

**GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY CRISIS
AND THE U.S. RESPONSE**

HEARING

BEFORE THE

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE**

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTEENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

—————
JULY 20, 2022
—————

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



Available via <http://www.govinfo.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 2023

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

ROBERT MENENDEZ, *New Jersey, Chairman*

BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland	JAMES E. RISCH, Idaho
JEANNE SHAHEEN, New Hampshire	MARCO RUBIO, Florida
CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, Delaware	RON JOHNSON, Wisconsin
CHRISTOPHER MURPHY, Connecticut	MITT ROMNEY, Utah
TIM KAINE, Virginia	ROB PORTMAN, Ohio
EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts	RAND PAUL, Kentucky
JEFF MERKLEY, Oregon	TODD YOUNG, Indiana
CORY A. BOOKER, New Jersey	JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
BRIAN SCHATZ, Hawaii	TED CRUZ, Texas
CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, Maryland	MIKE ROUNDS, South Dakota
	BILL HAGERTY, Tennessee

DAMIAN MURPHY, *Staff Director*
CHRISTOPHER M. SOCHA, *Republican Staff Director*
JOHN DUTTON, *Chief Clerk*

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Menendez, Hon. Robert, U.S. Senator From New Jersey	1
Risch, Hon. James E., U.S. Senator From Idaho	2
Thomas-Greenfield, Hon. Linda, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, New York, NY	5
Prepared Statement	6
Power, Hon. Samantha, Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Devel- opment, Washington, DC	8
Prepared Statement	9
Beasley, Hon. David, Executive Director, World Food Programme, Rome, Italy	32
Prepared Statement	34

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Responses of Ambassador Linda Thomas-Greenfield to Questions Submitted by Senator Robert Menendez	43
Responses of Ms. Samantha Power to Questions Submitted by Senator Robert Menendez	44
Responses of Ambassador Linda Thomas-Greenfield to Questions Submitted by Senator James E. Risch	51
Responses of Ms. Samantha Power to Questions Submitted by Senator James E. Risch	52
Responses of Mr. David Beasley to Questions Submitted by Senator James E. Risch	56
Responses of Ms. Samantha Power to Questions Submitted by Senator John Barrasso	61

GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY CRISIS AND THE U.S. RESPONSE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 20, 2022

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:00 a.m., in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Robert Menendez, chairman of the committee, presiding.

Present: Senators Menendez [presiding], Cardin, Shaheen, Coons, Murphy, Kaine, Merkley, Booker, Van Hollen, Risch, Romney, Portman, Young, Barrasso, and Hagerty.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ, U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW JERSEY

The CHAIRMAN. This hearing will come to order. Let me thank Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield and Administrator Power for appearing before our committee as we examine one of the most fundamental and far-reaching threats the world faces today, which is global food security.

We must be crystal clear about what is at stake. Nearly 828 million people are at grave risk of hunger and disease, with many at risk of outright starvation. While far more complex than a land war or terrorist attack, the global food security crisis represents the clearest threat to global peace and security we have seen in decades. Ruthless autocrats, militias, and terrorist organizations have always used food as a weapon of war, and Vladimir Putin is no different.

Ukraine has long been considered a critical breadbasket of the world. Disrupting food shipments and promoting a disinformation campaign about Ukraine's role in the resulting food crisis have been a deliberate byproduct of Vladimir Putin's brutal invasion in February. Russian forces occupied farms. They destroyed tractors and combines. They blockaded ports and bombed rail lines. The war has decimated three seasons of Ukrainian grain production.

We have to remember that the resulting food security process was not a byproduct of Russian aggression. Starvation is part of their strategy. In April, the Deputy of the Russian Security Council openly admitted food was the Kremlin's "silent but menacing" weapon. Now Putin is amplifying the horrific effects of the war in Ukraine, accelerating global hunger as leverage for sanctions relief.

Prior to Putin's invasion, 26 countries, many of them in the Middle East and across Africa, relied on Russia and Ukraine for wheat imports, but Putin just poured jet fuel on that fire. From climate

change and natural disasters to supply chain bottlenecks and the COVID pandemic, this crisis had been building for some time.

Over the last 2 years there has been an alarming 200 percent rise in people who go to sleep hungry and desperate, unsure where their family's next meal will come from, who will leave their homes in search of food, who will do what they must to survive. If we do not collectively respond, the global hunger crisis will deepen conflicts and further destabilize fragile regions of the world that are already struggling.

In the heart of Africa, an unprecedented three failed rainy seasons endangers the lives of 21 million people. Hundreds of thousands face starvation in Somalia alone. In Central America, the dry corridor spanning from Panama to southern Mexico threatens the livelihoods of millions and is one of the core drivers of forced migration.

We are also not immune from these threats here in the United States. Russia's war in Ukraine is a key factor behind historic levels of price inflation for fuel and food in the United States. Most homes across America are feeling the squeeze, with low-income households hit the hardest. The United States has an absolutely critical role to play combatting this global crisis.

Congress has taken action, in a bipartisan manner, passing the recent \$5 billion Ukraine Emergency Supplemental Package, to get food aid and agricultural support to parts of the world impacted directly by Russia's reckless actions. We need to make sure the money we have appropriated is spent expeditiously and responsibly so that we can help those who need it the most, but we also need to recognize that this is a political crisis, and to solve it we will need a political solution, with American diplomacy leading the way.

This hearing will examine what the United States must do to prevent the crisis from overwhelming the world, and I look forward to hearing more from our witnesses today on what actions the Biden administration is taking to combat the underlying drivers of food insecurity, how are you using the recent emergency supplemental funds provided by Congress, what do you need from Congress to achieve our national security and humanitarian goals. To get a better understanding of our diplomatic efforts, I want to hear more about the ways in which we are tackling this problem through close collaboration with our allies and friends who share our concerns.

