estimates) and associated lack of purchasing power; decline of the agricultural sector due to extreme lack of attention; environmental degradation due to erosion; lack of affordable public health and education services, lack of communication means. In 2008, several shocks aggravated the situation; the international price peak during the first half of 2008, three hurricanes in autumn, political unrest in the middle of the year.</p>
Affected Population:	<p>Affected Population: Food insecurity is mostly found in the rural areas. It also affects urban population with no source of living.</p>
Most Vulnerable:	<p>Most Vulnerable: those population in extreme poverty, i.e. with less than one US\$ per day (4 million persons), those rural population in remote and isolated areas (difficult physical access to food, environmental degradation), landless farmers.</p>
Main population needs:	<p>Agriculture:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to re-invest in basic services and infrastructure in support of smallholder agriculture, including in irrigation infrastructure, rural roads, storage facilities, sustainable land and water management, advisory services, etc. ▪ Policy framework more conducive to the development of local production (in particular of rice) is required; ▪ Need to land tenure arrangements to enable small holder food insecure farmers to invest in their lands; ▪ Need to increase resilience of agriculture to external natural shocks (hurricanes) ▪ Need to protect the production base (against erosion) by erosion control features and participatory watershed management interventions <p>Safety nets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing safety nets through food distribution and nutrition programmes is not part of the Government priorities • However international partners (WFP, UNICEF, UNCT in general) are encouraging such responses • Important needs to be covered from vulnerable population such as disabled, landless, isolated populations, the chronically malnourished. <p>Elements for strategic response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to switch from a recurrent emergency mode into developing and financing longer term and more sustainable approaches and activities • Urgent need to strengthen local human capacities in developing and implementing policies and actions in support of food security; • Re-invest in small holder agriculture together with improving the policy framework for reviving local production; • Decrease to some extent the excessive dependence on international markets; • Link agricultural development with environmental protection (watershed management) and income generation in rural areas; • Link various aspects of food security, availability, access and utilization (e.g. through projects

<p>Government responses to the situation</p>	<p>which link production with distribution of outputs to the most vulnerable).</p> <p>Safety nets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emergency program for job creation and protection of most vulnerable ▪ Scaling-up school feeding programs, mother-child programs and labor intensive workfare programs. <p>Market interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Government had little leverage to reduce the price of imported food (such as rice) as import tariffs were already very low (0 to 3%); ▪ The Government established a ceiling price for rice above which it would subsidize the difference so that the consumer price would remain below the ceiling. This was applied for four months until harvest and decrease in international price. It was costly for national budget; the World Bank helped with a US\$ 10 million budget support. <p>Agriculture:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Government raised US\$ 197 million from Petrocaribe (Venezuela) for an emergency programme in 2008; ▪ US\$ 36 million of these funds were used to rapidly boost agriculture through distribution of inputs (fertilizers and seed) and of about 300 tractors as well as maintenance and cleaning of irrigation facilities which had been damaged by the hurricanes.
<p>International Community responses</p>	<p>WB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has long term community driven project (US\$ 38 million) in rural and peri-urban areas which respond to local needs and often include activities in support of communities food security such as rural roads, small irrigation systems, water supplies, grain and cassava mills, community input shops and livestock improvement all contributing to improved food and nutrition security; • In June 2008, approved an additional US\$ 16 million for a project targeted to violence prone urban areas • Extending current school feeding program through the Education for All Project. The program will expand coverage by 50% (to 45,000) in the school year starting September 2008. (Est. needs: USD 18 million for 2008) • A grant of USD 10 million from the GFRP has helped ensure the availability of budget resources for the Govt. to mitigate food price increases and continue to provide critical social and infrastructure services, especially for the poor. <p>UNCT: Supported the Government's efforts at responding to the food crisis through the drafting of a response plan for the short and medium term which includes: i) activities to energize the agricultural sector; ii) increase in the number of beneficiaries of food distributions and nutritional programmes; and iii) increase of labour-intensive projects (HIMO). HIMO activities will concentrate interventions on environment disaster mitigation and will provide job opportunities for thousands of Haitians. The National Strategy and the Response Plan's main axes of intervention (food distribution, agriculture sector enhancement and HIMO), were used by the UN and partners to strengthen and re-orient their immediate response in order to accommodate the increasing needs of the most vulnerable. The UNCT also activated its food security cluster to coordinate activities during the crisis. Meanwhile, the UN and its partners are engaged in medium and long term initiatives aimed at ensuring sustainability of interventions within the Government frameworks such as the National Strategy or the draft agriculture sector reform plan.</p> <p>UNICEF/WFP: Providing 2008 hurricane-affected people with potable water, blankets, hygiene kits, cooking sets, high-energy biscuits, rice, beans, corn-soya blend and vegetable oil.</p> <p>FAO: 3 projects (total of about US\$ 3.8 million were implemented in 2008 and 2009 targeted to vulnerable population (e.g. affected by natural disasters) to rapidly boost agriculture through provision of essential inputs (seeds mostly and some fertilizers and small animals). In 2009, FAOP is also starting to implement two important projects responding to the crisis: (i) a US\$ 10 million project (financed from IFAD loan) to rapidly boost the seed improvement, multiplication and distribution system; (ii) a Euro 10 million project focusing on sustainable water management practices.</p> <p>IFAD: Made available USD 10 million from ongoing country programmes for measures destined to boost agricultural production in the short term as well as strengthening local capacities in multiplying and propagating improved seed. IFAD is also speeding up the launch of the development of small-scale irrigation project PPI-2, which will rehabilitate and construct of small-scale irrigation infrastructure (USD 27 million)</p> <p>IMF: Augmentation of access under the existing PRGF arrangement equivalent to some US\$ 25 million in response to the food (and fuel) price shocks (June 2008).</p>

