



G7 FOOD SECURITY WORKING GROUP

Financial Report on
Food Security and Nutrition



Index

p.1	INTRODUCTION
p.2	METHODOLOGY
p.6	MESSAGE OF THE ITALIAN G7 PRESIDENCY
p.8	CANADA
p.13	FRANCE
p.18	GERMANY
p.24	ITALY
p.29	JAPAN
p.34	UNITED KINGDOM
p.40	UNITED STATES
p.46	EUROPEAN UNION
p.54	ANNEX ELMAU FOOD SECURITY WORKING GROUP

Introduction

Food insecurity is a global crisis that demands concrete actions and more effective solutions from the international community. In line with the SDG2 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development - to end poverty and hunger worldwide - the G7, in 2015, pledged to work with partner countries and international actors to lift **500 million people in developing countries out of hunger and malnutrition by 2030**.

At the 2015 Summit in Elmau (Germany), the G7 adopted the Broad Approach to Food Security and Nutrition and launched an annual report to track progress towards food security and nutrition commitments. Since the G7 Italian presidency in 2017, The Financial Report on Food Security and Nutrition - “Elmau Financial Report” has been published annually, as part of the Food Security Working Group.



Methodology

This report provides data on bilateral and multilateral financial commitments, and disbursements in the food security and nutrition sectors for each G7 member for the year 2022 drawn from a combination of OECD/ DAC-validated data for some indicators and self-reported data for others. Indicators and the Financial Reporting Methodology featured in this report have been developed and enhanced through successive G7 presidencies. Below is an outline of the methodology:

Indicator	Definition
2.1: Percentage of G7 member programmes on agriculture and rural development that include objectives and expected results to increase the incomes of smallholder farmers  <i>Data Source:</i> <i>G7 self-reporting by G7 members</i>	Number of committed G7 agriculture and Rural development programmes (CRS Code 311, 32161, 312,313, 43040) in partner countries with objectives and expected results to increase incomes of smallholders Divided by Total number of G7 agriculture and Rural development programmes (CRS Code 311, 32161, 312,313, 43040); Multiplied by 100
2.2: Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include specific gender objectives  <i>Data Source:</i> <i>OECD DAC database (OECD Stat)</i>	Volume of commitments dedicated to CRS Code 310 (i.e. 311, 312, 313) that is targeted at gender equality and women's empowerment (OECD DAC marker for Gender equality and women's empowerment 1 or 2), divided by total volume of commitments dedicated to CRS Code 310 (i.e. 311, 312, 313); Multiplied by 100
2.3: G7 donors' performance standards for ODA-supported investment instruments are reviewed to be aligned with the VGGT and the Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems  <i>Data Source:</i> <i>Self-reporting by G7 members</i>	Performance standards for ODA-supported investment instruments are reviewed to be aligned with the VGGT and the Principles for Responsible Investment in Ag and Food Systems.

Indicator	Definition
2.4: Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include climate adaptation and/or mitigation objectives  <i>Data Sources:</i> OECD DAC database (OECD stat)	Volume of commitments dedicated to CRS Code 310 (i.e. 311, 312, 313) that is targeted at climate adaptation and / or mitigation (OECD DAC marker climate change adaptation 1 or 2; mitigation 1 or 2), divided by total volume of commitments dedicated to CRS Code 310 (i.e. 311, 312, 313); Multiplied by 100
2.4b: Short qualitative paragraph setting out progress on Sustainable Agriculture investments based on outcomes such as the 10 Core Performance Criteria & 5 Advanced Criteria of the FAO's TAPE tool*, agreed by G7 FSWG in 2021  <i>Data Sources:</i> Self-reporting by G7 members	The narrative text provided by partners should describe progress on Sustainable Agriculture investments advancing outcomes such as those set out in the 10 Core Performance Criteria and 5 Advanced Criteria of the FAO's TAPE tool. <i>Reference: FAO. 2019. TAPE Tool for Agroecology Performance Evaluation 2019 – Process of development and guidelines for application. Test version. Rome</i> Star-rating does not apply to this indicator. <i>*1) Secure land tenure, 2) Increased productivity, 3) Increased income, 4) Added value, 5) Decreased exposure to pesticides, 6) Increased dietary diversity, 7) Women's Empowerment, 8) Increased youth employment, 9) Increased agricultural bio diversity, 10) Improved soil health, 11) Increased resilience, 12) Improved Food Security & Nutrition, 13) Decent Work, 14) Increased water use efficiency & decreased water pollution, and 15) Climate change mitigation.</i>
2.5: Resources committed to nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions  <i>Data Sources:</i> Self-reporting based on N4G/SUN tracking of nutrition spending OECD DAC database (CRS Code 12240)	A) Absolute levels of commitments for nutrition-specific interventions B) Percentage change in commitments for nutrition-specific interventions compared to baseline A) Absolute levels of commitments for nutrition-sensitive interventions B) Percentage change in commitments for nutrition-sensitive interventions compared to baseline <i>(Nutrition-sensitive: methodology applied according to/equivalent with "SUN DONOR NETWORK Methodology and Guidance Note to Track Global Investments in Nutrition").</i>

Indicator

Definition

- 2.6:**  G7 strategic focus to strengthen linkages between short-, medium- and long-term food security and nutrition support/programmes and to enhance transition between relief and development

Data Sources:

Self-reporting by G7 members

Existence (in G7 members administrations) of a multi-sectoral strategy to strengthen linkages between short- medium- and long-term food security and nutrition support, and its implementation exist or not.

- 2.7:**  G7 governments have provided technical support and/or funding to improve and/or expand capacities to collect, analyze, and/or use food security and nutrition indicators in support of SDG2 targets

Data Sources:

Self-reporting by G7 members

Existence of specific programmes/projects aiming at expanding capacities to collect, analyze, and/or use food security and nutrition indicators in support of SDG2 targets.

- 3.1:**  G7 members Direct Assistance for agriculture, fishing, food security and nutrition

Data Sources:

OECD DAC database (OECD stat)

Absolute disbursement by G7 members dedicated to **CRS Codes 311, 313, 32161, 520, 72040, 12240** worldwide*

Absolute disbursement by G7 members dedicated to **CRS Codes 311, 313, 32161, 520, 72040, 12240** for Sub-Saharan Africa

** A single amount for the absolute disbursement should be provided, while a footnote should be included with a breakdown of the amount dedicated to each individual CRS Code.*

Indicator	Definition
3.2: G7 members other assistance with explicit objectives to improve people's food security and/or nutrition  <i>Data Sources:</i> Self-reporting by G7 members	Disbursement by G7 members dedicated to CRS Codes 112, 12220, 12261, 12281, 13020, 140, 16010, 16050, 16062, 210, 23210, 23310, 24030, 24040, 25010, 312, 32165, 32267, 41010, 41030, 43030, 43040, 43071, 43072, 43073, 73010, 74010 with KEYWORDS SEARCH APPROACH**

** A single amount should be provided for the overall total of all the CRS Codes combined, while a footnote should be included explaining which codes the overall total was extrapolated from.*

****Keywords for selecting the hunger-sensitive and/or nutrition-sensitive projects:**

<Hunger-sensitive>

Food security; Food insecurity; Hunger; Access to food; Food availability; Food utilization; Food stability; Food price; Hunger gap; Lean season; Food self-sufficiency; Food poverty; Food trade; Dietary diversity; Food policy; Right to food; Food sovereignty; Food fortification; Food systems; Food stocks; Biofortification; Food Preferences; Food Preparation; Feeding Practices; Food Storage; Food Safety; Wild Foods; Food Reserves; Food consumption; Net consumer household.

<Nutrition-sensitive>

aflatoxin; biofortification; breastfeeding; cash transfer; child feeding; CMAM(community management of acute malnutrition); deworming; diarrheal disease; diet; dietary diversification; direct feeding; enteropathy; feeding; feeding program; feeding programme food intake; food intake; food security; food subsidy; food voucher; fortification; GAM(global acute malnutrition); garden; gastrointestinal illness; global nutrition coordination; growth monitoring; growth monitoring and promotion.

Message of the Italian G7 Presidency

In 2022, the year covered by this report, estimates indicated that more than 300 million people faced acute food insecurity or were at high risk of experiencing it, a new record-breaking figure. The causes stem from multiple intertwined crises, including conflicts, ongoing global economic uncertainty, the loss of biodiversity, and the effects of climate change.

As of 2024, the situation remains alarming, with new conflicts and crises further threatening global food security, which continues to be a global crisis. This situation requires the international community to act collectively to develop new, more efficient, sustainable, and climate-resilient production methods.

Italy is strongly committed to achieving SDG 2 of the 2030 Agenda and eradicating food insecurity, particularly in Africa, by promoting the transformation of food systems in a sustainable manner. During its G7 Presidency, Italy made food security one of its priority areas, seeking to coordinate and advance global efforts in nutrition, sustainable agriculture, and resilient food systems.

To underscore the importance of this issue, G7 Leaders adopted the “Apulia Food Systems Initiative - AFSI” during the Summit held at Borgo Egnazia (13-15 June 2024). AFSI is designed to tackle structural barriers to improving food security and nutrition, leverage the pivotal role of food systems in achieving the SDGs and enhance the resilience of food systems in partner countries. This is achieved through multi-stakeholder partner-





ships aimed at unlocking the full potential of food systems. The results of AFSI were showcased at the Development Ministerial Meeting in Pescara (22-24 October 2024).

More broadly, the G7 Leaders' Communiqué reaffirmed that there is a *"steadfast commitment towards the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and we will redouble our efforts to accelerate progress toward the SDGs, as reiterated at the 2023 SDG Summit, to ensure nobody is left behind. Together with our partners, we will work on concrete and ambitious actions to achieve long-term sustainable development, strong environmental, social, and governance standards, and shared prosperity worldwide. Noting that we have already exceeded our joint commitment of USD 14 billion to global food security, announced in Elmau in 2022, we remain steadfast in addressing the escalating global food security and nutrition crisis, exacerbated by Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine."*

To further advance this process, Italy has also promoted synergies with the "Global Alliance against Hunger and Poverty," launched under Brazil's G20 Presidency .

Within the G7 framework, Italy remains committed to cooperating with the international community, governments, and non-governmental partners to achieve global food security and better nutrition.



Results

Thresholds

2.1:



Percentage of G7 member programmes on agriculture and rural development that include objectives and expected results to increase the incomes of smallholder farmers

71 programmes / 158 programmes

45%



- ★ Less than 25%
- ★★ 25-50%
- ★★★ More than 50%

2.2:



Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include specific gender objectives

Marker 1:
USD million 6,604 / 272,378 = 2,4%

Marker 2:
USD million 265,774 / 272,378 = 97,5%



- ★ Less than 30% with Marker 1 and 2
- ★★ 30-50% with Marker 1 and 2, with more than 0% with Marker 2 ("Principal")
- ★★★ More than 50% with Marker 1 and 2, with at least 5% with Marker 2 ("Principal")

2.3:



G7 donors' performance standards for ODA-supported investment instruments are reviewed to be aligned with the VGGT and the Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems



- ★ No review of consistency with VGGT and the Principles
- ★★ Review process started and ongoing
- ★★★ Review has taken place and standards are aligned with the VGGT
- ★★★★ ...and the Principles

Notes/Remarks:

Canada's food security investments are not reviewed against the VGGT or Principles.

