AGRICULTURE ACCOUNTABILITY
Holding Donors to their L’Aquila Promises
ONE is an advocacy and campaigning organization that fights extreme poverty and preventable disease, particularly in Africa, by raising public awareness and pressuring political leaders to support smart and effective policies and programs that are saving lives, helping to put kids in school and improving futures. A coalition of more than 2.5 million members, ONE is nonpartisan and works closely with African activists and policy makers.

www.ONE.org
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study: A Tale Of Two Farmers</td>
<td>7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1: History of ODA To Agriculture And The L’Aquila pledge</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2: The Commitments In Detail</td>
<td>13-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3: The Findings</td>
<td>16-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4: Country Report Cards</td>
<td>19-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5: Transparency And Accountability</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6: Looking Ahead</td>
<td>37-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For poor people in rural economies, smart investments in agriculture are key to reducing poverty, building viable livelihoods and accessing affordable food. Unfortunately, for decades, under-investment in sustainable smallholder agriculture has left poor farmers behind. In the lead-up to the food price crisis of 2007–08, maize prices tripled and those of rice and wheat nearly doubled. As a result, millions of people were pushed into poverty. Poor people in developing countries are especially affected by high food prices because they spend on average between 60 and 80% of their incomes on food. While prices declined to some extent in the aftermath of the global financial crisis, the pressures that caused them to skyrocket just three years ago have not disappeared. In fact, they are once again pushing up prices and making them more volatile.

After more than two decades of neglect, donors responded to the wake-up call of the 2007–08 global food crisis. At the 2009 L'Aquila G8 Summit, the G8 and five other donors committed to provide $22 billion in financing for agriculture and food security, of which $6 billion was new money. They also promised to do the following: (1) deliver the funds within three years; (2) agree to a set of principles to guide how they would spend this money; and (3) remain transparent and accountable on their commitments. Twenty-seven countries and 15 international organisations signed a joint statement of commitment at the summit, bringing into existence the L'Aquila Food Security Initiative (AFSI).

Four months after the L'Aquila Summit, the G8 and other donors adopted the ‘Rome Principles’ at the World Summit on Food Security in Rome, Italy. The principles include country ownership, strategic coordination, a comprehensive approach, multilateral improvement and support, and sustained commitment. Donors also made several additional core commitments to increase the effectiveness of investments in agriculture and food security. These included focusing on gender, environmental sustainability and transparency. Soon thereafter, the US government calculated the potentially massive outcomes of the AFSI: 40 million poor farming families, most of them living on less than $2 per day, would be on track to increase their incomes by 250%.

Food insecurity is a global challenge that requires a diverse response, including support from the emerging economies of the G20 and, most importantly, political will and financial resources from developing countries themselves. Yet it is critical that traditional donors remain accountable and that they lead by example in order to leverage action by others.

This report provides a principle-by-principle and country-by-country assessment of progress against both financial and non-financial AFSI pledges, focusing on the G7 and the European Commission (EC). Overall, ONE found that donors are still falling short of their commitment to mobilise $22 billion by the end of 2012, and that the qualitative challenges are not being approached with the political will and momentum needed to show a strong commitment to ending poverty and chronic hunger. Within the AFSI, donors did not agree to consistent pledge years or a uniform system for measuring progress. For example, most donors agreed to report financial progress in disbursements, but the US, Germany and Japan specified that their pledges would be measured in appropriations or commitments. Most donors are making an effort; however, this report shows that there is substantial room for improvement.
KEY FINDINGS

Donors have disbursed only 22% of their financial pledges to date, and most have not reported how they plan to reach the full pledged amount. The eight donors assessed in this report have reported disbursing $2.5 billion, or 11% of the total financial pledge. Together these countries account for 84% of the total ASFI pledge. Canada and Italy have disbursed more than two-thirds of their pledges. France, the UK and the US need to make substantial disbursements in order to be on track. Two years into their pledge periods, they have fulfilled only 28%, 30% and 2% respectively of their pledges. Meanwhile, Germany, Japan and the EC are difficult to assess because they have not yet reported any disbursements, for various reasons. Overall, donors are making some progress, but they are not on track to fulfill their promises within the three years promised.

In order to fulfill their promises on the Rome Principles and core commitments, even though they all show some signs of progress, donors need to make significant improvements in every area. From principle-by-principle and country-by-country analyses, ONE concludes that:

1. Most donors are not making a strong enough effort to invest in country-led plans, but their commitment to supporting the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) is a good first step.

2. While each of the eight donors assessed is a member or a funder of at least two of the five key coordination mechanisms mentioned in the AFSI Declaration, donors could do more to foster strategic coordination at the regional and national levels.

3. Donors have made progress in taking a comprehensive twin-track approach to food security, especially towards the root causes of the food price crisis. Of particular note, France has elevated the issue of food price volatility and food security during its 2011 presidency of the G8/G20.

4. With the exception of the UK’s multilateral aid review, donors have not reported taking any concrete steps to improve the effectiveness of multilateral organisations involved in food security. Additionally, only Canada and the US have made contributions to the Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme (GAFSP), which aims to fill financing gaps.

5. The US has created a five-year initiative and has changed its bureaucratic structure to ensure the longevity of its focus on food security. No other donor has made pledges or policy changes beyond its initial three-year pledge period. Canada’s funding has already fallen to pre-AFSI levels.

6. Progress on targeting women and integrating gender sensitivity into development plans is mixed.

7. Donors need to improve their commitment to integrate environmental sustainability into their agriculture and food security programmes.

8. Donors must make significant improvements to achieve transparency and accountability on the L’Aquila promises. The Deauville G8 Accountability Report of May 2011 failed to review the progress that donors have made using a uniform system of measurement.
While donors collectively are making insufficient progress on their L’Aquila promises, a three-year commitment to spend $22 billion on driving agricultural growth and combating food insecurity is not enough to tackle the challenge of global food insecurity in its entirety. It can make a significant dent, however. And because food prices are rising again and driving millions of people back into poverty, donors cannot afford to wait. Efforts to meet these promises must be reinvigorated in order to stave off future crises and create the necessary enabling environment to incentivise investments from the private sector and national governments. The G20 must also be encouraged to play a role.

As the G20 strengthen their role in development and food security, they should pave a pathway for an improved agenda for agricultural development and food security. At the upcoming G20 Summit in Cannes, France in November 2011, the G20 should commit to:

**Fulfill their L’Aquila commitments**
- Urgently and rapidly fulfill the L’Aquila commitments on aid quality and quantity for agricultural development and food security.
- The US should fulfill its outstanding pledge of $308 million to the GAFSP, and other countries should pledge additional monies to improve multilateral coordination for funding country-owned agricultural development and food security programmes.

**Reduce food price volatility**
- Make more information publicly available about grain stocks, and refrain from export bans to help prevent extreme food price spikes and to temper price volatility.
- Create position limits for food commodity futures on financial markets.
- Require all derivatives of food commodities to be subject to notification, clearing and monitoring by making position information publicly available.
- Establish a regulatory body, similar to the US Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC), for futures trading in European and other markets.

**Build on the AFSI to include emerging donors, more transparency and accountability, and commitments through 2015**
- Create equal partnerships between donors and recipients in the design and implementation of development assistance for agriculture and food security.
- Emphasise the need for investments in agriculture, food security and nutrition that target smallholder farmers, especially women, and that integrate environmental sustainability.
- Ensure that investments in agricultural risk management and social safety-net programmes ease the impacts of current price spikes and build the resilience of poor people to withstand future shocks.
- Ensure that public investments incentivise private sector investment and leverage innovative sources of finance.
- Improve transparency and accountability of delivering on promises by agreeing to:
  - A unified and consistent reporting standard
  - OECD DAC indicators to identify whether development dollars are targeted towards the most vulnerable people
  - Measurable outcomes and indicators and corresponding baselines to track progress.
ZAKIA’S STORY
A few years ago, Zakia and her fellow female farmers on the island of Zanzibar wondered why the expensive seed they bought was barely producing enough to feed their families, much less to sell for profit. It was frustrating. The work was long and arduous and they could never seem to get ahead. That is, until a couple of years ago when they began to learn new farming practices and obtain funding for refrigerated storage to keep their vegetables from spoiling, thanks to donor investments in agriculture and food security.

