

Food aid is a crucial part of helping tackle world hunger. However, food aid comes in various forms, and is often criticized for benefiting donors and their interests more than recipients.

Program Food Aid Is a form of in-kind aid whereby food is grown in the donor country for distribution or sale abroad. This is typically a government to government transfer. Rather than being free food as such, recipient countries typically purchase the food with money borrowed at lower than market interest rates. Relief, or Emergency Food Aid This is typically for emergency situations, such in cases of war, natural disasters, etc, where food is distributed for free. However, as Oakland Institute notes, a number of countries facing some forms of chronic food insecurity have also become permanent recipients of this form of aid. Project Food Aid This is food aid delivered as part of a specific project related to promoting agricultural or economic development, nutrition and food security, such as food for work and school feeding programs. Program Food Aid, or in-kind food aid, makes up the majority of aid for the US. Relief aid used to be a minor form of aid until the s when it shifted to being the dominant factor, signifying both the increase in emergencies, and the end of the Cold War where food aid as a political tool to aid the donor seemed to be less important. Back to top Problems with food aid Some core problems that Mousseau identifies drawing heavily from Barrett and Maxwell, too with international food aid is that It is a donor-driven system It promotes domestic interests of donor countries It is a foreign policy tool International institutions are driven by exporters Development is not necessarily the objective International food aid was initiated at a time when a policy of price support for agricultural commodities generated large surpluses of cereals. The disposal of surpluses through food aid made it a crucial instrument to support North American farmers because it reduced storage costs and opened access to new overseas markets. Food aid also rapidly became an instrument of foreign policy in the Cold War era, with food being used to support friendly or strategic countries. The European Common Agricultural Policy CAP , created in , is geared towards increasing agricultural productivity and food self-sufficiency. Through a combination of farm price supports and barriers to food imports, the CAP generated massive surpluses, especially wheat and animal products, which made the European Union EU and its member states major actors in international food trade and food aid. EU food aid now accounts for more than half of all European food aid contributions. Ending World Hunger In Our Time , The Oakland Institute, October In the s, the US was open about the fact that food aid was a good way to fight communism and for decades food aid has mostly gone to countries with strategic interests in mind. The domestic interests have somewhat shifted in recent decades from supporting the whole American agriculture sector to the interests of primarily the following groups A handful of large agribusiness, crop and food lobbies lobbies Wheat, rice, soybean oil and milk powder producers and exporters US shipping companies and NGOs and relief organizations. The shipping companies, for example, benefit from the US Farm Bill which requires that at least 75 percent of US food aid be shipped by US vessels. In addition, just four freight forwarders handle 84 percent of the shipments of food aid from the US and that a few shippers rely extensively on US food aid for their existence. This means that, Preference given to in-kind food produced in the US and to the US shipping industry makes US food aid the most expensive in the world. The premiums paid to suppliers and shippers combined with the increased cost of food aid due to lengthy international transport raise the cost of food aid by over percent compared to local purchases. Ending World Hunger In Our Time , The Oakland Institute, October Mousseau is also critical of some relief organizations, As a result of their heavy dependence on food aid as a resource, they are poorly inclined to question the current food aid system. The concept of food aid for development is therefore quite questionable. As early as the s, FAO [The Food and Agriculture Organization] had warned of the potentially harmful effects of [PL, the US in-kind food exports that is used as aid] food aid on local agriculture. This, in turn, adversely affects the livelihoods of rural populations and drives the non-competitive local farmers out of agriculture. Unfortunately, [Marshall Plans are] not always successful, and for many countries, food aid is integrated into policies leading to structural food deficits and increased dependency on food imports. For the poorest countries, such dependency combined with scarce resources to finance imports

