

# HOW POLICY EVOLVES

## A Comparative Analysis of the Global Food Security Act of 2016 and the Global Food Security Strategy 2022-2026

### THE GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 2016

In 2016, Congress passed the [Global Food Security Act \(GFSA\)](#) with overwhelming bipartisan support. The GFSA demonstrates U.S. commitments to global food security and nutrition policy through the [Feed the Future](#) (FTF) initiative and strengthens the program's transparency, monitoring, evaluation, and learning, and reporting mechanisms. FTF was initially created in 2010 in response to the global food crisis of 2007 and 2008, which spiked food prices for many of the world's most vulnerable communities. The passage of GFSA in 2016 and its reauthorization in 2018 further codified U.S. global leadership to respond to rising food insecurity and malnutrition and addressed root causes of poverty and hunger.

In 2023, the GFSA is up for reauthorization. This is an important opportunity for Congress to further strengthen Feed the Future to make it more multisectoral, transparent, and supportive of smallholder farmers, and to strengthen the gender and nutrition focus within FTF programming.

### THE GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY STRATEGY 2022-2026

Starting in 2017, Congress mandated the U.S. [Global Food Security Strategy \(GFSS\)](#). The Strategy charts the U.S. Government's (USG) contribution course to achieve global food security and guides the implementation of the Feed the Future initiative. The GFSS presents an integrated whole-of-government strategy with agency-specific implementation plans to drive Feed the Future programming.

In 2021, the USG has refreshed and updated the first U.S. Global Food Security Strategy 2017-2021 to help U.S. global food security programs meet and better address the challenges of today and tomorrow. This update was a significant opportunity to strengthen the Strategy, ensure that the GFSS is most effectively addressing the drivers of food insecurity today, and formalize newer ways of working and thinking.

The [Global Food Security Strategy 2022-2026](#), released in October 2021, builds on the lessons learned from the last decade of Feed the Future program implementation. It is responsive to the key drivers of food insecurity today: COVID-19, climate change, growing conflict, and rising inequality.

## HOW POLICY EVOLVES

As part of the development of the new GFSS, InterAction convened a series of consultations with local leaders, Feed the Future implementers, and NGO Members across our related policy working groups to understand the role of FTF programs in global food security efforts. Through these consultations, InterAction developed [NGO recommendations for the GFSS](#) in June 2021.

The comparative analysis below uses these NGO recommendations to highlight six areas of enhanced language or policy in the new iteration of the GFSS (2022-2026). These six areas are not an exhaustive list of how the program and strategy have shifted to respond to changing contexts and learning. Nevertheless, the six areas below represent key areas of change and evolution in topics and language from the [GFSA 2016](#) to the [GFSS \(2022-2026\)](#) that are important to the InterAction community.

1. Specification of country selection and the targeting approach for FTF Programs
2. Increased focus on locally-led development, capacity building, and local ownership
3. Diversified partnerships and expanding research investments beyond innovation labs
4. Incorporation of climate change
5. Integration of conflict mitigation, peacebuilding, and social cohesion
6. Accountability: improving metrics and evaluation



### SPECIFICATION OF COUNTRY SELECTION AND THE TARGETING APPROACH FOR FTF PROGRAMS

The GFSA identifies five criteria for Feed the Future target country selection, which the GFSS has significantly expanded upon. The updated targeting approach considers poverty, costs of not investing, climate change, and opportunity for regional economic integration in the selection process. The Strategy does not mention a specific formula to determine the number of target countries selected for implementation, and it does not provide a distinction between target and aligned countries. USAID is currently conducting a target country expansion process and is expected to announce a new list of FTF target countries in March 2022.

<u>Global Food Security Act 2016</u>	<u>Global Food Security Strategy 2022-2026</u>	<u>NGO Recommendations for the GFSS 2022-2026</u>
<b>SELECTING TARGET COUNTRIES FOR FEED THE FUTURE PROGRAMS</b>		
<p>The GFSA listed five criteria for identifying target countries:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. “Potential for agriculture-led economic growth</li> </ol>	<p>The GFSS added a sixth criterion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Opportunities for regional economic integration</li> </ol>	<p>There is a key tension or disconnect between the prioritization of market-based approaches and reaching the most marginalized and vulnerable</p>