Now, rather than simply tossing those expensive seeds onto the ground, they till the earth, plant the seeds and nurture them into row after meticulous row of gleaming eggplants, tomatoes and beans. They grow different crops during different seasons. They have built a water tank and the new irrigation lines snake throughout the fields. They make their own insecticides using ginger, hot chillies, garlic, neem leaves and cloves. They have constructed a charcoal-lined storage shed to keep their produce fresh until it can be taken to market. They have joined a co-operative where collective bargaining gets them a better price for their crops.

They still work long and hard hours. Up at 5:30am for prayer, they then head into the fields for the day, stopping only around mid-morning for breakfast. But it has all paid off.

Their income has increased so dramatically that they have bought a box with a lock and started their own community bank. They are reinvesting in their farms and are sending their children to secondary school. They are all eating more and better. Now they are even thinking of buying some livestock: chickens and perhaps a cow or two. They have begun to save for cages to prevent people from stealing new chicks, a chronic problem with traditional mud chicken huts. But once they have livestock, not only will they be able to sell the eggs and milk but their families will have access to more protein and they will no longer need to purchase manure for their fields.

‘All of this is living proof that when you teach a woman to farm, an entire community prospers.’
DONATA’S STORY
At the Chitsanzo Milk Bulking Group in Malawi, just one cow can turn around a family’s life. A single dairy cow has the potential to raise a farmer’s income six-fold per year, from the national average of $250. With an income of just $250 per year, the average smallholder farmer is living in extreme poverty – on less than $1 per day. It might be hard to imagine that one cow could make such a transformative difference in a family’s life, but it is happening every day.

Donata Kuchawo is a 45-year-old married mother of five who also looks after two orphans. Donata turned to dairy farming because growing maize and beans alone wasn’t enough to provide for her family. The milk bulking scheme works as follows: donors provide cows to members of the group and, when calves are born, those farmers give their female calves to other members. Members also learn how to pasteurise, cool and bulk their milk together so that they can negotiate higher prices from local distributors. In addition, raising a dairy cow helps save on fertiliser costs for maize and bean crops. Donata hopes to get a female calf from her pregnant heifer. If it’s a girl, she will be passed onto the next family on the waiting list and the virtuous cycle will continue.

As a result of her income, Donata has built a home for her family, has put three kids through secondary school and also supports her late sister’s two children, who attend primary school. An entrepreneur, she has constructed a small rental house, invested in a new piggery business and employed five people to help run this, and the dairy business and tend to crops. Looking ahead, she is already saving for another cow. She is such an inspiration, and is proof that when you give women farmers a few tools, the entire community benefits.

‘She is such an inspiration and proof that when you give women farmers a few tools, the entire community benefits.’
Zakia and Donata were very fortunate. They received support for farming whereas millions of others are on their own. For poor people in rural economies, smart investments in agriculture are key to poverty reduction, economic development and accessible affordable food. It works like this: Farming is hard work that requires a lot of people to till fields, plant seeds, manage fields and harvest crops. Once they’re grown, crops also need to be processed, stored, transported, marketed and sold. The demand for labor creates employment for millions of people in rural areas that are currently out of work. Once they start improving their own farms or working on their neighbors farms and earning incomes, they not only produce more food, but they spend their earnings on goods and services in their hometowns, creating businesses and vibrant rural economies. More food means lower food prices for them, their families, and people living in cities. Constant and reliable access to safe and nutritious food ensures food security that allows more families to give their children a head start on a brighter future.

Unfortunately, stories about famine and failure are more common, because for decades under-investment in sustainable, smallholder agriculture has left poor farmers behind. In fact, in 2008 when the last global food price crisis struck, donor investment in agriculture had fallen by 75% from its 1985 level. In response to millions of people being pushed into poverty due to high prices, which had raised the number of food-insecure people above 1 billion, donors at the L’Aquila 2009 G8 summit committed to reverse the decline in spending on agriculture and food security. But the pressures that led prices to skyrocket beyond the reach of poor people have not disappeared and may only intensify. In fact, the world may be entering a new era of repeated food crises characterised by scarce resources and market volatility.

The World Bank has estimated that, in early 2011, rising food prices pushed another 44 million people globally into poverty.\(^3\) Populations are growing. Land and water, both important resources for farming, are drying up. Higher oil prices are making fertiliser, irrigation and transport more expensive. Droughts and floods are becoming more severe. More and more food crops are being replaced by fuel crops, and investors are playing with food commodities in financial markets. Stories of famine, unrest and destitution are threatening to become commonplace. But with the right investments in agriculture and food security, donors can help poor farmers take advantage of high prices and stave off most future food crises. However, they cannot wait to respond until another crisis erupts. The last time was tragic; allowing such eruptions to return unnecessarily every few years would be criminal.

Smart investments in agriculture are proven to pull people out of poverty, reduce food prices, grow economies and build capacities to withstand shocks from high food prices or adverse weather.\(^4\) One of the major challenges for our food system is that donors, national governments and others have been too complacent about the availability and security of the world’s food

---

supply. Food prices fell back again in the aftermath of the global financial crisis and, as riots subsided, solving domestic budget battles consumed their attention. Nevertheless, rich donor countries are still the international engine that can prevent crises from striking again and again. This is why meeting the L’Aquila promises and improving on them is urgently needed to prevent future food emergencies and to lift people out of extreme poverty.

This report details the promises that donors made at the 2009 L’Aquila G8 Summit to tackle food insecurity. They promised to reverse the decline in spending on agricultural development and food security and to maximise the effectiveness of aid dollars by agreeing to several ‘smart’ aid principles at the 2009 World Summit on Food Security later that year. This report evaluates their progress toward fulfilling both these quantitative and qualitative promises. It also assesses the progress that donors have made on their commitments to transparency and accountability, and then suggests a path forward for the G20 to address global food insecurity.

‘Smart investments in agriculture are proven to pull people out of poverty, reduce food prices, grow economies and build capacities to withstand shocks from high food prices or adverse weather.’
At its height in the mid-1980s, global official development assistance (ODA) to agriculture reached $20 billion, before it declined precipitously to just $3 billion in the early 2000s. Slowly climbing back, total ODA to agriculture in 2009 was $9 billion. The reasons for the decline are many, but two stand out: (1) complacency about the world’s food supply after agricultural science dramatically improved food production in the 1960s and 1970s in Asia and Latin America; and (2) the development doctrine of the late 1980s and 1990s that insisted that developing country governments dismantle state-owned and state-run enterprises, including agricultural research, education and outreach services. No longer supported by even relatively small institutional and educational systems, developing country farmers were left in the dust. African countries, in particular, were hard hit, given their very underdeveloped private sector and public institutional systems. The ‘Green Revolution’ that transformed agricultural production in Asia and Latin America never reached Africa. Africa’s diverse microclimates, varied food staples and sparse connective infrastructure and marketing systems meant that the technologies developed for Asia and Latin America could not spill over here.

During the past 45 years, Africa’s agricultural productivity has lagged behind that of the rest of the world, with grain yields just one-third of those achieved when Asia and Latin America were developing. Disappearing funding for agriculture left farmers in the developing world vulnerable to shocks – depressingly low prices induced by subsidies lavished on developed country farmers, extreme weather events and unpredictable markets – that eventually erupted into a global food crisis. Between 2005 and 2008, maize prices nearly tripled, and the prices for wheat and rice increased by 127% and 170% respectively. The dramatic spike in food prices severely affected the asset base and nutritional status of poor people around the world, leading to irreversible economic and physical damage, riots and unrest.

Poor people in developing countries are especially affected by high food prices because they spend on average between 60% and 80% of their incomes on food. When food gets more expensive, they eat less and have to make many other hard choices. Faced with higher food bills, poor people eat cheaper, less nutritious food, sell off their productive assets such as livestock or tools to afford more food and cut back on other necessities such as medicines and school fees. Often, they cannot get much from selling assets as everyone else is coping in the same way, and they lose their ability to earn income later, so often they never recoup their losses.

After more than two decades of neglect, donors responded to the wake-up call of the 2008 global food crisis. At the 2009 L’Aquila
Donors have a lot to do in a short amount of time if they intend to fulfil their promises to address global food insecurity.

G8 Summit, the G8 and five other donors committed to mobilise $22 billion, $6 billion of which was new money, in financing for agriculture and food security. They also promised to do the following: (1) deliver the funds within three years; (2) agree to a set of principles on how they would spend this money; and (3) remain transparent and accountable on their commitments. They adopted principles four months later at the World Summit on Food Security and dubbed them the ‘Rome Principles’. Soon thereafter, the $22 billion commitment became known as the L’Aquila Food Security Initiative (AFSI), and the US calculated its potentially massive outcomes: 40 million poor farming families, most of them living on less than $2 per day, would be on track to increase their incomes by 250%.