has resulted in increased poverty and hunger. Ending World Hunger In Our Time , The Oakland Institute, October Mousseau adds that the negative correlation between food aid flows and international cereal prices shows that the main driver of food aid remains the domestic support to farmers and agribusiness interests rather than needs of the developing countries. Typically, food aid flow increases in periods of low prices and high level of food stocks in developed countries. In-kind food aid has been criticized in particular for being expensive. In addition, while it appears to release resources for the recipient government, those resources may not necessarily be used for development; they can be used for military purchases, for example and countries like those in the US, EU, etc are often the major arms sellers. In addition, such aid can also be tied to harmful conditions, such as Structural Adjustment Policies. One of the ideas behind policies such as Structural Adjustment for poor countries is to turn their agriculture sector into cash crops for export to earn foreign exchange to import food and help pay off debts. Program Food Aid has helped with this although phrases such as development and helping the hungry are what makes media headlines. While these could have been objectives, such policies had another effect: Mousseau illustrates this, amongst other ways, through this revealing quote: Clayton One of the examples was South Korea from one of the largest recipients of US food aid in the s and s to one of the largest buyers of agricultural products today. Another is the Philippines: US food aid may help to expand US exports in the short term and can build the foundation for future US sales. For example, the Philippines received soy meal under the PL program in the early s when its economy was in poor condition and it was difficult to finance the purchase of needed commodities. For most LDCs, food aid was never part of any development policy, other than the one in support of export growth for developed countries. As early as the s, FAO had warned of the potentially harmful effects of food aid on local agriculture. The organization was apprehensive that desirable, and in the long run, necessary agriculture development in the receiving countries will not take place if PL exports are continued and expanded. Throughout history, powerful countries do what they can to maintain or extend their power, and to compete with other centers of power. This may mean political power play, influencing economic policies to their favor, and, ultimately, war. Accompanying those tactics were messages and propaganda back to the home populations that they were civilizing the others, bring them modernization, development and various other benefits. Some changes in recent years? Positive for fighting hunger? Shift in policy and purpose As noted earlier, in recent years, food aid has seen some shifts. Europe, for example, has generally shifted away from in-kind food aid, preferring to purchase locally or help facilitate local purchases instead. There has also been a shift away from long term development to short term humanitarian relief. This has increased the role of NGOs and relief organizations and led to a prioritization on nations that actually need assistance whereas in the past food aid was often targeted towards countries that provided a strategic interest for the donor, i. Food aid remains conditional One of the fundamental problems remains with food aid in that it is still donor driven, and as such seen as compensation for economic reforms as Mousseau notes. In other words, food aid is tied aid, conditional upon economic reforms, such as structural adjustments. Priority countries still neglected? The fluctuations in the share of food aid received by priority countries [between and] reflect the fact that in periods of low international cereal prices, such as and , additional food aid deliveries are oriented to other countries, and are more likely to be tied to commercial transactions in periods of depressed markets. Therefore the recent increase in the share of food aid to priority groups does not reflect a stronger focus on these countries but instead results from the overall decrease of food deliveries due to high cereal prices. Further, it is remarkable that during periods of [need due to increased cost of food imports] food deliveries to priority countries dropped. Increasing costs and food aid Costs and prices have increased in a number of areas: More attention to biofuel crops has contributed to increased crop value Fuel costs have risen in recent years, important to both industrial agriculture and shipping The value of the dollar has fallen significantly. While this can help poor countries in their debt repayments, it increases the cost of food imports as well as value of exports While some can benefit from increases costs, the poor are the ones that can least afford more expensive food. The New York Times also adds that The higher food prices have not only reduced the amount of American food aid for the hungry, but are also making it harder for the poorest people to buy food for themselves, economists and advocates for the hungry say. Dugger, As Prices Soar, U. As Mousseau, Barrett and Maxwell have all noted,