Finally, I hope you will talk about the ways we can continue to keep the pressure on Russia for their inhumane and criminal actions. We must do better to combat Russia's successful disinformation campaign, blaming Ukraine and anyone else for Putin's own starvation campaigns.

With that I return to the Ranking Member for his opening statement. Senator Risch.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES E. RISCH,
U.S. SENATOR FROM IDAHO**

Senator RISCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No nation on Earth has done more to reduce global hunger and stimulate agriculture-led economic growth than the United States of America. It was American grit and ingenuity that spurred a Green Revolution back

in the 1950s and 1960s, which transformed global agriculture, reduced poverty, and ultimately saved billions of lives.

Today, through Feed the Future, we are trying to amplify that progress by helping people increase yields, gain access to markets, and grow their way out of poverty so they can secure the food and nutrition their families need to survive and thrive.

I am proud of the work America has done and the contributions my state have made to it. I also am proud of the work we have done to get emergency food aid to people in their hour of need. Here again, no nation on Earth has been more committed to helping avert starvation. Food security is national security. As we saw during the Arab Spring and in places like Sri Lanka today, hunger is a destabilizing force that brings people to the streets and sends leaders into exile.

It is in our interest to respond, first by providing emergency assistance when and where it is needed most, then helping people transition away from dependence and towards self-reliance. It is in America's best interest.

The Global Food Security Act provides a roadmap for this. I have joined forces with Senator Casey to reauthorize it this year and look forward to working with our colleagues to ensure it moves quickly, seamlessly, and unburdened by additional mandates.

It would be impossible to talk about the state of global food security today without focusing on Russia's unprovoked war in Ukraine. Let us be clear. This is not a crisis. It is a brutal, unprovoked war that has taken a massive toll, not just on Ukraine and Europe, but on the entire world. In this war, Putin is using food as a weapon, with the ultimate goal of starving the world into submission.

I recently returned from Ukraine where I saw bombed-out bridges, hospitals, and churches. I saw ambulances bringing Ukrainian soldiers and civilians to clinics, and train cars serving as surgical centers. I also saw evidence of deliberate campaign to permanently destroy and displace Ukraine's agricultural productivity in a campaign to bend the world to Putin's will by leveraging access to food for sanctions relief.

The U.N., including the World Food Programme, must not be complicit in this campaign. They cannot continue to appease Russia in order to secure short-term, partial compliance with international humanitarian obligations. It is very disheartening when I hear Americans, or for that matter, anyone else, particularly those who operate in the U.N., suggesting that Ukraine has any—any—responsibility for this at all. This is all Putin's. It is all Russia's fault.

Congress is doing its part. We have provided billions of dollars in assistance to stop the war and address its humanitarian impact across Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America. Obviously, other donors also need to do more.

In the meantime, we must do everything we can to stretch USAID dollars further. This includes removing U.S. cargo preference requirements on food aid that have outlived their purposes, drive up costs, and slow the delivery of lifesaving food up to 12 months. There are only three bulk carriers left in the U.S. fleet that carry food aid, none of which are militarily useful. To suggest that maintaining U.S. cargo preference for food aid is somehow vital to maintaining U.S. maritime security is inaccurate, at best.

Last year alone, cargo preferences cost USAID an extra \$80 million in transportation costs. Imagine all of the starving men, women, and children we could have reached with an additional \$80 million. Hungry people cannot eat transportation costs. It is time to end this brand of corporate welfare.

I look forward to the testimony today and to working with my colleagues to find practical solutions to address the biggest global food security crisis of our time.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Risch.

Before I introduce our fantastic panel let me just say we have very young staffers with us today. Everybody is included, but we welcome the youngest staffers that Senator Murphy has brought to assist him today, and I understand one of them is his niece. Welcome to the committee.

Senator MURPHY. Some new blood.

The CHAIRMAN. New blood. That has been Senator Murphy's feeling since he got here to the Senate, so welcome.

It is my privilege to welcome United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Linda Thomas-Greenfield, back to the committee. In her role, Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield leads efforts to advance U.S. interests of the United Nations in pursuit of peace and security. Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield is a veteran diplomat, having served our country for 35 years in the Foreign Service, including as the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, during which time she worked in many of the countries most impacted by the global food crisis today. Thank you, Ambassador, for joining us, and I appreciate our discussion, including the need for lifting the housing cap so that we can attract the talent we need at the U.N. to meet the challenges of Russia and China.

We are also joined by another formidable diplomat, USAID Administrator Samantha Power. In her role, Administrator Power oversees USAID's international development and humanitarian efforts around the globe. She has had a robust public service career, previously serving as the United States Ambassador to the U.N., as well as on the National Security Council, so we welcome you.

Our second panel today, after this panel, will welcome the Executive Director of the World Food Programme, David Beasley, who will be briefing the committee today. Mr. Beasley has served in this role since 2017, leading the world's largest humanitarian organization in its critical efforts to combat hunger around the world.

Previously, Mr. Beasley served as the governor of South Carolina, so we welcome you, Governor. Thank you for coming to the committee. It is a pleasure to have you with us.

I want to emphasize in light of your affiliation with the United Nations that you are appearing voluntarily today before the committee, as a courtesy to the committee, and we appreciate that.

With that we will begin with Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield. Your full statements will be included in the record. I would ask you to summarize them in around 5 minutes or so because, as you can see from attendance, there are many members who will want to engage in a conversation with you. Ambassador.