To achieve the strategic objective to ‘take urgent action to eradicate hunger from the world’, donors adopted the Rome Principles. In the Declaration of the World Summit on Food Security, where the principles were articulated, donors emphasised working with poor countries as partners, in particular through the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), improving coordination, strengthening the role of multilateral institutions and taking a comprehensive approach to food security. On the surface, this might all seem fairly straightforward, but it is actually a significant shift in donor transparency and, potentially, effectiveness. This is the first time that donors have committed to identifying how they plan to spend aid dollars, in terms of investment sectors (e.g. farming versus storage) and the target populations in which they intend to invest.

Food insecurity is a global challenge that requires a diverse response, including support from the emerging economies of the G20 and, most importantly, political will and financial resources from developing countries themselves. However, it is critical that traditional donors remain accountable and lead by example to leverage action by other actors. More pressure can be exerted on African governments to meet their Maputo targets to spend 10% of their national budgets on agriculture if L’Aquila donors make good on their promises. Similarly, greater donor support for agriculture and food security can encourage private sector investment. But failure to meet the L’Aquila commitments could lead to a retreat from agriculture. Based on the findings of ONE’s research, donors have a lot to do in a short amount of time if they intend to fulfil their promises to address global food insecurity.
ONE did a review of the specific promises donors made individually and collectively. ONE then analysed publicly available information and, in many cases, consulted with donors directly to assess their progress. The promises can be broken down into three major categories: financial commitments, qualitative commitments (including the Rome Principles) and other core commitments, including promises to invest in women and environmental sustainability and to be transparent and accountable.

THE FINANCIAL COMMITMENTS

In total, the 13 L’Aquila donors – Australia, Canada, the European Commission (EC), France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Russia, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States – pledged $22 billion in support for agriculture and food security. About $6 billion was pledged as new money. Another 16 countries and 14 international and regional organisations endorsed the AFSI and promised to provide technical support and cooperation. However, the major donors did not agree to consistent pledge years or a uniform system for measuring progress. For example, most donors agreed to report financial progress in disbursements, but the US, Germany and Japan specified that their pledges would be measured in appropriations or commitments. About half of the primary financial commitments are due to be delivered by the end of 2011 and the rest by the end of 2012.9 Donors pledged nearly half of the funds – $9.2 billion – to agriculture, forestry and fishing, and the remainder was split amongst multilateral channels and other development assistance sectors with the main purpose of food security. To uniformly measure donor financial promises and progress, ONE assessed: (1) disbursements; (2) commitments in the pipeline; and (4) disbursements needed to fulfil the pledge. Despite the fact that some donors pledged disbursements and others appropriations or commitments, ONE considers disbursements to be the ultimate measure of political will and bureaucratic expediency.

$22 Billion Pledge Financial Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Except for Australia, whose pledge period extends until FY2012/13.
THE QUALITATIVE COMMITMENTS

Just as important as the amount of funds donors promised is how donors promised to spend those funds. With severe budget constraints in many countries, maximising the impact of every aid dollar is imperative. The Rome Principles call on donors to design development plans based on the needs of developing countries and to ensure that all actors are working together cooperatively to achieve sustainable outcomes. In addition to the Rome Principles, ONE assesses donor transparency and attention to gender and environmental sustainability, all core commitments explicit in the AFSI promise. Below are the criteria for what ONE has looked at to measure donor progress in these categories.10

ROME PRINCIPLE 1: Country Ownership

Invest in country-owned plans, aimed at channelling resources to well-designed and results-based programmes and partnerships.

This means that donors will work to develop investment plans that are country-led, include the views of multiple stakeholders and align with any existing national development or agriculture and food security plans.

What we assessed:
• Multi-stakeholder decision-making
• Alignment with country development plans

ROME PRINCIPLE 2: Strategic Coordination

Foster strategic coordination at national, regional and global levels to improve governance, promote better allocation of resources, avoid duplication of efforts and identify resource gaps.

This means that donors will work towards improving coordination and collaboration with each other, national governments and multilateral organisations to avoid overlaps and fill gaps in programme financing.

What we assessed:
• Global coordination
• Filling finance gaps
• Regional and country level coordination

ROME PRINCIPLE 3: Comprehensive Approach

Strive for a comprehensive twin-track approach to food security that consists of: 1) direct action to immediately tackle hunger for the most vulnerable and 2) medium- and long-term sustainable agricultural, food security, nutrition and rural development programmes to eliminate the root causes of hunger and poverty, including through the progressive realisation of the right to adequate food.

This means that donors will continue to respond to food emergencies and support the chronically hungry, but that reducing poverty over the long term also means investing in farms, in people and in communities. It also involves reaching smallholder farmers, meeting women’s needs and promoting environmental sustainability.

What we assessed:
• Balanced twin-track approach
• Encourage private sector investment
• Actions taken to address the root causes of food insecurity
• Focus on smallholders
• Focus on capacity building

ROME PRINCIPLE 4: Multilateral Support and Improvement

Ensure a strong role for the multilateral system by sustained improvements in efficiency, responsiveness, coordination and effectiveness of multilateral institutions.

Donors here commit to leveraging the expertise of the multilateral institutions but also to work to make them more effective at their jobs.

What we assessed:
• Engagement in reform processes
• Pledges and contributions to the Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme (GAFSP)
• Multilateral share of resources
• Other coordination efforts

ROME PRINCIPLE 5: Sustained Financial Commitment

Ensure sustained and substantial commitment by all partners to invest in agriculture and food security and nutrition, with provision of necessary resources in a timely and reliable fashion, aimed at multi-year plans and programmes.

This means that donors will fulfil their promises to meet their pledges in a timely manner, but that they will also demonstrate their solid commitment to fight poverty and chronic hunger beyond the life span of the three-year L’Aquila initiative.

What we assessed:
• Timeliness
• Sectoral consistency of delivery with pledge
• Sustained commitment
• Funding increase from 2008

10 A more detailed description of the methodology can be found online at: www.one.org.
The Commitments In Detail

**Core Commitment:**

**Gender**

Taking a gender-sensitive approach to food security investments is paramount. Women are typically responsible for a family’s food and make up a large share of the world’s farmers. By providing women with the same level of access to resources as men, women could increase yields on their farms by 20–30%, in turn reducing the number of hungry people in the world by 12–17%.

**What we assessed:**
- Gender strategies (where available)
- Integration of gender into food security strategies
- Evidence of gender-sensitive programmes

**Core Commitment:**

**Environmental Sustainability**

Emphasizing environmental sustainability through soil conservation, water management, and smart land use practices and policy is critical to long-term agricultural productivity, resilience and food security. Many of those most affected by rising food prices are also threatened by environmental degradation, drought and changing weather patterns, all of which can compromise farmers’ ability to make a living and cost governments significantly.

**What we assessed:**
- Environmental sustainability in monitoring and evaluation frameworks (where available)
- Integration of natural resource management into food security strategies

**Core Commitment:**

**Transparency**

Transparency refers to how readily and thoroughly the donor shares information regarding food security funding and programs. This is key to making aid predictable for implementers and recipients and allowing civil society to hold donors accountable to their promises, both of which are extremely important to improving agricultural aid effectiveness as well as successfully ending poverty and chronic hunger.

**What we assessed:**
- Publicly available food security-related information
- Availability of specific information more generally
- ONE questionnaire response thoroughness

**Other Core Commitments**

**$22 Billion Pledge: Sectoral Breakdown**

- Agriculture 42%
- Multilateral 16%
- Transport and Storage 16%
- Other 10%
- Development Food Aid 7%
- Rural Development 4%
- Safety Nets 3%
- Nutrition 2%

---

11 “Growing a better future,” Oxfam, June 2011. www.oxfam.org/grow. Unfortunately, these findings cannot be substantiated with data from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), which monitors and tracks development assistance, because the data does not break down how much of donor contributions for multilateral organisations or for individual sectors, such as transportation, are food security-related.
**3: THE FINDINGS**

Overall, most donors are still falling short of what is needed to mobilise the $22 billion promised by the end of 2012, and the qualitative challenges are not being approached with the political will and momentum needed to show a strong commitment to ending poverty and chronic hunger. Most are making an effort, but the report card results show that there is substantial room for improvement.

