Food for Peace Strategy Dialogue
Figure 2.1. An Expanded Conceptual Framework for Understanding Food Insecurity

Desired Program Outcomes
- Resources: Natural resource, sustainability, productive assets, secure livelihoods
- Productivity: Labor productivity, livelihood stability and diversification
- Income: Market integration, purchasing power, savings potential, credit access
- Consumption: Equity in intra-household food distribution, food quality, quantity, and diversity
- Human Capital: Nutrition, health and sanitation, maternal/child care, dignity, education, skills, political voice, capacity, indigenous knowledge

Enhanced Community Resiliency
- Natural Shocks: Climatic shocks, natural resource mining and degradation, yield volatility, asset depletion, neglect of natural hazard mitigation
- Economic Risks: Income fluctuation, collapsed terms of trade, savings depletion, employment insecurity, price volatility, high transaction costs, information asymmetry, inflation
- Social and Health Risks: Epidemics, HIV, widespread untended malnutrition, risk perceptions, corruption, social disintegration, predatory extraction by armed forces, conflict, ethnic and social discrimination

Enhanced Livelihood Capacity
- Political Risks: Poor governance (national and local), lack of legal recourse, lack of accountability, inadequate provision of services and creation of public goods, adverse regulations, lack of recognition of human rights, political instability, ineffective institutions

Enhanced Human Capital

Food Security Outputs
- Adequate Food Availability
- Adequate Food Access
- Appropriate Food Utilization

Strategic Goal

Food Security

Source: USAID/FP Strategic Plan, p. 20.
Figure 2.2. USAID/FFP’s Strategic Framework for 2006–2010

Strategic Objective
Food insecurity in vulnerable populations reduced

IR 1: Global leadership in reducing food insecurity enhanced

IR 1.1: FFP’s role in U.S. and multilateral policy development increased

IR 1.2: National and global partnerships strengthened

IR 1.3: Evidence base for more effective policy and program approaches improved

IR 1.4: Technical excellence and innovation supported

IR 1.5/2.5: Timely and efficient program management achieved

IR 2: Title II impact in the field increased

IR 2.1: Human capabilities protected and enhanced

IR 2.2: Livelihood capacities protected and enhanced

IR 2.3: Community resiliency protected and enhanced

IR 2.4: Community capacity to influence factors (decisions) that affect food security increased

Contributing Result: Country enabling environments conducive to reduced food insecurity promoted

Contributing Result: Improvements in governance and conflict mitigation in a broader country context achieved

KEY

FFP responsible

*Other USAID offices or partners responsible
FFP Global Meeting: Changing Context *(March)*
FACG and TOPS-hosted online discussion: Changing context *(May-June)*
FFP internal “strategic framing” discussion *(June)*
FFP “Corp Group” established; review Vision, Mission, and Goal *(July-Aug)*
TOPS Event Key Questions *(July)*
FFP Corp Group finalizes first draft of Vision, Mission, Goal Statement and Objectives (and or options) for discussion/review *(Aug- September)*
FFP - Partner Consultations resulting in revision and circulation for comment *(Sept-Oct)*
FFP Corp group drafts IRs/options *(Oct)*
FFP-Partner Consultation to revise finalize Strategic Framework *(by Thanksgiving)*
FFP Core Group Writing *(through January)*
FFP-Partner Consultation/draft revision *(through Feb.)*
Circulation for Comment/final revisions *(through April)*
Launch *(May/June)*
## Technical and Cross-Cutting Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resilience</th>
<th>Climate Change Adaptation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition/WASH/FP – Ag/Nut</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Reduction</td>
<td>Urban Food Security</td>
<td>Safety Nets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building – local actors</td>
<td>Social Protection</td>
<td>Market Facilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Issues – Changing Landscape

