CONFERENCE REPORT
COMMEMORATING 40 YEARS OF FOOD FOR PEACE

A Conference Sponsored by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)

September 18 - 21, 1994

Marriott at Metro Center Washington, D.C.

Prepared by:

Mendez England & Associates
Under Contract No. PDC-0704-C-00-1043-00

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONFERENCE AGENDA

Sunday, September 18
Opening Reception

Hosts: M. Douglas Stafford
Assistant Administrator
Bureau for Humanitarian Response
USAID, Washington, D.C.

Lois Richards
Deputy Assistant Administrator
Bureau for Humanitarian Response
USAID, Washington, D.C.

H. Robert Kramer
Director
Office of Food for Peace (BHR)
USAID, Washington, D.C.

Monday, September 19

Welcome and Conference Overview
H. Robert Kramer

Opening Plenary Session: Food for Peace-40 Years of Accomplishments

Introduction: M. Douglas Stafford

Keynote Address: The Honorable George McGovern
Former U.S. Senator
Washington, D.C.

Moderator: Lois Richards

Panel: Peggy A. Sheehan
Chief Operating Officer
National Cooperative Business Association
Washington, D.C.

Willard J. Pearson
Director, REDSO/WCA
USAID/Abidjan, Cote D'Ivoire

Christopher Goldthwait
General Sales Manager
Foreign Agricultural Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C.

Questions and Answers

Panel: The Changing Role of Food Aid in Sustainable Development

Moderator:

Janet C. Ballantyne
Deputy Assistant Administrator
Center for Economic Growth
Bureau for Global Programs
Field Support and Research
Washington, D.C.

Panel:

Per Pinstrup Andersen
Director General
International Food Policy Research Institute
Washington, D.C.

John A. Donnelly
Deputy Executive Director
Catholic Relief Services
Baltimore, MD

Lynnett M. Wagner
Acting Deputy Administrator
Foreign Agricultural Service
International Cooperation and Development Division
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C.

Questions and answers

Panel: Bridging the Gap Between Emergencies and Development

Moderator: Richard McCall
Chief of Staff
USAID
Washington, D.C.

Panel: Julia Taft
President and CEO
InterAction
Washington, D.C.

Margaret G. Tsitouris
Director of the Regional Management Group
CARE
Atlanta, GA

Ted D. Morse
Director, Greater Horn of Africa Task Force
USAID
Washington, D.C.

Daan Everts
Deputy Executive Director for Operations
World Food Program
Rome, Italy

Break Out Sessions: Bridging the Gap Between Emergencies and Development

Tuesday, September 20

General Reporting Session

Moderator: H. Robert Kramer

Panel: A New Vision for Food Aid and Food Security

Moderator: Carol A. Peasley
Deputy Assistant Administrator
Bureau for Africa
USAID
Washington, D.C.

Speaker: Carol Lancaster
Deputy Administrator
USAID
Washington, D.C.

Panel: Curtis Schaeffer
Director, Food Security Unit
CARE
Atlanta, GA

Michael Frank
Director, Office of Program Resource Management
Catholic Relief Services
Baltimore, MD

Len Rogers
Director, Office of Program, Planning and Evaluation
Bureau of Humanitarian Response
USAID
Washington, D.C.

Panel: Legislative Issues--Food for Peace

Moderator: Jill Buckley
Assistant Administrator
Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs
USAID
Washington, D.C.

Panel: Kathleen Bertelsen Moazed
Professional Staff
Subcommittee on Economic Policy, Trade and Environment
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
Washington, D.C.

Bruce White
Staff Assistant
House Subcommittee on Foreign Agriculture and Hunger
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Joseph Fredericks
Legislative Officer
USAID/AA/LPA
Washington, D.C.

Panel: Private Sector Involvement in the Food For Peace Program

Moderator:

Ellen S. Levinson
Executive Director
Coalition for Food Aid
Washington, D.C.

Panel:

Carl Schwenson
Executive Vice President
National Association of Wheat Growers
Washington, D.C.

John M. Wise
Assistant Export Manager
ADM Milling Company
Overland Park, KS

William V. Brierre, Jr.
Senior Vice President
Lykes Brothers Steamship Co., Inc.
Washington, D.C.

Consantine Papavizas
Partner
Dyer; Ellis, Joseph & Mills
Washington, D.C.

Congressional Reception 1300 Longworth House Office Building

Sponsored by: The Alliance for Food Aid

Remarks: The Honorable Brian Attwood
Administrator
USAID
Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, September 21

Break-out Sessions: A New Vision for Food Security

General Reporting Session

Moderator: Jeanne Markunas
Deputy Director
Office of Food for Peace
USAID
Washington, D.C.

Conference Recap and Adjournment

H. Robert Kramer
Director
Office of Food for Peace
USAID
Washington, D.C.

INTRODUCTION

This conference convened in Washington, D.C. from September 18-21, 1994 to celebrate the 40th anniversary of USAID's Food for Peace program and to examine the outlook for the future. The event, the first of its kind, brought together USAID food aid professionals from Washington and the field as well as members of Congress, representatives from non-government organizations (NGOs), other U.S. agencies involved in food aid, international donor organizations, producers, and shippers. Panels featuring speakers from all these backgrounds discussed the choices and challenges lying ahead for food aid professionals in an era of tight budgets and chronic crises. This report serves as a summary, not a verbatim account, of conference themes and events.

USAID's Office of Food for Peace grew out of Public Law 480 (PL 480), enacted in 1954 as a means of reducing U.S. agricultural surpluses while working towards abolishing hunger in developing countries. The Food for Peace office opened its doors during the Kennedy administration, headed by the conference keynote speaker, Senator George McGovern. While the office initially focused on emergency aid, it very soon expanded its activities to include self-help through innovative monetization programs which support development projects. Revisions of PL 480 accompanied the growing understanding of the potential of food aid. The 1990 Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act (the Farm Bill), signed into law by President George Bush, contained a comprehensive revision of PL 480. The revision acknowledged food security as a primary goal, and divided PL 480's functions into three domains: Title I (concessional sales, administered by USDA); and the USAID-administered Title II (relief and development food aid) and Title III (government grants focused on policy).

PL 480 programs, including Titles II and III programs, have reduced hunger, increased productivity, and boosted individual and community incomes in developing countries. The programs have also benefitted U.S. industries such as farming, food processing, and transportation; and many former food aid recipients have gone on to become importers of U.S. commodities. Food aid has come into its own as a development tool.

But interlinked conditions in developing countries (including environmental depredation, population growth, natural and man-made disasters, and poor infrastructure) combine to keep hunger--food insecurity--alive in 800 million people. In donor countries, the absence of surplus and sharply decreased funding mandate a revision of food aid policy. The

conference both commemorated past triumphs and addressed future challenges by setting four goals:

1. Providing an overview of the past 40 years of Food for Peace, and of the challenges to come in policy, budgeting, and personnel;

2. Informing public and private-sector participants of the role of food aid in USAID strategic objectives, and of the effects of the 1995 Farm Bill revisions;

3. Allowing professionals from all venues of food aid to air and exchange views on strategies for achieving food security, including USAID policy issues;

4. Improving management of USAID food programs by encouraging input from USAID and its food aid partners.

The conference consisted of six sessions during which expert panelists covered the history of Food for Peace, the changing vision of food aid and its role in the relief/development continuum, the differing views of various agents involved in the delivery of food aid, and the effect of evolving USAID policy and the upcoming Farm Bill discussions on food aid and food security. Conference participants also had the opportunity to respond to a draft paper on policy as outlined by the USAID administration.

Conference events also included two breakout sessions for working groups. Each participant was assigned to one of five developing countries (Ethiopia, Bolivia, Rwanda, Bangladesh, and Armenia), and was given descriptions of the assigned country's government, population, economy, and food security situation. Breakout groups used this information to discuss two questions related to their country: how to bridge the relief/development gap; and how the USAID draft paper would affect each country. They summarized their findings in two general reporting sessions.

Monday, September 19
Opening Plenary Session: Food for Peace - 40 Years of Accomplishments

Opening remarks by H. Robert Kramer, Director, Office of Food for Peace, Bureau for Humanitarian Response (BHR), USAID, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Kramer opened the conference with brief remarks welcoming his colleagues from around the world with shared commitment and vision. He said that this conference, which commemorated the 40th anniversary of the Food for Peace Program, marks a transformation in the way food aid is perceived. The present administration, Mr. Kramer said, perceives food aid as a quality resource, vital to meeting humanitarian and development challenges around the world.

Describing the legal force behind U.S. food aid assistance, Public Law (PL) 480 (the Agriculture Trade Development and Assistance Act), Mr. Kramer called it a "bold stroke." He said that in the 1950s the law, which joined the need to use farming surpluses with the desire to provide assistance to the world's hungry, PL480, was a "landmark piece of legislation" whose potential was still unforeseen. Today, Mr. Kramer said, we know that agricultural surpluses can serve as a powerful instrument promoting welfare, peace, and freedom worldwide. For that reason, he proposes that the revised law be known as the Food for Peace Act.

He went on to recall how his field experiences taught him the power of food aid, beginning 17 years ago as an intern with the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) in Cajamarca, Peru. Subsequent field work in Bangladesh, Bolivia, and Ecuador showed him how well-conceived and well-managed projects have improved access to food and basic services, and have enhanced food security by building infrastructure improvements. These experiences, plus the example of recent lifesaving food aid in Rwanda, Mr. Kramer said, have convinced him that food aid is one of the most important humanitarian and development tools since access to food ia a "primordial right of every human being."

Mr. Kramer remarked that this conference was the first gathering of so many varied stakeholders and participants in food aid; this variety, he said, offered an opportunity to explore the challenges lying ahead. All food aid workers should be proud of past accomplishments and heed lessons learned. Among the lessons learned were the types of food aid efforts which were less effective, those which:

- target beneficiaries inappropriately
- ignore the effect of food aid on local markets
- do not aim for ultimate food security.

Monday, September 19
Opening Plenary Session: Food for Peace - 40 Years of Accomplishments

He also cited the need to document successes and the necessity of achieving food security by resolving the many interconnected factors which lead to hunger.

Mr. Kramer described the challenge facing conference participants: to help determine how to use food aid more effectively by focusing on four issues:

- the appropriate role of food aid in fostering sustainable development
- building more effective partnerships
- promoting food security at the individual, household, and national levels
- better documentation of the impact of food aid.

Mr. Kramer outlined conference events: beginning with keynote speaker George McGovern's reflections on the history of the food aid program; discussing selected country needs in discussion groups; moving to the changing roles of food aid and views by various stakeholders; and reporting on discussion group findings.

USAID, Mr. Kramer said, has embarked on a strategic planning process to increase the effectiveness of food aid, necessary in view of the many changes which have taken place since the enactment of PL480 four decades ago. Both surpluses and budgets have diminished. Mr. Kramer said that the perception of PL480, long conceived of as a cheap resource, is changing, and this change presents an opportunity for food aid professionals. He said that food aid managers have embarked on an ambitious program which will change the way they do business, and that conference participants are part of that change. He described the future as "brimming with opportunities" brought on by monumental political changes worldwide, cited new challenges including the disintegration of nations in the Horn of Africa, stagnant economies in the Newly Independent states, and stated a new imperative: to use food aid as a tool in reducing hunger and promoting food security and, ultimately, attaining world peace.

Mr. Kramer then opened the conference by introducing the moderator of the opening plenary session, **M. Douglas Stafford, Assistant Administrator, BHR, USAID, Washington, D.C.**
After praising Mr. Kramer as a dedicated and passionate food aid manager, Mr. Stafford noted what a pleasure it was to introduce the keynote speaker, the honorable George McGovern. He went on to note the tremendous challenges to come in providing humanitarian assistance and supporting sustainable development. The U.S., Mr. Stafford said, can feel proud of the progress made through PL 480. He cited the many countries in Asia, once racked by famine, which now not only meet their own food needs, but have become reliable U.S. trading partners. Nine of the top ten leading importers of U.S.

Monday, September 19
Opening Plenary Session: Food for Peace - 40 Years of Accomplishments

agricultural products were once food aid recipients. The challenges of the future, Mr. Stafford said, will be to supply expertise and leadership like that provided by the next speaker, the Honorable George McGovern.

Mr. Stafford summarized the highlights of Senator McGovern's life and his special concern for the hungry. A native of North Dakota and decorated World War II pilot, Senator McGovern taught history until 1956, when he was elected to the House of Representatives. President John F. Kennedy appointed him as the first director of the Food for Peace Office. Elected to the Senate in 1962, Senator McGovern served three terms and ran for president in 1972. He has served on the Senate Agricultural and Foreign Relations Committees and chaired the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, and presently serves as president of the Middle East Policy Council.

Mr. Stafford summed up by praising Mr. McGovern as a national leader of integrity and intellect, whose career has greatly advanced a more humane U.S. foreign policy, and to whom Food for Peace is greatly indebted.

Keynote Speaker: The Honorable George McGovern, former U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C

After acknowledging Mr. Stafford and conference participants, Senator McGovern stated his long-term belief that since World War II, the American farmer had been the country's greatest national resource: in his capacity to grow food; and in his ability to teach others more efficient ways of growing food. He remarked that his job setting up the Food for Peace office was the most enjoyable position in the Kennedy Administration. He then acknowledged the impact of John Kennedy's vision on the Food for Peace program and on the U.S. vision of humanitarian aid.

Senator McGovern described a scene in Mitchell, North Dakota (his home town) where presidential candidate Kennedy said to a crowd of 6,000 farmers gathered there that he regarded the agricultural surplus not as a problem, but as an opportunity for the U.S. and for the rest of the world. "I think the farmers can bring more credit, more lasting good will, more chance for freedom, more chance for peace than almost any other group of Americans," Mr. Kennedy said, "if we recognize that food is strength, and food is peace, and food is freedom, and food is a helping hand to people around the world whose goodwill and friendship we want." The crowd exploded, Senator McGovern said; with these words Kennedy reversed the common notion of food surplus as a burden, viewing it instead as a potential resource. Upon winning the election, President Kennedy called Senator McGovern to Washington to head the Food for Peace office.

Monday, September 19
Opening Plenary Session: Food for Peace - 40 Years of Accomplishments

Senator McGovern recalled that on moving to Washington, he frequently held discussions with his neighbor, Senator Hubert Humphrey, who was also attempting to transform PL 480 from its negative image as a means of "surplus disposal" to a positive tool for transmitting knowledge and productivity to the world community.

While President Kennedy indicated very early his interest in food aid, Senator McGovern said, the first Food for Peace office opened with borrowed staff, without a budget and without an assigned office. However, the day after his inauguration, President Kennedy issued an Executive Order to expand food assistance in West Virginia and other needy areas; the following day, a second Executive Order created the Food for Peace office. Senator McGovern quoted Executive Order Number Two to emphasize the tenets on which U.S. food aid has operated: "American agricultural abundance offers a great opportunity for the U.S. to promote the interest of peace in a significant way. We must narrow the gap between abundance here at home and near-starvation abroad. Humanity and prudence alike counsel a major effort on our part."

Senator McGovern recalls concentrating early Food for Peace efforts on concepts which are still part of USAID's food policy: strengthening food productivity by using food as an instrument of increased production; and improving family nutrition.

In the beginning, this latter concept centered around the school lunch program. Senator McGovern recalls that his conception of food aid as a development tool began after a conversation with the dean of the University of Georgia. The dean named the school lunch program in the South as the greatest benefit since the New Deal and subsequent legislation, in that school lunches resulted in better attendance, measurable health improvements, and measurably improved academic performance. Building on this trilogy, Senator McGovern said, one could conclude that school lunch programs laid the basis for healthier and therefore more productive families in the American South.

Senator McGovern said that throughout the political upheaval that took place during the Cold War--and despite funding competition from the Department of Defense--the Food for Peace program acted as a defense tool. The program, which offered hope by improving nutrition, reducing malnutrition and hunger, and increasing agricultural productivity, kept many countries from sliding into Communism. Senator McGovern stated his support of expanding the food aid program despite the absence of agricultural surpluses. No foreign assistance, he said, will be more important for the next decade than continuing efforts to reduce world hunger and malnutrition. He concluded by paying his respects to the food aid community representatives at the conference for what he called "a splendid public service."

Monday, September 19
Opening Plenary Session: Food for Peace - 40 Years of Accomplishments

Monday, September 19
Plenary Session Panel Discussion: Food for Peace - 40 Years of Accomplishments

The moderator for this session was **Lois Richards, Deputy Assistant Administrator to the Bureau for Humanitarian Response, USAID, Washington, D.C.** Ms. Richards introduced the first panelist, **Peggy Sheehan, Chief Operating Officer of the National Cooperative Business Association of Washington, D.C.** Ms. Sheehan praised Mr. McGovern's conciseness in laying out major accomplishments of the Food for Peace program. She stated that naming highlights was difficult not only because of the importance of food aid, but also because food aid professionals have not tracked their accomplishments in detail. Ms. Shechan listed what she viewed as the program's major accomplishments:

1. The program's flexibility allowed it to meet changing worldwide needs: food distribution in the sixties; development in later decades; this flexibility must be built into evolving food aid policy.

2. The program created a unique partnership between the public and private sectors, fostering cooperation among various government agencies, private voluntary agencies (PVOs), community organizations, agricultural producers, and for-profit agencies in and outside of the U.S.

3. The program had a direct positive effect on people in and outside the U.S.

4. The program supported institutional development at home and especially among organizations in host countries.

5. The program worked; many countries became independently self-sustaining as a result of food aid.

Ms. Sheehan concluded by suggesting a Congressional mandate for farmers to grow food specifically for food aid, both foreign and domestic.