<u>Global Food Security Act 2016</u>	<u>Global Food Security Strategy 2022-2026</u>	<u>NGO Recommendations for the GFSS 2022-2026</u>
<p>2. Government commitment to agricultural investment and policy reform</p> <p>3. Opportunities for partnerships and regional synergies</p> <p>4. Level of need</p> <p>5. Resource availability”</p> <p>(p. 3, Sec. 4.12)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Focus on areas with opportunities to promote and strengthen regional trade and development corridors, integrate markets, accelerate regional growth, and increase urban/rural links within and across countries” (p. 64).</li> </ul>	<p>households. An ag-led growth strategy centered only on high yield producing farmers, for instance, shifts focus away from vulnerable households. The GFSS must adapt to better target places where markets still stubbornly refuse to “work for the poor” (p. 3).</p>
<b>IMPLEMENTING BEYOND THE SIX CRITERIA</b>		
<p>Not addressed</p>	<p>The GFSS explains that countries which do not meet all six criteria can still be eligible for selection. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Areas with the highest levels of need, such as fragile states.</li> <li>• Areas with weak government commitment and limited opportunities for partnership.</li> <li>• Areas that present opportunities to reach populations living in highly vulnerable contexts and put them on a more sustainable development path (p. 65).</li> </ul> <p>Countries that receive interagency funding—beyond those that are selected as target countries based on the six criteria—represent FTF’s “broader spectrum of global engagement across diplomatic, trade, and development efforts” (p. 66).</p>	<p>“Sustainably expand the list of FTF target countries to include a larger and more diverse set of countries ... Initially, FTF programs were focused in 19 countries.</p> <p>However, in 2017, this number was reduced to 12 countries despite continued resourcing, and 35 countries were designated as aligned countries.</p> <p>The number of target countries should be re-evaluated and increased, with thoughtful and locally-led transitions in programming to support this expansion” (p. 9).</p>

<u>Global Food Security Act 2016</u>	<u>Global Food Security Strategy 2022-2026</u>	<u>NGO Recommendations for the GFSS 2022-2026</u>
<b>MEASURING THE CRITERIA: SELECTION PROCESS</b>		
<p>The GFSa identifies the need to “establish clear and transparent selection criteria for target countries, communities, regions, and intended beneficiaries of assistance” (p. 4, Sec. 5.a.2).</p>	<p>The GFSS specifies the need to use a range of “publicly available and transparent quantitative and qualitative data” to evaluate the six selection criteria, which can be broadly grouped into the categories of “need” and “opportunity for impact” (p. 66).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The level of need is an area “where there are high levels of food insecurity that are marked by extreme poverty and a high prevalence of stunting and where the cost of <i>not</i> investing may also be great” (p. 64). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Includes evaluating the impacts of accelerating climate change on the needs of a country.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Selected areas will be “periodically monitored” to determine if a change is necessary.</li> </ul>	<p>“Improve transparency and coordination of FTF countries with other related USAID Bureau for Resilience and Food Security (RFS) priority countries” (p. 9).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Including: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, Kenya, Mali, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, and Uganda.</li> </ul> <p>Better articulate the difference between target country and aligned country (p. 9).</p>



### **INCREASED FOCUS ON LOCALLY-LED DEVELOPMENT, CAPACITY BUILDING, AND LOCAL OWNERSHIP**

The GFSS expands upon the role of local entities in the development and implementation of its goals, whereas the GFSa only mentioned local actors as consultants and beneficiaries of the programs. The GFSS also more actively describes local entities as “partners” rather than stakeholders and specifically uses terminology like “locally-led.” The GFSS emphasizes the transition to strategies based on local ownership and capacity development, alignment with a country’s development, and collaborative partnerships among development partners and local actors.