#### Program and Operating Environment / Modalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feed the Future / SUN</th>
<th>Climate Change</th>
<th>Urbanization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emergencies – strategic focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning &amp; Adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity / Systems / Sustainability</td>
<td>G2G – Local Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts/Insecure Environments</td>
<td></td>
<td>LRP / Cash Transfers</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rough classification of issues in the key area of focus:

- **Feed the Future / SUN**
- **Climate Change**
- **Urbanization**
- **Integrated Programming**
- **Linkages within USAID**
- **Emergencies – strategic focus**
- **Learning & Adaptation**
- **Complexity/Systems / Sustainability**
- **G2G – Local Ownership**
- **Conflicts/Insecure Environments**
- **LRP / Cash Transfers**
- **Technology**
Targeting FFP non-emergency resources

FFP non-emergency programs traditionally target communities experiencing deep, chronic poverty and persistent food insecurity; however, as partners increasingly turn to market-oriented approaches to reducing vulnerability they are finding that forging links across/between vulnerable and viable households, livelihoods and even geographic regions may hold the key to sustainability.

*Does this have implications for how we target programs in the future?*
FFP’s unique role

Many of the organizations attending this event have helped to increase the flexibility of Title II resources—increasing the amount of 202(e) available to “enhance” as well as establish programs. At the same time, some have voiced concern that additional cash-based programming will blur the lines between FFP programs and other development and humanitarian programming.

What do you believe is FFP’s unique role in reducing hunger and poverty?
FFP Goal Statement

The Strategic Objective of FFP’s 2006-2010 strategy was: “Food Insecurity in Vulnerable Populations Reduced”. FAFSA III found that the majority of non-emergency programs chose “Improve Food Security” rather than “Reduce Food Insecurity” in their goal statements.

Do either/both of these frames adequately reflect the current and future goal of FFP? Why or why not? Options?
FFP’s Contribution

USAID’s new Mission Statement is “We partner to end extreme poverty and promote resilient, democratic societies while advancing our security and prosperity.”

Does FFP’s current Strategic Goal-- “Food Insecurity in Vulnerable Populations Reduced”-- adequately capture FFP’s potential contribution to USAID’s Mission?
But for any other name….

FFP’s 2006-2010 strategy embraced a definition of Food Security that includes Availability, Access, Utilization and Risk (or Stability). In this definition, “Utilization” is meant to capture all those factors that influence whether food that is available and accessible translates into healthy human nutrition.

*Does the concept of Utilization adequately address the issue of “Nutrition Security”? Why/Why not?*
FFP and Urban Hunger

FFP’s 2006-2010 strategic plan recognized the trend toward urbanization; however, it made clear that “increased urban poverty itself will not cause a structural reorientation of Title II activities away from rural areas if country-specific analyses of risks and vulnerabilities indicates that this is where the priorities still lie.”

Does this approach still hold?
Local Governance

Many of the approaches utilized by FFP partners at a community level—both in emergency and development programs—incorporate principles of democratic governance. Examples might be the establishment of a water-users group, a PTA, or an emergency distribution committee. Yet these are rarely seen as building blocks for more deliberate “governance” activities.

*Given that poor governance is a common contributor to hunger in areas where FFP works, is there more we should do to use FFP interventions as a vehicle to strengthen governance?*
FFP and Safety Nets

FFP programming—both emergency and development—has often served as an ad hoc safety net in countries where inadequate or no formal safety nets exist. FFP has also played a critical role in establishing, supporting, and implementing formal safety net programs (e.g. Ethiopia, Haiti, Bangladesh), but is struggling with the lack of clearly defined (and realistic) exit strategies.

What should be the role of FFP in regard to national safety nets?
Working ourselves out of a job

USAID is increasingly embracing a model of development that places the strengthening of local and national institutions, together with engaging the private sector, at the heart of sustainability.

What should this mean for FFP programming?
Small Group Discussion

FFP Strategy - Key Questions

- Discuss the question your group has been assigned.
- Capture as much as possible on your table’s flip chart.
- Star top 2 points of consensus
- Be ready to report out on 1 or both