The second panelist was **Willard J. Pearson, Director of REDSO/WCA at USAID's Abidjan mission in Cote d'Ivoire.** Mr. Pearson greeted the participants and especially the many colleagues who had served with him as interns during the beginning of the Food for Peace program. He went on to underscore several themes brought up during the opening remarks:

1. A main strength of Food for Peace has been its success as a political instrument. Key to this success has been its ability to offer roles to a range of actors: farmers, shippers, agents, governments, as well as the recipients who consume the food.

Monday, September 19
Plenary Session Panel Discussion: Food for Peace - 40 Years of Accomplishments

2. The program derives strength and durability from apparent contradictions--originating as a solution for a "burdensome surplus" while addressing a moral imperative to feed the hungry; evolving through adaptability while maintaining a constant presence and support.

3. The program stimulated and supported the role of U.S. non-government organizations (NGOs) and PVOs in development.

Mr. Pearson then referred to Ethiopia, which he had recently visited, as an example of the need to continue an effective, strong food aid program. The country's 1940 population was 11 million. By 1970, the population had grown to 25 million. The present population is 55 million; and the projected population in 2020 (with an unchanged growth rate) is over 120 million: an eleven-fold increase, and clearly unsustainable. The Food for Peace program, he said, is one of the most important connections with the developing world, and one which must make further connections with other development issues (such as population growth). Finally, he stated his hope that the U.S. find other foreign policy instruments as effective as Food for Peace has been during its 40-year life.

Ms. Richards next introduced **Christopher Goldthwait, general sales manager for the Foreign Agricultural Service at the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Washington, D.C.** Mr Goldthwait noted additional accomplishments to those already expressed, cited changes which have affected the Food for Peace program, and added caveats to incorporate in new food aid policy. Accomplishments include:

1. Dedication to a core objective of humanitarian aid;

2. Successful realization of an export development objective: introducing U.S. commodities into countries which can later become trading partners.

Among the changes he perceives Mr. Goldthwait noted:

1. Increasing responsibility, in the 1990 farm bill, to USAID for Title III of PL 480, and to USDA for Title I.

2. Political changes (such as reorganization in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union) have demanded efficient use of food aid funding, which resulted in closer relations between donors and PVOs.

Monday, September 19
Plenary Session Panel Discussion: Food for Peace - 40 Years of Accomplishments

3. Food aid is going to entirely different countries; most FY 1994 recipients received no food aid in 1990.

Thirdly, Mr. Goldthwait pointed to new challenges which will affect the development of food aid policy and food aid delivery.

1. The nature of disasters has changed; they are often man-made and difficult to foresee (i.e. Rwanda), and will require a different kind of emergency response.

2. Circumstances change quickly in countries which receive food aid, especially those which receive Title I assistance. In some years this assistance may be appropriate for a given country; in others, the same country may need more heavily concessional food aid; and new policies should allow this kind of flexibility.

3. Budgets are tighter, requiring a more flexible and efficient use of available resources.

Mr. Goldthwait expressed his interest in the developments ensuing from the conference, and his eagerness to work closely with all food aid stakeholders on the upcoming revision of PL 480.

Ms. Richards then opened the floor for a brief question-and-answer period. Names of questioners appear where available. Questions, comments, and responses are summarized (not quoted directly) as follows:

Q: In the seventies, nearly 50 percent of food aid went to Vietnam, though there was a severe food crisis in Africa and also in India. Were there similar diversions in the 50's, 60's and 80's away from humanitarian purposes and toward political ends, and what prospects exist in the 1990s for directing food aid solely towards its intended use?

A: (McGovern) That example was a deviation from the intention of food aid, and food was used as a means of sustaining the war. I don't believe there was a similar instance before or since, and, I hope it won't happen again.

(Sheehan) Egypt comes to mind, since quite a lot of food aid has gone there over the years, but never to the extent of Vietnam. But this debate over the use of food aid for political versus humanitarian purposes has gone on for a long time.

Monday, September 19
Plenary Session Panel Discussion: Food for Peace - 40 Years of Accomplishments

(Goldthwait) The difference with Egypt seems that food aid was a reward for not going to war, and the key to increased foreign assistance.

Q: (Don Rogers, Catholic Relief Services) Food has been used for three purposes: development, emergency relief, and humanitarian programs such as those run by Mother Theresa for leprosy patients and orphans. Since future policy will be concerned with development and emergency relief, what is the future of the third category of humanitarian programs?

A: (Pearson) There will be more and more food aid for emergencies over the next ten years, and probably less surplus in the U.S. and Europe because of the success of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT). Food aid will probably be targeted less broadly. But NGOs will argue that humanitarian aid needs to continue. There will be tension over how many will be fed each year without the possibility of graduation versus emergency needs; this will be an issue.

(Goldthwait) Legal changes governing domestic farm production eliminate the possibility of the large surpluses food aid counted on. We must have a mechanism for emergencies, such as planting a certain acreage or expanding the food security wheat reserve to include other commodities. It's an important question.

(McGovern) We can't rely on planned scarcity to contain domestic farm prices; we need some kind of price support. This makes sense on moral grounds and in terms of what we're doing in foreign policy.

Q: (Ghandi Selvanathan, OIC International) The population explosion (such as the one mentioned in Ethiopia) is going on in many recipient countries. What can Food for Peace do to contain the population explosion?

A: (Pearson) Sales programs, Title III or Title II monetization programs, might be one answer. There could also be direct distribution through mother-child programs with a strong family planning component.

Monday, September 19
Panel Discussion: The Changing Role of Food Aid in Sustainable Development

The moderator for this session was **Janet C. Ballantyne, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Center for Economic Growth, Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research, USAID, Washington, D.C.** Ms. Ballantyne said that since Food for Peace began its operation forty years ago, positive and negative changes had taken place. Positive changes included:

- the end of the Cold War and the development of new alliances;
- technological improvements in agricultural productivity and basic crops;
- the demise of centrally controlled economies, and the rise of market-based economies;
- the emergence of new democracies.

On the negative side Ms. Ballantyne noted continuing poverty and civil strife, malnutrition and poverty as lasting challenges to developing nations and to donors. She added that the manner of providing food aid had changed: moving beyond "quick fixes" towards sustainability. This sustainability, she said, would be the theme which the three panelists would address.

Ms. Ballantyne proceeded to introduce the first panelist, **Per Pinstrup-Andersen, Director General, International Food Policy Research Institute IFPRI, Washington, D.C.,** began by congratulating USAID for its Food for Peace program and the large number of people whom the program has helped to survive and thrive. He emphasized three basic points.

1. Food aid is an important resource for emergency relief and for development. Though food aid has received criticism arguing that it does more damage than good, its usefulness depends on effective application. This application depends on integration into a broader strategy for recipient countries.

2. Research at IFPRI for the last ten or 15 years shows that in most developing countries, agriculture is the most important lead sector for sustainable economic growth and alleviation of poverty. The most efficient way to promote this growth is to promote small-scale farming. IFPRI research shows that investment in farming on this scale yields very large multiplier effects for the rest of the economy. Research in Africa and Asia shows a doubling in non-agriculture income for every dollar of increase in farmers' incomes. Meanwhile, virtually all low-income developing countries with stagnant economies have exploited or ignored agriculture.

While food aid can depress prices, as it did in Somalia, this can be avoided by using the resource as part of an integrated package. Another source of depressed farm prices is unfair trade practices resulting from large subsidies given to farmers in the U.S., Europe, Japan, Korea and other countries. These subsidies make it difficult for developing countries to export competitively, and lead to reduced agricultural investment by farmers and, more importantly, by governments and financial institutions. These are problems resulting not from food aid but from artificially low prices, and they are very harmful to developing countries.

3. The rapid increase in emergency relief, in absolute terms and relative to development, is a serious concern. Such relief is very costly and comes too late. The magnitude of emergencies today indicate insufficient investment in development, especially in agriculture, in which only a handful of countries are investing. It is crucial to increase agricultural productivity and to reduce the risks of food production through investments in rural infrastructure.

   To achieve this, it is important to help farmers produce more per unit of resource than they have at hand. This requires agricultural research to generate new technology and more productive crops at a lower cost; for example, drought resistant crops. It requires improved credit programs oriented for consumption, rather than production (IFPRI research shows this to be more effective for ensuring food security than schemes for production).

   Additionally, it is important to focus on labor-intensive infrastructure projects. IFPRI research in 30 countries has shown how to design such projects efficiently. These projects accomplish two objectives; they target food security for the rural poor, and they build infrastructure. They can be financed by monetization in areas where markets work, and by cash where they do not.

   Finally, food aid can improve human resources through school and preschool feeding, which increase learning capacity and thus productivity.

In order to meet food security needs without depressing prices, Mr. Pinstrup-Andersen said, development professionals must fill needs that the hungry cannot express, putting more food in the market while creating an increased demand for food. This requires targeting efforts towards those households whose need exceeds their purchasing power.

Mr. Pinstrup-Andersen concluded by stressing the need to move towards an integrated use of food aid within efforts to promote sustainable development and provide.

emergency relief. While applauding USAID's emergency-development continuum, he suggested adding an additional component: prevention. When that fails, emergency relief, followed by development, can be put in place. It is necessary, the speaker stressed, to integrate these concepts into food aid both in Washington and in recipient countries.

Ms. Ballantyne next introduced **John Donnelly, deputy executive director of Catholic Relief Services, Baltimore, MD.** Mr. Donnelly congratulated conference organizers and acknowledged the importance of all food aid workers, stating that the occasion felt like a homecoming. He stated his intention to reflect on the history and future of food aid.

Mr. Donnelly defined "sustainability" as moving support from external to internal sources. Food aid, by that definition, becomes a part of the culture where it is received.

Food aid, Mr. Donnelly said, has always been a resource. It began as a lifesaving resource, moved to a development tool, and presently, is becoming integrated into global issues: environment, democracy, and growth. All food aid workers, including PVOs, government agencies and international donors, have undertaken this evolution simultaneously, as part of the maturing of food aid, in a continuum of application.

Mr. Donnelly urged consideration of a common thread as vital as the new global issues, and one with direct effects on sustainable growth: reconciliation. Sustainability, he said, demands tolerance of race, religion and color. It represents a movement away from an understanding of the world in terms of power. He mentioned Rwanda as a country which underwent growth and peace, but not tolerance.

Without the incorporation of reconciliation into sustainable growth, Mr. Donnelly warned, all development is tenuous--in danger of being lost. He stated that reconciliation was the new concept for the nineties, as relief had been for the sixties, and development for the seventies and eighties.

Mr. Donnelly said that CRS had enjoyed unique experiences in a kind of beginning of reconciliation, in demobilization and reintegration of army personnel. He suggested that development specialists look to the lessons learned in South Africa, where they broke through cultural barriers to create a win/win situation. In this situation, there is no need for a winner or for a loser--a loser who one day might try to win, resulting in the loss of sustainable growth.

Monday, September 19
Panel Discussion: The Changing Role of Food Aid in Sustainable Development

The last speaker for this panel was **Lynnett M. Wagner, Acting Deputy Administrator for the Foreign Agriculture Service, International Cooperation and Development Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Washington, D.C.** Ms. Wagner discussed the changes in the implementation of PL 480 from its inception in the 1950s through the 1990 Farm Bill, so as to understand upcoming discussions for the 1995 Farm Bill.

1950s: bipartisan agreement to use U.S. agricultural productivity to feed developing nations and reduce surpluses, originally through "cash on the barrel" sales for local currencies. Over 20 uses for local currencies were authorized for PL 480 funds, including scientific research, market development, rescue of antiquities, and loans to private sector businesses.

1959: long-term dollar credit, with payment terms of up to 20 years) financing a mix of programs.

1966: Production and supply approached balance; Congress rewrote PL 480 to combine long-term dollar credit sales with local currency sales into a new Title I program emphasizing self-help and development (which participating countries would agree to carry out).

1975: early steps in Title III program, allowing in-country agricultural development and world programs to be used as payment of Title I loans.

1985: amendments to the 1985 Farm Bill allowed local currency to be used as payment for Title I commodities, and then be lent back through private banks for private-sector agricultural and rural development. This arrangement encountered problems because of the weakness of the banking sectors in Title I countries.

1990: comprehensive reorganization of PL 480 through the Farm Bill revisions, in which Congress distinguished between developmental objectives (Title III) and marketing objectives (Title I). The 1990 revision of the Farm Bill also included modification of USDA's Food for Progress program, intended to encourage private sector agricultural development in emerging democracies. Title I funds support part of this program.

The result of these revisions is a PL 480 program in which USAID administers Title III funds, and USDA administers Title I funds, in separate sets of countries. For the past 40 years, concessional food aid has been used in two ways for development: by using U.S.-administered local currencies directly; and by leveraging commodity sale proceeds to

Monday, September 19
Panel Discussion: The Changing Role of Food Aid in Sustainable Development

fund development programs with joint U.S./host country administration. Both will continue in the 1995 Farm Bill.

Ms. Wagner cited several questions which will come up during the Farm Bill discussions:

- What role will agriculture play within USAID development programs?
- What role will sustainable development play?
- How can sustainable development mesh with USDA's goals?
- How will food aid address these questions?

Ms. Ballantyne then opened the floor for a question and answer period, summarized below.

Q: (Art Silver, USAID Asia/Near East) If the chief restraint on agricultural productivity is poor policy, why narrow policy to use food as food? And if 700 million people go to bed hungry because they can't afford food, why increase productivity instead of increasing incomes?

A: (Pinstrup-Anderson) On the first question, there is a need to target groups specifically. There is a danger that governments can misuse food aid, and that is why we need to incorporate food aid into a broader strategy.

Regarding the second question, we need to help extremely poor people generate more income, and to do this we would start with small-scale agriculture. We have to go for growth in those sectors where it matters most.

Q: (Dave Garms, Food for Peace, U.N., Rome, Italy) How do we get beyond emergencies to identify ways of preventing crises in the future?

A: (Donnelly) We need to focus on why emergencies keep happening.

(Pinstrup-Anderson) We need to focus on who can keep disasters from turning into famine, and that's the households. Usually they can cope with the first famine, but not the second; we need to increase the coping ability of low-income families. We also need to focus more on early warning. There's usually smoke before the fire breaks out.

Monday, September 19
Panel Discussion: The Changing Role of Food Aid in Sustainable Development

(Wagner) We need to look at long-term strategies and see how development goals (USAID) can work with market strategies (USDA).

Q: (Tom Marchione, USAID) In looking for a return on U.S. investment, some countries are excluded because of their low potential for return. What tradeoffs are we making in terms of low versus high-potential areas, especially in the context of preventing disasters?

A: (Pinstrup-Anderson) It depends on your goal. If it's to produce more food, your best return is from high-potential areas. If it's to alleviate poverty and protect natural resources, producing food is a means, not an end, and you should go to low-potential areas. And that's where most of the poor people are. But we can't leave high-potential areas without any investment; for one thing there are problems with overuse of water which affects the low-potential areas. For another thing, we're going to have massive migration to cities in the next 30 years, and a high-potential irrigated area would have to feed them. So you need a balance.

Q: (Comment) Ethiopia is a country with serious production problems which will be familiar to many field people. We need to increase production, and we need the resources from Washington to do that. Also, I'd like to see IFPRI come to USAID with an agenda, to say exactly what you need to increase productivity: the first thing; the second thing; and make that conditional for a Title III grant.

Q: (David Atwood, USAID Bangladesh) The proposed draft paper narrows food aid's focus to activities supporting nutrition and agricultural productivity. What are other donors doing in response to the continuing needs for agricultural productivity?

A: Support will probably increase in Germany and Japan, and the World Bank has set aside $2.5 billion for agricultural research. So the trend to cut back on agriculture investment may be reversing.

(Wagner) We're also watching what's happening with international financial organizations. And we're seeing more links among international organizations.

Q: (Ben Muskovitz, Food for Peace) What will the new GATT legislation do to food security in developing countries?

A: (Wagner) There would be little short-term effect, because tariffs will be phased in gradually. As time goes on, the increase in food prices may encourage productivity.

Monday, September 19
Panel Discussion: The Changing Role of Food Aid in Sustainable Development

(Pinstrup-Anderson) We would expect a negative short-term effect in net importing countries, but higher prices would probably increase productivity in and outside the agricultural sector. We need to watch what happens in Eastern Europe and China. If Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union install effective reforms, they could become major food exporters, which would depress prices.

Q: (Michael Amedee-Geodeon, USAID Haiti) How can you apply the principle of reconciliation when food aid beneficiaries are being repressed?

A: (Donnelly) I don't have a concrete answer, but we could still look at the example of South Africa. We must address this issue, coming at it so there is a common interest or a mutual gain. Otherwise, the oppressed will become terrorists and repressors themselves.

Following this final question, Ms. Ballantyne closed the second session for a lunch break.

Monday, September 19
Panel Discussion: Bridging the Gap Between Emergencies and Development

Lois Richards introduced the panel moderator, **Richard McCall, Chief of Staff at USAID.** Mr. McCall began by describing the discussion of the emergency/development gap as "timely." Because of today's complex disasters, he said, we can no longer desegregate relief strategies from development strategies, and must address the root cause in a series of simultaneous interventions.

Mr. McCall then introduced the panelists. The first to speak was **Julia Taft, President and CEO of InterAction (the American Council for Voluntary International Action), Washington, DC.** Ms. Taft began by relating an experience during her earlier tenure at the Office for Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) during which repeated plagues of locusts caused her to realize that the locusts represented a development problem and not a disaster, though it was easier to view as a disaster than to tackle problems with structure, training, and resources related to integrated pest management.

Ms. Taft described the emergency/development continuum not as a linear approach, but as a circular one; relief leading to recovery and development, but with a constant view on how each stage in the cycle relates to the other stages.