**FINANCIAL COMMITMENTS:**

Donors have met only 22% of their financial pledges to date, and most have not reported how they plan to reach the full pledged amount. ONE asked donors to identify how much they have delivered and how they plan to meet the promises over the next two years. Apart from Germany, which explained how it plans to meet these promises with commitments, no donor was willing to provide any information beyond what was reported in the 2011 Deauville Accountability Report, the G8’s self-assessment tool.\(^{12}\) Thus, both our research and this report indicate that L’Aquila donors collectively have disbursed 22% of their L’Aquila pledges, with another 26% ‘firmly committed’. The eight donors assessed in this report reported $2.5 billion in disbursements, or 11% of the AFSI pledge. Together these countries account for 84% of the total financial pledge. Countries such as Canada and Italy have disbursed more than two-thirds of their pledge. France, the UK and the US need to make substantial catch-up disbursements in order to be on track. Two years into their pledge periods, they have fulfilled only 28%, 30% and 2% respectively of their pledges.\(^{13}\) Meanwhile, Germany, Japan and the EC are difficult to assess because they have not yet reported any disbursements to the G8 or to ONE as part of the questionnaire.\(^{14}\) Although the G8 agreement calls for annual reporting on progress at the G8 summit, most countries face budget constraints that may restrict their reporting of disbursements in a timely manner. ONE can only count what it can see: based on disbursements reported, donors are making some progress, but are not on track to fulfil their promises within their pledge periods.

\(^{12}\) Unfortunately, these findings cannot be substantiated with data from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), which monitors and tracks development assistance, because the data does not break down how much of donor contributions for multilateral organisations or for individual sectors, such as transportation, are food security-related. \(^{13}\) The US committed to meet its pledge through appropriations. Thus far, it has appropriated $2.04 billion for FY2010 and FY2011, or 58.2% of its pledge. \(^{14}\) Germany and Japan agreed to report progress towards their pledges in commitments. Germany reported commitments of $919.6 million for 2010, representing 30% of its pledge. Japan reported commitments of $1 billion for 2010, representing 33% of its pledge.
**THE ROME PRINCIPLES**

**PRINCIPLE 1:**
**Country Ownership**

Most donors are not making a strong enough effort to invest in country-led plans, but their commitment to supporting CAADP is a good first step. The EC, France, Germany, Italy and the US have recently created new development strategies in which country ownership is mentioned, but in most cases it is not prioritized. Most donors emphasise that, by financially supporting CAADP, they are promoting country ownership. However, CAADP contributions make up only a very small percentage of any country’s agriculture and food security funding and do not involve regions other than Africa, suggesting that donors need to articulate better how they will enable country ownership that also emphasises multi-stakeholder consultations and inclusive decision-making processes.

**PRINCIPLE 2:**
**Strategic Coordination**

While each of the eight donors assessed is a member or a funder of at least two of the five key coordination mechanisms mentioned within AFSI pledging statements, they can do more to foster strategic coordination at the regional and national levels. While donors cited examples of working in or with donor groups or regional organisations such as the AFSI group, multilateral organisations and some regional organisations, and policy-making processes such as the Committee on World Food Security (CFS), as evidence of strategic cooperation, these examples actually are insufficient to demonstrate how donors are working together better to reduce overlaps and fill financing gaps. This suggests that progress towards making cooperation more strategic and effective has been weak.

**PRINCIPLE 3:**
**Comprehensive Approach**

Donors have made progress in taking a comprehensive twin-track approach to food security, especially towards the root causes of the food price crisis. Of particular note, France has elevated the issues of food price volatility and food security during its 2011 presidency of the G8/G20. All donors provided examples of how they have adopted comprehensive and twin-track approaches. In addition to emergency food aid, Italy is supporting several multilateral organisations, including an integrated approach to agriculture, food security, nutrition and rural development in partnership with the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). Japan channels its short-term support through the World Food Programme (WFP) and adopts a value chain approach throughout its additional lending that works to reduce risks in pre- and post-harvesting, build irrigation systems and develop rural infrastructure to improve market access.

**PRINCIPLE 4:**
**Multilateral Support and Improvement**

With the exception of the UK’s multilateral aid review, donors have not reported taking significant concrete steps to improve the effectiveness of multilateral organisations involved in food security. Additionally, only Canada and the US have made significant contributions to the GAFSP, which has a core function of filling financing gaps in development plans. Each donor provided examples of multilateral organisations that they are financially supporting, but few gave examples of how they are trying to improve the effectiveness of those organisations. Notably, the UK has launched a multilateral review process of each and every international organisation it supports financially to evaluate their effectiveness and to propose measures for improvement if results are unsatisfactory.

**PRINCIPLE 5:**
**Sustained Commitment**

Some donors have made non-binding policy changes and/or have taken steps towards sustaining commitments to food security beyond their initial three-year pledge period. Disappointingly, these steps are not very strong, and do not definitively extend the AFSI past 2012. The US government has planned its Feed the Future initiative for five years and has changed its bureaucratic structure to ensure the longevity of its focus on food security. Germany has just adopted a new rural development strategy that emphasises that rural development is a core priority of its development assistance. The EC points out that it has never divested funding from agriculture and EU Development Commissioner Andris Piebalgs regularly reaffirms the EC’s commitments to achieving food security. Yet not one donor has explicitly identified how it intends to eradicate food insecurity post-2012. In fact, Canada, which had a partially retroactive pledge ending in 2010, dropped its food security investment to pre-L’Aquila levels in 2011.

* The coordination mechanisms listed in the AFSI pledge statements are the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), the Committee on World Food Security (CFS), the Global Partnership on Agriculture, Food Security, and Nutrition (GPAFSN), the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development and the UN Standing Committee on Nutrition (SCN).
### Other Core Commitments:

#### Commitment: Gender

Progress on targeting women and integrating gender sensitivity into development plans is mixed. Canada, the EC and the US have explicitly committed to targeting women, recognising their role in agricultural development, food and nutrition security. However, other donors such as Germany, Italy and Japan do not emphasise gender issues. While the UK focuses on women and girls in its Business Plan 2011–2015 and its health strategies, women and gender are not identified specifically in relation to food security or agricultural development.

#### Commitment: Environment

Donors need to improve their commitment to integrate environmental sustainability into their agriculture and food security programmes. While some donors – such as Canada, France and in particular Germany – have expressed strong support for managing the environment and seeking pathways for sustainable agricultural production, most do not pay sufficient attention to addressing the threats of climate change and natural resource degradation within their agricultural development and food security programmes.

#### Commitment: Transparency

Donors must make significant improvements to achieve transparency and accountability on their L’Aquila promises. The Deauville G8 Accountability Report failed to review the progress made by donors based on a uniform system of measurement. This is in part because donors have yet to agree upon how they will measure their progress. Most donors were not particularly forthcoming to ONE with information that they had not already provided in the 2011 G8 Deauville report. In fact, most donors neglected to provide the data requested and few completed ONE’s qualitative questionnaire in full. Notably, Germany provided commitment data for 2011 and 2012, but it also shifted several of its pledge categories, as did Canada, France, Italy and the EC, thus making it near impossible to measure progress externally.
On the following pages are report cards for the G7 and the EC (the largest financial contributors to the L'Aquila Initiative), which break down how donors score against their financial pledges, the Rome Principles and other core commitments to gender, environmental sustainability and transparency.

Donors did not agree to a consistent and uniform system for measuring pledges. The G8 Muskoka Accountability report attempted to identify a uniform system, but it allows for exceptions. This makes holding all donors to account for their disbursements difficult. In this report, donors’ financial pledges are measured based on the proportion of disbursements to the time elapsed in their pledge period. A donor that has disbursed one-third of its pledge and is one year into its pledge period would be ‘on track’. Lesser amounts are noted as needing improvement to stay on track to meet the pledges. Where donors specified their pledges to be measured by appropriations or commitments, this is noted separately. The qualitative commitments are measured based on a series of indicators for each principle and core commitment set out in Section 2 of this report. Outstanding progress on a principle or commitment is noted as ‘on track’, mediocre to satisfactory progress is described as ‘somewhat on track’ and poor performance is reported as ‘needs improvement’.