**STATEMENT OF THE HON. LINDA THOMAS-GREENFIELD, U.S.
AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED NATIONS, NEW YORK, NY**

Ambassador THOMAS-GREENFIELD. Chairman Menendez, Ranking Member Risch, distinguished committee members, thank you so much for the opportunity to testify here today with Administrator Power.

Now my mother was a cook, and I think she was the best cook ever, as I am sure most of you feel about your own moms. She shared her gift widely and not just with our family. She would cook for the entire community all at once. Even though we did not have much, we made regular mass meals for anyone who was hungry.

My mother did this for a simple reason—she believed no one should ever have to go hungry. Over the course of my career, I have seen what happens to people and communities who have hunger thrust upon them. I have looked into the gaunt eyes of children who are, as the doctors say, wasting, their rib bones poking out, their parents helpless to save them, and I have seen the child die right in front of me from malnutrition. Once you see something like that you never forget it, and you keep it close to your heart.

It is for that reason that when I first arrived at the U.N. in 2021 and assumed the presidency of the U.N. Security Council, I made our signature event that month focused on conflict-induced hunger, because we knew that the vast majority of widespread hunger is manmade, and hunger is caused often intentionally by conflict.

Then came Russia's brutal, illegal, and unprovoked further invasion into Ukraine, and you combine that with the cocktail of COVID-19, climate change, high energy prices, and preexisting conflict, and the world's food crisis has become colossal.

After all, Ukraine, as you noted, Senator, was the breadbasket for the developing world, and according to the World Bank, some countries in Europe, the Middle East, Africa, Central Asia typically got up to 75 percent of their wheat from Russia and Ukraine. Russia has systematically sabotaged and destroyed Ukraine's farmland, equipment, and infrastructure and grain stockpiles, and Russia's naval blockade in the Black Sea and the threat of further naval attacks are currently preventing Ukraine crops from being exported to their destinations. We hope, for that reason, that the recent Ukraine-Russia talks that are being facilitated by the U.N. in Istanbul with Turkey will yield results.

In the meantime, we estimate that more than 20 million tons of grain are trapped in silos and ships at risk of rotting away. As long as Putin continues his war in Ukraine, millions and millions of people around the world will not know when or where they will get their next meal. Countries in the Middle East and Africa will feel these effects most acutely. To make matters worse, severe heat and other extreme weather events are ruining crops around the world. This is a five-alarm emergency, and I have never seen a food security crisis like this in my career. This is the kind of problem that no one nation can solve alone. It is the kind of problem that requires serious and sustained multilateral cooperation.

Again, that is why in May, during our presidency, Secretary Blinken joined me in New York, and we hosted a series of days of action on food security, and we brought together our closest partners to craft a roadmap for global food security. One hundred coun-

tries have now signed on to a common picture of this crisis and a common agenda for addressing it.

Since the ministerial, we have been working together with the U.N. and G7 and others to partner to get more donors around the world, but Russia claims falsely that sanctions posed by the U.S. and allies are to be blame for the global increase in food prices, but Russia knows full well, as you noted, that food and fertilizer are specifically excluded from U.N. sanctions.

The good news is that we have the tools to stop hunger and alleviate suffering, and we have to use them and rally the world to do the same. In this vein, we are sincerely grateful to Congress for providing the funding that you have already appropriated to respond to this crisis. I know that Administrative Power will speak in more depth about our efforts on the ground, but I want you to know that together we will continue to rally the world to take on the global food security crisis through every multilateral channel that we have. Because as my mother believed, to her bones, no child should have to go to bed hungry, and that is what we are working together to do.

Thank you, and I am honored to be here to take your questions.

[The prepared statement of Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield follows:]

Prepared Statement of Ambassador Linda Thomas-Greenfield

Chairman Menendez, Ranking Member Risch, distinguished committee members: Thank you, so much, for the opportunity to testify here today.

My mother was a cook—the best I’ve ever known. She shared her gift widely, and not just with our family. She’d cook for the whole town at once. Even though we didn’t have much, we made regular mass meals for anyone who was hungry.

My mother did this for a simple reason. She believed no one should ever have to go hungry.

Over the course of my career, I have seen what happens to people and communities who have hunger thrust upon them. I have looked in the gaunt eyes of children who are, as the doctors say, wasting: their rib bones poking out, their parents helpless to save them. I have seen a child die, right in front of me, from malnutrition.

Once you see something like that, you never forget it. And you keep it close to your heart.

That was one reason why, when I first arrived at the UN and assumed the Presidency of the UN Security Council a few days later in March 2021, I made our signature event that month focused on conflict-induced hunger.

Because we knew that the vast majority of widespread hunger—in places like Yemen, Syria, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Central African Republic, Mali, or South Sudan—is man-made. Hunger is caused, often intentionally, by conflict.

Then, this year, came Russia’s brutal, illegal, and unprovoked further invasion into Ukraine. Combine that with a cocktail of COVID–19, climate change, high energy prices, and pre-existing conflicts, and the world’s food crisis has become colossal.

After all, Ukraine was the breadbasket for the developing world. According to the World Bank, some countries in Europe, the Middle East, Africa, and Central Asia typically got up to 75 percent of their wheat from Russia and Ukraine.

Russia has captured some of Ukraine’s most productive farmland. They planted explosives throughout those fields. They stole and destroyed vital agricultural equipment and infrastructure. They bombed grain silos and are selling grain that we believe was stolen from Ukrainian stockpiles.

And Russia’s naval blockade in the Black Sea, and the threat of further naval attacks, are currently preventing Ukraine’s crops from being exported to their destinations. We hope that the Ukraine-Russia talks, which re-started in Istanbul on July 13 with Turkey and the UN, will yield results.