she describes the winners in American food aid as the American Government, farms, aid organizations and shippers. In , it was 4 million. With food and fuel prices steadily rising, the costs of buying food and getting it overseas have crippled the food aid program. In , we provided food for million people. By last year, that number had decreased to 70 million. According to the United Nations, there are still over million starving people in the world today. Sarah Johnson, Let them eat pie , The Stanford Daily, October 30, In another article for the New York Times , Celia Dugger notes that the rising costs and falling dollar value has led to relief organizations debating the best way to address food aid and adds: New data from the Department of Agriculture show that the prices paid for food for the main United States food aid program have risen 35 percent in and These sales are known as the monetization of food aid. This monetization of food aid has also fallen under much criticism from experts such as Mousseau, Barrett, Maxwell and others. Relief organizations; double interests? Largely dependent on US funding and food in-kind for their resources, the main food agencies usually follow the priorities of US foreign policy with regards to areas of intervention, volume of food aid and modalities of assistance. However, while their actions help save lives through immediate assistance, longer term strategies are unwittingly undermined: NGO requests for more aid overlook the political role they play as an alternative to government involvement in the poorest countries. NGOs also ignore that the fight against hunger cannot be won by their actions alone. Success will also require fundamental policy shifts. Positive but met with resistance The Bush Administration proposed a promising proposal a few years ago, as Sarah Johnson also noted: Unfortunately, Congress kept killing the proposal and the final amount was a lot smaller due to entrenched interest of agribusiness and the shipping industry: The farm bill, which is up for Congressional reauthorization every five years, was passed by the House in late July []. While the idea is the same, the scope is microscopic: But even this policy, which would have affected less than 2 percent of the food aid budget, was immediately and forcefully denigrated by agribusiness and shipping interests. Sarah Johnson, Let them eat pie , The Stanford Daily, October 30, European shift towards local purchases In recent years, the European Union has shifted towards local and triangular purchases food aid purchases or exchanges in one developing country for use as food aid in another country of food aid, which many argue will lead to more efficient distribution of food and better support for agriculture, trade and development in the developing nations. The shift from the export of surpluses to more purchases from within southern countries has been strongly promoted by a number of NGOs and researchers over the last twenty years. The EU officially adopted this policy standpoint in and adapted its food aid programs accordingly through a progressive increase in the share of cash assistance for triangular and local purchases and more attention for non-food interventions. As a result, a major share of EU food aidâ€™90 percent in â€™is now procured in developing countries this figure is only approximately 1 percent for the US. However, all is not rosy on the European front, either. Mousseau notes that while the EU itself has made this shift, nations such as France and Italy have maintained a parallel flow of in-kind food aid representing nearly 70 percent of their food aid. Furthermore, Ten years after the official dissociation between food aid and surpluses, the EU food aid remains under the influence of trade interests. Mousseau also notes that trade remains unequal. For example, Poor countries still mostly purchase key food crops from the rich the poor nations mainly export things like tobacco, tea, coffee, cocoa and so must spend a lot of their foreign earnings to meet needs. While some nations such as South Africa and Brazil may be able to provide food for other countries, often as part of triangular purchases, most developing countries do not have the transport and other infrastructure to make it economically efficient enough, yet. Other obstacles and constraints include constraints of supply chain consolidation and strict qualitative export standards. Given such constraints, Mousseau concludes, developing countries currently do not have equal access to trade opportunities and this limits their ability to benefit from food aid purchases. The promotion of local and triangular purchases is certainly desirable and must be encouraged. However, it is unlikely to benefit the poorest countries and their small-scale farmers if it is not part of a broader policy aimed at supporting small-scale agriculture in these countries. The other major reason Mousseau is cautious about the benefits of local purchases is the dominance of large multinational agribusinesses: Larger enterprises benefit in both respects , Mousseau quotes the FAO as saying.

Chapter 2 : Should the world fund food aid to North Korea? | World news | The Guardian

The issue of food aid reform was hotly debated during negotiations for the last farm bill, which took two years to pass, from to Corker, Coons and Royce led the charge in Congress for reform then, too.

Sign the petition What is US food aid? In the wake of World War II, the US launched an ambitious effort to help save lives by fighting the scourge of hunger. The idea was simple: Since then, US food aid has saved hundreds of millions of people from malnutrition and starvation. These efforts are helping to address urgent humanitarian need in places such as Syria and Sudan. As more frequent natural disasters and man-made crises leave millions of families struggling to survive, our humanitarian assistance is as important as ever. What is wrong with the current food aid program? Under current law, food aid must be purchased in the United States and at least half of it must be transported on US-flag vessels. As Oxfam has documented, this is an outdated and inefficient means of getting aid to people in need. During sudden emergencies such as the earthquake in Haiti, this delay can cost lives. Moreover, transportation and shipping costs generally make US food aid more expensive than buying food closer to the region of need. Right now, 59 cents out of every dollar we spend on basic grains for food aid ends up in the pockets of middlemen as a result of red tape and regulations. Reforming food aid would not only improve the efficiency of the program but it would also allow millions more people to be reached without increasing the federal budget by one penny. How can we make food aid feed more people? The solution to improving the efficiency and effectiveness of US food aid requires untying aid and dismantling the red tape and regulations that hamper the current program. Both Congress and the Administration recognize the need for change. In , the President included a major overhaul of food aid in his budget proposal. And in both the House and Senate bi-partisan legislation has been introduced that would modernize the way food aid works. Share the food aid infographic Think the cost of your groceries is on the rise? Now think about the tax money you spend on food aid to developing countries. If we reform food aid, we can get more food to the people who need it, more quickly, and at the same cost.

Chapter 3 : Why foreign aid fails “ and how to really help Africa | The Spectator

Modernizing Food Aid. Living in the United States, and especially knowing that I have gotten every opportunity I could have ever wanted, I can safely say that I have never gone starving.