Results

Thresholds

2.4:



Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include climate adaptation and/or mitigation objectives

Adaptation: 61%

Mitigation: 72%



- ★ Less than 20% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2
- ★★ 20-40% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2
- ★★★ More than 40% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2

2.4b:



Short qualitative paragraph setting out progress on Sustainable Agriculture investments based on outcomes such as the 10 Core Performance Criteria & 5 Advanced Criteria of the FAO's TAPE tool*, agreed by G7 FSWG in 2021

Canada's investments in agri-food systems are guided by the Feminist International Assistance Policy and support objectives related to FAO's TAPE tool. Canada is committed to strengthening the resilience of agri-food systems to improve food security and nutrition, contribute to economic growth and help protect biodiversity. Canada supports farmers, especially women smallholder farmers, to sustainably intensify production through the adoption of climate-smart agricultural practices at farm-level in alignment with existing national and regional agricultural development plans. Canada's efforts are increasingly emphasizing issues of fertilizer and soil health. Principal investments and contributions include:

- A \$CAD 10 million contribution to the **Africa Fertilizer Financing Mechanism (AFFM)** as the principal financing mechanism of the African Union Fertilizer Action Plan. Canada's contribution will help the AFFM to increase productivity by ensuring efficient and environmentally sustainable use of fertilizers and other soil amendments while increasing soil health innovations and advancing opportunities for women's leadership in the agricultural input supply chain. It is expected that 800,000 farmers, of whom at least 40% are women and 10% are youth, will have access to and safely use fertilizers and other inputs.
- The **4R Nutrient Stewardship Project**, a \$CAD 15 million innovative partnership that brings together the expertise in cooperative enterprise development of the Cooperative Development Foundation of Canada and expertise of Fertilizer Canada in soil nutrient management. This project promotes the 4R nutrient management tool as a best practice in integrated soil fertility management, helps strengthen women's leadership in agricultural cooperatives and helps farmers' access fertilizer and other agricultural inputs. The project is supporting 80,000 smallholder farmers in Ghana, Ethiopia and Senegal to increase agricultural productivity, income and improve their resilience to climate change.

* p.4

Results

Thresholds

2.4b:



- The **Building Equitable Climate-Resilient African Bean and Insect Sectors (BRAINS)** project (\$20 million 2024-2028) implemented by the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) in close collaboration with the International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE) is promoting the use of organic, chitin-rich, insect-based frass biofertilizers as an alternative to costly inorganic chemical fertilizer to help bean farmers increase productivity and contribute to climate adaptation and mitigation in 15 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa.
- The **Green Economy of Ghana (SURGE)** project (\$10 million 2021-2025) led by Ashesi University and the Ghana Climate Innovation Centre (GCIC) promotes climate-smart agriculture and aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by partnering with private sector businesses, including EMFED Farms, HJA Africa, and Deco Sustainable Farming, to support organic fertilizer production, and contribute to improving access and affordability to organic and inorganic fertilizers.
- **Greater Rural Opportunities for Women 2 (GROW2)** project (\$25 million 2021-2026) facilitated by the Mennonite Economic Development Associates (MEDA) supports institutional and human capacity development for sustainable soil health and fertilizer management through improving access to financial services, sustainable technologies for women smallholder farmers and promoting climate-smart agricultural practices such as minimum tillage and crop rotation.

2.5:

Resources committed to nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions



Nutrition specific:
USD million 63,235 (-42%)

Nutrition sensitive:
USD million 1,441,16 (+13%)

Nutrition specific:



Nutrition sensitive:



★ Decrease in commitments by 10% or more with respect to 2015

★★ Same level as 2015

★★★ Increase in commitments by 10% or more with respect to 2015

2.6:

G7 strategic focus to strengthen linkages between short-, medium- and long-term food security and nutrition support/programmes and to enhance transition between relief and development



★ No strategy

★★ Process of strategy development ongoing

★★★ Strategy developed and being implemented

Results

Thresholds

2.6:



Notes/Remarks:

In 2022, Canada did not have a specific multi-sectoral strategy for linking short, medium, and long-term food security interventions, but addresses food security needs indirectly through its comprehensive Feminist International Assistance Policy.

2.7:



G7 governments have provided technical support and/or funding to improve and/or expand capacities to collect, analyze, and/or use food security and nutrition indicators in support of SDG2 targets



- ★ No programmes
- ★★ Programmes under definition
- ★★★ Programmes ongoing

Notes/Remarks:

From 2022-2024, Canada has supported the FAO's IPC Initiative to help the humanitarian sector with the best possible food security analysis upon which to base their decisions.

3.1:



G7 members Direct Assistance for agriculture, fishing, food security and nutrition

(3.1a) Total Disbursement: USD million 501,155

CRS code	USD million
311.....	11
313.....	-
32161.....	5
520.....	13
72040.....	409
12240.....	63

(3.1b) Sub-Saharan Africa: USD million 168,159

CRS code	USD million
311.....	5
313.....	-
32161.....	2
520.....	12
72040.....	129
12240.....	20

3.2:



G7 members other assistance with explicit objectives to improve people's food security and/or nutrition

(3.2a) USD million 395,64

CANADA - MULTILATERAL 2022



Multilateral	Imputed % of core contributions to agriculture, food security & nutrition	USD MILLION
FAO	Core (92%)	10,994
WFP	Core (91%)	19,206
WHO	Core (2%)	9,997
UNICEF	Core (11%)	12,445
CGIAR	Core (55%)	19,206
IFAD	Core (82%)	-
WORLD BANK GROUP	WB Core (2%)	821,546
	Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (Public Sector Window)	
	IFC (Private Sector Window and Agribusiness Investment)	
AFDB	Core (12%)	321,660
ADB	Core (8%)	23,152
IDB	Core (2%)	2,570
EBRD	Core (2%)	
OTHERS*		
TOTAL		1,240,776

Results

Thresholds

2.1:

Percentage of G7 member programmes on agriculture and rural development that include objectives and expected results to increase the incomes of smallholder farmers



32 programmes / 75 programmes

42%



- ★ Less than 25%
- ★★ 25-50%
- ★★★ More than 50%

2.2:

Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include specific gender objectives



Marker 1:
USD million 138 / 390 = 35%

Marker 2:
USD million 4,3 / 390 = 0,01%



- ★ Less than 30% with Marker 1 and 2
- ★★ 30-50% with Marker 1 and 2, with more than 0% with Marker 2 ("Principal")
- ★★★ More than 50% with Marker 1 and 2, with at least 5% with Marker 2 ("Principal")

2.3:

G7 donors' performance standards for ODA-supported investment instruments are reviewed to be aligned with the VGGT and the Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems



- ★ No review of consistency with VGGT and the Principles
- ★★ Review process started and ongoing
- ★★★ Review has taken place and standards are aligned with the VGGT
- ★★★★ ...and the Principles

Results

Thresholds

2.4:



Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include climate adaptation and/or mitigation objectives

Adaptation 1+2:
USD million 336 / 390 = 87%

Mitigation 1+2:
USD million 142 / 390 = 36%



- ★ Less than 20% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2
- ★★ 20-40% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2
- ★★★ More than 40% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2

2.4b:



Short qualitative paragraph setting out progress on Sustainable Agriculture investments based on outcomes such as the 10 Core Performance Criteria & 5 Advanced Criteria of the FAO's TAPE tool*, agreed by G7 FSWG in 2021

France is strongly involved in supporting countries and populations in developing a sustainable agriculture, upon their demand. This is reflected in the **international strategy for food security, nutrition and sustainable agriculture** [www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/frances_international_strategy_for_food_security_nutrition_and_sustainable_agriculture_cle4f3e1a.pdf] (2019-2024), which includes the promotion of agroecology and the alignment of its development projects with the Paris agreement, in support of sustainable food systems, as a key priority, with particular emphasis placed on family farmers. Alongside, France also targets in its ODA the structuring of sustainable agri-food value chains to promote the creation of decent jobs in rural areas, with particular attention given to youth and women, as well as the resilience of vulnerable populations. Public investments in agriculture, food security and nutrition is also answering to two general commitments made by France: **50% of its ODA funding volume, all sectors included, is gender responsive or sensitive by the end of 2022** (see France's international strategy on gender equality [www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/meae_strategie_-_en_cle076525.pdf] 2018-2022) and **100% alignment of French development Agency's financial commitments with the Paris agreement** (taken in 2017).

France also supports the **FAO Tool for Agroecology Performance Evaluation (TAPE)** [www.fao.org/agroecology/tools-tape/en/] which French research organisms helped developed. TAPE is a guide to help practitioners implement agroecology as a holistic and context-specific approach acting on the three dimensions of sustainability: the environmental one as well as the economic and the social ones.

As concrete results, in 2022 French Development Agency's bilateral commitments allowed to **support directly (i) 748 000 family farms** to increase their competitiveness and (ii) **188 000 family farms** to perform their transition toward agroecological systems.

Results

Thresholds

2.5:

Resources committed to nutrition- specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions



Nutrition specific:
USD million 90 (+1.679%)

Nutrition sensitive:
USD million 116 (+404%)



- ★ Decrease in commitments by 10% or more with respect to 2015
- ★★ Same level as 2015
- ★★★ Increase in commitments by 10% or more with respect to 2015

2.6:

G7 strategic focus to strengthen linkages between short-, medium- and long-term food security and nutrition support/programmes and to enhance transition between relief and development



- ★ No strategy
- ★★ Process of strategy development ongoing
- ★★★ Strategy developed and being implemented

2.7:

G7 governments have provided technical support and/or funding to improve and/or expand capacities to collect, analyze, and/or use food security and nutrition indicators in support of SDG2 targets



- ★ No programmes
- ★★ Programmes under definition
- ★★★ Programmes ongoing

Results

Thresholds

3.1:

G7 members Direct Assistance for agriculture, fishing, food security and nutrition



(3.1a) Total Disbursement: USD million 601

CRS code	USD million
311.....	403
313.....	2
32161.....	36
520.....	22
72040.....	39
12240.....	95

(3.1b) Sub-Saharan Africa: USD million 210

CRS code	USD million
311.....	107
313.....	2
32161.....	-
520.....	12
72040.....	29
12240.....	60

3.2:

G7 members other assistance with explicit objectives to improve people's food security and/or nutrition



(3.2a) USD million 120

CRS code	USD million
112.....	16,0
12220.....	0,2
12261.....	-
12281.....	-
13020.....	-
140.....	1,0
16010.....	-
16050.....	-
16062.....	-
210.....	-
23210.....	-
23310.....	-
24030.....	-
24040.....	-

CRS code	USD million
25010.....	-
312.....	-
32165.....	-
32267.....	-
41010.....	-
41030.....	1,0
43030.....	0,5
43040.....	95,0
43071.....	2,0
43072.....	3,0
43073.....	-
73010.....	1,0
74010.....	-

FRANCE - MULTILATERAL 2022



Multilateral	Imputed % of core contributions to agriculture, food security & nutrition	USD MILLION
FAO	Core (92%)	16,00*
WFP	Core (91%)	72,00**
WHO	Core (2%)	0,30
UNICEF	Core (11%)	3,00
CGIAR	Core (55%)	3,00
IFAD	Core (82%)	25,00
WORLD BANK GROUP	WB Core (2%)	14,00
	Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (Public Sector Window)	-
	IFC (Private Sector Window and Agribusiness Investment)	-
AFDB	Core (12%)	4,00
ADB	Core (8%)	-
IDB	Core (2%)	-
EBRD	Core (2%)	-
OTHERS		
TOTAL		137,30

* The French contribution to FAO is also included as bilateral contribution in indicator 3.1.