In the meantime, we estimate that more than 20 million tons of grain are trapped in silos and ships, at risk of rotting away.

In essence, Russia is dumping out that breadbasket—and leaving only bread-crumbs for a hungry world.

As long as Putin continues his war in Ukraine, millions and millions of people—most of whom live well beyond Ukraine’s borders—won’t know when or where they’ll get their next meal. Countries in the Middle East and Africa will feel those effects most acutely. For example, the impact of Putin’s war is worsening the effects of the historic drought in the Horn of Africa where nearly 19 million people are in need of emergency food assistance. But all of us will suffer.

To make matters worse, our food supplies are on the front lines of climate change. Severe heat and other extreme weather events are ruining crops around the world and are causing spikes in staple foods and fertilizer prices.

This is a five-alarm emergency. I have never seen a food security crisis like this in my career.

This is the kind of problem that no one nation can solve alone—the kind of problem that requires serious, sustained multilateral cooperation.

That’s why this past May, during the United States Presidency of the Security Council, Secretary Blinken joined me in New York. Together, we rallied countries, regional organizations, NGOs, philanthropy, and the private sector to take serious, concrete steps to bolster global food supplies and resilience.

We hosted a series of Days of Action on Food Security, which featured a one two-punch: a Security Council meeting that put pressure on Russia, and a ministerial-level event—the “Global Food Security Call to Action.”

At that ministerial, we brought together our closest partners to craft a *Roadmap for Global Food Security*. Thirty-six attendees of the ministerial signed on the spot. Sixty-three other countries have joined since. That means we’ve now rallied 100 countries—a majority of UN member states—to a common picture of this crisis and a common agenda for addressing it.

The Roadmap affirms our collective commitment to act with urgency, at scale, and in concert to respond to this crisis. It commits us all to providing immediate humanitarian assistance, building resilience for those in vulnerable situations, supporting social protection and safety nets, and strengthening our food systems. But this is just the first step.

Since the ministerial, we have been working closely at the UN, with the G7, the G20, the EU and the AU, APEC, and other partners and donors around the world. As we work through these multilateral channels, we have also been rebutting Russian disinformation at every turn.

Russia claims, falsely, that sanctions posed by the United States and our Allies are to blame for the global increase in food prices. But Russia knows full well that food and fertilizer are specifically excluded from U.S. sanctions. The Department of the Treasury has even issued two General Licenses to authorize agricultural and medical trade, as well as humanitarian activities.

Russia is trying to spread this disinformation because they know just how easy it is to see the ripple effects of their horrific war. And sadly, our fear is that there could be more ripple effects to come.

According to the World Food Program, this kind of global food shortage could cause mass migration unlike anything we’ve seen since World War II. And food insecurity is both a threat and a multiplier for violent conflict. It is not only caused by conflict—it can also spark new ones in the countries and communities where food is scarce. A vicious cycle.

Fortunately, we have the tools and technology to combat hunger. Online platforms can connect farmers and equip them with the latest information about supply chains. Satellite imagery can improve our understanding of weather patterns and crop yields. High-quality seeds and agricultural inputs ensure farmers can produce enough food for everyone. The list goes on and on.

We have the tools to stop hunger and alleviate suffering. We just have to use them—and rally the world to do the same. So we are doing exactly that.

After all, the world takes its cues from the United States on humanitarian issues—which means your support, and the support of the entire Congress, sends an important signal to other donors to step up and pitch in. It helps reinforce our humanitarian values at places like the UN—and it gives us a leadership platform.

I know Administrator Power will speak in more depth about our efforts on the ground. But I want you to know that together, we will continue to rally the world to take on the global food security crisis—through the Roadmap, through the UN, U.S. food assistance, and through every multilateral channel we have.

Because, as my mother believed to her bones, no one should have to go hungry. Thank you. I am honored to be here and look forward to your questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Administrator Power.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. SAMANTHA POWER, ADMINISTRATOR, U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, WASHINGTON, DC

Ms. POWER. Thank you, Chairman Menendez, Ranking Member Risch, and all the esteemed members of the committee. Thank you all for turning out today.

After this hearing, I am going to be flying to the Horn of Africa, which is the epicenter of the unprecedented global food crisis that we face today. The crisis has many sources, as we know—record droughts and heatwaves that are destroying crops and livelihoods; economic shocks from COVID-19 that have shuttered markets, fed inflation, and erased the fiscal space that many countries had to deal with emergencies; and, of course, Vladimir Putin's vicious assault on Ukraine and his ongoing, devastating use of food as a weapon of war.

Putin's blockade of Ukrainian ports and his forces' bombardment of farmland and storage facilities, holding nearly 20 million tons of grain and maize hostage, has sent what were already record food prices even higher, and the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China also restricted the export of fertilizer, actions that have led, in many countries, to a tripling of fertilizer prices, threatening not just today's harvests, but next year's as well.

Since this crisis emerged, the United States, thanks in large part to the urgency and generosity shown by members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, is leading the world in a global response. Our fight against the global food security crisis has three main fronts: rapidly distributing emergency humanitarian aid, making sustained investments in agricultural productivity, and concerted diplomacy of the kind Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield has alluded to so that we marshal a global response to what is a global crisis.

With regard to humanitarian aid, USAID is on track to program more than \$11 billion by the end of this fiscal year, \$3.5 billion more than last year, which was itself a record amount. \$5.7 billion of this funding will be directed to the World Food Programme, and I know you will be hearing from Executive Director Beasley today.