	IDB is involved in major projects in support of the agricultural sector such as supporting intensification of agriculture, irrigation development, value chain strengthening, erosion control, micro-finance, etc.
Support potential by HLTF members:	<p>WB: intends to partly re-invest in the agricultural sector. This includes a US\$ 5 million capacity strengthening project to enable institutions to better deliver essential services.</p> <p>WFP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Productive safety nets to foster employment and build productive assets in rural and peri-urban/urban areas, providing the framework for an overall Sustainable Land Management framework to enhance food security (USD 10 million) • Expand nutritional, education and socio-economic safety nets in urban and rural areas, benefiting 2.5 million people; food support to vulnerable families through schools and health centers, targeted food distributions, and food-for-work. (Resource needs: USD 27 million) • Purchase for progress is to be started on a pilot basis and up scaled if found feasible
Commitments/pledges/investment from international community:	A series of donors conferences or meetings (Madrid, Rome, Washington) do not lead to satisfactory raising of funds. Yet, individually, international partners are committed to increase resource flow to the country.
Comment	<p>Coordination mechanisms exist in the UN system (clusters), in the donor community (donor sector groups) as well as organized by the Government (sector tables). These mechanisms could be more inclusive of the civil society.</p> <p>There is no common understanding between the Government and international partners on the actions to put in place in support of food security and agriculture as well as on the means to do that (project approach vs. budget support).</p> <p>A country owned institution in charge of coordinating food security (the Coordination Nationale de la Sécurité Alimentaire) provides good information and analysis on food security. It could be strengthened and used as a vehicle for developing inclusive partnerships for food and nutrition.</p>