** The French contribution to WFP is also included as bilateral contribution in indicator 3.1.

GERMANY

2022



Results

Thresholds

2.1:

Percentage of G7 member programmes on agriculture and rural development that include objectives and expected results to increase the incomes of smallholder farmers



44 programmes / 92 programmes

48%



- ★ Less than 25%
- ★★ 25-50%
- ★★★ More than 50%

Notes/Remarks:

Limited to programmes funded by BMZ; channel of delivery via GIZ & KfW (not considering support via multilateral channels or non-state actors)

2.2:

Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include specific gender objectives



Marker 1:
USD million 1.044,430 / 1.311,448 = 79,6%

Marker 2:
USD million 9,592 / 1.311,448 = 0,7%



- ★ Less than 30% with Marker 1 and 2
- ★★ 30-50% with Marker 1 and 2, with more than 0% with Marker 2 ("Principal")
- ★★★ More than 50% with Marker 1 and 2, with at least 5% with Marker 2 ("Principal")

2.3:

G7 donors' performance standards for ODA-supported investment instruments are reviewed to be aligned with the VGGT and the Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems



- ★ No review of consistency with VGGT and the Principles
- ★★ Review process started and ongoing
- ★★★ Review has taken place and standards are aligned with the VGGT
- ★★★ ...and the Principles

Results

Thresholds

2.4:



Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include climate adaptation and/or mitigation objectives

Adaptation 1+2:
USD million 1.116,937 / 1.311,448 = 85,1%

Mitigation 1+2:
USD million 516,376 / 1.311,448 = 39,3%



- ★ Less than 20% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2
- ★★ 20-40% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2
- ★★★ More than 40% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2

2.4b:



Short qualitative paragraph setting out progress on Sustainable Agriculture investments based on outcomes such as the 10 Core Performance Criteria & 5 Advanced Criteria of the FAO's TAPE tool*, agreed by G7 FSWG in 2021

In recent years, Germany has continuously increased its political and financial engagement for sustainable agriculture, including agroecological approaches and organic farming. Germany continued its financial commitments for agroecology. For example, the Indo-German Lighthouse Initiative “Agroecology and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources” of EUR 300 million until 2025, was signed in May 2022. It showcases Germany’s holistic approach to food systems transformation with rural livelihoods at its heart, in particular smallholders, female farmers, and youth. The agroecology initiative aims to improve the soil and its water storage capacity while increasing yields and incomes of smallholders. By switching to participatory and agroecological farming, the risk of crop losses is reduced, and climate resilience improved.

Soil protection and combating land degradation have been instrumental to counter-balance the loss of ecosystem services in agroecological systems. As the host state of the UNCCD and its largest donor, Germany advocates for and contributes to achieving land degradation neutrality (SDG 15.3).

Project examples from the Special Initiative “Transformation of Agricultural and Food Systems” illustrate progress in different areas relevant for the TAPE Tool:

In 2022, the global programme “Soil Protection and Rehabilitation for Food Security” contributed to an additional 67,504 hectares of soil protected and soil health rehabilitated to enable resumption of productive and sustainable agriculture in seven countries. By adopting innovative and agroecological methods and technologies to prevent erosion and increase soil fertility, smallholder farmers achieved an average of 38% higher yields, resulting in improved food security for 1.7 million people. In 2022, 122,394 smallholders have been trained in these methods, 59% of them being women.

Since 2015, the global programme “Responsible Land Policy” supported strengthening the land rights of over 210,000 small farming households, out of which a total of 83,000

Results

Thresholds

2.4b:



(40%) documents have been issued in the name of the woman or jointly as a couple. This has had positive effects on women's bargaining power and on their participation in household decision-making. Integrated into the programme is the "Responsible Governance of Investments in Land" component in Ethiopia, Laos and Uganda, which aims to ensure that investments in land are fair, productive and contribute to sustainable land management.

Under the German G7 Presidency in 2022, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development launched the initiative CompensACTION for food security and a healthy planet, which aims at compensating agricultural producers, especially smallholders in developing countries, for their multifunctional services by paying them for ecosystem services and their contributions to climate adaptation along the entire agricultural value chain. In 2022, the BMZ signed a financing agreement with IFAD for EUR 15 million for piloting compensation mechanisms through the "Enhanced Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Programme" (ASAP+) in Brazil, Ethiopia and Lesotho.

In 2022, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development supported the World Bank Umbrella Multi-Donor Trust Fund "Food Systems 2030" with more than EUR 121 million. Among other thematic areas, the Trust Fund deals with catalyzing food systems transformation through repurposing harmful agricultural support, e.g., in Ghana, Malawi, Mozambique, Madagascar and Bangladesh.

2.5:



Resources committed to nutrition- specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions

Nutrition specific:
USD million 189,729 (+160,9%)

Nutrition sensitive:
USD million 356,922 (+154,3%)



- ★ Decrease in commitments by 10% or more with respect to 2015
- ★★ Same level as 2015
- ★★★ Increase in commitments by 10% or more with respect to 2015

Results

Thresholds

2.6:



G7 strategic focus to strengthen linkages between short-, medium- and long-term food security and nutrition support/programmes and to enhance transition between relief and development



- ★ No strategy
- ★★ Process of strategy development ongoing
- ★★★ Strategy developed and being implemented

Notes/Remarks:

BMZ strategy on transitional development assistance, including food and nutrition security, focused on availability, access, use and utilization as one of four fields of action, was issued in 2020. The strategy guides the implementation of projects that support people and local structures in overcoming crises and strengthening their resilience over the medium- and long-term

2.7:



G7 governments have provided technical support and/or funding to improve and/or expand capacities to collect, analyze, and/or use food security and nutrition indicators in support of SDG2 targets



- ★ No programmes
- ★★ Programmes under definition
- ★★★ Programmes ongoing

Notes/Remarks:

1. As part of the Global Alliance for Food Security, Germany supported the launch of the **Global Food and Nutrition Security (GAFS) Dashboard** through the World Bank in November 2022. The dashboard brings together data on the global food situation from 40 organizations and presents it on a public interactive map.
2. As of January 2020, GER is supporting through the Knowledge for Nutrition Programme the global coordination function of **National Information Platforms for Nutrition (NIPN)**. NIPN, an initiative of the European Commission, provides technical assistance to nine countries for better nutrition information systems, enabling countries to improve data analysis for better-informed strategic policies and decisions. In addition, global coordination offers technical assistance to a limited number of EU partners and SUN member countries to strengthen their existing multisectoral nutrition information systems. Furthermore, as of January 2022, GER directly supports the implementation of NIPNs in Ethiopia and Niger.
3. Since 2020, GER and the European Commission support the advancement of the **Minimum Dietary Diversity for Women (MDD-W)** as SDG2 indicator for healthy diets and specifically, the adequacy of micronutrients in women's diets, through the Knowledge for Nutrition programme.
4. GER supports the **"50x2030 Initiative to Close the Agriculture Data Gap"** with 8 million USD. The initiative was launched in 2020 and aims to address the agricultural data gap, build national statistics systems, and promote evidence-informed agriculture in 50 low, lower-middle and middle-income countries around the world by the year 2030. Until the end of 2022, 9 countries have been supported to prepare or conduct agricultural surveys. The initiative is implemented by the World Bank, FAO and IFAD.

GERMANY

2022



Results

Thresholds

3.1:

G7 members Direct Assistance for agriculture, fishing, food security and nutrition



(3.1a) Total Disbursement: USD million 3,089,437

CRS code	USD million
311.....	1,350,955
313.....	27,832
32161.....	32,417
520.....	438,610
72040.....	1,072,083
12240.....	167,540

(3.1b) Sub-Saharan Africa: USD million 756,904

CRS code	USD million
311.....	224,770
313.....	3,046
32161.....	5,704
520.....	184,588
72040.....	254,147
12240.....	84,649

3.2:

G7 members other assistance with explicit objectives to improve people's food security and/or nutrition



(3.2a) USD million 565,869

CRS code	USD million
112.....	3,625,061
12220.....	5,694,192
12261.....	1,091,403
12281.....	-
13020.....	13,684,291
140.....	15,547,19
16010.....	160,134,099
16050.....	149,009,54
16062.....	-
210.....	0,126,617
23210.....	0,053,824
23310.....	-
24030.....	17,509,728
24040.....	-

CRS code	USD million
25010.....	7,876,353
312.....	8,051,178
32165.....	-
32267.....	-
41010.....	9,949,914
41030.....	10,077,423
43030.....	0,149,875
43040.....	72,062,141
43071.....	16,038,967
43072.....	70,066,203
43073.....	3,024,661
73010.....	2,096,375
74010.....	-

GERMANY - MULTILATERAL 2022



Multilateral	Imputed % of core contributions to agriculture, food security & nutrition	USD MILLION
FAO	Core (92%)	22,886
WFP	Core (91%)	114,847
WHO	Core (2%)	0,427
UNICEF	Core (11%)	11,568
CGIAR	Core (55%)	- ^a
IFAD	Core (82%)	19,403
WORLD BANK GROUP	WB Core (2%)	13,641
	Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (Public Sector Window)	- ^b
	IFC (Private Sector Window and Agribusiness Investment)	- ^c
AFDB	Core (12%)	6,632
ADB	Core (8%)	-
IDB	Core (2%)	-
EBRD	Core (2%)	0,024
OTHERS	African Development Fund (12%)	23,754 ^d
	Asian Development Fund (8%)	1,683 ^e
TOTAL		214,865

^a The German contribution to CGIAR is included as bilateral contribution in indicator 3.1. (bei Bedarf für 2022 noch BMZ-intern abzustimmen).