Whatsapp David Cameron speaks compellingly about international aid. Eradicating poverty, he says, means certain institutional changes: It means the freedom to participate in society and have a say over how your country is run. The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty. But diagnosing a problem is one thing; fixing it another. The British government is strikingly generous in foreign aid donations. But if money alone were the solution we would be along the road not just to ameliorating the lives of poor people today but ending poverty for ever. Photothek via Getty Images The idea that large donations can remedy poverty has dominated the theory of economic development “ and the thinking in many international aid agencies and governments “ since the s. And how have the results been? Not so good, actually. Millions have moved out of abject poverty around the world over the past six decades, but that has had little to do with foreign aid. Rather, it is due to economic growth in countries in Asia which received little aid. The World Bank has calculated that between and , the number of poor people in the world fell by about million “ and that in China over the same period, the number of poor people fell by million. In the meantime, more than a quarter of the countries in sub-Saharan Africa are poorer now than in “ with no sign that foreign aid, however substantive, will end poverty there. Last year, perhaps the most striking illustration came from Liberia, which has received massive amounts of aid for a decade. The sum was even larger in But last year every one of the 25, students who took the exam to enter the University of Liberia failed. All of the aid is still failing to provide a decent education to Liberians. One could imagine that many factors have kept sub-Saharan Africa poor “ famines, civil wars. But huge aid flows appear to have done little to change the development trajectories of poor countries, particularly in Africa. As we spell out in our book, this is not to do with a vicious circle of poverty, waiting to be broken by foreign money. Poverty is instead created by economic institutions that systematically block the incentives and opportunities of poor people to make things better for themselves, their neighbours and their country. Let us take for Exhibit A the system of apartheid in South Africa, which Nelson Mandela dedicated himself to abolishing. In essence, apartheid was a set of economic institutions “ rules that governed what people could or could not do, their opportunities and their incentives. Blacks had to have a pass, a sort of internal passport, to travel to the white economy. They could not own property or start a business there. The only jobs blacks could take in the white economy were as unskilled workers on farms, in mines or as servants for white people. The people in poor countries have the same aspirations as those in rich countries “ to have the same chances and opportunities, good health care, clean running water in their homes and high-quality schools for their children. The problem is that their aspirations are blocked today “ as the aspirations of black people were in apartheid South Africa “ by extractive institutions. You could see this in the protests behind the Arab Spring: Poverty in Egypt cannot be eradicated with a bit more aid. As the protestors recognised, the economic impediments they faced stemmed from the way political power was exercised and monopolised by a narrow elite. This is by no means a phenomenon confined to the Arab world. By throwing away a huge amount of potential talent and energy, the entire society condemns itself to poverty. The key to understanding and solving the problem of world poverty is to recognise not just that poverty is created and sustained by extractive institutions “ but to appreciate why the situation arises in the first place. Apartheid was set up by whites for the benefit of whites. This happened because it was the whites who monopolised political power, just as they did economic opportunities and resources. The logic of poverty is similar everywhere. He is the cousin of President Bashar al-Assad and controls a series of government-created monopolies. Recognising that poor countries are poor because they have extractive institutions helps us understand how best to help them. It also casts a different light on the idea of foreign aid. We do not argue for its reduction. Even if a huge amount of aid is siphoned off by the powerful, the cash can still do a lot of good. It can put roofs on schools, lay roads or build wells. Giving money can feed the hungry, and help the sick “ but it does not free people from the institutions that make them hungry and sick in the first place. When aid is

given to governments that preside over extractive institutions, it can be at best irrelevant, at worst downright counter-productive. Those sanctions came from pressure on governments – including the British government – that would have preferred not to see them implemented. Today it is no different. Pressure needs to come from citizens who do care enough about international development to force politicians to overcome the easy temptation of short-run political expediency. Making institutions more inclusive is about changing the politics of a society to empower the poor – the empowerment of those disenfranchised, excluded and often repressed by those monopolising power. But it needs to be used in such a way as to help civil society mobilise collectively, find a voice and get involved with decision-making. It needs to help manufacture inclusion. This brings us back to David Cameron. When answering a question at New York University almost two years ago, he put it perfectly. As the Prime Minister says, this is a very different thing to setting an aid spending target. Promoting his golden thread means using not just aid but diplomatic relations to encourage reform in the many parts of the world that remain in the grip of extractive institutions. It means using financial and diplomatic clout and Britain has plenty of both to help create room for inclusive institutions to grow. This may be a hard task – far harder than writing a cheque. But it is the surest way to make poverty history. Daron Acemoglu and James A.

Chapter 4 : How Long Do People Stay On Public Benefits? | HuffPost

Moreover, transportation and shipping costs generally make US food aid more expensive than buying food closer to the region of need. Right now, 59 cents out of every dollar we spend on basic grains for food aid ends up in the pockets of middlemen as a result of red tape and regulations.