The panelist's main theme was the Title II development program and how it can reduce or mitigate the effects of drought or famine. She cited the increased money being funnelled into Sub-Saharan Africa for emergency programs. Title II programs could be used for a number of interventions including food-for-work (water and soil conservation, terracing, road-building), monetization (cash for work or food transfer), which is an especially interesting option for NGOs. Ms. Taft added that such programs needed careful monitoring so as not to depress local food prices.

In order to ensure the sustainability of both approaches, it is essential to ensure:

- that the external food resource is not the dominant characteristic
- that the community participates
- that the process develop the capacity of local partners, which increases the sense of community ownership.

A problem with Title II, Ms. Taft said, is its inflexible implementation regulations; this issue must be resolved. She concluded that it is vital to stop viewing various specialists (disaster, relief, development) as members of different categories. This categorization is reflected in USAID personnel policy, which leads to a low rate of promotion for disaster specialists.

Monday, September 19
Panel Discussion: Bridging the Gap Between Emergencies and Development

Mr. McCall next introduced **Margaret Tsitouris, Director of the Regional Management Group at CARE, Atlanta.** Ms. Tsitouris briefly described the evolution of CARE and the strategies it uses to reach its goals. CARE began in 1946 as a relief agency, sending provisions in the well-known "Care package" during the European recovery. The organization also responded to PL 480 by expanding its programs to encompass relief and development. CARE separated the functions, focusing on logistics, commodity management, and transportation for relief, and mother/child programs for development. The organization then responded to the need to work with disasters and refugees. Seeing the interdependent relationship between development and relief, CARE developed three strategies to achieve balanced goals within the continuum: *livelihood provisioning; livelihood protection;* and *livelihood promotion.*

Livelihood provisioning addresses relief for quick-and slow-onset emergencies and chronic emergencies. To provide better relief, CARE plans for disasters, looks for early warning signs, and acts to utilize local capacities. The relief strategy includes infrastructure development by disaster victims, paid with food or cash rather than free food. CARE has several such programs functioning effectively in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, and Tanzania.

Livelihood protection strategies enhance community resiliency by protecting household livelihood systems. This prevents erosion of productive assets and helps households recover from emergencies. Activities include child survival and infrastructure programs, and soil/water conservation, as well as establishment of early warning systems. These strategies speak to recovery as well as resilience. CARE has provided such assistance effectively in Somalia, and plans to provide it in Rwanda.

Livelihood promotion aims at sustainability. It includes improved production, alternative income-generating activities, improved food storage, programs for health and sanitation, and promotion of family planning. These activities decrease the impact of disasters and increase communities' ability to recover. As part of this effort, CARE has carried out rapid food assessments in Honduras and Afghanistan, and plan others in Mozambique, Somalia, and Guatemala. CARE also plans to study families in Thailand, and their reactions when AIDS affects a family.

The next panelist was **Ted T. Morse, Director of USAID's Greater Horn of Africa Task Force, Washington, D.C.** Mr. Morse focused on eight principles necessary to bridge the relief/development gap:

- assume the existence of a continuum between relief and development.

Monday, September 19
Panel Discussion: Bridging the Gap Between Emergencies and Development

- integrate the tools of relief and development, such as water, food, and so on.
- address the root causes of disasters simultaneously. In 25 years Ethiopia has undergone an oil shock, droughts, and revolutions, and underlying problems of land reform and population control have never been addressed.
- agree on a common objective in setting goals and targeting root causes.
- build a capacity to cope; assume that some areas will be subject to prolonged, recurring crises.
- staff international organizations, or mandate structural changes, so as to facilitate action.
- adopt clear funding guidelines with sufficient flexibility for partners to use.
- desegregate and define conditions and activities throughout the development continuum; assume a condition not of stability, but of *instability*, and determine how to work with that instability.

Moderator Richard McCall introduced **Daan Everts, Deputy Executive Director for Operations at the World Food Program, Rome, Italy.** Mr. Everts paid tribute to America's pioneering role in food aid. His presentation consisted of seven caveats on the relief/development continuum.

- statistics on the prevalence of emergency funding can be misleading; some emergency funding goes for work which is essentially geared for development, and vice versa.
- a variety of sources for funding is a positive (if complex) thing, which increases the value of sum efforts.
- the relief/development continuum is not a new idea.
- only limited development-oriented activities can take place during emergency relief; survival is a development investment; do not belittle relief work.

Monday, September 19
Panel Discussion: Bridging the Gap Between Emergencies and Development

- during return from displacement, be careful not to think of instant solutions; many "quick impact" projects for returnees collapse if they are ill-prepared. Be professional, and don't design projects top-down.

- early warning systems and disaster mitigation strategies may work for natural disasters, but many disasters, and many unpredictable ones, are man-made and difficult to prepare for.

- cost efficiency and coordination are of great concern with limited resources. Food aid professionals need to compare the costs of various delivery methods more carefully. There are coordination problems within all categories of donors and food aid organizations. When information is not shared, serious errors in food delivery are made; programs become very top-down; and struggles take place not over delivering the food correctly, but over what agency takes the lead.

Richard McCall then opened a question-and-answer session.

Q: (Dave Garms, U.S. mission to the U.N., Rome) The U.S. government's emergency response operations have gotten very complicated; there are now twelve offices reviewing food aid requests. Is anyone addressing that?

A: (McCall) There are a number of factors. The nature of disasters has changed; there are political disasters. So you have greater interest, and more interests involved, often with contradictory strategies among actors. Whenever you set up a task force you must assume that the system as it is doesn't work. You must assume that crises will continue, and change your way of working.

Q: (Andreas Lendorff, International Committee of the Red Cross) The idea of the development continuum is not new; the Red Cross has had this idea for over 15 years, and the idea is "survive today and stay alive tomorrow." In Somalia we started almost the first day with our agricultural programs. The financial coverage is a problem. Sometimes transportation costs more than the food itself. And some donors want to categorize; they'll send you to the development people, and the development people will say it's a war, it's still an emergency and send you away. My question is what do you suggest about "bridging the gap" in an urban environment like Central Bosnia?

A: (Morse) Regarding your comment on the war situation, I still think we need to define the continuum early on. We've always separated the systems; if we looked

not just at weather and food stocks but also at political and social vulnerability, we may be able to stay ahead of the curve.

(McCall) Crises are often social, political or ethnic. So you need to look at conflict resolution. And then the aid can be politicized; the food can be used to further the interests of the groups involved. The international community has to step back and see if they're part of the problem or part of the solution.

Q: USAID is facing the prospect of losing Title III, one of our most powerful tools. Is there any attempt to save it?

A: (McCall) As you know, there's been substantial reorganization going on in the Agency, and some issues didn't get our attention. We are looking at these issues now.

Mr. McCall turned the podium over to Robert Kramer for closing remarks. Mr. Kramer summed up the first day's panel events by saying that the conference was part of an effort to reinvent the way in which food aid was programmed. The participants, he stressed, were the conference's greatest resources, and that their input during the day's last event, a working group session on "bridging the gap" would be of vital importance.

Tuesday, September 20
General Reporting Session: Bridging the Gap Between Emergencies and Development

Moderator: H. Robert Kramer, Director, Office of Food for Peace (BHR), USAID, Washington, D.C.
During this session, the first of two General Reporting Sessions, conference participants reported the conclusions they reached during Monday's breakout session. Each participant was assigned to a working group focusing on one of five countries: Armenia, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Ethiopia, and Rwanda. Each of these countries shares a history of periodic major disasters stemming from a variety of causes, but resulting in chronic food insecurity. The conference provided a briefing sheet on each country containing basic information on population, social/economic conditions, and food security.

During Monday's breakout sessions, working groups discussed ways of meeting food security needs across the relief/development continuum in each of the assigned countries. They addressed the following questions:

1. Identify one or two types of major emergencies which this country faces or is likely to face within five years.

2. Describe elements of a strategy for anticipating these emergencies.

3. Should the anticipated emergencies occur, describe specific interventions for meeting immediate food aid needs as well as long-term food security goals.

Mr. Kramer opened the general reporting session by stressing the interdependence among development systems and the importance of the development continuum concept, which represents a "new conventional wisdom." He said that the Administrator of USAID, J.Brian Atwood, had promised the President and the Congress that the Agency would aim for increased food security in the Horn of Africa. Mr. Atwood expressed the urgency of "putting meat on the bones" of the development continuum concept.

Mr. Kramer acknowledged that many factors make it challenging to outline concrete strategies for achieving a relief/development continuum. These include the perceived dichotomies between development professionals and emergency specialists. To make the development continuum work, Mr. Kramer said, would require the dissolution of perceived barriers and creative thinking about using available resources, including the $400 million in Title II funds for the Horn of Africa, to address immediate and long-term food security needs.

The need for creative thinking, Mr. Kramer said, lay behind the decision to set up Monday's breakout sessions. These sessions, he said, represented the beginning of this

Tuesday, September 20
General Reporting Session: Bridging the Gap Between Emergencies and Development

difficult and creative process of forging a concrete strategy for achieving short- and long-term objectives across the relief/development continuum. Mr. Kramer asked **José Garzón (USAID Philippines), representative of the Bangladesh group,** to present the group's findings.

Mr. Garzón stated that though Bangladesh has been described as a "basket case" it is, in fact, a success story and one to which Africa specialists should look. Bangladesh, he said, owes its existence to the 1969 cyclone, the 1971 civil war, misplaced relief efforts, flooding, famine, and revolution. He noted that mismanaged relief efforts during those disasters only added to the country's chaos. The development program put in place in 1980, however, has stopped the cycle of famines, so that now, the severe disasters which occur do not become complex disasters. Mr. Garzón added that the country had become relatively stable politically, and nearly self-sufficient in rice production--largely because of a Title III program to introduce market pricing for rice and to build infrastructure. Next, he summarized the way the Bangladesh group answered the three discussion questions.

1. The most likely disasters are cyclones and floods, and the main problem is containing the effects of those disasters without the disintegration of development efforts such as Title II and Title III programs and family planning, all of which are necessary to increase production, decrease population pressure, and generally stabilize the country's ability to respond to inevitable disasters.

2. Strategies for disaster preparedness (some are already in place) include:
   - a system of pre-qualifying NGOs for disaster grants, prepositioning disaster supplies, especially oral rehydration supplies from the family planning program.
   - expanded credit systems: though women's development programs and NGO credit systems exist, they reach only 20 percent of the population. Credit systems need to become more sustainable, and to establish more stable interest rates.
   - data collection. This especially includes nutritional surveillance, for disasters can have severe effects on particular groups even when the overall recovery goes well.

3. Specific interventions for Bangladesh include:
   - a combination of Title II and Title III programs, including direct intervention including credit, nutritional surveillance, pre-positioning supplies, and a

Tuesday, September 20
General Reporting Session: Bridging the Gap Between Emergencies and Development

contingency fund so the Mission can issue quick disaster grants while awaiting Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance funding.

- continuing, long-term development (5 to 10 years), which has historically worked better than disaster relief.

The next to speak was the representative for the Bolivia working group, **Sal Pinzino, USAID Bolivia.** Mr. Pinzino summarized his group's answers to the three questions:

1. Likely disasters for Bolivia include droughts, floods, and economic crises, also called structural readjustment.

2a. (Flood and drought) Anticipatory strategies and interventions include:

- policy dialogue and reform with the Bolivian government (through Title III programs) to address laws on forestry, land tenure, and natural resource management, and the enforcement of those law.

- sustainable agricultural development and agricultural practices through the new Title III program, focusing on peasant farmers in the valleys and altiplanos.

- infrastructure development, also through Title III. Mainly this would mean development of irrigation and road systems.

- intensified research on drought-resistent crops and techniques for increasing agricultural productivity.

- familiarity with all actors likely to respond in the event of an emergency, including government, private, PVO, and other groups. Knowledge of high-risk areas and of the local resources and infrastructure for disaster response is vital, as is training for long- and short-term preparedness.

- decentralization of services. A new law redistributing the tax resource base to municipalities, based on local populations, will be a valuable resource for Title II and III projects, and can provide additional activity funding.

- pre-positioning of commodities in case of an emergency, and emergency funding reserves. There also needs to be an early warning system, and improvement upon the existing Civil Defense disaster preparedness plan.

Tuesday, September 20
General Reporting Session: Bridging the Gap Between Emergencies and Development

2b. (Economic disaster or structural adjustment) Anticipatory strategies and interventions include:
- diversification of industry and agriculture.
- micro-enterprise development, especially reorienting the urban poor away from Food for Work and towards micro-enterprise.
- coordination of resources. USAID Food for Work programs complement PVO infrastructure building programs in 8 major cities and nearly 100 small towns in Bolivia. Continuing coordinated Title II, Title III, and balance of payment resources will help achieve a substantial impact on long-term food security.

3a. Specific interventions for short- and long-term food security in the face of flooding and drought include:
- watershed management, reforestation, soil conservation.
- community-level activities focused on fair resource distribution.
- pre-positioning of relief supplies, including seeds and tools.

3b. Specific activities targeting structural reform include:
- microenterprises and credit.
- policy reform.
- price stabilization.
- coordination with donors.
- infrastructure and community development activities.

Mr. Kramer asked the representative for **Ethiopia** to speak next. He added that while the two previous countries, Bangladesh and Bolivia, had received stable funding for decades, through all available resources, Ethiopia had received more intermittent PL 480 funding.

Charles May, USAID Mali represented the Ethiopia group.

1. The types of emergencies Ethiopia is likely to experience include:
- agricultural production shortfall. This could occur without the usual causes such as pest infestation or drought, because of the structural weakness of this country's agricultural sector.
- politics, including instability, poor policy formation, and slow implementation of good policy.

Tuesday, September 20
General Reporting Session: Bridging the Gap Between Emergencies and Development

2. Strategic elements for anticipating these emergencies include:
   - budgetary stability.
   - commitment to long-term development, and designing interventions for short-, Medium-, and long-term needs.
   - determining the sequence of implementation: what interventions should occur, and in what order.
   - policy dialogue, with the government and with partners.
   - democratization and free speech; this last is especially vital in spreading information about emergencies and in pushing political systems to respond.
   - market-oriented approaches as part of an overall strategy.
   - donor coordination at the home office and in the field.

3. Specific interventions include short-term, medium-term, and long-term activities:
   - short-term: emergency interventions--Food for Work; Cash for Work; employment guarantee schemes; and especially water and sanitation.
   - medium-term: information systems (including early warning systems and also social, cultural, and political elements); training; pre-positioning of emergency stocks; and the ability to replenish these stocks locally.
   - long-term: natural resource management (including land tenure, population, soil degradation, restocked herds, and agricultural research), economic growth (including consideration of livestock, cotton, and coffee for export), transportation infrastructure; and focus on political stabilization (including education, identification of local leaders, and reintegration of soldiers, possibly through food for guns or cash for guns).

Mr. May added that in Mali, Title III resources are used to deal with strategic elements of policy dialogue, donor coordination, economic reform, and early warning systems.

The next to speak was **Larry Messerve, USAID Abidjan.** His group discussed **Rwanda.** Mr. Messerve said that in Rwanda's case it was sensible to talk of days, weeks, or months rather than years, and that a further outbreak of civil strife was likely.

His group found that Rwanda required more than humanitarian aid, but needed to address underlying problems: one of the world's worst AIDS problems; high population; unresolved land tenure issues; the status of the army. The present purely humanitarian effort, the group found, was unsustainable.

The group found that Rwanda's unusual case required radical solutions:

Tuesday, September 20
General Reporting Session: Bridging the Gap Between Emergencies and Development

1. The international community needs to set up dialogues with the Rwandan government and get them to set up a plan for reintegration, peace and reconciliation, human rights monitoring, and restructuring of the army to make it more representative of the population. This would also involve the input of neighboring countries, especially Zaire.

2. Donors should form a consensus on what types of programs they could implement, and should make assistance conditional on certain goals. If conditions were not met, a radical solution might ensue, including:
   - expelling Rwanda from the U.N.
   - imposing a form of trusteeship, perhaps through another African country.

3. Specific interventions might include:
   - creating incentives for refugees to return.
   - boosting food security by providing seeds and tools; Rwanda has one advantage in that it is a very fertile country.
   - monitor human rights, perhaps through a group like Africa Watch.
   - deploying U.N. forces in Rwanda and at its borders.
   - creating the conditions necessary for the country to function, such as schools, health services, family planning and AIDS awareness programs, and restoring governmental function.
   - coordination of help from donors, and support from neighboring countries and the church network.
   - as a short-term solution, revive the agricultural sector, which provided the country's basic employment.
   - carry out a food needs assessment, including data collection to identify particularly needy groups.
   - implement food aid, including direct feeding, school feeding, large-scale Food for Work.
   - use surpluses from nearby countries, such as maize from Uganda.

Mr. Kramer introduced **Ben Muskovitz, Food for Peace,** representing what he called the most difficult country, **Armenia.**

1. Mr. Muskovitz said that Armenia represented a good example of a former Eastern Block country in that it is a very sophisticated and fairly well developed socially and economically. This country, he added, brings up the issue of allocation of resources and illustrates how political forces can shape the way food aid does business. Conditions leading to potential disaster include:

Tuesday, September 20
General Reporting Session: Bridging the Gap Between Emergencies and Development

- Armenia is a food deficit country, dependent on wheat, which they once received from the Soviet Union. Now the country must import bread, and there is no currency reserve.
- large numbers of at-risk populations who have become dependent on a social services system which no longer exists.
- pleasant summers but acutely cold winters.
- civil strife, presently with Azerbaijan (this is typical of countries in this region). The country is landlocked, blocked by Azerbaijan, Turkey, and Iran; humanitarian assistance can come only by way of Georgia.