We know from decades of experience that hunger cannot be fought with food alone. In places where markets still function, we are distributing emergency cash assistance that can both feed people and boost local economies. We also know that in severe food crises more people die from disease than hunger, so our assistance will also equip mobile health and nutrition teams to rapidly expand access to vaccines and to treat the severely ill. In drought conditions, clean water becomes incredibly scarce and the threat of waterborne diseases like cholera grows, so we are also needing to invest in providing water and sanitation kits.

We are also providing assistance to revive severely malnourished children, including \$200 million, which I announced this week, to UNICEF, which will dramatically expand the production and distribution of so-called RUTF, ready-to-use therapeutic foods, shelf-stable products that can help 90 percent of severely malnourished children survive where 90 percent typically perish without treatment. That announcement that I made a couple of days ago was immediately matched by \$50 million from private donors, and we

have set a goal of marshaling another \$250 million from global sources in the next several months.

These are just a few of the immediate responses we will mobilize, but as we know, crisis requires more than just short-term answers. It requires sustained investments. As Putin attempts to dismantle one of the world's largest breadbaskets, it is imperative that we work to rebuild it. That is why yesterday I announced the launch of the Agri-Ukraine Initiative, \$100 million that will provide seeds, fertilizer, financing, and equipment to Ukraine's farmers, will increase crop storage and export capacity in Ukraine, and spark the eventual reconstruction of the country's agricultural sector.

Around the world, the \$760 million that Congress has provided from the latest supplemental will allow us to give poor farmers greater access to drought-resistant seeds, apply precision fertilizer techniques that can both reduce waste and increase yields, and storage solutions that can prevent the 25 to 30 percent of food that is lost or wasted.

Ultimately, though, the U.S. cannot solve this crisis alone, which is why the work of Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield and Secretary Blinken is so vital. In 2016, the last time we saw significant drought in the Horn of Africa, wealthy countries significantly stepped up to prevent the outbreak of a famine. Today some of those same countries have spent just 8 percent of what they did then, despite a much more significant and devastating drought. The People's Republic of China, to date, has only supplied \$3 million to the World Food Programme. We have supplied \$3.9 billion to the World Food Programme.

We need all countries to keep their food and agricultural markets open and avoid export bans on food and fertilizer, and we need relevant creditors to provide debt relief and restructuring to prevent broader economic and political collapse along the lines of that which Senator Risch spoke to.

The United States Congress, reflecting the great decency of the American people, has helped mobilize an unprecedented response to an unprecedented crisis, but other governments, foundations, people in the private sector, and anyone else who can help must stand with us to meet this moment.

With that I look forward to taking your questions. Thank you so much.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Power follows:]

Prepared Statement of Ms. Samantha Power

INTRODUCTION

Thank you Chairman Menendez, Ranking Member Risch, and distinguished Members of the Committee. I am grateful for the opportunity to discuss USAID's efforts to combat the impacts of food security and malnutrition around the world that are being exacerbated by Putin's unprovoked and unjustified war in Ukraine. Thanks to Congress's generous and bipartisan appropriation of additional resources in the Ukraine supplementals, President Biden was able to announce an additional \$2.76 billion in U.S. commitments to address global food insecurity at the most recent G7 Leaders' Summit in Germany. This announcement augments the \$2.8 billion the U.S. has already spent since Russia further invaded Ukraine in February, demonstrating U.S. leadership in confronting this crisis.

Before Russia launched its full-scale invasion of Ukraine, the food security situation for hundreds of millions of people around the globe was already extremely fragile. Seven-hundred sixty-eight million people were chronically hungry, and 193 mil-

lion people were facing crisis levels of acute food insecurity. USAID teams around the globe have been responding to dramatically increased needs for well over a year, gathering information, engaging in humanitarian diplomacy, reorienting staff, programs and priorities to move expeditiously and at a scale that the Agency has never done before. This includes use of extraordinary tools, including the drawdown of the entirety of the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust. Today, the combined effects of Russia's war in Ukraine, the COVID-19 pandemic, multiseason droughts, and other climate-related impacts are pushing the world into an unprecedented global food crisis. USAID is scaling up programs to save lives, stave off starvation, and meet the moment.

RUSSIA'S FURTHER INVASION OF UKRAINE

President Putin's inhumane aggression against a sovereign neighbor has inflicted terror on the people of Ukraine, destroyed schools and hospitals, and triggered the largest refugee crisis in Europe since World War II. Widespread damage to civilian infrastructure, particularly in the Donbas region, has left thousands of residents without access to basic services such as potable water, electricity or gas supplies. As a result, the UN World Food Program (WFP) estimates that one-third of Ukrainian households is food insecure which is liable to worsen throughout Ukraine during the harsh winter season, beginning in October.

To date, USAID has provided more than \$780 million in humanitarian assistance inside Ukraine, including \$302 million to WFP to provide Ukrainians with food distributions and cash transfers. However, WFP and other USAID partners are only able to reliably provide relief to those in government-controlled areas. They are increasingly cut off from populations in parts of eastern Ukraine controlled by Russian forces, where humanitarian conditions deteriorate more and more each day. The U.S. continues to call on the Russian Government to allow safe passage for civilians fleeing areas besieged by Russian forces and to allow the delivery of humanitarian supplies to people who desperately need them.

GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY IMPACTS

Together, Russia and Ukraine produced roughly 30 percent of the world's wheat exports. In many countries in sub-Saharan Africa, Putin's war has made a bad situation worse. Countries in Sub-Saharan Africa and the Caucasus are particularly reliant on Ukrainian wheat exports, and according to the Global Hunger Index, every second to third piece of bread in the Middle East was produced from Ukrainian wheat before the war. With supply-chain disruptions, rising food, fertilizer and fuel prices, estimates suggest that up to 40 million additional people could be pushed into poverty and food insecurity over the coming year. This comes on the heels of protracted conflict—particularly in the Sahel and Horn of Africa—restricting domestic production and cutting off supply lines, as well as the shortages brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic.