Pdf Version Between and , the number of chronically hungry people in poor countries increased by over 20 million. People affected by food emergencies only represent a fraction of those suffering from hunger. But, that amount is increasing as global climate change and armed conflict have doubled the number of food crises since the s. Yet, the current global food aid system is crippled with problems. Donor countries often fail to pledge enough food aid and they deliver aid late and unevenly. Food aid can also undermine local agricultural production in recipient countries and threaten long-term food security. In fact, some donor countries have designed food aid programs that primarily promote their own domestic interests, rather than helping the hungry. For example, legislators set up the US food aid program to expand markets for US exports and dispose of agricultural surpluses generated by domestic farm subsidies. But, donor countries could overcome most food aid challenges if they prioritized the needs of the poor and hungry, rather than letting national strategic and commercial interests or media coverage decide how and where to provide food aid. Challenges of Global Food Aid 1 Not Enough Governments consistently fail to provide enough resources for hunger emergencies and food aid development projects. The World Food Programme WFP , which depends on voluntary contributions from governments, channels about 54 percent of all food aid and 75 percent of all emergency food aid. Many individual emergencies had over a 50 percent shortfall and "forgotten" refugee crises in Gambia and Djibouti experienced a percent shortfall. National interests and media attention, rather than need, often determine how governments as well as private donors prioritize crises. The hunger crisis in Niger in is perhaps the best known example of how international media can influence who gets funding. But it was only after media began broadcasting images of starving children in the summer of , that donors started to pledge money. Most hunger emergencies, though, go unreported, and the media seem to take an interest only when the crises have reached full-blown proportions. Powerful images of starving human beings are more likely to appear on the evening news than are reports about chronic hunger and poverty. Other cases of shortfalls show how donor countries use food aid to promote a political agenda. In , as the Washington-Pyongyang dispute over nuclear arms intensified, the US government halted all food shipments to North Korea. The WFP has very limited flexibility in transferring resources to the place they are most needed and to offset the uneven distribution of funds. This is because the bulk of the funding to the WFP is "bilateral" â€” donor countries earmark donations to specific countries or operations. Donors give only about 15 percent as undirected "multilateral" aid, allowing the WFP to decide where and how to distribute it. But, in most cases, direct transfers of food aid are costly, inefficient and risk pushing down prices and discouraging production in recipient countries, with severe effects on future food security. To avoid such an outcome, donor countries can instead purchase food within the recipient country local purchase or from a third, often neighboring, country triangular purchase. Experts generally agree that triangular, and in particular, local purchases speed up delivery, reduce transaction costs, better respect cultural eating habits, and support local and regional markets. In , donor countries â€” mainly European ones â€” purchased 38 percent of all food aid on local or regional markets. Cash donations generally give the WFP more flexibility than food donations, but sometimes donor countries apply spending restrictions, requiring that food aid be procured "in a certain manner or area or for a particular destination. Some estimate that the US spends half of its food aid budget on national processing and shipping. On a global scale, the FAO estimates that one third of all food aid resources get wasted by such requirements. The US food aid program was originally set up to dispose of agricultural surpluses generated by domestic farm subsidies. The US government buys this food aid from a handful of large agribusiness companies and then pays for shipping â€” all at above-market prices. But it would still significantly improve US food aid. The NGOs who fund part of their development work by selling US food aid, oppose a reduction of in-kind food aid, unless the US provide cash grants or a similar substitute for their loss of revenue. Direct