LIBERIA

<p>Situation</p> <p>Affected Population:</p> <p>Most Vulnerable:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Population: 3.8 million (2005) (<i>UNDP HDR 2007</i>) ▪ GNI: USD 554 million (2007) (<i>WB WDI 2008</i>) ▪ ODA: USD 226.48 million (<i>2007 Source: OECD</i>) ▪ Inflation rate: Overall: +13.4% (2008); food basket: +25% (in Jan..2008 alone) ▪ % of food insecure people: 14.3 percent (0.5 million persons) are food insecure while an additional 34.9 percent are considered highly vulnerable to food insecurity. Food insecurity is higher in rural areas (19.6 percent) than in urban areas (7.5 percent). Access to food is extremely difficult given the high poverty rates estimated at 68 percent in rural areas and 55 percent in urban areas. ▪ Malnutrition is very high: 39 percent of children under five are stunted, 27 percent are underweight and 7 percent are acutely malnourished. ▪ Dependence on cereals: dependence on cereal imports: 73% (WB), 90% of rice is imported from Asia and US, 74% of needs are covered by food aid. ▪ Production: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Import: Food 24% of total imports (of which rice constitutes 65%), fish, dried beans, groundnuts and pepper ○ Export: coffee, cocoa, rice, cassava, palm oil, sugarcane, bananas, sheep, goats <p>Food insecurity sources: Country is only just emerging from the economic chaos imposed by a 14-year civil war. It remains one of the poorest countries in the world. Agricultural production has been undermined by inadequate infrastructure, structural weaknesses, poor policies of previous governments, and the devastation resulting from armed conflict. All livelihood groups are now eating less-preferred food and looking for additional income-generating activities. 70% populations depends on agriculture for its livelihood</p> <p>Affected Population: 56% of rural and 29% of urban population below the extreme poverty line.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poor food consumption: 8% children under 5 are acutely malnourished; 39% chronically malnourished. ▪ Severe food access problems: 7.5% rate of malnutrition in children; 38.7% stunted. Malnutrition the single most important cause of death (44%) in children <p>Most Vulnerable: 31% of rural population and 36% of urban population are seriously affected and most vulnerable</p>
<p>Main population needs:</p>	<p>Agriculture:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Basic agricultural inputs (seeds, tools) to all groups ▪ Need to improve transportation infrastructure ▪ Scale-up and strengthen food production (including livestock, fisheries, poultry) and income-generating activities interventions in rural areas ▪ Technology, inputs to reduce significant pre- and post-harvest losses <p>Safety nets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scale-up nutrition interventions, including support to the nutrition <i>surveillance programme</i> • Assess the feasibility and pilot conditional cash/food transfers in urban areas • Shift from food for work to food/and or cash for assets ▪ Build capacity for cash transfer to vulnerable groups, pilot child sensitive social programme for vulnerable families, <p>Elements for strategic response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Increase agricultural productivity through access to improved seeds, improved pest management and the expansion of swamp-land agriculture.</i> • <i>Facilitate quick impact short cycle livestock restocking</i> • <i>Support aquaculture restocking, promote artisanal coastal fishing, fish processing & marketing</i> • <i>Expand local fabrication of agro-processing equipment</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Invest further in the agriculture and tree crop sectors</i> • <i>Boost smallholder bargaining power</i>