Countries assessed in this report
CANADA

DISBURSEMENT PROGRESS:
SOMewhat ON TRACK

• PLEDGE: $1.034 billion (in disbursements) over Canada’s FY2008/09–10/11

• ADDITIONALITY OF PLEDGE: $0.526 billion (52% increase)

• DISBURSED TO DATE: $0.919 billion (88.9% of pledge)

• COMMITMENTS IN THE PIPELINE: not reported

• DISBURSEMENTS NEEDED TO FULFIL PLEDGE: $0.115 billion

PLEDGE TRACKER

Disbursement Progress
Somewhat On Track

2011-100%

2010-67%

2009-33%

0%

TOTAL PLEDGE: $1.034 Billion

$0.115 Billion Outstanding

$0.919 Billion Disbursed
## Non-Financial Progress:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promise</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Country Ownership** | On Track | • Canada’s food security strategy includes alignment with all major aid effectiveness principles.  
• Canada’s bilateral disbursements have gone to national governments for use on their own priorities. |
| **Strategic Coordination** | Needs Improvement | • Canada has invested considerable resources in the G8/G20 Global Donor Platform approach to global food security but relatively little in the UN system, with the exception of co-hosting the release of the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) framework in 2010. |
| **Comprehensive Approach** | On Track | • Canada has integrated a focus on smallholders into its food security strategy.  
• The strategy comprehensively addresses root causes of food insecurity and local governance of the food system. |
| **Multilateral Support and Improvement** | Somewhat On Track | • 55% of Canada’s disbursement has been passed on to the GAFSP (38%), the WFP (5%) and IFAD (6%).  
• Canada’s food security strategy does not include any effort to improve governance of the global food system.  
• Canada has fulfilled its pledge to the GAFSP. |
| **Sustained Commitments** | Needs Improvement | • Half of Canada’s pledge period fell before the L’Aquila summit. After the end of 2010, when the pledge period ended, Canada’s food security investments fell to pre-AFSI levels.  
• Canada’s disbursements to multilaterals are consistent with its pledge, but agriculture disbursements are less than the original pledge amount. |
| **Gender** | On Track | • Canada has integrated a focus on women into its food security strategy. |
| **Environmental Sustainability** | Needs Improvement | • Canada mentions resilience and agro-ecological approaches to agriculture in its strategy, but it has not fully integrated environmental sustainability into its programmes at the country level. |
| **Transparency** | Needs Improvement | • The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) has made its food security strategy available online, but information on how it is meeting its L’Aquila commitments is limited.  
• CIDA received a 62% rating (16th out of 30 donors) on the ‘availability of specific information’ metric. |
EUROPEAN COMMISSION

DISBURSEMENT PROGRESS:
NO DATA PROVIDED

• PLEDGE:
  $3.8 billion (in disbursements) over 2010–12

• ADDITIONALITY OF PLEDGE:
  $0.742 billion (19.5% increase)

• DISBURSED TO DATE: not reported

• COMMITMENTS IN THE PIPELINE:
  $2.02 billion

• DISBURSEMENTS NEEDED TO FULFIL PLEDGE:
  $3.8 billion, less unreported disbursements to date
### Non-Financial Progress:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promise</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Country Ownership                | Somewhat On Track     | • Country ownership is a component of overarching EU food security policy, and there is some mention of empowering key stakeholder groups, but this is not directly linked to agriculture or development of food security plans.  
• Capacity building is not strongly referenced in the EU’s Green Paper on Inclusive Growth. |
| Strategic Coordination            | On Track              | • The EC is an active member of the AFSI group and the CFS, and is advocating for the CFS to become the global coordinating body for UN members’ food security policy setting.  
• The EC strives to reach agreement amongst EU member states on principles for development assistance. |
| Comprehensive Approach           | On Track              | • The EC balances its support relatively evenly between food aid and agricultural development.  
• The EC stresses smallholder resilience as a core priority in the EU food security policy framework.  
• Private sector involvement is key to the EU’s Green Paper on Inclusive Growth. |
| Multilateral Support and Improvement | Somewhat On Track    | • The EC has not made a pledge to the GAFSP.  
• The EC supports the reform process at the CFS, but is not notably engaged with FAO or CGIAR reform.  
• The EC is working to create a joint platform for cooperation with the Rome-based food and agriculture agencies. |
| Sustained Commitments            | Needs Improvement     | • As evidenced in commitments reported by sector, the EC does not plan to spend consistent with its original pledge.  
• The EC did not increase spending on agriculture between 2008 and 2009, according to the DAC.  
• Development Commissioner Piebalgs regularly publicly communicates a long-term commitment to food security. |
| Gender                           | On Track              | • The EU-wide food security policy specifically calls for investing in small-scale female farmers, supporting women’s agricultural education and building the capacity of women’s associations. |
| Environmental Sustainability     | On Track              | • EU-wide policy supports sustainable and ecological approaches to agricultural productivity and assisting developing countries to address climate change and its effects on food security. |
| Transparency                     | On Track              | • The EC scored a 72% rating (10th out of 30 donors) on the ‘availability of specific information’ metric.  
• The EC provided ONE with extensive answers to the qualitative questionnaire, but has not reported any AFSI disbursements to the G8 or to ONE. |
FRANCE

DISBURSEMENT PROGRESS: NEEDS IMPROVEMENT

• PLEDGE: $2.161 billion (in disbursements) over 2009–11

• ADDITIONALITY OF PLEDGE: $0.365 billion (16.5% increase)

• DISBURSED TO DATE: $0.606 billion (28.1% of pledge)

• COMMITMENTS IN THE PIPELINE: $1.337 billion

• DISBURSEMENTS NEEDED TO FULFIL PLEDGE: $1.555 billion

PLEDGE TRACKER

FRANCE

TOTAL PLEDGE: $2.161 Billion

$1.555 Billion Outstanding

$0.606 Billion Disbursed
## Non-Financial Progress:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROMISE</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Country Ownership             | Somewhat On Track   | • France’s New Development Cooperation Strategy highlights alignment with country development plans.  
                                |                     | • The global strategy does not articulate a multi-stakeholder decision-making process; however, most country strategies reference consultations with civil society and the private sector. |
| Strategic Coordination        | On Track            | • France has elevated food security and food price volatility as major issues at the G20.  
                                |                     | • France is an active participant in the CFS, the UN, SCN and CGIAR.  
                                |                     | • France promotes regional organisations in West Africa.                                                               |
| Comprehensive Approach        | On Track            | • France spends 6.4 times more on agricultural development than on food aid.  
                                |                     | • France places a strong emphasis on long-term efforts to address its root causes by prioritising smallholder farmers, capacity building and fostering private sector investment.  
                                |                     | • As the G20 President, France has been leading an effort to reduce food price volatility.                               |
| Multilateral Support and      | Somewhat On Track   | • France has not made a pledge to the GAFSP.  
                                |                     | • 4.6% of France’s AFSI disbursements have been channelled through multilateral organizations.  
                                |                     | • France is committed to reform of the CFS and the FAO.  
                                |                     | • France was the initial leader of the Global Partnership for Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition.                   |
| Sustained Commitments         | Needs Improvement   | • France has reported spending in categories that were not part of its original pledge.  
                                |                     | • France did not sustain an increase in ODA to agriculture from 2008 to 2009.  
                                |                     | • Agriculture and food security remain major pillars of France’s New Development Cooperation Strategy.                  |
| Gender                        | On Track            | • France highlights the importance of women to development in its New Development Cooperation Strategy, but it is not clear whether the strategy targets the needs of women or integrates gender sensitivity. |
| Environmental Sustainability  | On Track            | • Environmental sustainability is a key component of France’s New Development Cooperation Strategy.                                       |
| Transparency                  | Needs Improvement   | • France received a 65% grade (12th out of 30 donors) on the ‘availability of specific information’ metric.  
                                |                     | • France failed to respond to the ONE questionnaire or to participate in a ONE consultation process.                    |
GERMANY

PROGRESS AGAINST FINANCIAL PLEDGE: ON TRACK

DISBURSEMENT PROGRESS: NO DATA PROVIDED

- PLEDGE: $3 billion (in commitments) 2010–12
- ADDITIONALITY OF PLEDGE: $1 billion (33% increase)
- DISBURSED TO DATE: Not reported
- COMMITMENTS IN THE PIPELINE FOR 2010-12: $3.1 billion\(^\text{15}\)
- DISBURSEMENTS NEEDED TO FULFIL PLEDGE: $3 billion, less unreported disbursements to date\(^\text{16}\)