^b The German contribution to GAFSP is included as bilateral contribution in indicator 3.1.

^c Contributions to the International Finance Corporation are included in WB Core.

^d Data is based on the same percentage that is applied to data for AfDB.

^e Data is based on the same percentage that is applied to data for AsDB.



Results

Thresholds

2.1:

Percentage of G7 member programmes on agriculture and rural development that include objectives and expected results to increase the incomes of smallholder farmers



118 programmes / 209 programmes

56,5%



- ★ Less than 25%
- ★★ 25-50%
- ★★★ More than 50%

2.2:

Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include specific gender objectives



Marker 1:
USD million 30,64 / 146,81 = 20,9%

Marker 2:
USD million 0,55 / 146,81 = 0,4%



- ★ Less than 30% with Marker 1 and 2
- ★★ 30-50% with Marker 1 and 2, with more than 0% with Marker 2 ("Principal")
- ★★★ More than 50% with Marker 1 and 2, with at least 5% with Marker 2 ("Principal")

2.3:

G7 donors' performance standards for ODA-supported investment instruments are reviewed to be aligned with the VGGT and the Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems



- ★ No review of consistency with VGGT and the Principles
- ★★ Review process started and ongoing
- ★★★ Review has taken place and standards are aligned with the VGGT
- ★★★★ ...and the Principles

Results

Thresholds

2.4:



Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include climate adaptation and/or mitigation objectives

Adaptation 1+2:
USD million 50,04 / 146,81 = 34,1%

Mitigation 1+2:
USD million 38,71 / 146,81 = 26,4%



- ★ Less than 20% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2
- ★★ 20-40% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2
- ★★★ More than 40% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2

2.4b:



Short qualitative paragraph setting out progress on Sustainable Agriculture investments based on outcomes such as the 10 Core Performance Criteria & 5 Advanced Criteria of the FAO's TAPE tool*, agreed by G7 FSWG in 2021

In line with the "Three-year Programming and Policy Planning Document for 2021-2023", in 2022 Italy has funded several projects aiming at promoting diversified and ecologically sustainable food production - fostering the link between nutrition and health, with a focus on greater resilience to climate change - to ensuring the continuity of food, supply and distribution chains, and to securing the livelihoods of small farmers, breeders and fishermen: seeds, livestock feed, tools, veterinary care, as well as strengthening social protection systems promoting the participation of women and young people.

Within funded projects, it is worth mentioning a project aimed at transforming the mango directly on the harvest site in the rural areas of Ziguinchor, Kaolack, Bandia in Senegal. Farmers of these communities will be able to access the services of a mobile processing unit installed in a container and powered thanks to a zero impact photovoltaic energy system. The use of the mobile structure on the territory will allow to follow the seasonality of the mango. Training courses are provided to accompany young people and women to learn the principles of the circular economy and Fair Trade and to promote the marketing of products in the organic circuit.

In Kenya, an initiative offering small farmers direct social and economic benefits is Treedom agroforestry project. Treedom is a web platform that allows its users to plant a tree remotely and follow it online, strengthening plant nurseries through the training and awareness of local communities. The main expected results are the enhancement of nurseries for online sale, the training of technicians in management/maintenance of the nursery, and of producers on plants care and agroforestry systems, the improvement of the economic situation for local families, the improvement of the environmental quality of the territories following the planting of about 60,000 trees.

In Albania, the initiative RURALBANIA aims to support and promote traditional agricultural productions for the sustainable development of Albanian rural areas. The action supports the Albanian authorities and civil society to implement the Agenda 2030,

Results

Thresholds

2.4b:



concerning SDG 2 and the promotion of sustainable agriculture (Target 2.3). In this sense, the Project also supports Albania's accession path to the EU, of which adaptation to the CAP represents a fundamental element. Agricultural sector, one of the most important economic sectors in the country (23% of GDP) and source of income for the majority of the population, has increased significantly over the past decade. Furthermore, specific support measures are envisaged for farms active in rural tourism, a category particularly affected by the crisis generated by Covid-19.

2.5:



Resources committed to nutrition- specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions

Nutrition specific:
USD million 21,41 (+304,0%)

Nutrition sensitive:
USD million 14,59 (-32,45%)



- ★ Decrease in commitments by 10% or more with respect to 2015
- ★★ Same level as 2015
- ★★★ Increase in commitments by 10% or more with respect to 2015

2.6:



G7 strategic focus to strengthen linkages between short-, medium- and long-term food security and nutrition support/programmes and to enhance transition between relief and development



- ★ No strategy
- ★★ Process of strategy development ongoing
- ★★★ Strategy developed and being implemented

2.7:



G7 governments have provided technical support and/or funding to improve and/or expand capacities to collect, analyze, and/or use food security and nutrition indicators in support of SDG2 targets



- ★ No programmes
- ★★ Programmes under definition
- ★★★ Programmes ongoing

Notes/Remarks:

Italy supports the multi-donor "50x2030 Initiative Data-Smart Agriculture" implemented by WB - FAO and IFAD



Results

Thresholds

3.1:

G7 members Direct Assistance for agriculture, fishing, food security and nutrition



(3.1a) Total Disbursement: USD million 146,88

CRS code	USD million
311.....	75,25
313.....	3,10
32161.....	1,51
520.....	0,98
72040.....	52,19
12240.....	13,84

(3.1b) Sub-Saharan Africa: USD million 62,98

CRS code	USD million
311.....	36,60
313.....	1,08
32161.....	0,93
520.....	0,92
72040.....	11,57
12240.....	11,88

3.2:

G7 members other assistance with explicit objectives to improve people's food security and/or nutrition



(3.2a) USD million 10,26

CRS code	USD million
112.....	2,05
12220.....	0,67
12261.....	0,18
12281.....	0,11
13020.....	0,27
140.....	1,11
16010.....	0,35
16050.....	0,03
16062.....	-
210.....	-
23210.....	-
23310.....	-
24030.....	-
24040.....	-

CRS code	USD million
25010.....	-
312.....	55,99
32165.....	-
32267.....	-
41010.....	-
41030.....	0,74
43030.....	-
43040.....	0,02
43071.....	0,78
43072.....	1,37
43073.....	1,18
73010.....	1,79
74010.....	-

ITALY - MULTILATERAL 2022



Multilateral	Imputed % of core contributions to agriculture, food security & nutrition	USD MILLION
FAO	Core (92%)	18,92
WFP	Core (91%)	8,87
WHO	Core (2%)	0,31
UNICEF	Core (11%)	0,78
CGIAR	Core (55%)	-
IFAD	Core (82%)	28,97
WORLD BANK GROUP	WB Core (2%)	8,03
	Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (Public Sector Window)	-
	IFC (Private Sector Window and Agribusiness Investment)	-
AFDB	Core (12%)	2,29
ADB	Core (8%)	-
IDB	Core (2%)	0,03
EBRD	Core (2%)	0,08
OTHERS		
TOTAL		68,29



Results

Thresholds

2.1:

Percentage of G7 member programmes on agriculture and rural development that include objectives and expected results to increase the incomes of smallholder farmers



1.566 programmes / 2.005 programmes

78%



- ★ Less than 25%
- ★★ 25-50%
- ★★★ More than 50%

2.2:

Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include specific gender objectives



Marker 1:
USD million 317,15 / 664,96 = 47,70%

Marker 2:
USD million 0,37 / 664,96 = 0,05%



- ★ Less than 30% with Marker 1 and 2
- ★★ 30-50% with Marker 1 and 2, with more than 0% with Marker 2 ("Principal")
- ★★★ More than 50% with Marker 1 and 2, with at least 5% with Marker 2 ("Principal")

2.3:

G7 donors' performance standards for ODA-supported investment instruments are reviewed to be aligned with the VGGT and the Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems



- ★ No review of consistency with VGGT and the Principles
- ★★ Review process started and ongoing
- ★★★ Review has taken place and standards are aligned with the VGGT
- ★★★★ ...and the Principles



Results

Thresholds

2.4:



Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include climate adaptation and/or mitigation objectives

Adaptation 1+2:
USD million 244,57 / 664,96 = 36,78%

Mitigation 1+2:
USD million 28,06 / 664,96 = 4,22%



- ★ Less than 20% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2
- ★★ 20-40% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2
- ★★★ More than 40% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2

2.4b:



Short qualitative paragraph setting out progress on Sustainable Agriculture investments based on outcomes such as the 10 Core Performance Criteria & 5 Advanced Criteria of the FAO's TAPE tool*, agreed by G7 FSWG in 2021

In 2022, Russia's aggression against Ukraine further aggravated the situation surrounding food security throughout the world. Against this backdrop, Japan contributed a total of 72million USD to 27 countries and one region with its Government-Owned Rice as the main food aid.

In addition to bilateral support, Japan is engaged in efforts to provide food assistance in cooperation with international organizations. For example, through the World Food Programme (WFP), Japan supports school meal programs to improve access to education, as well as initiatives to encourage people to participate in the development of agricultural land and social infrastructure through the distribution of food. In 2022, Japan contributed grant aid of 1.9 million USD each in February and August through WFP to Sierra Leone, which chronically faces food shortages, with the provision of Japan's Government-Owned Rice, as well as beans and vegetable oils.

In developing countries, low purchase prices for agricultural products are one of the factors that prevent many farmers from escaping poverty.

Japan is promoting the establishment of food value chains for developing countries in cooperation with private companies. In 2022, based on the "Plan to Promote the Establishment of Global Food Value Chain," which defines priority initiatives to establish a food value chain in each country and region, Japan organized bilateral policy dialogues with Thailand and Palau.

Moreover, Japan places emphasis on agriculture as an essential industry that plays an important role in Africa's economic growth, and actively contributes to its development. Specifically, under the Coalition for African Rice Development (CARD) Phase 2, Japan proceeds with efforts to improve the quantity and quality of rice production applying the RICE approach. The approach includes support for the development of irrigation facilities, research on superior rice varieties including New Rice for Africa (NERICA), a hybrid of Asian and African rice varieties, and dissemination of production technology.



Results

Thresholds

2.4b:



Japan has been involved in the development of the “Agricultural Market Information System (AMIS)” in order to contribute to the improvement of food security through the enhancement of transparency in international agricultural markets.

In April 2022, Japan provided seeds, fertilizers, etc., to smallholder farmers in Ukraine. In July, Japan also provided food-related assistance in response to the impact on the global food security caused by the situation in Ukraine. As part of this effort, Japan decided to provide food-related assistance mainly to the Middle East and Africa and support the expansion of Ukraine’s supplemental grain storage capacity to facilitate its grain exports. Japan also supports research and development aimed at both increasing productivity and sustainability, including variety development, the introduction of digital agricultural technologies, and other efforts conducted by CGIAR, which is comprised of 15 international agricultural research institutions.