2. Strategies for addressing emergencies include:
   - assessment of needs; there has been little USAID presence to date in Armenia.
   - assessment of the political situation and where U.S. money is going (it might be buying arms).
   - assessment of where aid to Armenia fits in with U.S. aims.
   - identification of past and current market situations. (Eastern Block countries have relied on others to provide for their needs; entrepreneurial behavior is lacking.)
   - coordination with other donors, and establishment of standards for implementation, accountability, and monitoring to keep track of assistance in a country where the infrastructure is falling apart.
   - use of local currency from PL 480 programs to support agricultural extension (productivity has fallen drastically since the breakup of the Soviet Union).

3. Specific interventions, Mr. Muskovitz said, were all short-term. Eastern Block countries are unique in that short-term intervention, properly implemented, can have a positive long-term impact. These interventions include:

   - food aid targeted directly at vulnerable groups.
   - policy dialogue to focus government attention on short-term needs, then withdrawal of relief programs followed by implementation of development programs.

Mr. Kramer closed the reporting session, which ran past the time allotted for questions. He noted the variety of strategies the groups had devised to meet their countries' varying conditions, the range of resources available, and the limitation of USAID intervention in certain political circumstances. He stressed the need for just this sort of dialogue and suggested that they be further explored, perhaps in regular regional meetings.

Tuesday, September 20
Panel Discussion: A New Vision for Food Aid and Food Security

The panel's moderator was **Carol A. Peasley, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Africa, USAID, Washington.** Ms. Peasley noted the importance of linking relief and development efforts, and also of integrating food aid into broader development strategies. She said that the new draft policy paper represented an approach to that goal. Ms. Peasley said that the session's principal speaker, **Carol Lancaster, Deputy Administrator of USAID (Washington),** had played an important role in the Agency and in the increased prominence of food aid in policy deliberations.

Ms. Lancaster began by praising food aid as an extraordinary program which not only used agricultural surpluses but offered them to other countries for a variety of reasons. The program worked so well that it became unnecessary in countries like Israel, Chile, and Korea, which now not only feed their own people, but also buy U.S. commodities. Today, she said, the food aid program has changed. She stated her purpose: to explain the changes which had come about and how they led to efforts to develop a draft paper on food aid and food policy. She emphasized that the policy paper was a draft, and had been presented at the conference (and at missions) expressly to receive comments and reactions. She also praised USAID's Lois Richards and Len Rogers, who helped write the policy paper.

The first reason for drafting a new policy paper, Ms. Lancaster said, was the nature of the world food situation. The problem is *not* producing enough food to feed the world; that has been done. Ms. Lancaster cited three short-term challenges:

1. The 800 million people in the world who are still malnourished.

2. The great number of food emergencies due to man-made and natural disasters. Ms. Lancaster described the amount of money being spent on emergencies as "absolutely staggering" and also noted fears that these emergencies may increase in the future.

3. The need to meet food emergencies at a time when dollar resources are limited and surpluses are no longer available. Also involved with this challenge is providing food and relief without exacerbating the emergency, and how to encourage people to stay and continue producing, so as not to lose assets.

Ms. Lancaster also mentioned what she called a medium-term problem: uncertainty of the effects of the GATT agreements on the market. This uncertainty, she said, mandates increased focus on those countries which have difficulty responding to incentives which higher prices create. For example, reduced grain subsidies in the U.S. and Europe may

result in smaller production, and this may raise the world price for grains. This may cause difficulties for developing countries, especially those in semi-arid areas.

The long-term problem, Ms. Lancaster said, is the familiar one of ensuring that the world will be able to continue producing adequate food supplies for the next 40 or 50 years. Uncertainty about long-term food security stems partly from population growth and from uncertainty in agricultural productivity. A third factor is development in very large countries like China or Russia, and what might happen if incomes rise in a country like China and the demand for beef rises. In summary, Ms. Lancaster, said, the Agency needs to address food emergencies, identify pockets of hunger, and target long-term agricultural productivity.

Ms. Lancaster added that domestic situations also contributed to the need for a new food policy. These included:

1. Elimination of domestic agricultural surpluses.

2. Drastic cuts in Title III funding, which has been reduced by half in the past two years.

3. The Office of Management and Budget's ceiling on the 150 account, which now trades dollar aid directly against food aid in the federal budget. Ms. Lancaster added that transportation and subsidies make food dollars more expensive than other aid dollars.

4. Critical Government Accounting Office reports, some justified, Ms. Lancaster said.

5. Upcoming discussions on the farm bill. The 1995 reauthorization, Ms. Lancaster said, affords an opportunity to rethink food aid. The Agency would like to use this opportunity to design a proposal for a revitalized food aid program, one which they can show to the USDA, the Office of Management and Budget, and Congress.

All these reasons, Ms. Lancaster said, compelled the Agency to clarify and focus food aid on a limited number of objectives. This will require a capacity to show results: to be able to evaluate and analyze results before the Congress.

Ms. Lancaster said that the new policy paper focuses its program in two ways: to focus food aid on food-deficit countries; and to focus resources on activities involving food productivity and nutrition. These two factors provide greater coherence for food policy--

a coherence, she added, which General Accounting Office reports described as lacking. The policy writers included food and nutrition because food is often the key input of many programs, certainly of nutrition programs, but also of programs to increase agricultural productivity. Concentrating on food deficit countries is a way of ensuring that food provided is also food needed.

Ms. Lancaster said that though agriculture and nutrition remain important for USAID programs, they have been, and probably will continue to be, under-funded. Food aid may be a way of supporting agricultural programming. She mentioned an additional factor in budgetary restriction: but hard and soft earmarks require the Agency to program money in certain areas, diverting it from others. While programming focus is not a straitjacket, there will be more funding for food aid in Africa, and somewhat less in Latin America.

Briefly Ms. Lancaster mentioned other important elements in the policy paper. One was the integration of food aid into USAID mission strategies; missions will be expected to submit these, and food aid, or food security, will be part of strategic frameworks. The new policy will require indicators of results. It will also require closer collaboration and harmony between the missions and their partners, and greater flexibility for partners in programming food aid.

Ms. Lancaster repeated her desire for input on the policy paper, which was to undergo revision beginning the following week. She concluded by saying that food aid has arrived at a watershed. It is time to make a case for food aid which Congress and the public will accept. If that does not happen, food aid programs will continue to diminish; if it does, there will be cause for celebration in another 40 years.

Carol Peasley introduced the first panelist, **Curtis Schaeffer, Director of the Food Security Unit at CARE (Atlanta, Georgia).** Mr. Schaeffer began by saying that CARE has wrestled with the concept of food security for some time, and that there is much confusion over what food security means and over its practical implications at the field level. He commented that the draft policy was well-written and thoughtful, and raised as many question as it answers. He set out some of the concerns that the draft policy raised for CARE:

1. The focus on agricultural productivity is limiting; small farmers do not live solely from their production, and most have other off-farm sources of industry. A CARE rapid food security assessment in Rwanda, for example, revealed that while seeds and tools are important to provide, the fact that tea plantations there have closed

reduces the ability of farmers to earn sufficient income to survive; many of them depended on that extra income. Mr. Schaeffer said that CARE supports a focus on "sustainable livelihood" rather than a strict focus on agriculture.

2. The paper mentions little about urban food security, though much of Title II resources in fact go to infrastructure and other urban activities. This milieu should be addressed.

3. There needs to be a distinction between national food security and household food security. The different functions of Title III (national food security) and Title II programs need to be discussed and defined in the paper.

4. The geographical focus on Africa and Asia raises concern regarding the exclusion of other areas, such as Latin America, where pockets of food insecurity exist. He repeated Ted Morse's concern that while the Horn of Africa initiative is important, the Agency has missions in only four of 10 countries there.

5. The paper is prescriptive and top-down; CARE believes there should first be a discussion to identify food security problems and their causes, followed by development of interventions to address food insecurity.

6. The paper needs a more complete discussion of monetization, and greater flexibility in the use of monetized proceeds to support non-food development activities.

7. It is important to remember that food aid programs need good systems and competent people to manage them.

The next speaker was **Michael Frank, Director of the Office of Program Resource Management for Catholic Relief Services (Baltimore, Md.).** Mr. Frank's main topic was his concern with where food security fits in with other USAID strategies and policies. He raised the following concerns:

1. Where does food aid fit in with USAID's five pillars of sustainable development? Who will decide to support or not support a country, and will the decision be based on food insecurity or on economic factors? Once the policy is completed, where will the authority to implement it lie?

Tuesday, September 20
Panel Discussion: A New Vision for Food Aid and Food Security

2. How will the policy address the inconsistencies between food security goals and other aims? For example, why is USAID closing missions in some of Africa's most food insecure countries?

3. How will the concept of the relief/development continuum reconcile with the need to show results? In an emergency impact can be demonstrated, but in longer-term development--such as a Title II program--impact is harder to show.

4. USAID's natural desire to focus efforts for budgetary reasons pulls PVOs in the wrong direction. To reduce vulnerability to a single donor, PVOs are seeking to involve multiple donors, each with its own focus. USAID will need to build flexibility into its focus.

Finally, Mr. Schaeffer congratulated Len Rogers and other authors of the policy paper, saying that this was one of the best such papers he had seen. He also mentioned his agency's efforts to improve impact measurement, and stressed the importance of the Catholic Relief Services' efforts to increase the incomes of women. Emphasis on women's income and nutrition, he said, is integral to Title II non-emergency programs.

Moderator Carol Peasley next introduced **Len Rogers, Director of the Office of Program Planning and Evaluation at USAID (Washington, D.C.)**, and one of the principal authors of the draft policy paper. Mr. Rogers said that many of USAID's field missions had already responded to the draft. He summarized some of their main concerns, many of which parallelled concerns mentioned during the conference:

1. The paper must provide more guidance on the specific results the Agency hopes to achieve: what are specific measures of impact. (Mr. Rogers noted that other agencies which have developed ways of measuring impact quickly stand a better chance of continued funding. He also added that the paper's authors intended to address this question in subsequent drafts.)

2. The paper pays insufficient attention to income growth and access. Mr. Rogers pointed out that the paper defines achieving food security in terms of utilization, availability, and access, and addresses all three, though further drafts will need greater focus on income growth and access. Most of the poor in food insecure countries are small farmers and landless laborers, Mr. Rogers said, so that improving agricultural productivity will improve income, and expanding production will keep food prices down.

Tuesday, September 20
Panel Discussion: A New Vision for Food Aid and Food Security

3. A major concern is that the paper recognize the differences among countries and their circumstances, in order to allow flexibility to missions. While recognizing that need, Mr. Rogers said that USAID Washington is mandated to set priorities, and missions must design programs which achieve results according to those priorities. This means that if missions or PVOs feel they can achieve better impacts by prioritizing areas outside agricultural productivity and household nutrition, they receive an extra burden of demonstrating that impact. The priorities are clear, Mr. Rogers repeated, but they are not a strait-jacket, and Washington is willing to discuss alternatives.

4. Missions were concerned that the paper not oversell the flexibility of food aid. Though food aid can accomplish a great deal, it also requires complementary resources including dollar assistance, analytical skills, and management skills.

Speaker **Carol Lancaster** added that before the question and answer session, she wished to reassert the assumptions under which the policy paper was drafted.

1. In order for a policy to be effective (and to last), it must have a measure of coherence.

2. The program must demonstrate that it is achieving results, and that it represents a responsible use of funds.

3. One reason for focusing more heavily on utilization and production (rather than access) was that where chronic food insecurity exists, alternative or extra income (other than farming) is probably limited.

Ms. Lancaster added that a basic issue was the extent to which Title II non-emergency activities should be limited. It is not possible to carry out all possible activities under Title II, she said; the policy must have coherence. Funding is diminishing; the program must be made to work.

A question and answer period followed. Questions, comments, and speakers' replies appear in summary form.

Q: (Sal Penzino, USAID Bolivia: comments on the policy paper:
- the paper pays little attention to the urban poor. In Bolivia, where 55 percent of the urban population is poor, Title II activities have made very significant contributions to providing infrastructure and a safety net.

Tuesday, September 20
Panel Discussion: A New Vision for Food Aid and Food Security

Q: (Tom Johnson, USAID Honduras)
- Title III is a real concern for Honduras because it has been successful; the mission does not want to lose it. For example, agricultural production increased 7 percent in the first year of the reforms the program supported, and the proportion of poor living in program areas dropped by 23 percent. Over 6,000 hillside farmers increased their productivity by 50 percent, their incomes by more. An agricultural research program generated nearly $8.5 million and created over 6,000 jobs. The program also leveraged a $110 million agricultural sector loan from the World Bank and the IADB. These are measurable results from a Title III program.
- a question: why are there no specific criteria for achieving results? The paper says programs should have measurable results in 3 to 5 years. But with a lot of Title III assistance, that isn't realistic.

A: (Rogers) We have to balance the need to provide food aid to countries that have the greatest need, with the requirement to show results.

Q: (Dave Garms, Food for Peace, U.S. mission to the UN, Rome)
- information technology could help place food where the need is greatest.
- the paper makes no mention of international organizations; providing position papers to international organizations would help considerably.

Q: (José Garzón, USAID Manila)
- it's a good idea to give PVOs greater discretion, but missions seem to be getting less and less discretion. Missions are also asked to incorporate food aid into strategy statements and to put their money into food aid programs. There is no meaningful role for missions, and that is why they're not interested in food aid. There needs to be real decentralization of authority to the field so that missions and PVOs can put together programs that make sense for their country. That is the way to achieve partnership and integration.

Q: (Andres Landor, International Committee of the Red Cross)
- food aid is not cheap, and the cost increases even more with shipping. But many European donors deliver most of their food in the form of triangular operations. This means buying the food in neighboring countries. This gives a cost advantage, and may provide food which is more adapted to local needs.

Q: (Mike Harvey, USAID Ethiopia)
- I want to reiterate that Title II takes care of one problem, Title III takes care of another. They are both necessary.

Tuesday, September 20
Panel Discussion: A New Vision for Food Aid and Food Security

- NGO grants should be made without reference to government field missions. That is, USDA should not take over worldwide NGO grants. This is a recipe for disaster.

Q: (Joe Gettier, REDSO, Nairobi)
- the Food for Peace office operates on a very small staff: 35 people responsible for an $800 million budget, 5 people responsible for a $420 million emergency budget. Will there be an increase?

Q: (Kate Johnson, USAID, a nutritionist)
- the paper needs to strengthen the importance of good nutritional practices already in place, such as breast feeding. Also, is there a policy regarding the distribution of infant formula in emergency situations?

A: Not that I'm aware of.

Q: (Tracy Atwood, Office of Agriculture and Food Security, Global Bureau, USAID)
- the paper's emphasis on food aid programming in countries where there is a food gap leaves out a country like India, where there is enough food as a whole, yet the country has the largest malnourishment in the world.
- the paper should include efforts to make markets work, because food could moved from other countries, where there are surpluses, if marketing systems began to function.
- don't say, as the paper does, that there is a need for more funding for agriculture but there isn't going to be any. At least make the argument.

Q: (Heather Goldman, USAID India)
- in India we have gone through the strategic planning process, and we have decided to use food aid resources to support population control and women's empowerment.
- in a country as big as India, impact indicators are vital.

Carol Peasley cut the question and answer session short so that **Carol Lancaster** could make concluding remarks. After thanking conference participants for their thoughtful commentary, Ms. Lancaster made brief replies to some of the questions and comments which came up.

- there will be no radical increases in the Food for Peace staff.

Tuesday, September 20
Panel Discussion: A New Vision for Food Aid and Food Security

- to Dan Shaughnessy's question on tradeoffs between PL 480 programs and dollar programs: that the program is already diminishing is even more reason to provide evidence of the program's value and impact.

- it is important to program food aid in conjunction with broader program objectives.

- regarding flexibility for mission programming: Washington has a mandate to set up policy objectives and parameters. Missions have the flexibility to program against agreed parameters and objectives. Activities aren't Washington-driven or mission-driven; we hope that they are a collaboration.

- regarding the wish for more money supporting agriculture: it would be nice. There is a semantic problem; this paper is a policy paper, but it is not an overall strategy. Food security is broad enough to be sustainable development. There are strategies in the missions, which might not correspond exactly with our overall strategies. We have to make tradeoffs, and focus what we do, otherwise we have difficulty justifying our existence as an agency.

Mr. Kramer closed the session thanking the participants for their comments, which he said would result in a more informed policy paper. He also provided a preview of the afternoon sessions, which would deal with legislative issues surrounding food aid.

Tuesday, September 20
Panel Discussion: Legislative Issues--Food for Peace

Mr. Kramer introduced this session as an especially important one. USAID is preparing an administrative position in advance of the 1995 reauthorization of the Farm Bill; and the panelists were to discuss various legislative aspects related to that bill. He introduced the panel moderator, **Jill Buckley, Assistant Administrator for the Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs (BLP), USAID (Washington, D.C.).**

Ms. Buckley announced that because of the GATT negotiations, three of the four scheduled panelists were unable to attend. The alternative plan, to use the session productively, was to discuss the prospects for the Farm Bill's reauthorization and the major issues, and then open the floor for questions. First, however, Ms. Buckley described her job at LPA. LPA is a merged bureau which combines public affairs with legislation to build and inform the Agency's constituency. The bureau conducts outreach to Capitol Hill, PVOs and NGOs, contractors, universities, the business community, ethnic groups, and other constituents, and aims to find out how to conduct this outreach in the most honest and transparent way possible.