\(^\text{15}\) Note that these commitments are not commitments according to DAC standards – they are internal and binding budget allocations under national law (partially underpinned by an exchange of notes with partner countries). The Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) has communicated that it takes longer in the German context for budget allocations to appear as disbursements.\(^\text{16}\) Germany has not reported any disbursements under the AFSI. ONE therefore takes disbursements for the purposes of this chart to be zero. This figure will be corrected as soon as the DAC reports sectoral disbursements for 2010, at the end of 2011.
## Non-Financial Progress:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promise</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country Ownership</td>
<td>Somewhat On Track</td>
<td>• A requirement for aid under Germany’s new Rural Development Strategy is to invest in country-owned plans or to support their development, particularly in fragile states. The strategy, however, does not address multi-stakeholder consultation processes for determining development plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Strategic Coordination         | On Track   | • Germany cooperates with the CFS and CGIAR at the international level, with regional bodies such as the African Union and the regional economic communities and trade policy blocs across Africa, and in multiple donor coordinating groups, including the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development (GDPRD).  
• Germany is currently chair of the UN Standing Committee on Nutrition (SCN). |
| Comprehensive Approach        | On Track   | • Germany’s new strategy stresses a long-term approach to rural development alongside its emergency food aid programs.  
• Germany’s strategy focuses on value chains, vocational training, infrastructure, and agricultural research. |
| Multilateral Support and Improvement | Needs Improvement | • Germany has not made a pledge to the GAFSP.  
• Germany provides no evidence of how it improves the cooperation, communication or coordination of agriculture and food security-focused multilaterals.  
• Only 5.3% of Germany’s AFSI pledge was to multilateral mechanisms. |
| Sustained Commitments         | On Track   | • 43% of Germany’s pledge was to agriculture however, Germany has noted that it plans to spend only 31% of its disbursements on the sector.  
• Germany has a new strategic orientation towards rural development and food security.  
• Germany has made financial contributions for EU financing instruments and the multilateral development banks (MDBs) that are additional to its AFSI pledge. |
| Gender                         | On Track   | • Germany’s rural development strategy highlights targeting women in its agriculture programmes. |
| Environmental Sustainability  | On Track   | • Germany’s rural development strategy has sustainable management of rural resources as one of its four main pillars, and it highlights linking land and water management approaches in its agriculture programmes. |
| Transparency                   | Somewhat On Track | • Germany was the only donor to report commitments for years 2011 and 2012 of its pledge period to ONE.  
• Germany scored 40% (26th out of 30 donors) on the ‘availability of specific information’ metric. |
ITALY

DISBURSEMENT PROGRESS:
ON TRACK

- PLEDGE: $0.428 billion
  (in disbursements) 2009–11
- ADDITIONALITY OF PLEDGE:
  $0.180 billion (42% increase)
- DISBURSED TO DATE:
  $0.349 billion (81.6% of pledge)
- COMMITMENTS IN THE PIPELINE:
  not reported
- DISBURSEMENTS NEEDED
  TO FULFIL PLEDGE:
  $0.079 billion

PLEDGE TRACKER

Disbursement Progress
On Track

ITALY

TOTAL PLEDGE: $0.428 Billion

$0.079 Billion Outstanding

$0.349 Billion Disbursed
## NON-FINANCIAL PROGRESS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROMISE</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country Ownership</td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td>• Italy provides some budget support to recipients, and is making an effort to align with national investment plans through a system called STREAM (Synthetic, Transparent, Realistic, Exhaustive, Harmonized, Measurable).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Strategic Coordination | On Track | • Italy is currently co-chair of the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development (GDPRD) and is active in other aid coordination mechanisms at the national and European donor levels.  
• The Italian Development Cooperation agency is currently defining STREAM, which will help donors in-country to coordinate their programmes with national investment plans. |
| Comprehensive Approach | Somewhat On Track | • Italian interventions are concentrated on producers and households devoted to both commercial and subsistence agriculture, including those that are excluded by the markets.  
• Italy’s food security programmes focus on reducing risk and vulnerability, supporting diversification of the rural economy and emergency assistance through WFP. |
| Multilateral Support and Improvement | On Track | • At the global level, Italy actively supports reform of the CFS and CGIAR’s alignment with the Rome-based agencies. It does not appear to be an outspoken participant in the FAO reform process.  
• 46.3% of Italy’s AFSI disbursements have gone through multilateral channels.  
• Italy has not made a pledge to the GAFSP. |
| Sustained Commitments | Somewhat On Track | • Italy has under-disbursed in the agricultural and nutrition sectors and over-disbursed in the multilateral channels, development food aid, transport and storage and safety-net sectors.  
• A sustained commitment beyond the pledge period is not evident. |
| Gender | On Track | • The Italian Development Cooperation has recently released new guidelines on gender and is beginning to address gender inequality in its aid through monitoring investment flows by gender.  
• The Italian Development Cooperation works with many female-headed subsistence farmers in its agricultural programmes. |
| Environmental Sustainability | On Track | • The environmental guidelines for the Italian Development Cooperation program will be a tool for the identification, planning, approval, monitoring and evaluation of all Italy’s development initiatives. |
| Transparency | Somewhat On Track | • Italy received a 50% rating (25th out of 30 donors) on the ‘availability of specific information’ metric.  
• Italy provided ONE with extensive answers to its questionnaire for this report. |
JAPAN

PROGRESS AGAINST FINANCIAL PLEDGE: ON TRACK

DISBURSEMENT PROGRESS: NO DATA PROVIDED

- PLEDGE: $3 billion (in commitments) over 2010–12
- ADDITIONALITY OF PLEDGE: $0.6 billion (20% increase)
- DISBURSED TO DATE: not reported
- COMMITMENTS IN THE PIPELINE: $1 Billion
- DISBURSEMENTS NEEDED TO FULFIL PLEDGE: $3 billion, less unreported disbursements to date

TOTAL PLEDGE: $3 Billion

JAPAN

TOTAL PLEDGE: $3 Billion

- $3 Billion Outstanding
- $0 Disbursed
## NON-FINANCIAL PROGRESS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROMISE</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country Ownership</strong></td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>• NERICA rice, which is Japan’s primary agricultural investment, was developed outside of national research programs in Africa and did not involve farmers in its development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Coordination</strong></td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>• Japan’s primary AFSI coordination effort is through the Coalition for African Rice Development. • Japan is a funder of CGIAR and co-hosted the release of the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Approach</strong></td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td>• Japan supports the WFP and has adopted a value chain approach that directs investments into pre- and post-harvesting support, including infrastructure and market access. • Smallholder farmers do not appear to be a focus of Japan’s agricultural investments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multilateral Support and Improvement</strong></td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>• Japan has not made a pledge to the GAFSP. • Japan is supportive of reforming the FAO, the CFS and CGIAR. • None of Japan’s AFSI pledge was made toward multilateral mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustained Commitments</strong></td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>• Japan’s pipeline is almost evenly split between agriculture and storage and transport, however, its pledge is 2/3 transport and storage versus 1/3 agriculture. • Japan has committed to a goal of doubling African rice production over 10 years, however, it has not expressed intention to continue its investments in transport and storage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>• Japan provided no examples as to how it might be addressing gender its programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>Somewhat On Track</td>
<td>• Natural resource management and climate change adaptation are themes running through JICA’s programming, however, it is unclear they are integrated into food security programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparency</strong></td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>• Japan does not make publicly available much information on its food security programmes, provided sparse responses to the ONE questionnaire, and failed to report disbursements to the G8. • Japan scored 50% (23rd out of 30 donors) on the “availability of specific information” metric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNITED KINGDOM

DISBURSEMENT PROGRESS: NEEDS IMPROVEMENT

- PLEDGE: $1.718 billion (in disbursements) over UK FY2009/10–FY2011/12
- ADDITIONALITY OF PLEDGE: $0.312 billion (18.4% increase)
- DISBURSED TO DATE: $0.509 billion (29.6% of pledge)
- COMMITMENTS IN THE PIPELINE: not reported
- DISBURSEMENTS NEEDED TO FULFIL PLEDGE: $1.209 billion