<p>Government responses to the situation</p>	<p>Government actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Initiated a series of food security and nutrition monitoring surveys within the framework of the National Food Security and Nutrition Strategy ▪ <p>Planned Government actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Government aims at building Food Security Storage Facilities (USD 50,000/unit) in each of the districts in the 15 counties. <p>Safety nets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scaling-up of direct assistance to severely vulnerable households and targeted feeding programs (school feeding, supplementary feeding for pregnant and nursing mothers, and food- and cash-for-work schemes). ▪ Direct assistance to severely vulnerable households ▪ Targeted feeding programmes (school feeding) ▪ Cash/food employment project for vulnerable urban youth, including “back to soil” initiative ▪ <p>Market interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Temporary suspension of tariffs on rice imports; and negotiating supply contracts with friendly governments; ▪ Reduced VAT, import restriction and price control to ensure adequate import volumes ▪ Encourage importation of inputs through favorable tax regime <p>Agriculture:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Distribution of essential planting materials (mainly seeds and perhaps fertilizer), improved post-harvest systems (basic processing technology such as rice millers and improved storage facilities) to reduce post-harvest losses. ▪ Provision (with help of FAO and WFP) of locally-procured seed rice to vulnerable farmers ▪ Production support through producer credit ▪ Increase of national budget allocated to agriculture to 6.8%
<p>International Community responses</p>	<p>Joint UN system response: The Government of Liberia and the United Nations - Joint Programme on Food Security and Nutrition FAO, IFAD, UNDP, UNICEF, UNMIL, WFP, WHO, and the WB (with linkages to ILO, UNHCR, UNFPA, UNOPS, OHCHR, UNAIDS and UNIFEM). The entire UN system in Liberia is committed to the principle of “At Work Together”. Under the leadership of the Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordinator, and drawing on considerable analytical work of FAO and WFP, the UN system sought to align its support to national priorities. Key partners (FAO, UNDP, UNICEF, UNMIL, WFP, WHO and the WB) developed a novel approach to the food security and nutrition crisis. Each Agency was encouraged to contribute its particular perspective and concentrate on areas of comparative advantage to leverage synergies and avoid duplication. The result is a Liberia/UN Joint Programme on Food Security and Nutrition. This UN-family response reflects a number of existing approaches combined with innovative rapid-response initiatives. The Joint Programme is aligned with the strategic pillars of the Government’s response to the crises. It also offers support for emergency preparedness and response to the current short-term crisis in food prices. In the longer term the Joint Programme is aligned with the Poverty Reduction Strategy of the Government. Interventions include support for i) access to markets and factors of production; ii) access to basic services and safety nets; iii) nutrition priority interventions; iv) development of related policy, legislation and guidelines, and v) national leadership and coordination.</p> <p>WB: A key partner in the Joint Programme, it is already engaged in providing support, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agricultural productivity intervention through Agriculture and Infrastructure Development Project and establishment of local seed multiplication facilities. • Cash for work employment program through the Community Empowerment Project. • School feeding program <p>Take home rations for girls in grade 4 to 6 Program for vulnerable women, mainly pregnant. The WB disbursed USD 2 million to WFP in Aug. 2008, of which USD 1.8 million has supported school feeding programs targeted to pre-school and primary school children, and the remainder is to support</p>