President Putin's forces are blocking Black Sea ports, leaving as many as 50 million tons of global food supplies trapped in temporary silos or on ships, thus preventing them from entering the global market. Russia is also the world's largest exporter of fertilizer, and Putin's export ban has contributed to a fourfold increase in global fertilizer prices compared to a year ago. While President Putin falsely claims that the global food crisis is a result of Western sanctions; however, it is his use of food as a weapon of war that has strangled food and agriculture production and driven up prices for food and fertilizer everywhere from Indiana to Indonesia.

USAID'S LEADERSHIP IN THE GLOBAL FOOD CRISIS

USAID recognizes that this crisis is global in nature and will require a long-term response. Our teams are working as quickly and responsibly as possible to scale-up immediate humanitarian assistance to countries in crisis while also helping countries to develop their agricultural sectors to be self-sufficient. USAID's response is centered along four lines of effort.

First, we are using data analysis to project the potential impacts of the crisis in countries with existing humanitarian emergencies to prevent even further deterioration in conditions. The impacts of the global food crisis extend beyond just the amount of food communities can eat. They affect people's health and nutrition and change the types of risks to violence that women and girls face.

Second, we are scaling up emergency food assistance in countries that have high levels of food insecurity, are vulnerable to price shocks, and are reliant on Russian or Ukrainian food imports. Since Russia's further invasion of Ukraine in February, the U.S. has provided \$2.8 billion to scale up emergency food security programming in countries impacted by the food crisis. In the coming weeks, USAID will have pro-

grammed another \$2 billion in Ukraine supplemental funding for humanitarian needs, with a focus on emergency food assistance and related investments in the hardest hit places like Yemen, the Horn of Africa, the Sahel, Haiti, and Democratic Republic of Congo.

Third, we are using Feed the Future investments to reduce countries' dependence on fertilizer imports and provide more support to smallholder farmers, through drought tolerant seeds and improved storage for crops, to bolster farm productivity and minimize crop losses. At the G7 Leaders' Summit, President Biden announced the expansion of Feed the Future to eight new target countries: the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Zambia. USAID is investing \$760 million from Ukraine supplemental funding to bolster Feed the Future programs and combat the acute effects of high food, fuel, and fertilizer prices.

Fourth, we are partnering with other donors to increase funding to prevent a global food security crisis. It is important that this assistance be additive in nature, so that donors do not reduce funding from other crises to support this one. We are working with partners, allies, and the UN to engage emerging donors, such as Gulf countries and private foundations, to fill critical gaps. Securing greater support from Gulf donors was a priority for President Biden during his trip to the region. Earlier this week, I announced an additional \$200 million contribution to UNICEF to support treatment of severe wasting in the most food insecure countries. USAID is leveraging this contribution to get other private donors, such as the Eleanor Crook Foundation and the Children's Investment Fund, to announce significant contributions of their own. Together we have called upon the donor community to join us in doubling our donations by September.

WORLD FOOD PROGRAM

WFP is one of USAID's most important partners in the response to global food insecurity. It is the world's largest humanitarian organization focused on hunger and food security, and has the scale and capacity to deliver emergency food assistance and the ability to work with communities to improve nutrition and build resilience worldwide. The United States is consistently the largest donor to WFP by a considerable margin and plans to program \$5.5 billion through the organization in FY 2022, representing a 50 percent increase compared to the previous fiscal year. USAID enjoys a strong relationship with WFP and maintains constant communication with them at both headquarters and in the field to achieve our shared objective of saving lives in emergencies and using food assistance to build a pathway to peace, stability and prosperity around the globe.

At the same time, the response to the global food security crisis requires a multi-sectoral effort. USAID is using supplemental resources to fund other UN agencies and NGOs who have the expertise to provide comprehensive programs on nutrition, protection, health, and water, sanitation, and hygiene assistance.

HORN OF AFRICA

While the entire globe will continue to face the impacts of President Putin's actions, the most immediate needs are present in the Horn of Africa. The region is experiencing one of its worst droughts in four decades that has the potential to lead to famine. As many as 20 million people are at risk of starvation by the end of this year. The prolonged drought is also having dire nutritional impacts on children, putting them at a severe risk of malnutrition.

In April, the Biden-Harris administration made the extraordinary decision to fully draw down on the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust (BEHT), providing an additional \$244 million to procure and transport U.S. commodities to bolster existing emergency food operations in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia.

Ahead of my trip to the Horn of Africa this week, I announced nearly \$1.3 billion in additional funding for the region, bringing USAID's contributions to the regional drought response to more than \$1.6 billion in FY 2022. This funding supports our partners, including WFP, UNICEF and non-governmental organizations, to deliver emergency food, nutrition, protection, health, and water, sanitation and hygiene assistance. For example, in Ethiopia, this funding will support urgent food assistance for more than 4 million people in drought-affected regions. In Somalia, this funding will provide life-saving emergency food assistance to over 2 million people each month.