17 For FY10/11, DFID expects that disbursements are roughly the same level as FY2009/10 ($0.509 billion).
### Non-Financial Progress:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROMISE</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Country Ownership             | Needs Improvement              | • The UK financially supports the CAADP process but in its response to ONE did not identify how it promotes country-ownership and multi-stakeholder decision-making processes within or outside of Africa.  
• The Bilateral Aid Review discusses evaluation and consultation with DFID country offices but did not explain how host country governments and other stakeholders were involved in this process. |
| Strategic Coordination        | On Track                       | • The UK supports the CFS, launched the South Asia Food Security and Nutrition Initiative with the World Bank and promotes regional market integration in several African sub-regions  
• The UK is considering a contribution to the GAFSP                                                                                                                                  |
| Comprehensive Approach       | On Track                       | • The UK supports vulnerability assessment and analysis for food assistance in Southern Africa.  
• Agricultural productivity, risk management and social protection are all integral to DFID’s food security work.                                                                                                                   |
| Multilateral Support and Improvement | On Track                   | • Through its Multilateral Aid Review, the UK measured the effectiveness of each organisation that the UK supports, and is aligning its support with the results of the review.  
• The UK has not yet made a contribution to the GAFSP.  
• 11% of AFSI disbursements to date have gone through multilateral channels.                                                                                                                      |
| Sustained Commitments        | Needs Improvement              | • Food security does not factor strongly amongst DFID’s priorities, thus the commitment may not be sustained.  
• The UK’s sectoral disbursements are consistent with its pledge.                                                                                                                      |
| Gender                        | On Track                       | • DFID’s Business Plan includes the creation of economic assets for women and girls, including through agriculture and related businesses, as one of its four pillars.                                                                                                      |
| Environmental Sustainability | On Track                       | • In bilateral agriculture work, conservation agriculture and land management are key areas.  
• A new research programme addresses the sustainability of ecosystems related to food production.                                                                                                                                         |
| Transparency                  | On Track                       | • The UK provided ONE with adequate responses to the questionnaire.  
• Agency-wide, DFID scored a 70% rating (9th out of 30 donors) on the ‘availability of specific information’ metric.                                                                                                                     |
**Country Report Cards**

**UNITED STATES**

**PROGRESS AGAINST FINANCIAL PLEDGE: SOMewhat ON TRACK**

**DISBURSEMENT PROGRESS: NEEDS IMPROVEMENT**

- **PLEDGE:** $3.5 billion (in appropriations) over US FY2010–12
- **ADDITIONALITY OF PLEDGE:** $1.8 billion (51.4% increase)
- **DISBURSED TO DATE:** $0.073 billion (2.1% of pledge)\(^{18}\)
- **COMMITMENTS IN THE PIPELINE:** $2.04 billion\(^{19}\)
- **DISBURSEMENTS NEEDED TO FULFIL PLEDGE:** $3.427 billion\(^{20}\)

---

**PLEDGE TRACKER**

_Dischursee Progress Needs Improvement_

**2012-100%**

**2011-67%**

**2010-33%**

0%

**UNITED STATES**

**TOTAL PLEDGE: $3.5 Billion**

- $3.427 Billion Outstanding
- $0.073 Billion Disbursed

---

18 For the AFSI, the US counts only the disbursements that were allocated by Congress in 2010 and disbursed in 2010. The US disbursed a total of $419 million for the agriculture sector in FY2010, most of which was allocated in prior years.

19 This represents Feed the Future Congressional appropriations for FY2010 and estimated budget allocations for FY2011. The US will meet its L'Aquila pledge if $1.46 billion is appropriated in FY2012 for Feed the Future.
## NON-FINANCIAL PROGRESS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROMISE</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country Ownership</strong></td>
<td>Somewhat On</td>
<td>• The US does not require missions to hold public, in-country stakeholder consultations as part of the development of its Country Investment Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Track</td>
<td>• Country ownership is a pillar of Feed the Future (FTF), the US global food security initiative, which bases its plans for focus countries on CAADP compacts and country investment plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Coordination</strong></td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td>• FTF focus country implementation plans involve communication and coordination with multiple regional and country-level donor, NGO and government coordination bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The US does not provide direct budget support to FTF countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The US champions the 1000 Days Initiative, which represents its commitment to the UN SCN’s goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Approach</strong></td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>• The US allocates twice as much to emergency food aid as it does to agricultural development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Only two out of 55 indicators in the FTF monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E) framework relate to smallholders. All are optional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Leveraging private sector funds is a major goal of FTF. This is integrated throughout its plans and M&amp;E framework, with an Office of the Private Sector and Innovation to implement it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Capacity building is a focus of 15 out of 55 indicators in the M&amp;E framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multilateral Support and Improvement</strong></td>
<td>Somewhat On Track</td>
<td>• The US has made a pledge to the GAFSP, but is on track to deliver only 40% of this by the end of 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The US works to improve the effectiveness of the CFS, CGIAR and the Rome-based agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 92% of US AFSI disbursements to date have gone through multilateral channels. However, only 5% of its total 2010 pipeline is scheduled to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustained Commitments</strong></td>
<td>Somewhat On</td>
<td>• FTF is a five-year initiative, and USAID has instituted a Bureau for Food Security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Track</td>
<td>• The US has obligated FY2010 funds to the transport and storage and rural development sectors, although it has not pledged such funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td>• USAID has a new Gender Index and Guide that it plans to apply to all of its bureaux.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>Somewhat On</td>
<td>• The US has recently added several indicators for natural resource management to its M&amp;E framework. However, they are optional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparency</strong></td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td>• FTF has made significant efforts to be transparent, including the publication of country-level plans, public stakeholder consultations in the US and opportunities for public input into its M&amp;E framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The US scored a 75% rating (7th out of 30 donors) on the ‘availability of specific information’ metric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Last but not least, at L’Aquila donors pledged to be more transparent and more accountable; for the first time, they were going to be clear about how they planned to deliver on their commitments by breaking down their pledges into aid categories over a specified period of time. Donors have kept their promises to write annual accountability reports, but the quality of these reports is disappointing. The lack of systematized reporting significantly over-complicates the measurement of donor progress and their ability to hold one another accountable. An analysis of the nature of donors’ pledges and the content of the reports uncovers several specific issues that call into question the G8’s commitment to accountability:

1. Overall aid figures were reported in current dollars to make the G8 appear more successful in delivering their promises.
2. L’Aquila donor reporting varied between commitments and disbursements, whereas all donors should have reported both.
3. Nearly each donor chose a different time window for delivery.
4. Several donors reported spending in areas that were not in their original pledges.
5. Pre-AFSI baselines are nearly impossible to calculate.

The inability to establish a pre-AFSI baseline of food security spending makes the overall financial accomplishment of the initiative difficult to calculate. Agriculture, nutrition and development food aid are considered food security-specific and would all be included in a baseline figure for use in comparison with AFSI disbursements. However, in an effort to be comprehensive, donors included transport and storage, safety nets, rural development and ‘other’ sectors in the initiative. These sectors are not food security-specific in the OECD DAC database and thus an independent evaluator has no way of knowing what share of sector disbursements was spent ‘with the main purpose of improving food security’. They should be included, however, so that commitments and disbursements can be independently verified.

Other persistent challenges in tracking donor progress are that the pledges do not distinguish between grants and loans, the multilateral delivery channels do not require international organisations to identify how they intend to spend these funds or align with the Rome Principles, and there are no DAC tracking markers to show if funds are targeted towards small-scale farmers. Further, no agreed upon indicators for meeting the Rome Principles exist, making assessing progress quite subjective. Moving forward, donors must recommit to transparency and accountability by developing consistent data and measurable criteria for reporting spending, spending categories, targets and aid effectiveness.

If left unaddressed, the issues of not being able to (1) determine pre-AFSI baselines and (2) clearly monitor progress toward qualitative commitments will mean that civil society will be unable to check donor progress at will, thus making monitoring ad hoc and overly reliant on the G8 to gather information and write reports. Two main recommendations therefore emerge from an analysis of AFSI pledges and reporting. First, the G20 should call on the OECD DAC to add a ‘food security’ tracking marker to reported aid flows, as well as a marker that indicates whether development dollars are being targeted towards the most vulnerable people. Second, donors should agree upon measurable outcomes and indicators, as well as corresponding baselines, to track progress toward the promises of the AFSI.
A three-year commitment to spend $22 billion on driving agricultural growth and combating food insecurity is a laudable goal, yet the barriers to food security and poverty reduction remain higher than ever. Food prices are rising again, driving millions of people back into poverty. Climate change threatens to stifle agricultural productivity, if not send it into reverse, and rivers and basins are drying up, leaving rain-fed farmers in even greater peril. Investments to tackle these issues often overlook those who need the most support or those who would stand to benefit the most. Based on weak progress against the L’Aquila promises, donor apathy appears to be growing again. The L’Aquila promises are just the foothills of an uphill climb, but one that donors cannot afford to retreat from.