	<p>supplemental feeding (rations for pregnant and lactating women attending clinics and hospitals). FAO: Emergency Coordination in place, ongoing seed distribution, fertilizer, animal health supplies (USD 1.3 million) WFP: Supports pilot school gardens, currently initiated in 250 schools jointly with partners in counties with acute food insecurity and high vulnerability to food insecurity. School gardens providing additional ingredients for school meals. Schools receive seeds and technical assistance from agricultural technicians hired by partner organizations (FAO, etc.). Other activities: improvement of agriculture and rural road networks, water points (USD 3 million) UNICEF: Supports treatment of acute malnutrition in children from 6 specialized units in 4 counties and 22 out-patient sites 2 counties in collaboration with partners. (USD 1.3 million) UNICEF and WFP will conduct 3 rounds of food security and nutrition surveys in the next 12 months to provide information on how the crisis is affecting nutritional status, household expenditure, food consumption and coping strategies. This will support further policy and programmatic development. UNICEF is prepared to support the strengthening of the national nutrition surveillance program.</p>
<p>Support potential by HLTF members:</p>	<p>There is an urgent need for resources to fund the Joint Programme so that it can be fully implemented. The most immediate priorities within the Joint Programme are: Increasing agricultural production (C.01.01 and C.01.03) Post-harvest processing (output C.02.01) Improvement of Agricultural market facilities (C.04.01) Local procurement initiative at county level (Purchase of food for school feeding programme) (C.04.03) Access to safe water and sanitation (D.02.01) School feeding in primary schools (D.01.01) Treatment of acutely malnourished children (E.02.01). Management of the food crisis (A.01.01). The management of the Joint Programme allows for any donor contribution to be allocated to priority needs under the direction of the Government, using a fast pass through mechanism. The Programme's alignment with already identified national goals and the consequent reduction on administrative burdens on government capacity accords with the Paris Principles of Harmonization. The cost of the emergency component of the Food Security and Nutrition Joint Programme is approximately USD 49 million for the coming 12 months. Some USD 11 million is funded, with a balance remaining of USD 38 million.</p> <p>WFP: plans to assist 212,700 people impacted by high food prices, in direct support of the UN/Government joint programme on food security and nutrition. Scaled up activities focus primarily on Monrovia and its immediate suburbs, incorporating school feeding, nutrition, cash- and food-for-work programmes. FAO: Expand smallholder production: provide foundation rice seeds, tuber cuttings and equipment for in-country certified multiplication. Capacity building of Central Agricultural Research Institute (CARI); supply certified rice and cassava planting materials. Provide tools and small machinery. Enhance capacity and train MoA staff and Farmer Based Organizations (FBOs). Expansion of agriculture land and crop diversification; quick impact short cycle livestock, poultry and small ruminants restocking; enhance capacity and train veterinary technicians; support aquaculture restocking; rehabilitate existing dams and swamplands to enhance lowland rice production. Support marketable surplus with post-harvest interventions; expand local fabrication of agro-processing equipment, storage facilities and primary agro-processing (threshers, winnowers) at farm/FBO level; establish Technology Transfer Centres (TTC) including secondary agro-processing, storages/warehousing of processed products under proper hygienic conditions. UNICEF: Supports the mitigation of the impact of food crisis on children. Immediate scalable activities include treatment of acutely malnourished children, focusing first in the Greater Monrovia, which is likely to suffer a greater impact of the crisis; strengthen community therapeutic sites, which promote infant and young child feeding practices including community-based growth monitoring and provision of micronutrients for pregnant and lactating women and children in 130 facilities and their catchment areas.</p>
<p>Commitments/pledges/investment from international community:</p>	<p>Denmark: contributed USD 2.1 million to Joint Programme on Food Security and Nutrition, with an additional USD 6.5 million promised for 2009-2011.</p>
<p>Comment</p>	<p>Coordination is good both within the United Nations (UN) system and between the UN system and the Government. There is neither partnership nor institution covering the full scope of food security. However, a pilot partnership at programme level has recently emerged through the Purchase for Progress (P4P) project supported by WFP and which involves FAO, the Government and farming communities. At regional level, Liberia is committed to establishing a joint food security monitoring capacity for the Manu River Union with Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea and Sierra Leone.</p>