2.5:

Resources committed to nutrition- specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions



Nutrition specific:
USD million 18,92 (+769,28%)

Nutrition sensitive:
USD million 156,02 (N/A)



- ★ Decrease in commitments by 10% or more with respect to 2015
- ★★ Same level as 2015
- ★★★ Increase in commitments by 10% or more with respect to 2015

Notes/Remarks:

Japan used the following methodological approach for nutrition-sensitive commitments (From the time of reporting for 2016): Japan used a pre-identified subset of CRS objective codes linked to nutrition-sensitive outcomes (12220, 13020, 14030, 14031, 14032, 52010, 72040) to identify nutrition sensitive projects. As Japan recognizes these projects as partially nutrition-sensitive projects, 25% of the total commitments under these CRS codes is reported as the nutrition-sensitive commitments.



Results

Thresholds

2.6:



G7 strategic focus to strengthen linkages between short-, medium- and long-term food security and nutrition support/programmes and to enhance transition between relief and development



- ★ No strategy
- ★★ Process of strategy development ongoing
- ★★★ Strategy developed and being implemented

2.7:



G7 governments have provided technical support and/or funding to improve and/or expand capacities to collect, analyze, and/or use food security and nutrition indicators in support of SDG2 targets



- ★ No programmes
- ★★ Programmes under definition
- ★★★ Programmes ongoing

3.1:



G7 members Direct Assistance for agriculture, fishing, food security and nutrition

(3.1a) Total Disbursement:
USD million 780,19

CRS code	USD million
311.....	429,27
313.....	63,47
32161.....	2,03
520.....	66,91
72040.....	199,58
12240.....	18,92

(3.1b) Sub-Saharan Africa:
USD million 287,93

CRS code	USD million
311.....	98,88
313.....	28,50
32161.....	0,46
520.....	54,78
72040.....	104,30
12240.....	1,01

3.2:



G7 members other assistance with explicit objectives to improve people's food security and/or nutrition

(3.2a) USD million 53,08

Notes/Remarks:

Japan is of the view that a consistent methodology should be used to calculate and report on its explicit objectives to improve people's food security and/or nutrition in the Elmau Accountability Report. To establish the baseline figures for indicator 3.2a, Japan used the following methodological approach: Japan used Creditor Reporting System (CRS) purpose codes listed under Definition; a key-word search in the project title and summary with "nutrition" and/or "food security".

JAPAN - MULTILATERAL 2022



Multilateral	Imputed % of core contributions to agriculture, food security & nutrition	USD MILLION
FAO	Core (92%)	38,91
WFP	Core (91%)	4,55
WHO	Core (2%)	0,82
UNICEF	Core (11%)	2,13
CGIAR	Core (55%)	0,22
IFAD	Core (82%)	11,75
WORLD BANK GROUP	WB Core (2%)	47,73
	Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (Public Sector Window)	-
	IFC (Private Sector Window and Agribusiness Investment)	-
AFDB	Core (12%)	20,77
ADB	Core (8%)	34,23
IDB	Core (2%)	0,37
EBRD	Core (2%)	0,35
OTHERS		
TOTAL		161,82

Results

Thresholds

2.1:

Percentage of G7 member programmes on agriculture and rural development that include objectives and expected results to increase the incomes of smallholder farmers



10 programmes / 32 programmes

31%



- ★ Less than 25%
- ★★ 25-50%
- ★★★ More than 50%

2.2:

Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include specific gender objectives



Marker 1:
USD million 83 / 194 = 43%

Marker 2:
USD million 1,5 / 194 = 1%



- ★ Less than 30% with Marker 1 and 2
- ★★ 30-50% with Marker 1 and 2, with more than 0% with Marker 2 ("Principal")
- ★★★ More than 50% with Marker 1 and 2, with at least 5% with Marker 2 ("Principal")

2.3:

G7 donors' performance standards for ODA-supported investment instruments are reviewed to be aligned with the VGGT and the Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems



- ★ No review of consistency with VGGT and the Principles
- ★★ Review process started and ongoing
- ★★★ Review has taken place and standards are aligned with the VGGT
- ★★★★ ...and the Principles

Results

Thresholds

2.4:



Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include climate adaptation and/or mitigation objectives

Adaptation 1+2:
USD million 94 / 194 = 48%

Mitigation 1+2:
USD million 87 / 194 = 45%



- ★ Less than 20% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2
- ★★ 20-40% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2
- ★★★ More than 40% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2

2.4b:



Short qualitative paragraph setting out progress on Sustainable Agriculture investments based on outcomes such as the 10 Core Performance Criteria & 5 Advanced Criteria of the FAO's TAPE tool*, agreed by G7 FSWG in 2021

The UK has championed the global transition to sustainable agriculture through UN, G20/G7 and other multilateral fora. Since COP 26, the UK taken forward two initiatives to accelerate a shift to more sustainable and resilient agriculture production: 'The Policy Dialogue on Accelerating Transition to Sustainable Agriculture through repurposing public policies and support and scaling innovation' and the Agriculture Breakthrough, which aims "to make climate-resilient, sustainable agriculture the most attractive and widely adopted option for farmers everywhere".

Across Africa and Asia, the UK is supporting sustainable agriculture transformations, backing local and regional initiatives and plans and leveraging public and private finance. Programmes seek to drive uptake of climate-smart practices appropriate to local contexts, while delivering other economic development priorities, alongside improved food security.

The FCDO's 2022 Commercial Agriculture Portfolio Review (CAPR) shows that that FCDO programmes improve income and productivity of smallholder farmers through better access to markets, finance, and sustainable practices. Programmes are reaching over 24.5m smallholder farmers (83% of the target total, 40% women), working with almost 17,500 Small and Medium Sized Enterprises and stimulating half the target amount of investment of £1bn.

The UK's International Climate Finance (ICF) 2023 Results report shows that between April 2011 and March 2023 across ICF programmes, 101 million people were directly supported to cope with climate change; and 2.7million hectares have been brought under sustainable land management practices – with FCDO's agriculture portfolio contributing substantially towards these results, through interventions such as drought resilient crops, irrigation systems and agricultural extension and demonstrating the

Results

Thresholds

2.4b:



important role that well-designed commercial agriculture programming can play in supporting rural communities to adapt to the effects of climate change.

Examples of food and agriculture programmes and investments include:

- Commercial Agriculture for Smallholders and Agribusiness (CASA) programme, which has supported 103 small and medium-sized agribusinesses with smallholder supply chains in over 20 countries in Africa and Asia; increasing smallholder productivity and resilience to the impacts of climate change.
- Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme (GAFSP), which has pooled over \$2 billion in donor funds to build resilient and sustainable agriculture and food systems in the world's poorest countries and conflict affected states.
- Africa food trade and resilience programme, which is working through AGRA with African companies that source, process, and trade food in the region, to maximize investment, coordination, climate resilience and benefits to smallholder farmers; and improving the transparency and predictability of Government policies to unlock regional food trade.
- The UK's longstanding support for CGIAR has helped millions of farmers to increase the resilience of their crops to drought and disease and contributed to the food security of millions of people. CGIAR-related crop technologies have been adopted on at least 221 million hectares across Asia, Africa and Latin America.
- Global Land Governance Programme (GLGP) supports partner countries and communities to advance robust land governance systems; strengthening land and forest tenure for communities and ensuring more inclusive reform processes.

2.5:

Resources committed to nutrition- specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions



Nutrition specific:
USD million 34 (-49%)

Nutrition sensitive:
USD million 332 (-47%)



- ★ Decrease in commitments by 10% or more with respect to 2015
- ★★ Same level as 2015
- ★★★ Increase in commitments by 10% or more with respect to 2015

Results

Thresholds

2.6:



G7 strategic focus to strengthen linkages between short-, medium- and long-term food security and nutrition support/programmes and to enhance transition between relief and development



- ★ No strategy
- ★★ Process of strategy development ongoing
- ★★★ Strategy developed and being implemented

2.7:



G7 governments have provided technical support and/or funding to improve and/or expand capacities to collect, analyze, and/or use food security and nutrition indicators in support of SDG2 targets



- ★ No programmes
- ★★ Programmes under definition
- ★★★ Programmes ongoing

3.1:



G7 members Direct Assistance for agriculture, fishing, food security and nutrition

(3.1a) Total Disbursement: USD million 503

CRS code	USD million
311.....	95
313.....	4
32161.....	-
520.....	76
72040.....	283
12240.....	45

(3.1b) Sub-Saharan Africa: USD million 146

CRS code	USD million
311.....	19
313.....	0,21
32161.....	-
520.....	38
72040.....	69
12240.....	19

Results

Thresholds

3.2:



G7 members other assistance with explicit objectives to improve people's food security and/or nutrition

(3.2a) USD million 46,9

CRS code	USD million	CRS code	USD million
112.....	0,28	25010.....	-
12220.....	-	312.....	-
12261.....	-	32165.....	-
12281.....	-	32267.....	-
13020.....	0,02	41010.....	2,47
140.....	-	41030.....	5,39
16010.....	20,98	43030.....	-
16050.....	-	43040.....	-
16062.....	-	43071.....	0,85
210.....	-	43072.....	-
23210.....	0,62	43073.....	-
23310.....	-	73010.....	9,71
24030.....	-	74010.....	-
24040.....	-	74020.....	6,62

UNITED KINGDOM - MULTILATERAL

2022



Multilateral	Imputed % of core contributions to agriculture, food security & nutrition	USD MILLION
FAO	Core (92%)	17,2
WFP	Core (91%)	44,9
WHO	Core (2%)	2,7
UNICEF	Core (11%)	1,1
CGIAR	Core (55%)	12,8
IFAD	Core (82%)	-
WORLD BANK GROUP	WB Core (2%)	9,9
	Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (Public Sector Window)	-
	IFC (Private Sector Window and Agribusiness Investment)	-
AFDB	Core (12%)	4,0
ADB	Core (8%)	29,6
IDB	Core (2%)	-
EBRD	Core (2%)	-
OTHERS		
TOTAL		122,2



Results

Thresholds

2.1:

Percentage of G7 member programmes on agriculture and rural development that include objectives and expected results to increase the incomes of smallholder farmers



2 programmes / 61 programmes

3%



- ★ Less than 25%
- ★★ 25-50%
- ★★★ More than 50%

2.2:

Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include specific gender objectives



Marker 1:
USD million 634,83 / 1.433,89 = 44,3%

Marker 2:
USD million 294,47 / 1.433,89 = 20,5%



- ★ Less than 30% with Marker 1 and 2
- ★★ 30-50% with Marker 1 and 2, with more than 0% with Marker 2 ("Principal")
- ★★★ More than 50% with Marker 1 and 2, with at least 5% with Marker 2 ("Principal")

2.3:

G7 donors' performance standards for ODA-supported investment instruments are reviewed to be aligned with the VGGT and the Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems



- ★ No review of consistency with VGGT and the Principles
- ★★ Review process started and ongoing
- ★★★ Review has taken place and standards are aligned with the VGGT
- ★★★ ...and the Principles

Notes/Remarks:

Performance standards for ODA-supported investment instruments are reviewed to be aligned with the VGGT and the Principles for Responsible Investment in Ag and Food Systems.