The Farm Bill is not the only upcoming legislation of concern to USAID. A new bill, the Peace, Prosperity and Democracy Act (PPDA), if passed, will replace the Foreign Assistance Act. The bill has been marked up in the Senate and is now under discussion in the House; the bill will come up in January of 1995. Administrator Atwood feels this bill is a critical part of USAID's reform.

The Agency also seeks input on what position the administration should take for the reauthorization discussions. The Agency would like to incorporate Food for Peace in the farm legislation, and to put it into context with USAID's five overall targets under sustainable development: supporting economic growth, building democracies, stabilizing world population, protecting health, and providing humanitarian assistance.

Panelists, Ms. Buckley said, would discuss the major issues in the 1995 Farm Bill revisions, the timeline Congress would probably follow in pursuing the amendments, and the roles which committees, PVOs, NGOs, and the administration will play in the reauthorization. She introduced the first panelist, **Kathleen Bertelsen Moazed, Professional Staff, Subcommittee on Economic Policy, Trade & Environment, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, D.C.**

Ms. Bertelsen Moazed explained that the Committee on Foreign Affairs shares jurisdiction with the House Agriculture Committee on Food for Peace, and will begin working on the new legislation in the fall of 1994 and spring of 1995. The process will probably begin in February 1995 with discussions on Title II and Title III, and the

Tuesday, September 20
Panel Discussion: Legislative Issues--Food for Peace

committees will begin writing legislation in March and April. Ms. Bertelson Moazed emphasized her committee's desire for input from food aid professionals before writing the legislation.

The panelist mentioned what she saw as major issues in the upcoming legislation:

1. Divisions of authority in Titles I, II, and III. The goal of these divisions when they were established in 1990 was to allow each agency to manage its responsibility without interference.

2. How Title II is working for PVO partners: has their role become more constructive since the 1990 legislation, and can their input in policy formation and implementation be made more effective?

3. Funding levels, very important because PL 480 has come under attack (as have all foreign aid programs) because of budget constraints. Setting five-year levels is very important.

4. The balance between emergency and development funding.

5. Plans for a strategic food reserve, so that emergencies do not siphon funds or money from other programs.

6. How to enhance development under Title II while still meeting humanitarian needs. (A problem, Ms. Bertelsen Moazed said, is that Congress does not understand the potential power of Food for Peace in development. Congress must be educated on the importance of maintaining this balance.)

7. How is Title III working? It has worked in Ethiopia, but the Committee needs examples of other countries in which Title III has proven effective.

8. A concise definition of food security; PVO communities have complained that USAID has been unresponsive in developing this definition.

9. The need for grass roots support for food aid: letters from constituents expressing support for food aid programs or the food aid work of PVO partners. This support is vital, because food aid is poorly understood in Congress.

Tuesday, September 20
Panel Discussion: Legislative Issues--Food for Peace

Ms. Buckley introduced a stand-in panelist, **Bruce White, a staff member on the House Subcommittee on Foreign Agriculture and Hunger.** Mr. Buckley mentioned some of the ideas the Subcommittee is considering:

1. PL 480 could function as part of the development trade continuum, as a means to provide basic humanitarian needs for food security. This would be a way of achieving a series of long-term goals, including enhanced trade opportunities for countries around the world.

2. Reaching that stage would require strong development efforts; and Title I received a critical report from the General Accounting Agency. So the Subcommittee is considering developing endowments to monetize food under Title I. (These ideas might also apply to Title II.) There is discussion of a pilot, for example, to carry out

   broad-based agricultural economic development through an endowment financed by commodity monetization.

3. PVOs working in the PL 480 program have a unique relationship with USAID; the Subcommittee is considering how to best manage PVO activities under PL 480.

Ms. Buckley introduced the second panel stand-in, **Joseph A. Fredericks, Legislative Officer with USAID's Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, Washington, D.C.**

Mr. Fredericks explained the process by which the Farm Bill reauthorization works. USAID (under the leadership of Lois Richards) and USDA are discussing how the bill should be rewritten. In November or December, suggestions from both agencies will be forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget. Because food aid is a foreign aid program, the State Department will also be involved. In early 1995, preliminary hearings begin on Capitol Hill.

At present, Mr. Fredericks said, the Agency is in the process of formulating ideas, and is very interested in suggestions from all stakeholders. USAID will consult with PVOs, missions, producers, and processors, to ensure that the process goes in the right direction.

Following the panelists' presentations, Ms. Buckley opened the floor for discussion and questions. Comments and questions are summarized below.

Tuesday, September 20
Panel Discussion: Legislative Issues--Food for Peace

Q: (Arthur Silver, USAID Asia/Near East) Is it reasonable to require demonstration of measurable impact as a requirement for continued support for food aid? Things with easily demonstrated impact are not necessarily the most effective, and demonstrating impact costs money.

A. (Bertelson Moazed) Congress dislikes foreign aid, and USAID has institutional problems. Demonstrating impact may prove that activities are working and should be continued.

(Buckley) Management for results is a strategy for development, which is our business. But Congress doesn't like foreign aid because its constituents don't like foreign aid. Taxpayers are reasonable in asking for a demonstration of why they should support development, and in asking for results.

(Bertelsen Moazed) At the grass roots you can say that Americans don't like foreign aid, but do they like to feed hungry children, or see them immunized? When you break things down that way you can get support. If Congress and its constituents felt comfortable with what we're doing, that will be an important factor in their support.

(Buckley) USAID has not explained its work well; its field successes have not been publicized.

Q: (David Atwood, USAID Bangladesh) Let me explain the usefulness of Title III. It's an effective development program. Bangladesh has a real need for food, though there has been progress. Title III in Bangladesh has helped eliminate subsidies to the middle class. As a result, some members of the middle class are buying some commercially imported food. This effort also focused attention on getting food to those who really need it. In addition, Title III local currencies have helped expand government health and family planning programs. I also would like to know what the constituency for PL 480 is.

A. (Frederick) PL 480 moves almost a billion dollars of commodities overseas a year, so there are processors and producers who support it. There are also shipping organizations, because U.S. flagships move most of PL 480 commodities. The problem for Title III is that the constituents don't care where the money is programmed--under Title I or II or III. So Title III has a weaker constituency than development assistance programs.

Tuesday, September 20
Panel Discussion: Legislative Issues--Food for Peace

(White) Agricultural trade magazines often mention PL 480, and the program is a big motivator in that community. Traditional constituents are not as interested as they might be because they don't see PL 480 as a potential benefit for them. We need to highlight PL 480's potential for trade.

(Bertelsen Moazed) The chairman of our committee wants to know why we just give all those commodities away. But he likes to hear that we asked for macroeconomic reform in exchange for those commodities. So Title III is a good answer to people's complaints about foreign aid programs.

Q: (Joe Gettier, REDSO) Americans are generous to NGOs and donate large amounts to charity, and the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance is very well funded. It seems inconsistent that Congress finds food aid less worthy.

A. (Bertelsen Moazed) The problem is that everything gets lumped together as money going overseas. And the news footage helps. But people on our committee have started wondering when it's ever going to end. They get compassion fatigue. And with Title II programs, there's no disaster but there's an ongoing need, and we need a five year budget for what we think might happen.
(Fredericks) And PL 480 doesn't separate out budget functions as other budget requests do.

Q: (Rudy Vigil, USAID Burkina Faso) I'd like to comment on emergency food reserves. They're costly and management intensive, but they're very good for addressing emergencies quickly. You could reserve a percentage of your program for monetizing accounts in an emergencies, and buy grain quickly, perhaps in other countries. (It usually takes about eight months to get the commodities once a need is determined.)

A. (White) The World Food Program is doing similar things.

Q: (Roberta van Haeftner, food policy advisor, USAID Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean) I want to say more about Title III programs in Latin America. We have very good programs, we've come a long way in a short time. Title III can leverage political reform, and it works best with development assistance. We've had good success in agriculture in Honduras and Nicaragua, using Title III reforms to leverage reforms in trade policy and marketing. We have evidence of important impact on increased agricultural production in Honduras. But we've also used Title III in Nicaragua to leverage policy reforms in health care, to increase focus on water

and sanitation, which is important in food utilization and nutrition. These are wide-ranging programs, but they're integrated with mission food security objectives. And they work well with Title II programs. We've achieved measurable impact in Honduras. In summary, Title III is a very useful tool for food security.

Q: (Bob Sears, USAID/Abidjan) PVOs and missions can have legitimate differences in priorities. When that is the case, whose program is it? What is the legislative basis to answer that?

A. (Bertelsen M zed) We don't want to micromanage! Seriously, there have been complaints to us from PVOs. It's risky to generalize, but I would say the program is the PVO's with USAID oversight.

Q: (Mike Harvey, USAID Ethiopia) Will USDA be implementing Title I programs in the same places where USAID has missions? Or worse, will USDA manage programs from Washington? There is already a precedent in the Food for Progress grants to the Newly Independent States, which were done in Washington without regard to field arrangements.

A. (White) With Title I programs we are looking at countries near or at graduation from USAID programs, which might become trading partners. Also, the Agriculture Committee's feeling is that USDA has much expertise to offer; agriculture is not USAID's forte, nor is agriculture one of the Agency's five developmental pillars.

(Mike Frank, Catholic Relief Services) I work in a Baltimore soup kitchen and I'm amazed every day at the great compassion that exists in the U.S. My suggestion is that we get the public more involved in food aid programs. There's a Canadian program in which farmers contribute part of their crop for assistance. This might be a consideration as we seek public support.

(Buckley) USAID has also started a program called "Lessons Without Borders", and we did an event in Baltimore, bringing field workers to talk to people there about their common problems. In Baltimore there are problems with illiteracy, immunization; they're trying to start people with microenterprises. There are similar programs in Boston and Seattle.

Q: (Bob Sears, Food for Peace, Africa) We have a story to tell on the use of all PL 480 resources, and we haven't told it well. Several months ago we almost totally lost

Tuesday, September 20
Panel Discussion: Legislative Issues--Food for Peace

Title III; it was restored on a technicality, not because of empirical evidence. The reauthorization of the Farm Bill gives us another opportunity to improve PL 480.

Tuesday, September 20
Panel Discussion: Private Sector Involvement in the Food for Peace Program

Mr. Robert Kramer opened the afternoon's final session by saying that during this session, USAID's food aid partners including producers, processors, and shippers would discuss their view of PL 480 programs. He introduced the session's moderator, **Ellen S. Levinson, Executive Director of the Coalition for Food Aid (Washington, D.C.).**

Ms. Levinson described her work on behalf of PVOs and cooperatives which conduct overseas food aid programs under Title II and other authorities, and her role in relating their concerns to policy-makers in Congress and in the Administration. She said that she finds much consistency, despite diversity, among PVOs in that they respect each other's missions and their right to carry these missions out. Each organization, she said, is a constituency in itself, sending not only food or cash, but also the message that people care about the hungry overseas.

Ms. Levinson said that she was dismayed to see a food security policy paper which speaks of scarcity as if the U.S. did not produce enough food to supply at least a part of overseas needs. If the U.S. abandons its heritage as a provider of commodities for domestic, trade and humanitarian use, and cannot take a leading role in food security, she said, the country is taking a long step backwards. It is necessary to broaden our minds, she said, and realize that USAID's internal changes are only a part of the world of food aid. This panel, Ms. Levinson added, would introduce conference participants to part of that broader world. She first introduced **Carl Schwensen, Executive Vice President of the National Association of Wheat Growers, Washington, D.C.**

Mr. Schwensen gave a history of PL 480 from the wheat growers' perspective. In the 1950s, he said, when PL 480 was developed, wheat growers developed self-help programs to use PL 480 in overseas markets. At that time wheat exports amounted to approximately 7 million tons, with PL 480 accounting for 60 percent of product. This percentage soon grew to 75 percent. Marketing programs in Japan in the post-war era, and used farmer dollars which were later enhanced by USDA funding.

The Wheat Growers Association has 13 foreign offices serving local markets with mobile kitchens, milling and bakers' programs, and educating users with sophisticated milling and baking techniques on modern machinery. So wheat growers helped push PL 480 through Congress, and carried out demand-based programs in foreign markets. Today wheat exports have expanded almost fivefold. Although PL 480 only represents about 10 percent of wheat exports, and farmers receive less government support, wheat growers continue to support PL 480, Mr. Schwensen said.

Wheat growers will have to conform export programs to the GATT agreements, the panelist continued. Early during the negotiations, wheat growers and other farm organizations tried to recycle money which could not be spent on export subsides into designated programs, including crop insurance subsidies, agricultural research programs, and PL 480, into "green box" programs, exempt from discipline. At stake is $1.7 billion; its fate [as of September 20] is still undetermined. Also, wheat growers want to use unallocated export subsidy monies for PL 480, and spend them as quickly as possible. Major exporting countries have been buying their market share. Wheat growers look forward to satisfactory resolution of the GATT discussions.

Mr. Schwensen added that his association has held about 11 million acres (with the potential for producing 11 million tons of wheat) in semi-permanent reserve through the Conservation Reserve Program. Contracts will mature, and acreage will come back into production, in 1995. Whether the U.S. or the world market can absorb it is doubtful. The PL 480 discussions will include decisions on what to do with this acreage and the potential production it can yield.

The next panelist was **John M. Wise, Assistant Export Manager of ADM Milling Company, Inc., Overland Park, Kansas.** Mr. Wise began by stating that ADM is one of at least seven manufacturers who have provided processed, blended, fortified foods specifically for Title II programs. He described Title II as a unique program involving partnerships among industry, USAID, and PVOs. Part of ADM's role has been to help this partnership develop; another part has been continuing quality management and improvement to ensure that food aid programs run smoothly. So PL 480 is important to the food processing industry for several reasons:

1. Volume. In 1994 over a million tons of processed foods and 500 million pounds of bagatelle grains, and 300 million tons of whole grains went through Title II and the Food for Progress program.

2. Program longevity. First, PL 480 supports American interest in eliminating worldwide hunger; second, the program allows U.S. leadership in the fight against hunger.

3. Export of value-added commodities. This aspect has employment and economic spinoffs benefitting packers, transporters, railroads, stevedores, and ocean carriers.

Tuesday, September 20
Panel Discussion: Private Sector Involvement in the Food for Peace Program

These factors, Mr. Wise said, garner continuing political support for PL 480, and this support has helped make the program a strong tool for development, promotion of humanitarian interest abroad, and domestic economic growth.

Mr. Wise said that industry took a middleman role in Title II, supporting management of food programs. He cited some recent changes in the food processing industry which contribute to the delivery of higher-quality goods:

- double-sealed bags to further decrease transit losses.
- seal peel testing for mills to control the quality of packaging and seals.
- a study on the viability of vitamin A, with an eye to using vegetable oil to carry the vitamin and enhance its shelf life.
- monitoring of ship loading to prevent damaged goods from being transported overseas.
- standardized rail car loading facilities.

Mr. Wise explained that the concept of processing and fortifying food began in the 1960s and 1970s to address protein calorie malnutrition. Combining mineral and caloric enrichment with cereal and soys, he said, produced nutritive supplements useful, for example, for nursing women, without raising the cost.

The speaker acknowledged the difficulty of managing food distribution programs, and the added complication of negative public perception of foreign aid, and reiterated his industry's support of PL 480. Food as a tool, he went on, cannot replace good management; the usefulness of PL 480 programs depends on the skills, interest, and commitment of donor agencies, including USAID, to addressing hunger issues.

Mr. Wise brought up several questions and concerns concerning PL 480 and the draft policy paper:

1. How relevant is the packaging of commodities to food aid programs now and in the future? The food processing industry would like feedback.

2. Legislative minimums are more honored in the breach; if USAID will not meet these minimums and subminimums, how does that skew commodity requests for these programs? (will USAID, in trying to approach subminimum, simply fill in gaps with whole grain? This would reflect negatively on other types of processed foods.)

Tuesday, September 20
Panel Discussion: Private Sector Involvement in the Food for Peace Program

3. How can donors protect non-emergency programs while trying to meet emergency needs on a restricted budget? You can't turn a regular program on and off like a spigot and expect it to work effectively. (Mr. Wise said he doubted that Title II was originally intended for the heavy demands current emergencies are making on it.)

4. Regarding the policy paper: though the draft policy mentions that sustainable programs must be based on grass roots involvement, USAID drafted the paper top-down, without discussing issues with the volunteer community.

5. Agricultural policy is generally looked at as a residual policy; what is not used will go to export programs, which marginalizes the importance of export programs so that food aid, essentially, has been a temporary program for 40 years. There needs to be emphasis of programs like PL 480 higher in the power structure.

6. It would be useful to develop emergency food reserves to ease current strains on relief and development systems.

7. Though the policy paper emphasizes Africa, USAID is closing many of its missions. Does this mean that food programs and support for voluntary food aid agencies will also close down? Is that closedown done to support an appearance of consistency, and if so, does that not downgrade the importance of food aid programs by not evaluating them on the basis of their individual worth? Or could regional offices take over programs where missions have closed?

8. A problem with narrowing focus is that as USAID limits the basis on which it will consider programs, it may preempt innovative programs which PVOs may propose.

The next speaker was **William V. Brierre, Jr., Senior Vice President of Lykes Brothers Steamship Co., Inc., Washington, D.C.** Mr. Brierre attended the conference on behalf of the maritime liner industry. Liners provide regularly scheduled service to designated trade routes. Liners are also distinguished by the size and type of ship (container ships, multipurpose twin deckers, lash vessels, railroads, barges), and by the number of shippers represented on board (liners have multiple bills of lading to various destinations).