**THE GROWING ROLE OF THE G20**

Under the weight of these daunting global challenges, a new era of global politics is emerging through the growing power of the G20. Within the G20, the Development Working Group offers a forum to discuss development issues and to determine how the G20 can support development in low-income countries and address issues such as food insecurity. As part of the G20 Development Working Group, France has elevated food security on the G20 agenda and strongly champions curbing commodity price volatility to reduce global food insecurity. Rampant speculation in commodity markets is a driver of price volatility and price increases. Better transparency and limits on the volume of food commodity futures that can be traded will help to minimise major price swings. This alone, however, will not produce the transformative effects that can be achieved through investing in agriculture.

Speculation on financial markets is not the only driver of high and volatile prices. Challenges such as climate change, Northern country biofuel policies, growing populations and dramatic weather events all contribute. This suggests that building the resilience of vulnerable populations to shocks – no matter what their origin – will be most effective in staving off global food insecurity. The influence of the emerging economies in the G20, which have recent expertise in development through agricultural-led growth, and which are becoming donors themselves, have significant value to add in improving development assistance to agriculture, generating appropriate private sector investment and building knowledge capacity.

**BEYOND L’AQUILA**

Foreign assistance from the G8 and other L’Aquila donors is not the only source of investment in agriculture. In fact, it is only one of many components to achieving food security, reducing poverty and growing economies. Investments are generated from the private sector, national governments and innovative sources of finance. The challenge is to ensure that, first, public investments leverage and encourage additional and continued support from other sources of finance and, second, that these investments are aligned with ‘smart aid’ and human rights principles.

**THE PRIVATE SECTOR**

More and better investments in agriculture are sorely needed, but not all investments are equal. Donor and taxpayer fatigue has generated a new mantra of calling for public-private partnerships and private sector investments to achieve development. However, emerging private sector responses to these calls often...
Looking Ahead

NATIONAL GOVERNMENT INVESTMENTS

The Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) is an African-led initiative that seeks to improve food security and increase agricultural productivity growth. Through a process of inclusive multi-stakeholder consultations under the initiative, African countries develop strategic plans or compacts that, once agreed, can be transformed into investment plans to be co-financed by African governments and donors. In 2003, at a summit in Maputo, Mozambique, African Union heads of state committed to spend 10% of their national budgets on agriculture to reach agricultural growth of 6% annually. Known as the ‘Maputo Commitments’, these promises are a framework for ensuring that African governments play their part and adequately invest in agriculture and rural economic growth. To date, however, progress against the commitments has been mixed.

As of June 2011, 25 countries had signed CAADP compacts but only seven – Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Guinea, Malawi, Mali, Niger and Senegal – had met their commitments to spend 10% of their budgets on agriculture. Nevertheless, CAADP has changed the way in which national governments approach agricultural development by putting agriculture back on the front burner. In countries like Malawi, a refocus of support for smallholder farmers has helped to stabilise food prices and increase supply, despite setbacks to donor financing. While it is in the self-interest of African governments to meet, if not exceed, these commitments, they are partly swayed by donor apathy. The CAADP process picked up significant momentum after the announcement of the L’Aquila promises, and expectations of new financing prompted African governments to put in place plans designed to be co-financed by donors. However, if donor apathy towards meeting the L’Aquila promises wins out over political will for preventing hunger and reducing poverty, it is possible that some African governments could backslide.

INNOVATIVE FINANCE

Aid for agriculture and food security will fall short of the resources needed to eradicate hunger and poverty; therefore, it is critical that the G8 and G20 leverage innovative financing mechanisms in the coming years. Relative to other sectors, agriculture presents greater barriers to private sector investment because diverse landscapes, poor infrastructure and weak markets suggest that returns will be low. Global research and development spending on agriculture totalled $25 billion in 2000, but more than 40% of this was privately funded and 96% of the research was conducted in developed countries. This trend should be reversed by the G8 and G20 by ‘pulling’ the private sector into investing in R&D in poor countries for poor country crops and challenges. The private sector is largely absent, but it could make significant strides in areas such as improving the distribution and adoption of existing technologies. Some examples include conservation practices, appropriate fertiliser use, small-scale irrigation, post-harvest handling and storage practices and value-added food processing in remote and under-served areas. The G8 and G20, however, need to incentivise their investment, first by fulfilling their commitments and, second, by creating the right policy environment and adequate infrastructure to minimise risk and stimulate growth.
### African Progress On The Maputo Commitments, Average Expenditure 2003-2009, Selected Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries that have met their commitments to spend 10% of their budgets on agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries spending 5 - 10% of their budgets on agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Donor progress against the L’Aquila promises shows that the G8 and other major donors are not approaching agriculture and food security with the urgency they deserve. Partial transparency and accountability on reporting what has been accomplished so far hamper rather than invigorate the process. A major injection of political will and good faith are needed without further delay to leverage support from other donors, recipient country governments and the private sector.

Progress against the L’Aquila promises has been insufficient to address the scale of the challenges now and ahead, especially given that less than one-third of the pledges actually consisted of new money. Delivering less than a quarter of commitments one year into a three-year pledge does not convince ONE that donors are ‘on track’ to meet their commitments. Even though around another quarter is ‘firmly committed’, little information is provided as to how, when, where or for what purposes. The remaining 50% is still a complete mystery. Without evidence of progress, how will donors reassure smallholder farmers that they will deliver? Also critical, is how these funds will reach poor and vulnerable populations. While some donors such as the US have undertaken substantial efforts to improve the way that they do business, this is not evident across the G7.

Accountability and transparency are not just espoused ideals for aid effectiveness, they are real promises made by the L’Aquila donors to real people in peril; real people whose lives and futures depend on better aid for agriculture, food security and rural development. They were also promises made to African governments and international institutions and to future partners within the private sector. Failure to meet these promises would result in abysmal consequences, and even partial or lackluster progress is damaging, if not destabilising. While the L’Aquila donors are not the only ones responsible for tackling the challenges presented by food insecurity and poverty, they are the lynchpin to success. Without overwhelming enthusiasm to meet their promises – financial and qualitative – and working towards a longer-term strategy for eradicating poverty, political will from African governments and financial support from the private sector may begin to fade away.

Looking ahead, the L’Aquila donors must recognise that the scale of these challenges far outstrips anything that $22 billion over three years could possibly accomplish. There are nearly one billion people in the world who are food-insecure today. Rising and more volatile food prices threaten to roll back much of the progress that has been made in the fight against extreme poverty and continue to plague those who are chronically poor and vulnerable to food price, economic and climatic shocks. If donors, recipient governments and the private sector do not get serious about confronting these issues now, the number of food-insecure people will only climb, by the millions.

‘Donor progress against the L’Aquila promises shows that the G8 and other major donors are not approaching agriculture and food security with the urgency they deserve.’
Conclusion

At the upcominG20 Summit in France in November 2011, the G20 should commit to:

1. Fulfill their L’Aquila commitments
   • Urgently and rapidly fulfill the L’Aquila commitments on aid quality and quantity for agricultural development and food security.
   • The US should fulfill its outstanding pledge of $308 million to the Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme (GAFSP), and other countries should pledge additional monies to improve multilateral coordination for funding country-owned agricultural development and food security programmes.

2. Reduce food price volatility
   • Make more information publicly available about grain stocks, and refrain from export bans to help prevent extreme food price spikes and to temper price volatility.
   • Create position limits for food commodity futures on financial markets.
   • Require that all derivatives of food commodities are subject to notification, clearing and monitoring by making position information publicly available.

3. Build on the AFSI to include emerging donors, more transparency, accountability, and commitments through 2015
   • Create equal partnerships between donors and recipients in the design and implementation of development assistance for agriculture and food security.
   • Emphasise the need for investments in agriculture, food security and nutrition that target smallholder farmers, especially women, and that integrate environmental sustainability as the fastest pathway out of poverty.
   • Ensure that investments in agricultural risk management and social safety-net programmes ease the impacts of current price spikes and build the resilience of poor people to withstand future shocks.
   • Ensure that public investments incentivise private sector investment consistent with the Rome and other aid effectiveness principles and leverage innovative sources of finance.
   • Improve transparency and accountability of delivering on promises by agreeing to:
     • A unified and consistent reporting standard
     • OECD DAC indicators to identify whether development dollars are targeted towards the most vulnerable people
     • Measurable outcomes and indicators and corresponding baselines to track progress.

Establish a regulatory body, similar to the US Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC), for futures trading in European and other markets.