USAID works to ensure that its land-related programming aligns with the important principles of the VGGT by supporting the improved governance of land and (primarily) forests by government actors, the private sector and civil society. This work places an emphasis on strengthening the capacity of government officials to support equitable and participatory land governance processes including land demarcation, land registration, land use planning, and land and resource management. This includes efforts in a number of countries to recognize and respect the legitimate land tenure and resource rights of local women, and men, including those living in areas under customary and collective management and so, including Indigenous Peoples.



Results

Thresholds

2.4:



Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include climate adaptation and/or mitigation objectives

Adaptation 1+2:
USD million 740,01 / 1.433,89 = 51,6%

Mitigation 1+2:
USD million 365,91 / 1.433,89 = 25.5%



- ★ Less than 20% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2
- ★★ 20-40% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2
- ★★★ More than 40% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2

2.4b:



Short qualitative paragraph setting out progress on Sustainable Agriculture investments based on outcomes such as the 10 Core Performance Criteria & 5 Advanced Criteria of the FAO's TAPE tool*, agreed by G7 FSWG in 2021

USAID works to ensure that its land-related programming aligns with the important principles of the VGGT by supporting the improved governance of land and (primarily) forests by government actors, the private sector and civil society. This work places an emphasis on strengthening the capacity of government officials to support equitable and participatory land governance processes including land demarcation, land registration, land use planning, and land and resource management. This includes efforts in a number of countries to recognize and respect the legitimate land tenure and resource rights of local women, and men, including those living in areas under customary and collective management and so, including Indigenous Peoples. To promote more equitable and participatory land governance, USAID supported the process of developing and reviewing a new land policy and a new land law in Mozambique while also supporting tens of thousands of community members to delimit and record their community land rights. Additionally, and in alignment with RAI principles, USAID supported an innovative program to responsibly divest or return lands and forest resources held by a private sector company back to local community members whose lands had been lost to investors in the past. This effort results in the peaceful transfer of lands and assets including standing timber to communities to several communities across two provinces. In Malawi, USAID worked with the Government to support a gender-responsive approach to map and record the land rights of residents of Traditional Land Management Areas Mwansambo, registering over 10,000 parcels. USAID also supported the implementation of the 2018 Land Law in Liberia to enable communities, country and national government to safeguard community land rights. In Zambia, USAID supported the Government of the Republic of Zambia to support and monitor community forest management groups based on their exercise of customary tenure rights to forests. USAID has also continued to support the Government of Ethiopia to deliver gender-responsive land rights to rural women and men, while supporting efforts to strengthen land policies at both the national and state levels. In Colombia, USAID has



Results

Thresholds

2.4b:



worked closely with national and municipal governments to raise awareness of and secure the land rights of rural women, including supporting gender-responsive land restitution and formalization. USAID continues to address land and resource governance and responsible land based investment issues in a number of countries, prioritizing work on inclusive, equitable approaches that build local capacity to access, own, manage and benefit from the land and other critical natural resources.

2.5:



Resources committed to nutrition- specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions

Nutrition specific:
USD million 337,46 (+43,8%)

Nutrition sensitive:
USD million 8.183,56 (+211,5%)



- ★ Decrease in commitments by 10% or more with respect to 2015
- ★★ Same level as 2015
- ★★★ Increase in commitments by 10% or more with respect to 2015

2.6:



G7 strategic focus to strengthen linkages between short-, medium- and long-term food security and nutrition support/programmes and to enhance transition between relief and development



- ★ No strategy
- ★★ Process of strategy development ongoing
- ★★★ Strategy developed and being implemented

Notes/Remarks:

The Vision for Adapted Crops and Soils (VACS) provides a framework for making short- and medium-term interventions at the nexus of soils and crops to promote long-term agricultural resilience and sustainable land use and to boost nutritional outcomes—especially for women and children—through increased production of and access to a diverse range of crops. In support of sustainable development to the end of decreasing the need for emergency relief, two goals of VACS are to increase the climate resilience of smallholder farmers to the end of reducing the need for humanitarian aid in the wake of major climatic shock and to increase pre-natal, post-natal, and natal and infant and early childhood nutrition to the end of reducing the need for humanitarian nutrition interventions.



Results

Thresholds

2.7:



G7 governments have provided technical support and/or funding to improve and/or expand capacities to collect, analyze, and/or use food security and nutrition indicators in support of SDG2 targets



- ★ No programmes
- ★★ Programmes under definition
- ★★★ Programmes ongoing

Notes/Remarks:

The USG supports the multi-agency partnership, 50x2030 Initiative, to transform data systems in 50 countries by 2030. By providing access to high-quality, relevant agricultural data, policymakers can form sound decisions that drive economic growth and reduce poverty. USAID's support of the 50x2030 Initiative will allow it to conduct methodological research to improve survey design and analysis and support program management. It will also fund the Living Standard Measurement Studies (LSMS) to support methodological research and enhance longitudinal data collection and analysis to support the ability to determine the attributable impact of USAID programming. The 50x2030 Initiative focuses on improving country data by developing a fit-for-purpose, integrated, and financially sustainable agricultural and rural survey program that fosters a culture of data use for decision-making to support agricultural sustainability and rural development, address food crises, and mitigate the impacts of climate change. Additionally, USAID's Surveys for Monitoring in Resilience and Food Security (SMRFS) project implements Data Dissemination and Use Workshops in Feed the Future focus countries to disseminate survey results and facilitate exercises and discussions about their use through participatory seminars, audience-centered communication products, and other tools that translate data into information accessible to USAID Missions, host country governments, and USAID implementing partners.

The USG has been working to reduce food loss and waste through research and development, public-private partnerships, and global convening to achieve SDG 12.3 to halve food loss and waste by 2030. In July 2023, the USAID Center for Nutrition and the Feed the Future Food Systems for Nutrition Innovation Lab hosted a technical workshop with our G7 development colleagues to advance our collective work on reducing food loss and waste (FLW) in our programming and advocacy. In May 2024, USAID joined the Federal Interagency Food Loss and Waste (FIFLAW) Formal Agreement with USDA, EPA, and FDA. Through FIFLAW, the four Agencies will better leverage their assets by promoting private sector engagement and partnerships to identify innovative solutions and best practices to reduce food loss and waste in the growing, manufacturing, transporting, selling, handling, preparation, storage, and disposing of food; exchanging knowledge; sharing resources; and coordinating efforts to influence national and global change.

UNITED STATES

2022



Results

Thresholds

3.1:

G7 members Direct Assistance for agriculture, fishing, food security and nutrition



(3.1a) Total Disbursement: USD million 5.092,41

CRS code	USD million
311.....	794,60
313.....	0,10
32161.....	0,64
520.....	739,50
72040.....	3.457,15
12240.....	100,43

(3.1b) Sub-Saharan Africa: USD million 3.402,87

CRS code	USD million
311.....	388,15
313.....	0,09
32161.....	0,60
520.....	595,65
72040.....	2.356,06
12240.....	62,32

3.2:

G7 members other assistance with explicit objectives to improve people's food security and/or nutrition



(3.2a) USD million 263,37

CRS code	USD million
112.....	216,18
12220.....	1,72
12261.....	-
12281.....	-
13020.....	21,27
140.....	1,05
16010.....	3,72
16050.....	0,01
16062.....	-
210.....	-
23210.....	1,61
23310.....	-
24030.....	-
24040.....	-

CRS code	USD million
25010.....	6,77
312.....	-
32165.....	-
32267.....	-
41010.....	3,28
41030.....	1,49
43030.....	-
43040.....	-
43071.....	6,27
43072.....	-
43073.....	-
73010.....	-
74010.....	-

UNITED STATES - MULTILATERAL

2022



Multilateral	Imputed % of core contributions to agriculture, food security & nutrition	USD MILLION
FAO	Core (92%)	127,68
WFP	Core (91%)	-
WHO	Core (2%)	-
UNICEF	Core (11%)	34,02
CGIAR	Core (55%)	-
IFAD	Core (82%)	35,26
WORLD BANK GROUP	WB Core (2%)	30,27
	Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (Public Sector Window)	-
	IFC (Private Sector Window and Agribusiness Investment)	-
AFDB	Core (12%)	6,56
ADB	Core (8%)	-
IDB	Core (2%)	-
EBRD	Core (2%)	10,00
OTHERS		
TOTAL		243,79



Results

Thresholds

2.1:



Percentage of G7 member programmes on agriculture and rural development that include objectives and expected results to increase the incomes of smallholder farmers

42 programmes / 60 programmes

70%



- ★ Less than 25%
- ★★ 25-50%
- ★★★ More than 50%

Notes/Remarks:

Under the relevant DAC sector codes, the EU data present:

Donor agencies: EU Institutions (European Commission and European Development Fund) and European Investment Bank.

Aid flow: gross bilateral ODA grants and ODA loans commitments

Geographic coverage: all partner countries, excluding EU candidate countries as defined in 2021

2.2:



Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include specific gender objectives

Marker 1:
USD million 963,2 / 1.334,8 = 72,2%

Marker 2:
USD million 2,6 / 1.334,8 = 0,2%



- ★ Less than 30% with Marker 1 and 2
- ★★ 30-50% with Marker 1 and 2, with more than 0% with Marker 2 ("Principal")
- ★★★ More than 50% with Marker 1 and 2, with at least 5% with Marker 2 ("Principal")

Notes/Remarks:

Under the relevant DAC sector codes, the EU data present:

Donor agencies: EU Institutions (European Commission and European Development Fund) and European Investment Bank.

Aid flow: gross bilateral ODA grants and ODA loans commitments



Results

Thresholds

2.3:



G7 donors' performance standards for ODA-supported investment instruments are reviewed to be aligned with the VGGT and the Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems

In 2022, the EU has analysed numerous investment proposals under the Global Gateway, its major investment channel to support sustainable development in partner countries. 2 out of 6 principles of the Global Gateway action are of direct relevance to the VGGT and the RAI guidelines: i) Democratic values and high standards and ii) Good Governance and Transparency. In this context the EU only selects the investment proposals that are sustainable for people, environment and economy.

The EU also decided to continue its support to international networks and processes working on the tracking of land investments and the promotion of VGGTs and RAI principles. In 2022, it allocated EUR 12 million to support the International Land Coalition in its efforts to promote equitable and transparent land tenure, and more broadly the implementation of the VGGTs globally. The action also includes a specific component on the collection, analysis and dissemination of land governance and tenure data. Land data is indeed required for EU supported investments, as well as in the context of due diligence efforts.