<u>Global Food Security Act 2016</u>	<u>Global Food Security Strategy 2022-2026</u>	<u>NGO Recommendations for the GFSS 2022-2026</u>
<b>ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY IN LOCAL MARKETS</b>		
<p>The GFSA states that FTF programs, activities, and initiatives should “Increase the productivity, incomes, and livelihoods of small-scale producers, especially women, by working across agricultural chains, enhancing local capacity to manage agricultural resources effectively and expanding producer access to local and international markets...” (p. 2, Sec. 3.a. 3).</p>	<p>The GFSS discusses action items for transitioning local actors and reducing the need for humanitarian aid:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● “Empower individuals and their communities in the design, implementation, execution, and ownership of development activities” (p. 66).</li> <li>● “Working with our humanitarian assistance partners, we will also continue to identify local systems-level structures, platforms, and targeting mechanisms that can be used to ensure we reach people who are vulnerable to shocks and stresses with the right assistance package” (p. 67).</li> </ul>	<p>Encourage food producers to utilize local, community-based markets and allow private sector investors to promote and prioritize the use of external global value chain markets (p. 4).</p> <p>Promote locally appropriate and nutritional crop cultivation to expand agriculture initiatives beyond ag-led growth and improve the balance between local food production, diet availability, and export or cash crop production (p. 4).</p>
<b>CENTERING LOCAL EXPERTISE &amp; PRIORITIES IN PROGRAM DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION</b>		
<p>The GFSA states that the USG should “Facilitate communication and collaboration, as appropriate, among local stakeholders in support of a multisectoral approach to food and nutrition security...” (p.5, Sec. 5.7) and “Seek to ensure that target countries and communities respect and promote land tenure rights of local communities, particularly those of women and small-scale producers” (p. 5, Sec.5.15).</p>	<p>The GFSS places emphasis on creating sustainable partnerships and fostering inclusive dialogue and mutual accountability with local actors, specifically with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Marginalized populations (p. 66)</li> <li>● Indigenous peoples (p. 66)</li> <li>● And women (p. 67)</li> </ul> <p>A partner is considered a local entity if it meets the following criteria (p. 67).</p>	<p>Increase collaboration with a diverse group of domestic and international stakeholders to ensure initiatives and programs are context-specific and locally appropriate (p. 10).</p> <p>There needs to be more multisectoral collaboration across host country governments, local producer organizations, and extension agencies, where those services exist and are capable of</p>

<u>Global Food Security Act 2016</u>	<u>Global Food Security Strategy 2022-2026</u>	<u>NGO Recommendations for the GFSS 2022-2026</u>
<p>Three of nine Key Stakeholders mention “local” as a description. Key Stakeholders are described as “actors engaged in efforts to advance global food security programs and objectives” (p. 3, Sec.4). The three are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. National and local governments in target countries</li> <li>2. International, regional, and local financial institutions</li> <li>3. International, regional, and local private voluntary, nongovernmental, faith-based, and civil society organizations</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is legally organized under the laws of a country that is receiving assistance from the USG.</li> <li>2. It has its principal place of business or operations in a country receiving assistance from the USG.</li> <li>3. It is majority-owned by individuals who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of a country receiving assistance from the USG.</li> <li>4. It is managed by a governing body, the majority of whom are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the country receiving assistance from the USG.</li> </ol>	<p>partnership. This can improve the sustainability of impact on communities and address root causes of food insecurity in a context-specific manner (p. 12).</p>



### **DIVERSIFIED PARTNERSHIPS AND EXPANDING RESEARCH INVESTMENTS BEYOND INNOVATION LABS**

The GFSA included partnerships with various institutions and organizations but received criticism for not being as locally inclusive as possible. As a result, the GFSS 2022-2026 has adapted its partnership guidelines to promote diverse inclusion and emphasize local ownership in Feed the Future implementation. Additionally, the GFSS 2022-2026 focuses explicitly on including Minority Serving Institutions (MSI) and expanding research beyond innovation labs toward collaborative global agriculture research systems.

<u>Global Food Security Act 2016</u>	<u>Global Food Security Strategy 2022-2026</u>	<u>NGO Recommendations for the GFSS 2022-2026</u>
<b>DIVERSIFICATION AND BUILDING THE CAPACITY OF LOCAL RESEARCH PARTNERSHIPS</b>		
<p>The GFSA listed the following partnerships:</p>	<p>In addition to the GFSA partnerships, the GFSS included</p>	<p>Agriculture research and innovation need to partner with</p>

<u>Global Food Security Act 2016</u>	<u>Global Food Security Strategy 2022-2026</u>	<u>NGO Recommendations for the GFSS 2022-2026</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• United States-based universities, including land-grant colleges, universities, and institutions in target countries and communities that build agricultural capacity (p. 2, Sec. 3 a.8).</li> <li>• Partnerships with the private sector; farm organizations; cooperatives; civil society and faith-based organizations; and agricultural research and academic institutions (p. 5, Sec. 5a.13).</li> </ul>	<p>minority-serving institutions (MSIs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusion of MSIs supports the operationalization of the GFSS's new diversity, equity, inclusion, and accountability (DEIA) initiatives (p. 71).</li> </ul> <p>“To achieve lasting transformation, support must build the capacity of country partners to identify and address their own research needs and to take new technologies and practices to scale” (p. 13).</p>	<p>and strengthen host country research institutions and be more inclusive of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and Tribal Colleges in the U.S. (p. 7-8).</p>