USAID's long-term investments in the Horn of Africa are supplementing our emergency assistance in the region. In Ethiopia, USAID is supporting local agribusinesses to increase productivity to offset reliance on imports, expanding financing of fertilizer, as well as investments to increase availability and lower costs, and

improving access to irrigation and agricultural inputs to diversify and expand crop and fodder production. Through Feed the Future, we are partnering with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the International Fertilizer Development Center and other partners, to develop a low-cost approach for rapidly developing more effective fertilizer recommendations. When piloted in Ethiopia, farmers were able to reduce fertilizer wastage by up to 80 percent and increase crop yields by up to 200 percent over a 3-year period. We are working to replicate these successes across the region.

CONCLUSION

Due to the overlapping crises of climate shocks, coupled with the COVID-19 pandemic, and the ripple effects of the war in Ukraine, millions more across the world are at risk of being driven into starvation unless rapid action is taken. Thanks to the bipartisan support of Congress, USAID is investing billions of dollars to ensure families can feed their children, while ramping up our own domestic food and fertilizer production, protect the poorest households around the world by scaling up social safety nets, and unleash American technical expertise to spur the long-term agricultural productivity that essential to combatting hunger. I thank the Committee for its continuous support of our work, and I look forward to discussing with you in more detail.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. We will start a round of 5 minutes. Let me start off with Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield. Ambassador, as has been pointed out in the testimony, and as I said in my opening statement, there is 20 million tons of grain and vegetable oil and other essential food exports trapped in Ukrainian port silos and warehouses. It is ultimately a political crisis that requires an urgent solution. Can you give us an update on the negotiations occurring at the U.N. between the U.N., Russia, Ukraine, and Turkey, aimed at resuming Black Sea grain exports from Ukraine?

Ambassador THOMAS-GREENFIELD. Yes, Senator, and we have been keeping up with those negotiations very closely. First and foremost, as all of you have noted, this is an issue that Russia could resolve immediately by stopping the war, and they have not, and they have caused this crisis. As we look at what the U.N. is doing, we support their diplomatic efforts to find the solution to get that 20 million tons of Ukrainian grain moved into the marketplace.

Those discussions, as I heard from the Secretary-General late last week, his assessment is that they are going well. We are hopeful that they continue to go well, and we will look forward to the results of the discussions and really press the Russians to honor any commitments that they make during those discussions. We, in the meantime, continue to try to find other ways around getting the wheat out until that agreement is actually signed.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I do not understand that. I see that Putin went to Iran, met with Raisi and Erdogan. I do not know that that is the venue that you are going to solve a global food crisis problem. It seems to me that you would solve it at the United Nations. If there is a real will, this can happen really relatively immediately.

What about the Chinese? I heard the number from you, Administrator. That is pretty shocking—\$3 million versus 3-point-what?

Ms. POWER. Five-point-seven billion dollars committed to WFP, \$3.9 billion already obligated.

The CHAIRMAN. Three-point-nine billion dollars of the United States delivered for food insecurity, \$3 million from China. What

role is China playing in trying to urge its friend, Putin, to unlock the potential? Do you see any action on their behalf at the U.N.?

Ambassador THOMAS-GREENFIELD. I certainly have not. The Chinese very closely align with the Russians. They are supporting the Russian efforts in Ukraine. We have continued to press the Chinese to step away from what we see as a really bad relationship that they have established with the Russians in terms of supporting their activities in Ukraine, and it goes against what the Chinese themselves have indicated is a priority, and that is protection of the charter and the sovereignty of borders.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, it seems to me we have to collectively do a better job of highlighting, both here at home and across the world, about what both Russia and China are doing in this regard. I mean, the Russian messaging and disinformation about the causes and solutions to food insecurity in Africa and the Middle East, are pretty pervasive, and we do not counter that sufficiently at our own peril. I hope the Administration will be engaged in more proactively engaging that part of the challenge as well. I think it is incredibly important.

Administrator Power, Congress recently approved more than \$40 billion in emergency funding for Ukraine, which included billions to tackle the secondary impacts of the war on global food insecurity. It was an effort to give the ability to the Administration to act swiftly and boldly in the early stages of the crisis, understanding that time is of the essence.

Recognizing that the unprecedented levels of needs from the global food crisis will grow next year, what funding gaps does USAID anticipate facing? Do you anticipate funding shortfalls, and what is our strategic plan for next year to address the ongoing crisis?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First, if I may just pick up on the China exchange that you had with Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield, just to note it is not only not giving to these public international organizations at scale, remotely commensurate to the crisis at hand. I would note, actually, the last time China gave \$34 million for a crisis, but a much lesser crisis than this.

Another issue is the amount of debt that these countries that are so vulnerable right now have incurred principally, in many cases, bilaterally to China. The amount of money—I was just in Zambia and Malawi—that these countries spent on infrastructure that sadly does not currently exist or on very high interest rates that are still now basically impeding the ability of these governments to borrow and to put in place the kind of social safety nets that are needed right now, it is horrific. Greater energy in that space, as well from Beijing would make a huge difference for countries really finding themselves on the brink.

With regard to your question, just to say that, again, we have moved very swiftly to take advantage of the incredible generosity that the people up here have shown and the American people have shown, above all, we are proceeding in a manner that takes, right now, advantage of preexisting awards. In a sense, with an organization like the WFP, we are plussing up their preexisting rewards rather than having to start from scratch and do all the pre-award surveys and things that guard against fraud, waste, and abuse. We

are moving aggressively again through public international organizations.

We would like to shift, over time, to more local organizations, particularly in Ukraine, as those are the agents who have been able to move very nimbly on the ground, often into very, very hard-to-reach, hard-to-access areas. I think we want to be able to walk and chew gum at the same time because the big U.N. agencies, of course, are the only organizations that can really provide food and cash at scale.