TAJIKISTAN

Situation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Population: 6.74 million (2007) (<i>WB</i>) ▪ GNI: USD 3,103 million (2007) (<i>WB WDI 2008</i>) ▪ ODA: USD 105.96 million (2007 <i>Source: OECD</i>) ▪ Inflation rate: Food: +27.5% (2007); overall food inflation estimated at 33% (ADB). Bread: +49.6% (2007) ▪ % of food insecure people: 30% of the population is food insecure, corresponding to 2.2 million, including 1.6 million in rural areas and 0.6 million in urban areas. ▪ Production: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Import: The country imports 60% of its grain requirements. Average wheat import amounting to about 300,000 – 500,000 MT per year ○ Export: grain, fruits, grapes, vegetables, cattle, sheep, goats. Main non food crop export is cotton <p>Food insecurity sources: There were structural causes of food insecurity such as the difficult resource base (scarcity of land and water), the effects of climate change, the long lasting civil war. In addition, the extremely harsh winter of 2007-2008, combined with power shortages and high energy prices, imposed great hardship, including stress on health, and rising expenses on the population, particularly in rural areas. Damages are estimated at US\$ 250 million (7% of GDP). In 2008, the country faced a food shortage, high food prices, and a locust infestation. The availability of credit for all farmers is now very low, but small-scale farmers are particularly affected, and are at risk of not being able to acquire needed inputs for the next production cycle. The impact of the economic downturn will also be substantial in a country in which remittances from out migration represents the major source of income for 55% of the households. A multi-agency needs assessment took place on 27 April – 18 May 2008.</p>
Affected Population:	<p>Affected Population: 2.2 million people, about 30% of the population, are threatened by a chronic lack of food, and tens of thousands go entire days without eating (UN Report in June 2008). Approx. 53% of the population lives below the poverty line. Malnutrition is also widespread with a 27 percent stunting rate and 5 percent wasting.</p> <p>A needs assessment was conducted in close collaboration with the Tajik Government and the relevant donors working on mother and child health and nutrition in the health sector, particularly WHO and UNICEF. The assessment revealed that people are eating fewer meals, have increased sales of livestock, that migration has increased, that debts are growing, there is decreased school attendance, and increased disease. (WFP)</p> <p>There is also a need for nutritional supplementation to compensate for the drop in the available nutrient-rich food for the at-risk population, particularly in children under 5 and pregnant and lactating women. The assessment showed that funds are needed to procure nutritional supplements, food packages and growth monitoring equipment in PHC centers to diagnose and treat malnourished children.</p>
Most Vulnerable:	<p>Most Vulnerable: The most affected rural social groups include large families with high dependency ratio, small-scale farmers and women-headed household. The mostly affected urban groups included female-headed households, households depending on remittances and pensions, casual labourers and low income civil servants.</p>
Main population needs:	<p>Agriculture:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to diversify the agricultural sector from one largely focusing on producing cotton for export ▪ Need to reverse environmental degradation, protect resource base, better manage water and soil resources and maintain and improve irrigation infrastructure <p>Safety nets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most vulnerable segments of the population affected by climatic events, decrease in remittances.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improved nutrition should be promoted for the most vulnerable <p>Elements for strategic response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A coherent approach in addressing the compound food security crisis linking the short term humanitarian response to longer term development programmes is required • Strategies should be developed to link the different dimensions of food security such as availability (agricultural development) to access (e.g. through purchase for progress) or nutrition (through crop and livestock diversification); • A special emphasis on improved nutrition of children is required
<p>Government responses to the situation</p>	<p>Government actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Government worked out a National Action Plan following the harsh winter and the 2008 crisis. <p>Safety nets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased State supplies of basic food and other products ▪ Implementing social protection programs such as food for work and school feeding. ▪ <p>Market interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Price controls imposed on flour and other major staples ▪ VAT exemption on imported grain and flour; ▪ <p>Agriculture:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget for the agricultural sector increased by 220% for 2008, for small and medium-sized loans to farmers;
<p>International Community responses</p>	<p>The UNCT activated the food security cluster</p> <p>A United Nations (UN) Flash Appeal was conducted in Spring 2008 to address the humanitarian crisis following the severe winter, including measures to address the food crisis. Another consolidated food security appeal was prepared in September 2008 which shown the strong UN humanitarian response capacity in the sector. It was based an the findings of needs assessment missions in rural and urban areas conducted jointly by Government UN (FAO,UNICEF WFP) in May and June 2008</p> <p>This appeal was designed to cover the most urgent need of an estimated 1 million person. Priorities included the emergency seed and fertilizer provision and multiplication followed by Medium term agricultural rehabilitation (National seed policy and legislation, assistance to crop research, training of wheat and potato seed producer associations)</p> <p>This was followed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Home-based livestock rehabilitation Small-scale irrigation rehabilitation Support to horticulture rehabilitation <p>A Food Security Monitoring System (FSMS) was established last year as part of the joint FAO UNICEF WFP food security and vulnerability assessment exercise</p> <p>The UN-WB Tajikistan Country Team is appealing for a revised target of USD 27.2 million to support the Government its efforts to address humanitarian needs arising from the compounding crisis (UNDP).</p> <p>FAO: Emergency Coordination in place, ongoing projects to support the transition to market economy, Immediate support to the most food insecure households suffering from soaring food prices. (USD 11.8 million)</p> <p>WFP: Assists in the creation of sustainable productive community assets to improve farmers' food security (using FFW). This includes watershed management such as access to safe drinking water (USD 1.2 million).</p> <p>In 2008 most donors (EU,USAID,WB,ADB) have scaled up their assistance to Tajikistan mainly to support longer- term development projects and technical assistance programmes (promote rural development, enhance social protection safety nets programmes ,address governance inadequacies, upgrade physical infrastructures, enabling a favourable business environment and speed up implementation of reforms mainly in the economic and agricultural sectors).</p>