transfers of food aid from the donor country generally slow down the delivery. US food aid shipments take five months on average to reach their destination. If the aid arrives at harvest time, at the end of the hunger season, it could create a surplus of food available, which may undermine the prices local farmers get for their products. Targeting food aid refers to the attempt to deliver food aid to the ones in need – including all the people who need it and excluding the people who do not. About one quarter of global food aid is not targeted to vulnerable groups, but instead sold at the open market to generate cash. In 2008, 26 percent of global food aid deliveries went to emergencies, while in 2007 this figure was 64 percent. This increase reflects the upsurge of food crises, but it also results from more pressure on policy makers to provide food aid targeted at the most vulnerable and needy groups. Non-emergency food aid such as project food aid can also be targeted at vulnerable groups. This includes food aid projects improving nutrition among certain groups, such as women or families affected by AIDS. But some project food aid is "monetized," i.e. The FAO and many others have urged that organizations should stop monetizing food aid as it risks distorting local markets and production. And overall, NGOs have increased monetization. In 2008, NGOs monetized 68 percent of all their project food aid. Governments are the only providers of program food aid, with the largest contributors in being the US, the European Commission and Japan. Instead, recipient governments sell the food aid - always procured in the donor country - on the open market. By definition, such food aid undermines local production and can harm long-term food security. To make matters worse, governments provide 17 percent of the program food aid as low-interest loans - concessional sales - rather than as grants. Fortunately, data suggests that these concessional sales are decreasing. Program food aid has declined from 2000. In 2008, program food aid made up only 13 percent of all global food aid, down from almost 40 percent 10 years earlier. Changes in commodity prices and availability of agricultural surpluses in donor countries play important roles as well. When donors of in-kind food aid have larger surpluses of domestic stocks, they can flood markets with cheap products, pushing prices down and threatening production by local farmers. For example, in 2008, unusually good harvests produced a large surplus of agricultural goods in donor countries. As a result the quantities of food aid increased by 79 percent compared to the previous year. The bulk of this increase consisted of program food aid, again showing that donors respond primarily to domestic interests, rather than the needs of the poor and hungry. Between 2007 and 2008, when cereal prices rose, food aid volumes fell by half. For example, during the West African Sahel food crises in the 1970s and 1980s, massive shipments of wheat and rice shifted consumer demand towards Western crops. Another related controversy concerns the provision of Genetically Modified GM crops as food aid. Biotech industries and major agribusiness companies, such as Monsanto, have effectively promoted GM products since the mid 1990s. They claim that biotechnology provides environmental and economic benefits to farmers and consumers. But critics warn that GM crops may cause health problems and endanger biodiversity. So, by providing GM food aid, donors may cause long-term environmental and health problems in recipient countries, harming food security. The WFP argued that no other food aid was available and after a few months of worsening crisis, all countries, except for Zambia, agreed to accept GM food aid. But in recent decades, they have increasingly channeled food aid through multilateral organizations. Since the 1990s, NGOs have increased their participation in management and delivery of international food aid. Funded by governments and private donors, NGOs channel about 27 percent of all global food aid. While some governments give undirected "multilateral" aid to the WFP, most governments earmark aid for specific countries or operations. So, the WFP cannot easily transfer funds to where they are most needed. So while a multilateral approach tends to better target food aid at vulnerable groups, the WFP sometimes seems less like a multilateral agency and more like an extension of bilateral food aid programs – and in particular that of the US. The governments mandated the new CERF to provide "additional" and "more predictable and timely" funding to humanitarian disasters. The CERF represents a vital step towards speeding up the delivery of humanitarian aid. Moreover, the CERF spends one third of its funds on under-funded emergencies, or "forgotten" crises, in an effort to offset the lack of interest among donor countries. Still, some NGOs argue that the CERF has added an extra layer of bureaucracy in the UN system, which actually both slows down and decreases the overall funding for emergencies. The fund depends entirely on voluntary contributions, mainly from governments. One of the basic principles of the CERF is to provide "additional" funding, but a report by Oxfam

International raises concerns that some donors may have simply diverted funds from existing humanitarian funding commitments, rather than increasing the total amount of humanitarian funding. Others have advocated new ways of funding the CERF, including through compulsory government assessments and global taxes. Under the convention, donors commit to a minimum level of food aid and they agree to provide "timely" aid, targeted at vulnerable groups. The FAC also sets standards for food aid quality and delivery, urging member countries to procure food aid at local and regional markets and to respect "local food habits and nutritional needs. While the convention was due to expire in , donors have deferred re-negotiations and instead extended the convention on a yearly basis. FAC members have agreed to re-negotiate the convention once the World Trade Organization WTO reaches a decision on the use of food aid as a tool to support domestic agriculture. They argue that the FAC should raise the minimum levels of food aid that donors commit to provide. Current levels are too low to be meaningful, they say, as donor countries generally exceed the levels by large amounts. WTO members had also agreed on a "safe box" of emergency food aid to ensure that WTO rules would not impede countries from responding to food emergencies. Also, at the ministerial meeting in Hong Kong, some governments argued that food aid donors should gradually shift non-emergency food aid "towards untied, in-cash food aid. WTO members further disagreed on food aid provided as concessional sales and whether to allow NGOs and governments to sell food aid on the open market in recipient countries. Conclusion and Recommendations After decades of providing food aid, donor countries have not succeeded in eradicating hunger in poor countries. Therefore, some critics conclude that food aid is a waste of money. But, those critics ignore the fact that food aid is not always primarily aimed at reducing hunger. Donor countries often use food aid to promote their own commercial and national strategic interests. Under such circumstances, food aid is not likely to reduce hunger, and can even harm food security in recipient countries. Donor countries have a responsibility to ensure that food aid favors the needs of the poor and hungry. They should provide more timely and predictable funding and increase quantities for neglected hunger crises. They should abolish program food aid and monetization, provide all food aid as un-conditional grants, and purchase food aid locally and regionally. And, they should "target" the aid at the ones who need it most and abstain from donating potentially harmful GM crops. Also, the major international actors and conventions governing global food aid need reform. But donors can still influence how and where the money is spent.