The EU continue to apply the Value chain for Development (VCA4D) analysis, which informs the interventions on value chain and private sector development. The methodology takes into account also the use of land and water rights, transparency and consultation, compensation, in line with the VGGTs.



- ★ No review of consistency with VGGT and the Principles
- ★★ Review process started and ongoing
- ★★★ Review has taken place and standards are aligned with the VGGT
- ★★★★ ...and the Principles

Results

Thresholds

2.4:



Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include climate adaptation and/or mitigation objectives

Adaptation 1+2:
USD million 1.110,9 / 1.334,8 = 83,1%

Mitigation 1+2:
USD million 519,6 / 1.334,8 = 38,9%



- ★ Less than 20% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2
- ★★ 20-40% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2
- ★★★ More than 40% with Adaptation and/or Mitigation Marker 1 and 2

Notes/Remarks:

Under the relevant DAC sector codes, the EU data present:

Donor agencies: EU Institutions (European Commission and European Development Fund) and European Investment Bank.

Aid flow: gross bilateral ODA grants and ODA loans commitments

2.4b:



Short qualitative paragraph setting out progress on Sustainable Agriculture investments based on outcomes such as the 10 Core Performance Criteria & 5 Advanced Criteria of the FAO's TAPE tool*, agreed by G7 FSWG in 2021

In 2022, combined with the impact of the COVID-19 pandemics and unprecedented global challenges (incl. population growth, urbanization, political conflicts, climate change, biodiversity loss and natural resources depletion), Russia's war of aggression on Ukraine brought about a major food, energy and fertilisers crisis worldwide. As a result, over 281 million people in 59 countries were to find themselves in a situation of food crisis a year later. Against this backdrop, the EU pursued its efforts to support transformative changes towards productive, sustainable, resilient, and inclusive agri-food systems capable of delivering economic prosperity, livelihoods, and healthy diets and nutrition for all in healthy environments. One of the key prerequisites to do so being equitable and transparent land tenure, in 2022, the EU provided EUR 12 million to support the International Land Coalition (ILC), a global network of over 250 organisations working to secure land rights for smallholder farmers, communities and indigenous people. The action included an important component involving the Land Portal, the Land Matrix programme, the Prindex programme and ILC, to collect, analyse and communicate land governance related information. With a view to contributing to the maintenance of healthy ecosystems and related agrobiodiversity, the EU promoted ex-situ and in-situ plant genetic conservation, management and use by smallholder farmers through the provision of EUR 3 million to the Crop Trust to support international genebank collections, and of EUR 4 million to support the Access and Benefit sharing work of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agri-

Results

Thresholds

2.4b:



culture through their 5th Benefit Sharing Fund grants. This work was complemented by an ongoing EC funded project by the Global Forum for Agricultural Innovation and Research (GFAiR) Collective Action on Forgotten Foods. In support of the DeSIRA initiative, aiming at strengthening Research and Innovation to foster a productive, green, and inclusive transformation of agriculture and food systems in low and middle-income countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America, a EUR 6.3 million Technical Assistance grant was awarded to provide long and short term technical assistance support to the DeSIRA projects and the Organisations implementing them. In parallel, first aggregated results of the DeSIRA Initiative brought to light that as of December 2022, 1564 researchers had been involved in the implementation of the activities of 46 DeSIRA projects, including 1024 from target countries, of which at least 190 were women. Many organizations played a key role in implementation, including 221 research institutes, 113 NGOs, 161 Farmers' Organisations (FOs), 72 private sector entities, 136 other non-research organisations (e.g. ministries) and 56 networks. In 2022, based on the lessons learned from DeSIRA, the EU initiated the formulation of its phase 2, a EUR 118 million Sub-Saharan Africa regional programme aimed at promoting 1) innovations at scale for agroecology in Sub-Saharan Africa (DeSIRA+) as well as 2) Regional Multi-actor Research Networks in Agroecology.

2.5:



Resources committed to nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions

Total EU commitments with nutrition objective:
USD million 1.710,5

Humanitarian nature:
USD million 486,0

Development nature:
USD million 1.224,5

- ★ Decrease in commitments by 10% or more with respect to 2015
- ★★ Same level as 2015
- ★★★ Increase in commitments by 10% or more with respect to 2015

Notes/Remarks:

The figures provided encompass the complete budget of projects that have been designated as having a principal or significant objective under the OECD nutrition policy marker. Coinciding with the achievement of the EUR 3.5 billion pledge in 2020 and the start of the EU programming period 2021-2027, at the N4G summit in Tokyo the EU made a new nutrition pledge, to commit EUR 2.5 billion to international cooperation with a nutrition objective from 2021 to 2024 (EUR 1.4 billion in development aid and EUR 1.1 billion in humanitarian aid). At the same time, the EU, alongside other nutrition donors and with the support of the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Donor Network, committed to reporting



Results

Thresholds

2.5:



official development assistance (ODA) to the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) using its voluntary Nutrition Policy Marker to identify actions with a nutrition objective. From 2021 nutrition resource tracking in the EU will therefore follow the OECD DAC guidelines for nutrition reporting.

2.6:



G7 strategic focus to strengthen linkages between short-, medium- and long-term food security and nutrition support/programmes and to enhance transition between relief and development

The worsening conditions of global food insecurity since Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine have led to a swift and comprehensive Team Europe Response by the Council of the EU, which seeks strengthening linkages between short-, medium and long-term food security and nutrition support and programmes. Its four strands of action – namely, solidarity, sustainable production, trade, and effective multilateralism – aim at tackling vulnerability and unmet needs, and address root and immediate causes of food insecurity and malnutrition. The response is backed by a commitment of EUR 600 million to food security in African, Caribbean and Pacific countries (ACPs) from de-committed funds from the 10th and 11th European Development Fund. The EU financed food security and nutrition programmes aim at scaling up of both nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions and systems to ensure the resilience of individuals and communities, especially in contexts of protracted food crises. Our approach integrates strengthening the enabling environment (political, legal, economic and human resource) through multi-stakeholder collaboration. These actions also aim to promote innovation (e.g. on water irrigation, linking access to energy and agri-value chains activities, etc).



No strategy



Process of strategy development ongoing



Strategy developed and being implemented



Results

Thresholds

2.7:



G7 governments have provided technical support and/or funding to improve and/or expand capacities to collect, analyze, and/or use food security and nutrition indicators in support of SDG2 targets

Several studies, reference reports and data collection and analysis tools are funded through the Global Network against Food Crises, including the Global Report on Food Crises, the Hunger Hotspots Report, “Monitoring food security in countries with conflict situations” update that feed the UNSC, near-real time monitoring systems etc. Plus, other supports, notably the 50×2030 Initiative, Food Security Portal and Strengthening Food Security Statistics at country level to monitor Target 2.1 of the 2030 Agenda. The Minimum Dietary Diversity (MDD) indicators for women (MDD-W) and children (MDD-C) have been proposed as SDG2 indicator in the 2025 Comprehensive Review of the SDGs with the aim to strengthen the agenda on sustainable, healthy diets for food systems transformation. The EU and Germany support MDD-W through funding to the Global Diet Quality Project aiming to standardize and facilitate accurate, comparable MDD-W data collection. In the Commission, it forms part of the OPSYS core indicators for design and monitoring of EU-funded interventions and has been added to the Global Development Data Tool. It is promoted for use by delegations since many years and it is part of many log frames of EU-funded nutrition projects. transformation taking into account climate change challenges while providing a pathway to improved diets. The studies recommend priority investments, based on the earlier CERES 2030 study that identified the 10 most effective (groups of) investments in order to reduce hunger.



No programmes



Programmes under definition



Programmes ongoing



Results

Thresholds

3.1:

G7 members Direct Assistance for agriculture, fishing, food security and nutrition



(3.1a) Total Disbursement: USD million 1.691,5

CRS code	USD million
311.....	927,1
313.....	30,0
32161.....	19,7
520.....	41,2
72040.....	553,8
12240.....	119,7

(3.1b) Sub-Saharan Africa: USD million 686,9

CRS code	USD million
311.....	272,5
313.....	18,6
32161.....	17,8
520.....	13,9
72040.....	304,9
12240.....	59,2

Notes/Remarks:

Under the relevant DAC sector codes, the EU data present:

Donor agencies: EU Institutions (European Commission and European Development Fund) and European Investment Bank

Sub-Saharan African countries are also the main beneficiaries of global projects that cannot be further disaggregated at the country and regional levels at this time.

3.2:

G7 members other assistance with explicit objectives to improve people's food security and/or nutrition



(3.2a) Not available

EUROPEAN UNION - MULTILATERAL

2022



Multilateral	Imputed % of core contributions to agriculture, food security & nutrition	USD MILLION
FAO	Core (92%)	0,368
WFP	Core (91%)	-
WHO	Core (2%)	-
UNICEF	Core (11%)	-
CGIAR	Core (55%)	-
IFAD	Core (82%)	-
WORLD BANK GROUP	WB Core (2%)	-
	Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (Public Sector Window)	-
	IFC (Private Sector Window and Agribusiness Investment)	-
AFDB	Core (12%)	-
ADB	Core (8%)	-
IDB	Core (2%)	-
EBRD	Core (2%)	-
OTHERS	International Cocoa Organization (ICCO)	1,530
	International Coffee Organization (ICO)	0,957
	International Cotton Advisory Committee (ICAC)	0,089
TOTAL		2,944

ELMAU FOOD SECURITY WORKING GROUP

Final report of the informal technical sub-group on the Elmau reporting methodology

Background

In the past years, the G7 have had an important discussion on the quality and consistency of the Elmau commitment reporting methodology. Under the leadership of the Italian Presidency, an informal technical sub-group was created to revise the methodology building on the discussions already launched in the previous years, especially during the German and the Japanese G7 Presidencies.

The objective of the technical sub-group was to identify conceptual pillars of the methodology, before acting on the indicator framework, and to draft a concept note that presents a shared vision for the review and drafting of future years' Elmau financial reporting.

The informal technical sub-group met three times in 2024 and addressed several technical topics such as the changes in CRS codes, the use of keywords, the use of commitment versus disbursement and the use of the grant equivalent. The meetings were also dedicated to more general issues such as the stock-taking of the Elmau goal, the inner coherence of the whole indicator set and how to make the Elmau report easily readable.

This report sums up the rich and fruitful discussion carried out in the three meetings of the informal technical sub-group and tries to convey key messages and elements that could be further addressed and/or implemented in the next round of the Elmau financial reporting.

General issues

There is a general agreement among the experts of the informal technical sub-group on the need for a **review of the current indicators used to measure progress on the Elmau commitment**. G7 members generally agree that, while the existing indicators cover the key challenges of food insecurity and malnutrition, there are concerns about their **consistency, relevance, and practicality**. The indicators might not always be consistently applied across countries, leading to difficulties in comparison and interpretation.