<p>Support potential by HLTF members:</p>	<p>WB: (In collaboration with the Government of Tajikistan) additional financing for the Community and Basic Health Project financed from the Food Price Crisis Response Trust Fund. The additional financing is USD 4 million (P112136) to the Tajikistan Community and Basic Health Project (CBHP) (P078978) over next two years. The additional financing will help to improve the nutritional status of women and children, focusing on two forms of malnutrition (i) under-nutrition caused by inadequate intake of quantity of calories and protein, including through inadequate breastfeeding; and (ii) specific deficiency resulting from a lack of Vitamin A deficiency, and iron and folate deficiency. Improved nutrition is expected to improve health outcomes. Investment in growth monitoring in PHC centers will help early detection of wasting and stunting among children and allow immediate treatment. (Est. needs for scaling-up: USD 10 million)</p> <p>WFP: Due to the sharp rises in basic food prices, extension of assistance to an additional one million people in support of the national action plan. Activities include food packages for families before and after the winter to help them survive and prevent further erosion of assets, along with expanded support for children through schools and clinics. WFP is also exploring the possibility of introducing cash and voucher programmes, as well as new nutritious products. (Resource needs: USD 39 million)</p> <p>UNDP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Support for agro-business unions and new approaches in agriculture</i> Overall objective: Grants will be provided to newly established unions to improve access to agricultural inputs. Members will be able to receive credits for fertilizers, good quality seeds, and insecticides that will enable them to produce better quality agricultural outputs. • <i>Improving land productivity and ensuring food security</i> Overall objective: Establishment of Farmer Field Schools to introduce advanced agriculture techniques and approaches to farm management; Establishment of seed and mineral fertilizer banks where the Development Fund can get high quality seeds in the beginning of the agriculture season and return with an affordable interest rate after collecting the yield; The same approach for mineral fertilizers. • <i>Microfinance for agriculture in Zerafshan Valley</i> Overall objective: In order to support farmers, it is proposed to create a separate activity line within the MLF Loan Portfolio (Micro Loan Fund “Rushdi Vodii Zarafshon” was created within the DFID-UNDP funded Zerafshan Valley Initiative and provides micro-loans to rural inhabitants) with a special focus on loans for procurement of agricultural inputs like fertilizers, quality seeds, etc. to meet farmers’ seasonal demands. Special schemes to support drought-affected farmers will also be developed. • <i>Enhancing agricultural productivity and food security in the Sughd region</i> This project will have three dimensions: (a) access to agriculture inputs through credits; (b) increasing agricultural productivity through improving irrigation conditions; and finally (c) capacity building of farmers through trainings on modern agricultural techniques and effective farming. • <i>Development of the Associations of Agro-businessmen of Kulyab area (AAK)</i> Objective: AAK will be organized with the aim of providing dehqan farms and the population with agricultural seeds, mineral fertilizers, pesticides and diesel/fuel. • There are several community based small scale innovative agricultural projects currently supported by FAO,IFAD and implemented by international and local NGOs , These can be consolidated and expanded
<p>Commitments/pledges/ investment from international community:</p>	
<p>Comments / challenges ahead</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While official development assistance (ODA) has increased in volume over the past three years, it remains fragmented unpredictable and donors driven. • Currently the coordination between government donors UN and NGOs on strategic policies and programmes focuses on the humanitarian response, in particular through the UN cluster on food security which involves OCHA,WFP, UNICEF WHO and FAO as well as NGOs • Low involvement and implementation capacity of the Government; governance issues; and miscommunication between various partners as well as historically absent civil society organization are constraints to the development of more inclusive partnerships for increased food security.

ANNEX 6:



**EUROPEAN
COMMISSION**

Directorate-General
Development and
Relations with African,
Caribbean and Pacific
States.
Directorate General
EuropAid.

**Meeting between UNHCTF/UN agencies/WB and the EC on the European Food Facility
At IFAD, Rome, 24 April 2009**

The meeting was co-chaired by David Nabarro (United Nations High Level Task Force and Lluís Riera (European Commission - EC)) and attended by 15 participants from the EC and from FAO, WFP, IFAD, UNICEF and World Bank (the UN/WB system).

At its conclusion participants agreed that the EC and UN/WB system would

- (a) issue a joint summary and circulate it widely,*
- (b) work jointly on a visibility package, which could include public events for signature of contracts and joint publications,*
- (c) a possible joint presentation of the first due report by the European Commission to the European Parliament in December 2009. and*
- (d) organise follow-up meetings so as to review progress and address challenges in September and December 2009.*

Summary

The participants were updated by the EC on the status of the European Food Facility and were informed about EC decisions related to its implementation.

Participants were also updated on the (generally good) progress being made by individual implementing agencies towards finalising their detailed descriptions of intended actions, a prerequisite for the signature of individual contracts (first signatures expected in late April/early May).

Specific questions were raised by implementing agencies and answers were provided by the EC (either on the spot or after the meeting).

Participants appreciated that at this time responsibility for the implementation of the Facility is about to shift. The EC has been responsible for the programming phase of the Facility and the final choice of activities in countries. Once contracts are signed and the delivery phase is underway, UN agencies and the World Bank will assume responsibility - in particular for ensuring that expected results are realized.