Chapter 5 : Food for pets in need | Pet Food Aid

The Food Aid Product Information Guide provides information on U.S. food aid products, programming and procurement. This information is for implementing partners of food assistance activities, as well as project managers, technical advisors, procurement and logistics specialists, and vendors and manufacturers working to address hunger.

Tied aid A major proportion of aid from donor nations is tied , mandating that a receiving nation spend on products and expertise originating only from the donor country. For example, the World Bank presses poor nations to eliminate subsidies for fertilizer even while many farmers cannot afford them at market prices. However, after the government changed policy and subsidies for fertilizer and seed were introduced, farmers produced record-breaking corn harvests in and as production leaped to 3. Carlos Santiso advocates a "radical approach in which donors cede control to the recipient country". Sending cash is also faster than shipping the goods. In for sub-Saharan Africa, food bought locally by the WFP cost 34 percent less and arrived days faster than food sent from the United States, where buying food from the United States is required by law. Aid is "stovepiped" towards narrow, short-term goals relating to particular programs or diseases such as increasing the number of people receiving anti-retroviral treatment, and increasing distribution of bed nets. These are band aid solutions to larger problems, as it takes healthcare systems and infrastructure to create significant change. Donors lack the understanding that effort should be focused on broader measures that affect general well being of the population, and substantial change will take generations to achieve. Aid often does not provide maximum benefit to the recipient, and reflects the interests of the donor. For example, a report composed by the World Bank in stated that an estimated half of the funds donated towards health programs in sub-Saharan Africa did not reach the clinics and hospitals. Money is paid out to fake accounts, prices are increased for transport or warehousing, and drugs are sold to the black market. This type of corruption only adds to the criticism of aid, as it is not helping those who need it, and may be adding to the problem. For example, an earthquake in in Bam, Iran left tens of thousands of people in need of disaster zone aid. Although aid was flown in rapidly, regional belief systems, cultural backgrounds and even language seemed to have been omitted as a source of concern. Items such as religiously prohibited pork, and non-generic forms of medicine that lacked multilingual instructions came flooding in as relief. An implementation of aid can easily be problematic, causing more problems than it solves. The recipient countries then make a plan for how to use the aid based on how much money has been given to them. According to Sachs, in the view of some scholars, this system is inherently ineffective. The first step should be to learn what developing countries hope to accomplish and how much money they need to accomplish those goals. Goals should be made with the Millennium Development Goals in mind for these furnish real metrics for providing basic needs. The "actual transfer of funds must be based on rigorous, country-specific plans that are developed through open and consultative processes, backed by good governance in the recipient countries, as well as careful planning and evaluation. A middle of the road viewpoint is that aid has shown modest favorable impacts in some areas especially regarding health indicators, agriculture, disaster relief, and post-conflict reconstruction. Some studies find a positive correlation, [39] while others find either no correlation or a negative correlation. Summing up the experience of African countries both at the national and at the regional levels it is no exaggeration to suggest that, on balance, foreign assistance, especially foreign capitalism, has been somewhat deleterious to African development. It must be admitted, however, that the pattern of development is complex and the effect upon it of foreign assistance is still not clearly determined. But the limited evidence available suggests that the forms in which foreign resources have been extended to Africa over the past twenty-five years, insofar as they are concerned with economic development, are, to a great extent, counterproductive. Despite the intense criticism on aid, there are some promising numbers. Maternal deaths have dropped from , in to , in Under-five mortality rates have also dropped, from 12 million in to 6. There are only a few goals that have already been met or projected to be met by the deadline. The economist William Easterly and others have argued that aid can often distort incentives in poor countries in various harmful ways. Aid can also involve inflows of money to poor countries that have some similarities to inflows of money from natural resources that