**TECHNOLOGY AND RESEARCH SYSTEMS: EXPANDING RESEARCH INVESTMENTS BEYOND INNOVATION LABS**

<p>The GFSA identifies a need to “harness science, technology, and innovation, including the research and extension activities supported by relevant Federal Departments and agencies and Feed the Future Innovation Labs, or any successor entities” into the GFSS (p. 5, Sec. 5.a.11).</p>	<p>The GFSS expands on the GFSA by adding Science, Technology, and Innovation (STI) as key partnerships. This includes the integration of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agriculture research, development, and extension</li> <li>2. Behavioral science</li> <li>3. STI capacity</li> <li>4. Emerging technologies</li> <li>5. Uptake of technologies</li> </ol> <p>“FTF research investments include 21 USG-led FTF Innovation Labs that are implemented by more than 60 top U.S. colleges, universities, and international agricultural research centers including those collaboratively funded by the Consultative Group</p>	<p>Improve investments in research beyond Innovation Labs.</p> <p>Collaborative global agriculture research systems, like CGIAR, are critical in developing and adapting specific tools for agriculture in developing economies (p. 8).</p>
--	--	---

<u>Global Food Security Act 2016</u>	<u>Global Food Security Strategy 2022-2026</u>	<u>NGO Recommendations for the GFSS 2022-2026</u>
	on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)” (p. 23).	



## INCORPORATION OF CLIMATE CHANGE

The GFSS 2022-2026 expands upon the broad language used in the GFSa to address the urgency around climate change. Using language that connects climate change with food security, the GFSS specifies adaptive, innovative research, partnerships, and cooperation as methods that FTF programs should focus on. Additionally, the GFSS includes climate change and rapidly rising temperatures as both a long-term stressor and risk multiplier to food insecurity, which has led to increased crop failures, water insecurity, depletion of natural resources, and more frequent and extreme weather events. The GFSS 2022-2026 prioritizes urgent and sustainable action, including reducing emissions intensity, enhancing carbon storage, and other climate-smart innovations.

<u>Global Food Security Act 2016</u>	<u>Global Food Security Strategy 2022-2026</u>	<u>NGO Recommendations for the GFSS 2022-2026</u>
<b>CHANGING CONTEXT AND FOCUS ON CLIMATE CHANGE</b>		
GFSa includes provisions for “manmade and natural disasters” and to “develop community and producer resilience to natural disasters, emergencies, and natural occurrences that adversely impact agricultural yield” (p. 4, Sec.5.a).	<p>The GFSS takes an ambitious approach to climate change and how it exacerbates all issues related to hunger and food insecurity. It states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Addressing the immediate and long-term impacts of climate change underpins the achievement of all GFSS Objectives” (p. 6).</li> <li>• “It is essential to dramatically reduce GHG emissions from the global food and agriculture system, avoiding extensification and resulting land conversion while increasing carbon storage through use of conservation</li> </ul>	<p>More is understood about the impact of climate and conflict. There is a need for the GFSS to adjust its focus to be more comprehensive and encompassing, beyond agriculture and economic growth initiative to address the rights of the most vulnerable to their land becoming “contested spaces” (p. 11-12).</p> <p>The GFSS must also include a more robust incorporation of resilience; climate; water and WASH systems; and food linkages (p. 12).</p> <p>Supporting communities to have a stronger understanding</p>