Lykes Brothers, founded in 1900 in Tampa by a pediatrician turned farmer turned shipper, is a part of the U.S. flag liner industry, which includes seven companies operating about 100 vessels. To increase operating efficiency, Lykes Brothers has replaced its fleets several time since it was founded in 1900. Liners have been carrying

cargo for the Food for Peace program, Mr. Brierre said, since its inception. The flag liner industry has been an innovator in carrying cargo safely to developing countries. Some of these innovations involved other industries in the transportation network, including rail, truck, inland waterway, and port systems. Liners are part of a much larger domestic constituency which has built up around Food for Peace, and which contributes billions of dollars to the U.S. economy. Mr. Brierre said he was distressed by the reduced funding and further cuts proposed in food aid. His industry, he said, will fight for increased funding for the farm bill. He added that if food aid stakeholders don't work together, they will work against each other.

The last panelist was **Constantine Papavizas, partner with Dyer, Ellis, Joseph & Mills, Washington, D.C.**, representing the bulk industry. Because of time constraints, Mr. Papavizas spoke very briefly, first noting his industry's support of PL 480. He said that about 120 bulk ocean-going ships, about one-third of the U.S. flag fleet, transported food aid during the past few years. Food aid is very important to the U.S. flag fleet, Mr. Papavizas said, and the bulk industry will support food aid during the Farm Bill discussions.

Ellen Levinson allowed time for only one question, as the session had run overtime.

Q: (Bob Sears, REDSO/WCA) If liners are replacing their fleets for more cost efficiency, why are U.S. rates so expensive?

A: (Brierre) Part of the cost is because we are U.S. flag vessels, and we have to employ American crews. This is more expensive. Also, we have had to build ships in the U.S., which is more expensive than building them abroad. It depends on what kind of business you're referring to; cargoes moving in containers or in liner parcels often move under conference rates that have a membership with foreign lines. The rates are the same. Bulk or tramp vessels, which compete in an unregulated market, will reflect company cost structures. Foreign vessels will be operating with crews of various nationalities, and will have lower cost structures.

Robert Kramer then wrapped up the day's session by thanking the panel and talking briefly about Wednesday's sessions. He stressed the need for input from the field on the draft policy paper, and said that the morning breakout sessions, in which working groups would apply questions about the policy paper to their designated countries, would help to test the policy's validity and implications.

Wednesday, September 21
General Reporting Session: A New Vision for Food Security

Country working groups convened Wednesday morning to consider how the draft USAID policy on food aid resources would affect the delivery of food and related resources in each of the five countries (Bolivia, Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Rwanda, and Armenia. This discussion was an important element of the conference as it applied field skills to examine Washington's vision of the future of food aid.

The draft policy paper lists six major points for consideration:

1. Greater priority in allocating food aid should be given to countries most in need of food, which will mean that during the foreseeable future an increasing share of U.S. food aid will go to Africa.

2. Greater priority should be given to programs focused on enhancing agricultural productivity and improving household nutrition, which will mean USAID will be better able to demonstrate the benefits food aid has for poor and hungry people.

3. Food aid should be integrated to a greater extent with other USAID resources. Food aid by itself is rarely sufficient to achieve food security objectives. Proceeds from the monetization of food should complement direct feeding programs or should be used for development programs which enhance agricultural productivity and improve household nutrition.

4. Greater attention and resources should be allocated to strengthening the program development and management capacity of USAID's food aid partners, the Private Voluntary Organizations, and the World Food Program. USAID field missions will strengthen collaboration and dialogue in working to achieve mutually agreed objectives.

5. Greater budgetary flexibility needs to be developed so that necessary resources are available to respond to emergencies without draining away food aid planned for development programs.

6. Greater priority should be given to the relief to development continuum. Food insecure countries must be prepared to cope with recurring drought and even with political conflict. Equally important, relief programs must ensure families are able to return as quickly as possible to productive lives.

Wednesday, September 21
General Reporting Session: A New Vision for Food Security

Each of the country working groups referred to these six points while addressing two basic questions:

A. Do the six statements above represent a shift of policy which will have positive effects and/or create new opportunities for your case study country?

B. Are there other significant policy and management implications from the six statements above, positive and negative, which may affect your case study country? What is the specific impact of ongoing country programs?

Robert Kramer opened the session by introducing the moderator, **Jeanne Markunas, Deputy Director of the Office of Food for Peace (USAID, Washington, D.C.).** Ms. Markunas lauded the conference as the first opportunity in many years for food aid professionals to meet and exchange views with each other, both formally at sessions and informally during coffee break. Conference accomplishments, she said, included more than celebrating the 40-year history of Food for Peace; it was also vital to be able to discuss the draft policy paper, issues for the upcoming farm bill, ways to use food aid to better support sustainable development, and the meaning of the relief/development continuum. Even so, she said, discussions only scratched the surface.

The first to speak was **Roberta van Haeftner, representing the Bolivia working group.** Ms. van Haeftner said that the new emphasis on allocating food to the most needy countries was unlikely to have a positive impact on Bolivia. There was concern in the group that Latin America had been excluded from the policy paper. The feeling was that it was necessary to focus not on a region but on food insecurity. As a whole, Africa is the most food insecure region, but parts of Latin America are extremely food insecure. This is especially the case in Bolivia, where disasters can lead to transitory food insecurity. The group felt, basically, that the paper should use food insecurity as a basis for allocating food aid. An additional criteria should be the past history of food aid impact.

There was much concern about the priority given to enhancing agricultural productivity and nutrition, and a feeling that this would again affect Bolivia negatively. Ms. van Haeftner said the proper focus would be on food insecurity, and referred to another participant's suggestion of focusing activities on recipients rather than limiting activities. The Bolivia group also felt programs should be measured and evaluated according to clear objectives.

An additional problem in the case of Bolivia, Ms. van Haeftner said, is that the paper offers no framework for the many urban poor which constitute many of Bolivia's food

Wednesday, September 21
General Reporting Session: A New Vision for Food Security

insecure groups. Nor does the paper address Bolivia's rural poor, with whom the basic cause of food insecurity is lack of land base and therefore, lack of income. Ms. van Haeftner mentioned that a restructuring of Bolivia's Title III program does focus on these two groups.

The Bolivian group responded positively, on the whole, to the paper's third point, about integrating food aid with other USAID resources. However, the group felt that the emphasis on agriculture and nutrition would make integration difficult; more flexibility would increase the chances of integration.

The group wanted to broaden the stipulation of strengthening PVO partnerships to include local partners and recipients, *including* PVOs. They also supported more training for partners, though this would be a trade-off because most PVOs want to use their funding for programs. The group felt that better management from headquarters and within the World Food Program would improve the efficiency of field operations.

The Bolivia group felt that greater budgetary flexibility would benefit their country, especially in its use of cash resources. The emphasis on the relief/development continuum concerned the group, however, because it implies a linear relationship between two states which are interrelated in complex ways. Bolivia appears to be in the development side of the "continuum." However, continuing food aid is vital to build the country's resiliency, should another disaster occur. Ms. van Haeftner concluded by saying that at this point in the paper, there should be acknowledgement of the complex factors, including political, economic, and cultural factors, that can give rise to food insecurity. Ms. van Haeftner said the phrase "the best defense is a good offense" summed up where Bolivia was in terms of development.

Ms. Markunas introduced **Heather Goldman, Food for Peace Officer, India, representing the Bangladesh group.** Ms. Goldman said that though the policy paper described an emphasis on Africa, the majority of the world's malnourished live in Asia. Bangladesh, for example, relies on donor food for its malnourished; the country needs its resources for development programs. So the policy shift towards Africa could have enormous effects, especially short-term ones, on household-level food security in Bangladesh.

The group felt that the policy's emphasis on agricultural productivity would have little positive effect if development assistance was not accompanied by monetization. In addition, the policy must be flexible enough to allow links between infrastructure development, increased agricultural productivity, and improved nutrition; and this will take time. The Bangladesh group felt, also, that the paper defined "nutrition" narrowly,

Wednesday, September 21
General Reporting Session: A New Vision for Food Security

and that this narrow definition would preclude using food resources for sudden-onset disaster response.

The group felt that food aid in Bangladesh and in Asia was integrated with other USAID resources, and that the policy stated this clearly. As to strengthening PVOs, the group felt that funding was limited, and policy authors should consider the trade-offs the policy implies for other development-supported food security efforts. Regarding strengthening the World Food Program, the group felt that USAID should consider the management and resource implications for USAID.

When discussing the point on budgetary flexibility, the group agreed that an emergency reserve was vital. They also agreed that demonstrating impact would require a commitment of 3 to 5 years or longer. A subgroup also mentioned the importance of Title III and the need for flexibility within that program to address disaster response.

As to the relief/development continuum, the group felt that Bangladesh had invested in long-term development, and exemplified a commitment to self-sufficiency in dealing with frequent natural disasters, and hoped that the new policy will not reduce support for development and thus make millions of people vulnerable to food insecurity.

Ms. Goldman said her group discussed the implications of the draft policy on Bangladesh and found that Asia and Bangladesh rated a high priority for continued efforts to achieve food security. Bangladesh will also require monetization to maximize the impact of food. Ms. Goldman illustrated her point with an anecdote: a program in a small Indian town documented steady growth rates among children receiving food aid; but suddenly the children's weight dropped sharply. The reason, she found, was an epidemic of measles; there had been no effort at immunization. This indicated, Ms. Goldman said, that it was not enough to think of food as food; the program must accommodate all areas that are important to health.

Ms Goldman concluded by saying that the Bangladesh group felt strongly that the policy paper must define and clarify the meaning of "partnerships." This clarification is crucial to the food aid program's existence and ownership as PVOs diversify their funds.

Ms. Markunas next introduced **Mike Harvey, Chief of USAID's Office of Food for Humanitarian Assistance, Addis Ababa, representing the Ethiopia working group.** Mr. Harvey commented first that the policy paper does not specify prioritizing Africa or South Asia; it specifies prioritizing those countries where food insecurity is a defining

problem. The problem, he said, lay in the phrase which followed, which said: "therefore, more food will go to Africa."

The group felt that Ethiopia would benefit from the policy's emphasis, for though the country has had good food aid support, levels have been unpredictable. The real advantage to Ethiopia, the group felt, would come from programming food on a consensus based on macro-level need indicators. This would provide predictable input. The group expressed concern about seeing good programs cut, and disliked the idea of Africa competing with other regions for funding.

The group approved of the paper's emphasis on agricultural production; this is a critical need in Ethiopia, where agricultural productivity is alarmingly low. Mr. Harvey cited the usefulness of the approaches offered by Titles II and III. However, he said the paper needs to define the roles of these two resources more closely. The Ethiopia group also discussed the importance of livestock, rather than crops, to their country's access to food. There was concern that resources would go to high-productivity villages, when food insecurity is greater in low-productivity areas.

The group approved of the emphasis on the relief/development continuum; it was largely felt that this issue was more of a problem in Africa than in other regions.

The group expressed concern regarding delegation of authority to field professionals; it was felt that food aid professionals needed to seek more approval from Washington than professionals from other fields. The group suggested that Washington allot specific amounts of Title II and Title III funds, and allow the field to determine where the funds will go, based on an approved strategic plan. This would allow flexibility for monetization and for PVO funding, as well as creative uses of resources which current regulations do not permit.

Finally, the group pointed out the inconsistency between the paper's stated intention of sending food where it is most needed, and closing missions in most of the countries where food is most needed.

The next speaker was **Robert Sears, Regional Officer of Food for Peace, USAID, Abidjan, who presented the findings of the Rwanda group.** In the interest of saving time, the group answered the first question briefly: the six policy statements represented a shift which would *not* have a positive effect on Rwanda. To the second question on policy and management implications, they shortcomings in the paper as it applied to Rwanda.

Wednesday, September 21
General Reporting Session: A New Vision for Food Security

Rwanda, the group agreed, is a man-made disaster, and this disaster has generated massive numbers of refugees who need relief. The group discussed the need to coordinate the many donors involved in Rwanda relief efforts, and commented that a governing body was necessary.

The group also felt that the policy paper did not address the way in which food aid would mesh with other multilateral agencies which USAID supports; for example, will USAID support a proposal which does not conform to Agency policy?

And following the accomplishment of immediate security goals for Rwanda, there would be a need for a transition to development, through a mix of Title II and Title III programs. Rwanda is a special case in that monetization cannot take place inside the country because of the market collapse; monetization might be shifted to a neighboring country like South Africa and its proceeds used for development and integration in Rwanda. The special case of Rwanda would also require the consent of the Rwandan government and of neighboring countries--or perhaps a temporary "colonization" by a neighbor in the event that Rwanda will not cooperate.

The group approved of the use of food resources for improved agricultural production. Necessary resources included local seeds and further cash support, and possibly, as the country goes into a transition mode, a development policy within the country. This would probably require opening a new USAID office in Rwanda. In general, Mr. Sears summarized, his group had focused on Rwanda's need for policy reform and on ways of using food aid resources to leverage that reform.

Ms. Markunas introduced **Harlan Hale, of CARE (Atlanta), as the representative of the fifth country group, Armenia.** Mr. Hale spoke first on the policy's Africa focus, saying that greater need should have more weight than geography in determining priorities. The group felt that in allocating Title III funds, macro indicators would be sufficient. However, many countries with good overall indicators house pockets of desperate hunger; therefore, to allocate Title II funds it would be necessary to target vulnerable groups within a country. Mr. Hale added that political pressure from groups in the U.S. might be a significant factor in assistance to this country.

The group felt that for Armenia, income generation was probably a more important focus than agriculture or nutrition. Members felt that the paper addresses food availability through agricultural production, and utilization through nutrition, but fails to address access or purchasing power.

The group approved of the paper's emphasis on integrating food aid with other resources. On the point about strengthening partner capacity, the group felt that local institutions should also receive attention. On budgetary flexibility, the group stressed the need for quick emergency response and suggested that USAID review administrative rules governing food resource use.

Discussing the sixth point about the relief/development continuum, the group felt that peace and reconciliation would be important to Armenia. This was not a case, Mr. Hale said, of an underdeveloped country, but of a badly developed country, in which food aid, though useful, might need to be employed in non-traditional ways.

The group responded to Question A with a qualified "yes." To Question B, the group agreed that the policy should address the role of local institutions, and that some focuses seem restrictive. This could be a problem because every situation is so different. More options, more precise wording, or examples would be helpful, they felt. In addition, the policy appears to ignore the urban poor, and to link funds exclusively to agriculture. The group felt that in order to address access, the policy must allow funds to be used to address other sources of food insecurity, such as infrastructure weakness.

A question and answer period followed the presentation of group findings. Ms. Markunas invited Robert Kramer and Lois Richards to come to the dias to participate.

Ms. Richards spoke first, responding to some of the concerns she had heard during previous presentations. She pointed out first that the food aid policy paper was derived from USAID's five strategy papers, several of which mention food security. The paper's intention, she said, is to define food insecurity more clearly. She also made the point that very few missions name food security as a mission strategic objective, though many missions receive food aid through Titles II and III. This must change, Ms. Richards said; missions will have to name food security as an objective, and it will take more than food aid to achieve that. Ms. Richards added that she would like more reliable support for Title II and Title III levels; she emphasized that Congress's sympathy and PVO activism on Capitol Hill had kept Title II levels relatively constant. Funding from Section 416, which had been a useful resource, was also disappearing; much of the changes in funding, Ms. Richards said, is beyond the Agency's control.

As to the Africa emphasis, Ms. Richards said that the paper intends to say that USAID will prioritize food insecure people. However, according to established criteria, the most food insecure populations are in Africa and South Asia, and the Agency expects to concentrate funding there. However, USAID does not wish to cut good programs.

Wednesday, September 21
General Reporting Session: A New Vision for Food Security

Regarding the discussions about the relief/development continuum, Ms. Richards said that though the term is problematic, it describes the fact that many food aid recipients are states which have failed for a variety of reasons. Addressing this failure is not solely the province of food aid, but food aid can be used to concentrate resources and donor efforts around strategies aimed at ultimate self-sufficiency for states in chaos. Ms. Richards said that food security would be a major part of this effort in Africa, whereas other countries, though more disaster-prone, had gone further in developing their own capacity to recover.

Finally, Ms. Richards responded to comments on staffing and management. The Agency, she said, has held a training program in food aid management for employees from Washington and the field, and hopes to expand this training into certification programs for food aid managers. She also acknowledged problems with decentralization and delegations of authority, due in part to the complications added by price changes, shipping, and similar logistical issues, and concluded by complimenting conference participants on their input and comments.

Robert Kramer thanked Ms. Richards and applauded her strong advocacy of food aid. He added that the afternoon session for Agency food aid managers would afford more opportunities for discussion.

Q: Art Silver, Food for Peace, USAID Near East/South East Asia) First, what is the rationale for the Africa earmark? Most of the food insecure people live in Asia, and it's people who are hungry, not countries, and just as we put population programs where the population is highest, we should put food aid where people are most food insecure.

Second: we're focusing on agricultural productivity and nutrition to be able to show impact. But being able to show impact is not necessarily the same as maximizing it.

Third: regarding the integration of food aid with other resources, it is difficult to reconcile the fact that Congressional earmarks have depleted money for agriculture (which is why agricultural activities have shifted to food aid) with the idea of integration.

Fourth: Regarding strengthening program development and management capacity, Mr. Mugo of our group suggested funding E-mail connections among the major partners of USAID missions.

Fifth: the idea of budgetary flexibility is unclear: does this mean that development assistance funds will be used for emergencies instead of food aid?
Finally: Lois's explanation of the relief/development continuum was clear and useful.

A: (Richards) I can't answer all your questions, but the question on budgetary flexibility is unclear. My earlier point was that food aid has a greater role in food security than is understood. Administrator Atwood is trying to make the case that the many earmarks are adversely affecting our ability to improve economic growth in developing countries.