Participants committed to sustaining the close and effective cooperation demonstrated during the programming phase. All parties have worked hard to ensure the highest possible standard of work during the programming phase. The same attention to detail and outcomes is needed in the delivery phase - not least because of the political importance of this programme for all organisations. The locus for cooperation and effective action is now within countries where the linkages between UN /WB system, EC Delegations and national authorities must be as strong as possible. A key opportunity for forging these links is the forthcoming Food Facility/Food Security Workshops at Country level. The EC requested that the organizations of the UN/WB system designate "one leading agency" per country so that the in-country responsible focal point would be clearly identified.

To this end, there was a detailed exchange of views on lessons to be drawn from the programming phase of the EU Food facility. Participants intended that these lessons should be applied during the delivery phase, and they propose that future EC/WB/UN collaboration and future policy developments at global level in Food Security/Agriculture and Rural Development should build upon this experience.

The lessons to date can be summarized as follows:

Strong political backing has been needed to devise and programme the Facility: Within the EC, the President of the Commission has given strong and consistent support for the creation of a Food Facility and has expressed this in diplomatic exchanges and public statements throughout its gestation during 2008. Within the UN, UN SG Ban Ki-moon charged the UNHLTF with coordinating and leading an integrated UN response to the global food crisis. Similarly, individual agencies placed the global food crisis at the core of their work in the middle of 2008 (e.g. FAO - Conference of June, IFSP; WB Global Food Crisis Response Programme). The S-G has welcomed the EC's political initiative: he has mandated the HLTF to support programme development. This direct support from the S-G has enabled the rapid mobilization of agencies, and facilitated the flow of essential information from agencies to EC. The backing from the UN SG enabled the HLTF secretariat to form an effective bridge between the UN agencies and the outside world (including the European institutions).

Timeliness: the facility was being devised and programmed at a time when the political, social, and economic effects of the food crisis were being felt in a range of countries, and before the global financial and economic crises had dominated the headlines. The prompt production and release of the HLTF Comprehensive Framework for Action in response to the Global Food security Crisis, widely perceived as a useful document to inform policy makers and to guide responses by development agencies, gave the EC a sound reference basis, and a clear rationale for working with the UN. It also provided credibility to the quality and speed of operations of the UN HLTF.

The steering role of the EC: the EC made the essential decisions: on the scope of the activities within the Food Facility, on the target countries, on the financial allocations and on the selection of projects within countries. The UN system provided information to facilitate decision making but did not need to make the decisions. This process minimised direct competition between agencies and fostered cooperation. It also allowed the HLTF to remain a 'neutral' force, supporting the general interests of the UN system in dialogue with the EC.

Strong UN/WB coordination: The EC's steering role encouraged strong cooperation between the UN agencies and the World Bank. The UNHLTF played a key role in this and proved to have effective convening power in terms of bringing UN systems agencies together so they acted in a united manner and provided the required information. This meant that the EC did not have to deal with agencies individually, reduced demands on EC staff time and lessened the risk of miscommunication. The HLTF's convening power is related to its political mandate, to the effectiveness of its (small) secretariat, and to the degree to which individual agencies allowed themselves to be convened by the task force.

Reflection of country-level realities and needs: In responding to challenges of food insecurity the Food Facility takes account of country-level realities and needs. . This required effective interchange between the Commission, international organizations and national authorities leading to an understanding of country-level conditions, policies, structures and programmes. The conduct of joint needs assessments by the UN/WB system at country level helped greatly in identifying potential beneficiary countries, clarifying their needs and proposing projects in need of support. In addition, the global network of EC Delegations played an important role undertaking reality-checks in the process, allowing the EC to make informed decisions on targeting and selection.

Development of programming/implementation teams: The EC set up a specific Steering Group mid 2008 to work on the concept of the facility: as the design evolved, a Task Force was created to prepare and manage implementation. This involved reallocation of assignments so that existing personnel could be moved into the Task Force, and some recruitment of new staff. Within the UN/WB system, specific contact points and coordinating mechanisms were set up to prepare for implementation. As the programming phase evolved, a committed team of people from all the organizations worked together with the firm belief that through their efforts the Facility could be made both functional and effective

Spirit of Partnership: The individuals within the various organisations and the various teams of the organisations have worked together in a spirit of a true partnership, pursuing the strategies outlined for the facility and demonstrating the flexibility needed for effective implementation. This was essential in the uncertain and ever-evolving political context which has existed right up to the final adoption of the facility's legal basis.