<u>Global Food Security Act 2016</u>	<u>Global Food Security Strategy 2022-2026</u>	<u>NGO Recommendations for the GFSS 2022-2026</u>
	agriculture, perennial crops, agroforestry, improved soil and water management, and other climate-smart practices” (p. 15, 50).	of climate-smart and natural resource management incentives strengthens land tenure for sustainable agriculture practices, which increases resilience of small-scale farmers (p. 12).
<b>MULTISECTORAL COOPERATION AND PROGRAMMING</b>		
The GFSA states, “It shall be the policy of the United States, in coordination with other donors, regional governments, international organizations, and international financial institutions, to fully leverage, enhance, and expand the impact and reach of available United States humanitarian resources, including for food assistance” (p. 7, Sec.7.b).	The GFSS Cross Cutting Intermediate Result 4 (Enhanced Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation), Result 5 (Improved Natural Resource Management), and Result 6 (Improved Water Resources Management) all set explicit carbon emissions reduction goals. An example goal states:  “An equitable transition in use of land and water resources that reduces poverty requires a diverse, coordinated approach including government policies for low-emissions supply chains, alternative revenues from ecosystem services (like carbon credits), and meaningful livelihoods for former subsistence producers” (p. 50-56).	The USG must prioritize a multisectoral approach to programming and partnership, improving coherence across USG agencies, and related sector leads (p. 12).
<b>MAKING ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE FEASIBLE</b>		
The GFSA states that it shall be the policy of the United States “...to mitigate the effects of manmade and natural disasters by utilizing innovative new approaches to delivering aid	The GFSS acknowledges the need to develop and scale technologies and integrated approaches that allow crops, livestock, and fisheries to thrive under increasing temperatures,	Research, innovation, and effective dissemination of technologies and adoption of those technologies are critical to helping small-scale farmers and communities adapt to the

<u>Global Food Security Act 2016</u>	<u>Global Food Security Strategy 2022-2026</u>	<u>NGO Recommendations for the GFSS 2022-2026</u>
<p>that supports affected persons and the communities hosting them, build resilience and early recovery, and reduce opportunities for waste, fraud, and abuse” (p. 7, Sec.7.b).</p> <p>The GFSA also states in Section 491 that funds are “intended to provide the President with the greatest possible flexibility to address disaster-related needs as they arise and to prepare for and reduce the impact of natural and man-made disasters” (p. 8, Sec.7.d.1).</p>	<p>greater climate variability, and changing trends in precipitation (p. 50).</p> <p>It emphasizes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Climate mitigation-adaptation and resilience” (p. 100)</li> <li>• Climate-smart innovation (p. 6)</li> <li>• Climate research (p. 136)</li> <li>• Increasing the resilience of agricultural systems to climate risks, especially through water, soil, crops, and livestock (p. 35-36, 110).</li> </ul>	<p>impacts of climate change and better plan for future challenges to agriculture production and resilience (p. 8).</p> <p>However, public funding for international agricultural research has been stagnant (p. 8).</p>



### **INTEGRATION OF CONFLICT MITIGATION, PEACEBUILDING, AND SOCIAL COHESION**

The GFSS 2022-2026 highlights conflict as an emerging key driver of food insecurity that requires emergency assistance and long-term investments. The GFSS 2022-2026 expands on the language in the GFSA, which indicates that “innovative new approaches to delivering aid” should be used to respond to humanitarian emergencies. Additionally, the GFSS 2022-2026 spotlights the humanitarian-development-peace nexus to address large-scale complex humanitarian crises. The GFSA authorizes the Emergency Food Security Program to meet the emergency food needs during humanitarian crises, yet this does not extend to making humanitarian and development assistance cohesive.

<u>Global Food Security Act 2016</u>	<u>Global Food Security Strategy 2022-2026</u>	<u>NGO Recommendations for the GFSS 2022-2026</u>
<b>BRIDGING HUMANITARIAN AND DEVELOPMENT AID</b>		
<p>The GFSA does not explicitly address bridging humanitarian and development aid. However, it indicates that “innovative new</p>	<p>The GFSS outlines strengthening the humanitarian-development-peace coherence, which “aims to transition from long-term</p>	<p>“Strengthen the bridge between humanitarian, development, and resilience programming and improve USG global food security</p>

<u>Global Food Security Act 2016</u>	<u>Global Food Security Strategy 2022-2026</u>	<u>NGO Recommendations for the GFSS 2022-2026</u>
<p>approaches to delivering aid that supports affected persons and the communities hosting them” should be used in response to humanitarian emergencies because they “build resilience and early recovery” (p. 7, Sec. 7.b).</p>	<p>emergency assistance focused on reducing immediate risks to longer-term efforts that build resilience to future shocks and reduce the likelihood of needing future humanitarian aid” (p. 19).</p>	<p>layering to complement sector programs” (p. 11).</p> <p>“Establish a coherent and fit-for-purpose integrated response that builds off humanitarian investments and provides a clear path to development in all settings” (p. 12).</p>
<b>ADDRESSING THE IMPACT OF CONFLICT AND FRAGILITY ON FEED THE FUTURE PROGRAMS</b>		
<p>Not Addressed</p>	<p>The GFSS supports the implementation of the Global Fragility Act of 2019 by “contributing to the development of country and regional plans and ongoing leadership for designated priority areas, and integrating associated activities relative to food security, nutrition, and resilience into activities” (p. 60).</p>	<p>Equal attention should be paid to more local, contextualized social dynamics; cohesion; local peacebuilders; gender inequality; and other underlying drivers of conflict, in addition to the focus on the global crisis and mass conflict as drivers of global food insecurity.</p>