(Kramer) There is a finite amount of money, so decisions must be made. But the perception that all Asian and Latin American programs will be closed is wrong. Regarding management by appearance: as Carol Lancaster said, if we can't show results, we might lose the resource, and I'd say we would deserve to. We're proud of PL 480,
and we feel that management by objectives helps us articulate our accomplishments better and increase our success.

Q: (Heather Goldman, USAID India) Lois, in some countries where survival and food security is a key objective, then food security could be a key objective. But there are other countries where food security might fit better at a program objective level, for example, to achieve population stabilization.

A: (Richards) We will probably have some rethinking about mission strategic objectives. We have less funding than we need for ongoing Title III programs; I think that if a mission doesn't prioritize food security, why should they have a Title III program? We have to look at these things; whether we can save Title III or not will be a question as we reauthorize the Farm Bill. Title III has few defenders on Capitol Hill.

Q: (Roberta van Haeftner) Our Bolivia working group discussed the question: does food security have to be a mission objective for funds to be allocated? The group said no, because food security is an integrating concept, above our strategic objectives and below sustainable development objectives. In Latin America our strategic objectives are a component of food security. In Honduras, for example, we have the strategic objective of alleviating poverty. The indicators include adequate income for adequate nutrition: the indicators are the same. This is also true for health objectives. Adequate water and sanitation, reducing child mortality, these are indicators of improved food security.

Wednesday, September 21
General Reporting Session: A New Vision for Food Security

A: (Richards) When nothing in the program mentions food security, when nothing in the PRISM [Program Performance Information for Strategic Management] system mentions food security, it's difficult to support food security at the Office of Management and Budget and the Government Accounting Office. The PRISM system is based on what missions came up with as strategic indicators. You yourselves are not making the argument. You must show how your programs relate to food security, and how your use of food will achieve food security. If you can't focus on access, availability and consumption, focus on just one, but show how your program achieves it.

A: (Kramer) The definition of food security has been far too broad; almost any activity could subsume it. We've engaged in a strategic planning process to focus our objectives; we worked with PVOs. We've just started this process. We're trying to come up with a set of core indicators for Title II and Title III--like the kind of indicators the family planning programs have had. We must be more specific, not straitjacket ourselves, but come up with generic performance indicators to define impact.

Q: My question is about a vulnerable population which has received assistance for the last 40 years, the elderly and the chronically ill, people in orphanages or AIDS hospices. It's difficult to set performance indicators, yet food keeps them alive. This problem is chronic and it's not developmental. Is there room in the Bureau of Humanitarian Response for a humanitarian program?

A: (Kramer) We recognize the importance of these programs, and they will not be cut, nor will they be expanded.

Ms. Markunas asked Mr. Kramer for a very quick adjournment. Mr. Kramer said that he had, perhaps, shown his biases as a field person by emphasizing input from food aid field professionals. However, he reiterated the importance of input from the field and said that there were too few opportunities such as this conference afforded to meet with people from all areas of the food aid program and share ideas. Nothing should be done in a vacuum, he said, and this was what made the contributions of field people, PVOs, and support organizations so important to Washington.

Mr. Kramer said the informal talks in coffee breaks and at lunch played as important a role as the formal presentations and breakout sessions. While the conference gave a good overview of PL 480 and helped clarify some of the questions surrounding it, this conference had been only a beginning--just "scratching the surface," Mr. Kramer said.

Wednesday, September 21
General Reporting Session: A New Vision for Food Security

The purpose of the event was to inform and be informed on the changes in politics, management, Congress, and world donors and how these are affecting the business of food aid. These changes are necessary, he said, not only because of the "stern challenge" from the General Accounting Office, but because changing is the right thing to do. He quoted Carol Lancaster's statement that PL 480, though an extraordinary program, will disappear if food aid professionals do not document their progress.

Mr. Kramer said that the conference events should disabuse people of the notion that food aid people are "bean counters." He echoed Administrator Atwood praise of conference participants, saying, "You, talented, dedicated professionals, are the real silent heroes. And we [at USAID] are here to support you."

In conclusion, Mr. Kramer said that he would like this to be the first of many conferences which would create an *esprit de corps* among those who work to build food security worldwide. He said he hoped that he would see participants again, perhaps at another such conference, next year.

APPENDIX A

COMMEMORATING 40 YEARS OF FOOD FOR PEACE
a Conference Sponsored by the U.S Agency for International Development
September 18 - 21, 1994
Washington, D.C.

CONFERENCE SPEAKERS

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1994

H. Robert Kramer
Director, Office of Food for Peace
Bureau for Humanitarian Response
USAID
SA-8
Washington, D.C. 20523-0807
TEL: (703) 351-0106
FAX: (703) 351-0154

M. Douglas Stafford
Assistant Administrator
Bureau for Humanitarian Response
320 21st St., N.W. , Rm. 5314 A
USAID, Washington, D.C. 20523
TEL: (202) 647-0220
FAX: (202) 647-0218

The Honorable George McGovern
Former U.S. Senator
President, Middle East Policy Council
1730 M Street, N.W. (Suite 512)
Washington, D.C. 20036
TEL:(202) 296-6767
FAX: (202) 296-5791

Lois Richards
Deputy Assistant Administrator
Bureau for Humanitarian Response (BHR)
USAID
320 21st St., N.W., Rm 5314A
Washington, D.C. 20523
TEL: (202) 647-0253
FAX: (202) 647-0218

Peggy A. Sheehan
Chief Operating Officer
National Cooperative Business Association
1401 New York Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20005
TEL: (202) 638-6222
FAX: (202) 638-1374

Willard J. Pearson
Director, REDSO/WCA
USAID/Abidjan
c/o American Embassy, 01 B.P. 1712
Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire
TEL: 011/225.41.45.28
FAX:011/225.41.35.44

Christopher Goldthwait
General Sales Manager
Foreign Agricultural Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
14th & Independence, S.W., Rm. 4071 SAG
Washington, D.C. 20250
TEL: (202) 720-5173
FAX: (202) 690-1595

Janet C. Ballantyne
Deputy Assistant Administrator, Center for Economic Growth
Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research
USAID
515 22nd St, N.W. Rm. 501
Washington, D.C. 20523
TEL: (202) 663-2288
FAX: (202) 663-2373

Dr. Per Pinstrup-Andersen
Director General
International Food Policy Research Institute
1200 17 the St, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
TEL: (202) 862-5600
FAX: (202) 467-4439

John A. Donnelly
Deputy Executive Director
Catholic Relief Services (CRS)
209 West Fayette Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
TEL: (410) 625-2220
FAX: (410) 685-1635

Lynnett M. Wagner
Acting Deputy Administrator
Foreign Agricultu. l Service
International Cooperation & Development Division
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture (USDA)
14th and Independence Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.
TEL: (202) 690-0776
FAX: (202) 720-6103

Richard McCall
Chief of Staff
USAID
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20523
TEL: (202) 736-4447
FAX: (202) 736-7665

Julia Taft
President and CEO
Interaction
1717 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036
TEL: (202) 667-8227
FAX: (202) 667-8236

Margaret G. Tsitouris
Director of the Regional Management Group
CARE
151 Ellis Street
Atlanta, GA 30303
TEL: (404) 681-2552
FAX: (404) 577-1205

Ted D. Morse
Director of the Greater Horn of Africa Task Force
USAID, Africa Bureau
515 22nd St., N.W. Rm. 301
Washington, D.C. 20523-0234
TEL: (202) 663-2595
FAX: (202) 663-2708 [663-2797]

Daan Everts
Deputy Executive Director
World Food Program
426 via Cristoforo Colombo
Rome, Italy 00145
FAX: 011/396.522.828.34

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1994

Carol A. Peasley
Deputy Assistant Administrator
Bureau for Africa
USAID
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20523

TEL: (202) 647-9235
FAX: (202) 647-7621

Carol Lancaster
Deputy Administrator
USAID
320 21st Street, NW
Washington, D.C.20523
TEL: (202) 647-8578
FAX: (202) 647-1770

Curtis Schaeffer
Director, Food Security Unit
CARE
151 Ellis Street
Atlanta, GA 30303
TEL: (404) 681-2552
FAX: (404) 577-1205

Michael Frank
Director, Office of PRogram Resource Management
Catholic Relief Services
209 West Fayette Street
Baltimore, MD 21201-3443
TEL: (410) 625-2220
FAX: (410) 234-3178

Len Rogers
Director, Office of Program, Planning and Evaluation, BHR
USAID
320 21st St., N.W. SA-8
Washington, D.C. 20523
TEL: 703/351-0102
FAX: 703/351-0118

Jill Buckley
Assistant Administrator
Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs (LPA)
USAID
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20523
TEL: (202) 647-4200
FAX: (202) 647-3945

Kathleen Bertelsen Moazed
Professional Staff
Subcommittee on Econ. Policy, Trade & Environment
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
O'Neil Building, Room 702
Washington, D.C. 20515
TEL: (202) 226-7820
FAX: (202) 226-2722

Bruce White
Staff Assistant
Subcommittee on Foreign Agriculture and Hunger
Committee on Agriculture
1336 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515
TEL: (202) 225-1867
FAX: (202) 225-0970

Joseph A. Fredericks
Legislative Officer
Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs
U.S. Agency for International Development
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20523-0016
TEL: (202) 647-8190
FAX: (202) 647-8321

Ellen S. Levinson
Executive Director
Coalition for Food Aid
c/o Cadwalder, Wickersham & Taft
1333 New Hampshire Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
TEL: (202) 862-2256
FAX: (202) 862-2400

Carl Schwensen
Executive Vice President
National Association of Wheat Growers
415 Second Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002
TEL: (202) 547-7800
FAX: (202) 546-2638

John M. Wise
Assistant Export Manager
ADM Milling Company, Inc.
8000 W. 110th Street
Overland Park, Kansas 66210
TEL: (913) 491-9400

William V. Brierre, Jr.
Senior Vice President
Lykes Brothers Steamship Co., Inc.
1100 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20036
TEL: (202) 659-3737
FAX: (202) 659-1562

Constantine G. Papavizas
Partner
Dyer, Ellis, Joseph & Mills
600 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
TEL: (202) 944-3000
FAX: (202) 944-3068

The Honorable J. Brian Atwood
Administrator
USAID
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20523

The Honorable E. (Kika) de la Garza
U.S. House of Representatives
1401 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1994

Jeanne Markunas
Deputy Director, Office of Food for Peace
Bureau for Humanitarian Response
USAID/SA-8
Washington, D.C. 20523-0807

APPENDIX B

COMMEMORATING 40 YEARS OF FOOD FOR PEACE
a Conference Sponsored by the U.S. Agency for International Development
September 18 - 21, 1994
Washington, D.C.

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Scott Adams
Food Security Advisor
Food Aid Management
300 I St., N.E., ste. 212
Washington, DC 20002

Jim Agnew
Director
Commodity Operations Division
USDA/ASCS
P.O. Box 2415
Washington, DC 20013

Gary E. Alex
Chief of Office of Agriculture and
Natural Resources
USAID/Colombo
Washington, DC 20521-6100

Michaele Amedee-Gedeon
Senior Public Health Advisor
USAID/Haiti
c/o American Embassy
Blvd. Harry Truman
Port au Prince, Haiti

John Anania
Agricultural Development Officer
USAID/BHR/FFP/DP
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523-0809

Jim Arnold
Consultant, ARTI
USAID/BHR/FFP/POD
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Tracy Atwood
Chief, Food Policy Division
USAID/G/EG/AFS/FP
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523-1809

David Atwood
Deputy Director of the Office of Food
and Agriculture
USAID/Bangladesh
U.S. Embassy, Madani Ave., Baridhar
Dhaka, 1212 Bangladesh

Leslie Barcus
Associate
Nathan Associates
2101 Wilson Blvd., ste. 1200
Arlington, VA 22201

Jose Barrientos de Ugarte
National Director
Caritas Boliviana
Cajon Postal No. 475-14399
La Paz, Bolivia

Gene Belcher
Chief, Export Commodity Claims Branch
USDA
Kansas City, MO

COMMEMORATING 40 YEARS OF FOOD FOR PEACE
a Conference Sponsored by the U.S. Agency for International Development
September 18 - 21, 1994
Washington, D.C.

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Bob Bell
Deputy Director
Food Security Unit
CARE
151 Ellis Street
Atlanta, GA 30303

Lynn Belland-Sauls
International Program Officer
World Vision Relief & Development, Inc.
220 I St., NE
Washington, DC 20002

Kathleen Bertelsen Moazed
Professional Staff
Committee on Foreign Affairs
U.S. House of Representatives
702 Annex One
Washington, DC 20515

David Black
U.S. Representative
Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture
1889 F St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

Jon Brause
Emergency Specialist
USAID/BHR/FFP/POD
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC

R. Gary Brendel
Human Resources
ADRA/I
Silver Spring, MD

William V. Brierre, Jr.
Sr. Vice President
Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc.
1100 Connecticut Ave., N.W. #330
Washington, DC 20036

Walter Britton
Country Director
ADRA, Bolivia
Casilla 6044
Mira Flores, La Paz
Bolivia

Carl Brockman
Executive Secretary
PL480 Title III Secretariat
La Paz, Bolivia

Lynn Brown
Researcher
International Food Policy Institute

Merle K. Brown

Deputy Director
Commodity Operations Division
USDA/ASCS
P.O. Box 2415
Washington, DC 20013

Judy C. Bryson
Director, Food for Development
Africare
440 R St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20001

Edward P. Bullard
Founder and President
TechnoServe, Inc.
49 Day Street
Norwalk, CT 06854

Armando Busmail
PL480 Title III Project Manager
USAID/Honduras
Unit 2927
APO AA 34022-3480

Frank Catania
Assistant Director
Save the Children
54 Wilton Road
Westport, CT 06880

Linda Chesley
Consultant, ARTI
USAID/BHR/FFP/POD
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20253

Getachew Chuko
Director of Material Aid
Mercy Corps International
3030 S.W. First Ave.
Portland, OR 97201

Eunyong Chung
Nutrition Advisor
USAID/G/PHN/HN/NMH
SA-18, ste. 411
Washington, DC 20523-1808

Ann Claxton
Regional Director of Intl Programs
WVRD
220 I St., NE
Washington, DC 20003

Bruce Cogill
Project Director
IMPACT Project/USAID
1129 20th St., NW ste.800
Washington, DC 20036

Olivier Cohen
Physician and Coordinator for Food Aid
Medecins Sans Frontieres France
(MSFF)
8, rue Saint-Sabin, 75544
Paris, CEDEX 11
France

Frederick M. Cole
Disaster Policy Advisor
USAID/BHR/PPE
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523-0806

Dudley Connelly
Country Director

Project Concern International
Casilla 4678
La Paz, Bolivia

Jaime Correa
Food for Peace Officer
USAID/BHR/FFP/DP
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523-0809

Douglas C. Coutts
Deputy Director, North America Office
World Food Programme
DC 2 - 2500, 2, UN Plaza
New York, NY 10017

Keith L. Crawford
Food Aid Advisor
USAID/Africa Bureau
2201 C St., NW
Washington, DC 20520

Vince Cusumano
Coordinator
USAID/PPC/PC
320 21st St., N.W. Rm. 3947 NS
Washington, DC 20523

Mike D'Adamo
Deputy Director, OPRM
Catholic Relief Services
209 W. Fayette St.
Baltimore, MD 21201

Frances R. Davidson
Nutritionist
USAID/G/PHN/HN/CS
Washington, DC 20523-1808

Philip Davies
Director - D.C. Office
Feed the Children
300 I St., NE
Washington, DC 20002

Karen Decker
Office of International Development
Asst.
U.S. Department of State
Washington, DC 20520

Regi Delgadilla
ENIMPORT
Managua, Nicaragua

Andre Desrosiers
Senior Program Manager
Food Aid Centre, CIDA
200 Promenade du Portage
Hull, PQ K1A 0G4 Canada

Maxx Dilley
Visiting Scientist
USAID/OFDA
Rm 1262 A
Washington, DC 20523-0008

Maitland DiPinto
Assistant Vice President, Programs
ADRA/I

12501 Old Columbia Pike
Silver Spring, MD 20904-6600

Vicky Dreyer
OIC
USAID/OFDA
Washington, DC

Donald Drga
Agricultural Development Officer
USAID/Mozambique
c/o U.S. Department of State
Washington, DC 20521-2330

James B. Durnil
Assistant Inspector General for Audit
USAID/IG
320 21st St., N.W., Rm. 5756
Washington, DC 20523

David Elmer
Communications Director
Food Aid Management
300 I St., N.E., ste. 212
Washington, DC 20002

Daan Everts
Deputy Executive Director for
Operations
World Food Programme
426 via Cristoforo Colombo
Rome, Italy 00145

Betsy Faga
President
Protein Grain Products Intl.
600 Maryland Ave., S.W. #305 W
Washington, DC 20024

Joseph M. Farrell
Executive Vice President
Waterman Steamship Corporation
1000 16th St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Daniel Fetherston
President
International Grain Processors
ste 106
100 Wilburn Rd.
Sun Prarie, WI 53590

James Firth
Chief, Exporter Programs
USDA/ASCS
P.O. Box 2415 Rm 5755-S
Washington, DC 20013

Ken Flemmer
Assistant Vice President
ADRA/I
12501 Old Columbia Pk.
Silver Spring, MD 20904

Michael Frank
Director, OPRM
Catholic Relief Services
209 W. Fayette St.
Baltimore, MD 21201

Tim Frankenberger
Food Security Advisor
CARE
151 Ellis Street
Atlanta, GA 30303

Joseph A. Fredericks
Legislative Officer
USAID/AA/LPA
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Flynn Fuller
Food for Peace Officer
USAID/BHR/FFP/DP
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