provoke the resource curse. Portions of the corn may be diverted by corrupt politicians to their own tribes, or sold on the black market at prices that undercut local food producers. Similarly, Kenyan recipients of donated Western clothing will not buy clothing from local tailors, putting the tailors out of business. Some believe that aid is offset by other economic programs such as agricultural subsidies. The various organizations have united to call for a new Foreign Assistance Act, a national development strategy, and a new cabinet-level department for development. The video "Africa for Norway" was a parody of Western charity initiatives like Band Aid which, he felt, exclusively encouraged small donations to starving children, creating a stereotypically negative view of the continent. The parody video shows Africans getting together to campaign for Norwegian people suffering from frostbite by supplying them with unwanted radiators. These issues arise from targeting inefficacy and poor timing of aid programs. Food aid can harm producers by driving down prices of local products, whereas the producers are not themselves beneficiaries of food aid. Unintentional harm occurs when food aid arrives or is purchased at the wrong time, when food aid distribution is not well-targeted to food-insecure households, and when the local market is relatively poorly integrated with broader national, regional and global markets. The use of food aid for emergencies can reduce the unintended consequences, although it can contribute to other associated with the use of food as a weapon or prolonging or intensifying the duration of civil conflicts. Increasing conflict duration[edit] International aid organizations identify theft by armed forces on the ground as a primary unintended consequence through which food aid and other types of humanitarian aid promote conflict. Food aid usually has to be transported across large geographic territories and during the transportation it becomes a target for armed forces, especially in countries where the ruling government has limited control outside of the capital. Accounts from Somalia in the early s indicate that between 20 and 80 percent of all food aid was stolen, looted, or confiscated. On top of that 30 percent, bribes were given to Croatian forces to pass their roadblocks in order to reach Bosnia. These shipments of humanitarian aid helped the rebel leader to circumvent the siege on Biafra placed by the Nigerian government. These stolen shipments of humanitarian aid caused the Biafran civil war to last years longer than it would have without the aid, claim experts. Humanitarian aid workers have acknowledged the threat of stolen aid and have developed strategies for minimizing the amount of theft en route. Academic research emphatically demonstrates that on average food aid promotes civil conflict. Namely, increase in US food aid leads to an increase in the incidence of armed civil conflict in the recipient country. However, it is important to note that this does not find an effect on conflict in countries without a recent history of civil conflict. Community-driven development CDD programs have become one of the most popular tools for delivering development aid. Casualties suffered by government forces as a result of insurgent-initiated attacks increased significantly. These results are consistent with other examples of humanitarian aid exacerbating civil conflict. Related findings [58] of Beath, Christia, and Enikolopov further demonstrate that a successful community-driven development program increased support for the government in Afghanistan by exacerbating conflict in the short term, revealing an unintended consequence of the aid. Dependency and other economic effects[edit] One of the economic cases against aid transfers, in the form of food or other resources, is that it discourages recipients from working, everything else held constant. Targeting errors of inclusion are said to magnify the labor market disincentive effects inherent to food aid or any other form of transfer by providing benefits to those who are most able and willing to turn transfers into leisure instead of increased food consumption. Food aid programs hence take productive inputs away from local private production, creating a distortion due to substitution effects, rather than income effects. This type of disincentive impacts not only food aid recipients but also producers who sell to areas receiving food aid flows. In structurally weak economies, FFW program design is not as simple as determining the appropriate wage rate. Empirical evidence [65] from rural Ethiopia shows that higher-income households had excess labor and thus lower not higher as expected value of time, and therefore allocated this labor to FFW schemes in which poorer households could not afford to participate due to labor scarcity. Similarly, FFW programs in Cambodia have shown to be an additional, not alternative, source of employment and that the very poor rarely participate due to labor constraints. First, monetization of food aid can flood the market, increasing supply. In order to be granted the right to monetize, operational agencies must demonstrate that the recipient country has adequate

storage facilities and that the monetized commodity will not result in a substantial disincentive in either domestic agriculture or domestic marketing. This can be most easily understood by dividing a population in a food aid recipient area into subpopulations based on two criteria: Because the price they receive for their output is lower, however, net sellers are unambiguously worse off if they do not receive food aid or some other form of compensatory transfer. However, food aid distributed directly or through FFW programs to households in northern Kenya during the lean season can foster increased purchase of agricultural inputs such as improved seeds, fertilizer and hired labor, thereby increasing agricultural productivity. Food aid is usually exported from temperate climate zones and is often different than the staple crops grown in recipient countries, which usually have a tropical climate.

Chapter 6 : Aid - Wikipedia

About Pet Food Aid. Our office is located at 79 Church Green Taunton, MA. We are going to need help to do so please consider volunteering or making a donation.

Chapter 7 : North Korean famine - Wikipedia

The provision of emergency humanitarian aid consists of the provision of vital services (such as food aid to prevent starvation) by aid agencies, and the provision of funding or in-kind services (like logistics or transport), usually through aid agencies or the government of the affected country.

Chapter 8 : Food Aid for the Hungry?

Food Assistance. Find out how to get food in case of an emergency, apply for food stamps and what free or low-cost food programs are available for infants, children and seniors.

Chapter 9 : Food Aid Product Information | Food Assistance | U.S. Agency for International Development

Unlike food stamps, which are paid for in full by the federal government, welfare is partly funded by the states. That means it is significantly more expensive for states to expand access to welfare, which may be part of the reason this ban has been slower to fall.