### **ACCOUNTABILITY: IMPROVING METRICS AND EVALUATION**

The GFSS 2022-2026 broadly outlines monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) procedures for Feed the Future programs. While sections three and five of the GFSA guides MEL practices for the GFSS 2022-2026, the GFSA gives deference to the executive agency to define performance metrics that measure the progress and success of Feed the Future (FTF) programs. The GFSS 2022-2026 uses the Results Framework to structure indicators with performance targets to monitor and evaluate FTF programs.

<u>Global Food Security Act 2016</u>	<u>Global Food Security Strategy 2022-2026</u>	<u>NGO Recommendations for the GFSS 2022-2026</u>
<b>SETTING METRICS FOR FTF PROGRAM EVALUATION</b>		
<p>The GFSA states that the GFSS “shall set specific and measurable goals, benchmarks, timetables, performance metrics, and monitoring and evaluation plans that reflect international best practices relating to transparency, accountability, food and nutrition security, and agriculture-led economic growth” (p. 4, Sec. 5.a.1).</p>	<p>The GFSS developed the Results Framework to guide Monitoring, Evaluating, and Learning practices. See Figure 1: U.S. Government Global Food Security Strategy Results Framework (p. 25).</p> <p>The USG will track changes in indicators at the goal level (i.e., to sustainably reduce poverty, hunger, and malnutrition) and at the strategic objective level (i.e., agriculture-led economic growth, strengthened resilience, and a well-nourished population) of the Results Framework but will not set performance targets for these indicators because indicators are not within the USG’s direct control. Performance targets are set for the ZOI indicators and IR level of the Results Framework (p. 80).</p>	<p>“Establish tracking mechanisms for sector outcomes and their related funding streams to support greater multisectoral learning and improve collaboration and program design” (p.7).</p>
<b>COLLECTING DATA ON MARGINALIZED POPULATIONS</b>		
<p>Throughout the GFSA, women and children are consistently mentioned, but other marginalized populations are not explicitly addressed.</p>	<p>The GFSS mentions prioritizing disaggregation to track commitments made to women and youth by collecting relevant individual-level indicators like sex and age (p. 80).</p>	<p>Tracking of vulnerable populations should include indicators for marginalized identities outside of gender. For example, while a specific focus on women and adolescent girls is appropriate, there should be a broader focus on other marginalized groups such as people with disabilities and LGBTQIA+ people.</p>

<u>Global Food Security Act 2016</u>	<u>Global Food Security Strategy 2022-2026</u>	<u>NGO Recommendations for the GFSS 2022-2026</u>
<b>GRADUATION OF TARGET COUNTRIES</b>		
<p>The GFSA states that the GFSS should include criteria and methodologies for graduating target countries and communities from assistance (p. 5, Sec. 5.a.16).</p>	<p>The GFSS does not include new guidance for graduating target countries. However, it declares that graduating target countries from target status was suspended in 2020 indefinitely due to the severe global poverty and hunger caused by the COVID-19 pandemic (p. 66).</p>	<p>Not addressed</p>

InterAction’s Food Security, Nutrition, and Agriculture Working Group will continue to track and engage in the progress of the Global Food Security Act Reauthorization and GFSS 2022-2026 implementation. For further information or to arrange a time to discuss more in-depth with working group members, please contact Breanna Gomillion, [bgomillion@interaction.org](mailto:bgomillion@interaction.org), or Sara Nitz Nolan. [snitz@interaction.org](mailto:snitz@interaction.org).



### **ABOUT INTERACTION**

Founded in 1984, InterAction is the largest U.S.-based alliance of international NGOs and partners. We mobilize our Members to think and act collectively to serve the world’s poor and vulnerable, with a shared belief that we can make the world a more peaceful, just and prosperous place—together.