Countries acknowledge that the data reported over the years are often incoherent, with instances of overreporting and inconsistent methodologies, making it difficult to compare contributions accurately across time as well as between G7 members. This

inconsistency **weakens transparency and accountability**, as different G7 members use varying reporting frameworks and definitions, particularly for indicators that require a keyword approach.

It could be helpful to update the conceptual framework to better align with the current, **broader approach on food security and nutrition** that includes other themes such as sustainable agriculture and food systems and climate resilient practices, and for clarifying definitions, particularly for sectors like agriculture, where inconsistencies in application exist. Some indicators may overlap, and others lack clear methods or robust assessment processes, further complicating the evaluation of progress. Overall, there is an agreement on the importance of **simplifying the indicators, ensuring their coherence across G7 members, and improving their usability and relevance, especially as new global challenges and policy lenses emerge**. The goal is to refine the indicator set so that it remains meaningful, reliable, and easier to communicate, while also being future proofed to support consistent, long-term monitoring.

Overall, G7 members agree that without addressing these reporting issues, **it will remain challenging to assess the true impact of G7 financial contributions toward achieving the Elmau goal**.

This is especially relevant given that the Elmau commitment aimed to “*lift 500 million people out of hunger and poverty through combined efforts*”. However, the reporting from Elmau has primarily focused on financial figures rather than concrete progress toward that goal. In 2023, 733 million people are in chronic hunger, compared to 570 million in 2015. In a business-as-usual scenario, 2030 level will still be above 2015 numbers ([SOFI, 2024](#)). Any stock-taking of the Elmau objective would likely highlight an unfavourable story for G7 countries, particularly with the worsening global food and nutrition security, which is being exacerbated by complex factors such as conflict and climate change. Nonetheless, there is broad agreement that as well as highlighting the challenges and current financial picture, the review should emphasize joint success stories, rather than focusing on the efforts of individual G7 members.

At the same time, sub-group members are well aware that a revision of Elmau methodology can be undertaken only based on a clear political statement by the G7 members, which goes well beyond the scope of work of the sub-group itself. Considering these aspects and given the major global shifts since the Elmau 2015 Commitments, **it is recommended that the FSWG make a decision on revision of the Elmau methodology and/or a new reporting model to adjust to the new normal**.

Keywords

Keywords are currently used to identify G7 members' contributions under Indicator 3.2a - other assistance with explicit objectives to enhance food security and nutrition. According to the FSWG, this indicator cannot be calculated solely by relying on purpose codes; instead, project details such as titles, short descriptions, and long descriptions must be screened. Keywords assist in refining total contributions but come

with certain limitations. The FSWG noted that more advanced tools, such as **machine learning**, could improve the screening process, though such an approach would require substantial investment and consideration of information security, cyber security and data protection management.

In the meantime, keywords remain essential, though the FSWG acknowledges that countries do not consistently apply the set of official keywords established by the methodology. Given this, **a general review and harmonization of keywords would likely be beneficial**. At a minimum, we recommend that countries specify in the Elmau report any keywords used to screen projects for indicator 3.2a if they differ from the official set.

Commitment versus disbursement

The informal technical sub-group analysed the possibility to harmonise the use of commitment or disbursement among the Elmau indicators.

Some G7 members state that the use of disbursements (for indicators 2.2, 2.4, and 2.5) will be a more transparent and accurate method of measuring the aid received by partner countries. This is particularly relevant in cases where commitments are made in a given year for projects that span multiple years. Due to budgetary cycles of donors, commitments are more susceptible to fluctuations over years and do not accurately reflect the actual evolution of aid received by partner countries. Some partners would prefer to use commitments because reporting on commitment levels for quantitative indicators would also be consistent with qualitative indicators, reflecting policy (commitment) advancements for a reporting year.

The sub-group would then recommend the use of disbursement for indicators 2.2, 2.4, and 2.5 considering that this is already the practise for some countries.

Star ranking system

The informal technical sub-group reviewed the current use of the three-star ranking system, which appears outdated and no longer effectively communicates its intended message. Nevertheless, a star ranking system can be a softer and more flexible evaluation method compared to numerical scores and there is no widespread support for abandoning it. The sub-group evaluated the possibility for increasing the number of stars used. Given that half-star ratings (such as 2.5 stars, as seen in indicator 2.3) are sometimes applied, **adopting a five-star system could provide more precision and clarity in evaluations**.

However, increasing the number of stars will not address the weaknesses of the indicators and **any revision of the star ranking system should be accompanied by a thorough reassessment of the indicators themselves**. This should include developing clear, evidence-based rationales for the thresholds used in the ratings.

Grant equivalent

In 2018, the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) implemented a new methodology for calculating Official Development Assistance (ODA) for loans, moving from a cash flow approach to a grant equivalent measure. This change aims to improve transparency and facilitate better comparisons between loans and grants, particularly to support lending in least developed countries. The grant equivalent ODA is determined by multiplying annual loan expenditures by the loan's grant element, reflecting the loan's concessionality. While the new method was adopted in 2014, its full implementation took place in 2018 after a transition period, meaning that historical ODA data prior to 2018 cannot be directly compared. Although this method provides a clearer picture of donor efforts, it disrupts ODA time series continuity, complicating longitudinal analyses. In 2023, the DAC also decided to apply the grant equivalent approach to Private Sector Instruments (PSI), with a planned transition.

The sub-group **would recommend a transition to this new methodology despite the challenges of handling and communicating a methodology change**. The sub-group recommends a break in time series.

WP-STAT¹ involvement

A comprehensive assessment of what constitutes “food and nutrition security finance” and how this definition should be operationalized would be a valuable transparency exercise not only for the Elmau exercise but also for the DAC. Currently, **there is no officially established methodology at the DAC level for measuring food and nutrition security finance**, resulting in varying estimates that differ significantly from Elmau data and could vary between DAC publications as well. For instance, the recently published DAC report, *Tackling Poverty and Inequalities through the Green Transition*², states, “The volume of DAC members’ ODA to food security reached a historical high of USD 15.1 billion in 2022.”

To avoid conflicting narratives, the G7 should consider the involvement of the WP-STAT on how to measure “food and nutrition security finance” in order to establish a harmonised methodology (at least for Indicator 3.1) that would be used by Elmau and by the DAC whenever there is the need to publish data on this topic.

Moreover, the SOFI report³ published by FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO defines financing for food security and nutrition to eliminate differences among definitions, thereby creating consistency and accountability. This report provides a core and extended definition for financing food security and nutrition. The involvement of the WP-STAT could be beneficial to assess if these definitions could be incorporated for

¹ DAC Working Party on Development Finance Statistics

² https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/development-co-operation-report-2024_d280e049-en

³ The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World

improving the Elmau methodology in the long-term.

To this end, G7 members may request official involvement from WP-STAT to assist in revising the Elmau methodology, utilising their expertise on development finance reporting standards such as purpose codes and keywords, and producing a methodological report on the transparency of food and nutrition security development finance.

Aspects related to specific indicators

Indicator 2.1: *Percentage of G7 member programmes on agriculture and rural development that include objectives and expected results to increase the incomes of smallholder farmers.*

There is a lack of comparability across countries with respect to this indicator and the methodology used is not always well documented. In some cases, donors employ a highly time-intensive methodology for the screening of projects and, due to time constraints, they only provide figures for the main institutions, resulting in incomplete estimates. Such approaches appear to be occasionally conducted manually, resulting in estimates that are subjective, lacking transparency, reproducibility, and consistency. Methodologies outlined by donors seem to vary and rely on different keywords or concepts. **It would be necessary an in-depth review of the different methodologies with the aim to define a set of keywords**, consistent with the information presented in SDG 2.3, standardised for all donors.

Indicator 2.2: *Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include specific gender objectives*

It should be clarified why indicator 2.2 has been limited to agriculture, forestry and fishing only and not enlarged to all DAC codes used for Elmau. **The wider option (DAC Codes corresponding to food security, nutrition and agriculture) looks more relevant and coherent with the other indicators.**

Indicator 2.4: *Percentage of resources committed to agriculture that include climate adaptation objectives*

Currently there is **double counting** among the two categories used for reporting (Adaptation and Mitigation), this is due to the fact that a programme can have both Adaptation and Mitigation marker at the same time. **A review of the method should consider whether this double counting can be removed and further clarify the category descriptions to make this clear.**

Indicator 2.5: *Resources committed to nutrition-sensitive and nutrition-specific interventions*

The sub-group strongly recommends distinguishing with a different id number these two indicators. The same system used for indicators 2.4 could be applied and **the sub-group agrees on identifying as 2.5a Resources committed to nutrition-specific interventions and 2.5b Resources committed to nutrition-sensitive interventions.** Moreover, both indicators 2.5 are evaluated against values from 2015, which is not as pertinent in the present context. **The formulation could be modified to reduce its dependence on baseline data.** The star ranking could be adjusted accordingly.

Indicator 2.5a: *Resources committed to nutrition-sensitive interventions*

The technical sub-group **suggests using a more consistent and simplified method for nutrition-sensitive commitments to achieve greater consistency and transparency. However, the technical sub-group cannot identify an immediate solution.**

The sub-group acknowledges that the reporting on resources spent on nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions should be based on the Global Nutrition Reporting (GNR) of the SUN methodology, but the SUN methodology is very complex and not used by all countries, furthermore corresponding programme documents are sometimes not available or not accessible. On the other hand, there is no standardised use of the Nutrition Policy Marker that is still considered optional in the CRS. Also, the Nutrition Policy Marker does not allow for disaggregating programme components with different purpose codes, hence would give a less accurate picture of resources spent for nutrition related activities as part of a wider programme.

Indicator 2.6: G7 strategic focus to strengthen linkages between short, medium, and long-term food security and nutrition support/programmes and to enhance transition between relief and development

This qualitative indicator might not be relevant anymore as the majority of G7 members have reached the three stars over the years and perhaps a different way of highlighting and proving the link relief-development might be proposed.

Alternatively, the sub-group could consider ending reporting on this indicator or replace it with a new indicator, aiming to incentivize implementation of different strategies.

Indicator 2.7: *G7 governments have provided technical support and/or funding to improve and/or expand capacities to collect, analyse, and/or use food security and nutrition indicators in support of SDG2 targets*

As is for indicator 2.6, **this qualitative indicator might not be relevant anymore as the majority of G7 members have reached the three stars** over the years and perhaps a different way of highlighting and proving the support to data collection and analysis for SDG2 might be proposed.

Indicator 3.2: *G7 members other assistance with explicit objectives to improve people's food security and/or nutrition.*

The indicator 3.2a involves many CRS purpose codes and a keyword search. Firstly, **the technical sub-group agrees that the purpose code 74010 (discontinued by now) should be replaced with 74020 and 43060**. Moreover, once the word search has been carried out, the next steps of reviewing the results should be set out in the methodology to ensure that donors take as much of a harmonised approach as possible. Alternatively, it could be explored to reduce the number of CRS codes and keywords.