David J. Garms
Attache for Humanitarian Response
FODAG/FFP
c/o U.S. Embassy Rome
PSC 59, Box 100
APO, AE 09624

Jose M. Garzon
Food for Peace Officer
Office of Voluntary Cooperation
USAID/Manila
U.S. Department of State
Washington, DC 20251-8600

Jennifer L. Gayer
Summer Intern
USAID/BHR/FFP
202 Woodmoor Drive
Silver Spring, MD 20901

Joseph Gettier
Chief
USAID/REDSO/ESA/FFP
Post Box 30261
Nairobi, Kenya

Lois Godiksen
Social Science Analyst
USAID/PPC/CDIE
Rm. 308 SA-18
Washingtonm, DC 20523

Heather W. Goldman
Office Director
USAID/New Delhi
B 28, Institutional Area, Near Quta
New Delhi, 110016 India

Peter Frans Goossens
Food for Peace Officer
USAID/Khartoum
c/o American Embassy
P.O. Box 699
Khartoum, Sudan

John Grant
Deputy Director
USAID/BHR/PPE
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Sylvia Graves
Program Specialist, Program Operations Division
USAID/BHR/FFP/POD
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Paul B. Green
Export Consultant
Millers' National Federation
600 Maryland Ave., S.W., ste 305 West
Washington, DC 20024

David Hagen
Chief, Emergency Relief Division
USAID/BHR/FFP/ER
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Arlene Hair
Consultant, ARTI
USAID/BHR/FFP/POD
Washington, DC

Harlan Hale
Assistant Director, Food Logistics
CARE
151 Ellis St.
Atlanta, GA 30303

Amy Harding
Consultant, ARTI
USAID/BHR/FFP/POD
Washington, DC

Michael Harvey
Chief, Office of Food for Humanitarian Assistance
USAID/Addis Ababa
U.S. Department of State
Washington, DC 20521-2030

Delia Haustein
A.B. Prisma
Av. Las Artes 360
Lima, Peru

Charlotte Hebebrand
Development Affairs Officer
Delegation of the European Commission
2100 M St., NW
Washington, DC 20037

Robert Hechtman
1822 Deer Drive
McLean, VA 22101

Peter Heffron
Assistant Country Director
CARE Honduras
151 Ellis St.
Atlanta, GA 30303

M. Christine Hjelt
Food Security Specialist
USAID/Somalia
REDSO/ESA (SOM), Unit 64102, APO AE
Washington, DC

Marianne Hock
Head of Relief Resources
Relief General Division
International Committee of the Red Cross
19, Avenue de la Paix
Geneva, CH-1202 Switzerland

Tracie Hoeffel
TechnoServe, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

Bob Holbrook
Senior Manager
ADRA International
12501 Old Columbia Pike

Silver Spring, MD 20904-6600

Robert Houston
Program Officer
U.S. Department of State
1281 SA-1
Washington, DC 20522-0112

Rita Hudson
Food for Peace Officer
USAID/BHR/FFP/ER
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Carolyn Hughes
Food for Peace Officer
USAID/BHR/FFP
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Jan Hurwitch
Haiti Representative
Inter-American Institute for
Cooperation on Agriculture
1889 F St., NW
Washington, DC 20006

Julia M.A. Hussa
Food Aid Specialist
USAID/Guatemala City
la Calle 7-66, Zona 9
Guatemala City, 01009 Guatemala

John Huxtable
Food for Peace Officer
USAID/BHR/FFP/ER
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Darren Jenkins
Consultant, ARTI
USAID/BHR/FFP/POD
320 21st N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Cate Johnson
Health and Nutrition Specialist
USAID/G/PHN/HN/NMH
SA-18, Rm 1200
Washington, DC 20523-181

Thomas Johnson
Project Development Officer
USAID/Honduras
Unit 2927
APO AA 34022

Luis Jordan
Program Manager
PL480 Title III Secretariat
La Paz, Bolivia

Samuel Kahn
Senior Nutrition Advisor
USAID/G/PHN/HN
320 21st, N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

H. Robert Kramer
Director, Office of Food for Peace
USAID/BHR/FFP/D
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Margaret Kromhout
Deputy Chief of Program Direction and Management
USAID/Guatemala City
la Calle 7-66, Zona 9
Guatemala City, 01009 Guatemala

Ronald A. Kushner
Assistant Director
USGAO/NSIAD
441 G St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20548

Victor Lainez
Director, Food Projects
Caritas del Peru
Calle Omicron 492, Apartado 89
Lima, Peru

Paula Lang
Managing Associate
Nathan Associates
2101 Wilson Blvd., ste 1200
Arlington, VA 22201

Mary Lange
Refugee Officer
Refugees, Population & Migration
U.S. Department of State
2401 E St., NW Rm. 1265
Washington, DC 20520-0110

Carelle Laurent
Food for Peace Officer
USAID/BHR/FFP
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Eric Laurent
Logistic Officer
Medecins Sans Frontieres France (MSFF)
8, rue Saint-Sabin 75544
Paris, CEDEX 11
France

Tim Lavelle
Special Assistant to the Director
USAID/BHR/FFP
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Marianne Leach
Assistant Director
CARE/Washington Liaison Office
2025 Eye St., NW #1024
Washington, DC 20006

James Lehman
Food for Peace Officer
USAID/BHR/FFP/DP
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523-0809

Andreas Lendorff
Head of Relief General Division
International Committee of the Red Cross
19, Avenue de la Paix
Geneva, CH-1202 Switzerland

Norman Lent
Associate
Dyer, Ellis, Joseph & Mills
Washington, DC

Daniel Levin

Vice President
AFRAM Carriers
Bethesda, MD

Ellen S. Levinson
Executive Director
Coalition for Food Aid
1333 New Hampshire, N.W. 7th Floor
Washington, DC 20036

John Lewis
Director, Office of Agriculture and Food Security
USAID/AFS
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523-1809

Miguel Luina
Comptroller
USAID/BHR/PPE
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Paula Reed Lynch
Foreign Affairs Officer
Office of Policy
State/PRM/P
2401 E St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20522

Jerre Manarulla
Economist
USAID/LAC/DPB
Room 2246-A, NS
Washington, D.C. 20523

Tom Marchione
Program Analyst
USAID/BHR/PPE
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Jeanne Markunas
Deputy Director, Office of Food For Peace
USAID/BHR/FFP/DD
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Andrew M. Maxey
Program Office Director
USAID/Costa Rica
Unit 2503
APO AA 34020

Charles May
Food Policy Advisor
USAID/Mali
BP 34
Bamako, Mali

Margaret McCoy
Project Manager
The Cooperative Housing Foundation
8300 Colesville Road, ste. 420
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Darell McIntyre
Food for Peace Officer
USAID/BHR/FFP/ER
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Alice McNutt Miller
Program Examiner
OMB
725 17th St,m NW
NEOB 10025
Washington, DC

James B. Mead
Manager
Daniel F. Young, Inc.
1629 K St., NW
Washington, DC 20006

Lawrence Meserve
Regional Food for Peace Officer
USAID/Abidjan
U.S. Department of State
Washington, DC 20521-1010

Steve Miteff
Chief, Contract Management Branch
USDA/ASCS
P.O. Box 2415, 14th & Independence
Washington, DC 20013

Rudy Monsalve
Senior Manager
ADRA International
12501 Old Columbia Pike
Silver Spring, MD 20904

Emily C. Moore
President
Polimore Associates
10506 Pennydog Lane
Silver Spring, MD 20902

George Mugo
Assistant Food for Peace Officer
USAID/Nairobi
Unit #64102
APO AE 09831-4102

Heriberto Muller
Country Director
ADRA, Peru
Casilla 4130
Lima, Peru

Catherine Murchie
PL480, Title II and Special Programs
USDA
14th & Independence Ave.
Washington, DC 20013

Ben Muskovitz
Food for Peace Officer
USAID/BHR/FFP/ER
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Carolyn Mutamba
Disaster Response Coordinator
USAID/Nairobi
Unit 64102
APO AE 09831-4102

Ben Myatt
Packaging Specialist
USDA/ASCS
P.O. Box 2415, 14th & Independence,
Washington, DC 20013

Gary Nava
Chief, Community Development
Caritas Boliviana
Cajon Postal No. 475-14399
La Paz, Bolivia

Jens Nielson
Research Fellow
IFPRI

Egil S.W. Nilssen
Deputy Head International Department
Norwegian Peoples' Aid
Storgt 33A, P.O. Box 8844 Youngstor
Oslo, 0028 Norway

Wayne Nilsestuen
Director
USAID/LAC/RSD
2242 NS
Washington, DC 20523-0010

Jim Nindel
Program Analyst
USAID/LAC
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Paul Novick
Director
USAID/AFR/DRCO
320 21st St., N.W., Rm. 3909
Washington, DC 20523-0013

Elizabeth Nyang
Evaluator
GAO/NSIAD
441 G St., NW
Washington, DC 20548

Ted Okada
Director, Washington Office
Food for the Hungry
P.O. Box 75166
Washington, DC 20013

James O'Meara
Director, Emerging Democracies Office
USDA
South Building, Rm. 6506
Washington, DC 20250

Alex Palacios
Deputy Assistant Administrator
USAID/LPA/LEG
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Pankaja Panda
Office of Health & Nutrition
USAID/G/PHN/HN
SA-18
Washington, DC 20523

Charlie Papavizas
Partner
Dyer, Ellis, Joseph & Mills
Washington, DC

Susan M. Parks
Chief, Program Operations Division
USAID/BHR/FFP/POD
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Willard J. Pearson
Director, REDSO/WCA
USAID/Abidjan
U.S. Department of State
Washington, DC 20521-2010

Katherine Perkins
Foreign Affairs Specialist
US Department of State/PRM/P
Washington, DC 20520

Jim Phippard
Sr. Vice President
ACDI
50 F St., suite 900
Washington, DC 20001

Robert Pierce
Consultant
Marine Overseas Services
Washington, DC

Janet Piller
Program Examiner
OMB
Washington, DC

Salvatore Pinzino
PL480 Title II Program Manager
USAID/Bolivia
Unit 3914
APO AA 34032

Kathrin Puffenberger
FFPO
USAID/Asmara
c/o American Embassy-Asmara
Wash, D.C. 20521-7170

Randy Purviance
Senior Manager
ADRA
12501 Old Columbia Pike
Silver Spring, MD 20904

Hema Ramaswamy
Deputy Chief, Office of Food for Development
USAID/New Delhi
Washington, DC 20521-9000

Tom Ray
Food for Peace Officer
USAID/Senegal
U.S. Department of State
Washington, DC 20521-2130

John Rifenbark
Food Aid Coordinator, Title II Emergency
USAID/AFR/DRCO
320 21st St., N.W., Rm. 3909
Washington, DC 20523-0013

Timothy J. Ring
Manager Government & Project Sales
Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc.
1100 Connecticut Ave., NW #330
Washington, DC 20036

Mario G. Rios Espinoza
General Secretary
Caritas del Peru
Calle Omicron 492, Apartado 89
Lima, Peru

Michael Roessler
Stagiare (Intern)
Delegation of the European Commission
2100 M St., NW
Washington, DC 20037

Donald Rogers
Area Coordinator, Eurasia
Catholic Relief Services
209 W. Fayette St.
Baltimore, MD 21784

Len Rogers
Director
Office of Program Planning and Evaluation
USAID/BHR/PPE/D
320 21st St., NW
Washington, DC 20523

Helge Rohn
Resident Representative
Norwegian People's Aid
P.O. Box 39207
Nairobi, Kenya

Donna Rosa
Audit/Planning
USAID/IG
320 21st St., N.W., Rm. 1236 SA-16
Washington, DC 20523

Rafael Rosario
Food for Peace Officer
USAID/BHR/FFP/DP
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Brian Rudert
Rural Development Officer
USAID/Nicaragua
c/o U.S. Embassy
Managua, Nicaragua

Fred Sands
Vice President-Marketing
Launoff Grain Co.
One Launoff Centre
Danville, IL 61832

James V. Scala
Representative
Waterman Steamship Company
Washington, DC

Curtis Schaeffer
Director
Food Security Unit
CARE
151 Ellis Street
Atlanta, GA 30303

David Schroeder
Agriculture Development Officer
USAID/G/EG/AFS/FP
320 21st St., NW
Washington, DC 20523

Janis G. Schulmeisters
Attorney in Charge
Department of Justice
26 Federal Plaza. ste. 320
New York, NY 10278

David R. Scotton
Director
United Nations Development Programme
1889 F St., N.W., Ground Floor
Washington, DC 20006

Thomas W. Scoville
Director of Policy & Planning
American Maritime Congress
1300 I St., NW, ste. 250 West
Washington, DC 20005

Robert D. Sears
Regional Food for Peace Officer
USAID/Abidjan
U.S. Department of State
Washington, DC 20521-2010

Gandhi Selvanathan
Director, Food-Assisted Programs
OIC International, Inc.
240 West Tulpehocken St.
Philadelphia, PA 19144

Lisa Sharpe
Consultant, ARTI
USAID/BHR/FFP/POD
Washington, DC

Daniel E. Shaughnessy
Executive Director
Project Concern Intl.
3550 Afton Road
San Diego, CA 92123

Jennifer Shaw
Associate
Dyer, Ellis, Joseph & Mills
600 New Hampshire, NW #1000
Washington, DC

Rebecca Sill
Grants Coordinator
World Concern Development
Organization
19303 Freemont Ave.
Seattle, WA 98133

Arthur Silver
Food for Peace Coordinator
USAID/ANE/SEA/SPA
320 21st St., N.W., Room 102, SA-2
Washington, DC 20523

Robert H. Sindt
Special Counsel
International Food Additives Council
c/o Burditt & Radzius
901 15th St.,NW,ste.901
Washington, DC 20005

Elliott T. Smith
Project Manager
The Cooperative Housing Foundation
8300 Colesville Road, ste. 420
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Leslie Snell
Program Manager, Russia
Cooperative Business International
1401 New York Ave, N.W. ste. 1100
Washington, DC 20005-2160

Martin Sorkin
Consultant
2700 Virginia Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20037

Catherine Spaur
Program Assistant

Feed the Children
300 I St., NE
Washington, DC 20002

Louis C. Stamberg
Director, Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation
USAID/BHR/PVC
320 21st St., NW
Washington, DC 20523

Gloria D. Steele
Deputy Director
USAID/PPC/DP
Room 3889 New State
Washington, DC 20523-0045

Cornelis Stek
Deputy Chief
USAID/REDSO/ESA/FFP
Post Box 30261
Nairobi, Kenya

Nydia R. Suarez
Agricultural Economist
Economic Research Service
USDA
1301 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20005-4788

John Swanson
Chief, Food and Agriculture Division
USAID/Bangladesh
U.S. Embassy, Mandani Ave., Baridha
Dhaka, 1212 Bangladesh

Andrew Swiderski
Nutrition Advisors
USAID/G/PHN/HN/NMH
SA-18, suite 411
Washington, DC 20523-1808

Anne Swindale
Food & Nutrition Specialist
Food Security & Nutrition Monitoring (IMPACT)/ISTI
1129 20th St., NW, ste.800
Washington, DC 20036-3434

Charles L. Sykes
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Bureau for Population, Refugees & Migration
U.S. Department of State
2201 C St., N.W. Rm5824
Washington, DC 20520

Lon Taylor
Director
Feed My People International, LTD
11052 N. 24th Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85029

George A. Taylor Jr.
Senior Evaluator
USGAO
441 G St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20548

Donna L. Testerman
Chief, Export Operations Division
Kansas City Commodity Office
USDA
9200 Ward Parkway, 3rd floor

Kansas City, MO 64114

Didier Thys
Manager, Small Enterprise Development
Catholic Relief Services
209 W. Fayette St.
Baltimore, MD 21201

Sandra Torres
Executive Secretary
PL 480 Title III
USAID/Managua
Unit #2725 Box #9
APO AA 34021

Liz Turner
Executive Director
SUSTAIN
1401 New York, Ave. NW ste.1100
Washington, DC

Paul Ulrich
Food for Peace Officer
USAID/BHR/FFP/DP
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Roberta van Haeftner
Food Policy Advisor
USAID/LAC/RSD
2201 C St., NW
Washington, DC

Frederic Rudolph Vigil
Agricultural Development/Food for Peace Officer
USAID/Ouagadougou
U.S. Department of State
Washington, DC

Michael A. Viola
Executive Director
Marine Overseas Services, Inc.
905 16th St., N.W., ste. 301
Washington, DC 20006

Jessie Vogler
Program Analyst
USAID/BHR/PPE
320 21st St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

Rudy von Bernuth
Associate Vice President
Save the Children International
54 Wilton Rd.
Westport, CT 06880

Pat Weeks
Program Coordinator
Food Aid Management
300 I St, N.E., ste. 212
Washington, DC 20002

Carolyn Weiskirch
Senior Policy Analyst
USAID/PPC/DP
320 21st St., N.W., Rm. 3957 NS
Washington, DC 20523

Bruce White
Staff Assistant
Subcommittee on Foreign Agriculture and Hunger
U.S. House of Representatives
1336 Longworth HOB
Washington, DC 20515

84

Robert J. Wilson
Food for Peace Officer
USAID/Peru
Unit #3760
APO AA 34031-3230

Amy Winton
Food Aid Coordinator
U.S. Department of State
2201 C St., N.W., Rm. 3526
Washington, DC 20520

John M. Wise
Assistant Export Manager
ADM Milling Company
8000 West 110th St.
Overland Park, KS 66210-2312

Thomas Zopf
Director
Food Aid Management
300 I St., N.E., ste. 212
Washington, DC 20002