I think that seeing Europe, which has responded so heroically to Ukrainian needs, meet some of the appeals in places like the Horn of Africa, where right now we are responsible for 86 percent of the WFP appeal with the \$1.3 billion I announced earlier this week for Kenya, Somalia, and Ethiopia. That is not tenable. It absolutely has to be the case that our friends step up to deal with needs in sub-Saharan Africa, as well. We also think, out of the President's trip to the Gulf, that there is a lot more room there, not only to support funding needs in Yemen, which is in a better place because there is a truce, but still an abysmal place because of the acute food needs. There are a whole host of donors that really need to do far more.

If I could just make one last point, this is something also the Russian disinformation machine takes advantage of, some notion that donors are more interested in giving to Ukraine than to starving people in sub-Saharan Africa, not, of course, making mention of the fact that the Russian Federation itself gives almost nothing to meet food needs in sub-Saharan Africa or anyplace else. In fact, just creates food needs with its brutality and use of food as a weapon of war, but to be able to show, again, that the democracies of the world show up for vulnerable people in need while the authoritarians create those needs in the first place, I think is very important.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I appreciate that. Before I turn it to Senator Risch, let me just say from my view, China—this is not benign neglect on their behalf. This is helping Russia's tactic at the end of the day of using food as a weapon of war. China is responsible as well as Russia for allowing Russia to use food as a weapon of war, or the denial of food as a weapon of war.

Hunger leads to insecurity, which leads to people doing what they need to do in order to survive, and whether that be the mass movement of people to find a place where they can be fed or to turn to entities and organizations that will take their hunger and their anger and use it in violent ways, this is a real challenge to the organized civil society in terms of the repercussions that flow, from the first instance, from a humanitarian disaster to all the other elements.

Senator Risch.

Senator RISCH. Thank you, and I would certainly like to associate myself with the remarks of the Chairman in that last exchange. Ambassador Greenfield, that is a good segue into what I wanted to talk with you about and that is the discussion we have had here today shows the tremendous disconnect between America and the other democracies in the world and the autocracies and their seem-

ing ambivalence, at best, to people starving all over the world and refusing to do anything about it.

When that happens, you sit here and you wonder, what is this United Nations for anyway? I mean, the United Nations, as the Chairman has pointed out, is a place where these things should be resolved, and we just had reference to the fact that there are these negotiations going on that we all know about. It was done in Iran with Turkey and Russia. Where is the United Nations on this? It seems that they are just absent on it. I am not saying this is your fault by any stretch. The organization itself, a lot of us have had reservations for a long time about—they spend a lot of money, but what gets done?

Ambassador THOMAS-GREENFIELD. Thank you for that question, and I understand your frustration, Senator. I will say that the United Nations has been proactively engaged in these negotiations that have taken place in Istanbul, and they were responsible for bringing the parties together, for bringing the Ukrainians, the Russians, and the Turks together. The Iranians were never involved in any of these discussions. What we see happening now in Iran is very much separate from the engagement that the United Nations was responsible for putting together.

I will also say that in New York we are able to galvanize countries from all over the world. We brought 141 countries to the table to condemn Russia's actions. I can tell you that the Russians were making every effort to intimidate and press those countries away from supporting this General Assembly resolution. Their disinformation campaign is extraordinarily effective, which is why we have to ramp up our efforts to engage with these countries and get the information out that will counter the Russian narrative.

I have had a series of what I have referred to as listening tours with various regions, with Africa, with Latin America, with the ASEAN countries, with the Middle East to put on the table the facts of what is happening on the ground and making sure that they understand that Russia is responsible for what is happening. It is not Ukraine's fault. It is not sanctions. It is their brutal war against Ukraine.

Senator RISCH. Well, I appreciate that, and you did good work getting the number of people to condemn. What amazes me, sitting here as an outsider and looking at it, that there were even a handful of people that would get behind the Russians. That absolutely amazes me. It is all well and good that that vote was as lopsided as it was, but then what? The United Nations is supposed to exist to resolve this stuff, and when you have a vote that lopsided, we know what is right, we know what is wrong, but nothing has happened. Certainly NATO is a strong force. NATO has responded and come together and is stronger than it has ever been, but the U.N., again, just seems to be absent on the thing. Talk is wonderful, but doing something on the ground is so much more important, and it is not happening.

Ambassador THOMAS-GREENFIELD. Again, looking at the fact that the U.N. has been responsible for feeding more than 10 million people, with our support and with your generosity as well as that from the rest of the world, but I commend the World Food Programme and others who have really taken a proactive approach to respond-

ing to the humanitarian crisis. We could not do that without the United Nations, but I am not here to defend every action. We know that the organization has its flaws, and that is why I sit every day in New York and make every effort to work with other countries to reform the organization.

Senator RISCH. Well, thank you. I appreciate that. Administrator Power, I think that those statistics that you rolled out about what we are doing and what China is doing is something that really is not out there in the general media. I think all of us ought to be pressing that. I think that, better than anything, demonstrates the cavalier, nonchalant, careless attitude that China and the other people that are complicit with Russia in this have.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Senator Cardin.

Senator CARDIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and let me thank both of our witnesses for their extraordinary leadership at the United Nations and USAID.

First, I just want to underscore the point that the United States and the Congress has been responsive to the food insecurity issues. We have provided substantial amount of funding, as you have pointed out. We do not see the commensurate response by our allies internationally, and I would first underscore the point that we need to develop a unified strategy to get the type of help internationally to deal with these issues that have been provided by the United States.

I say that because both of you have underscored the point that Russia has weaponized food. We should not be surprised. We know their asymmetric arsenal that they have used before. They have used energy as a coercive form to try to get countries to do certain things. They have used misinformation. They have funded extreme groups. They do all these things in order to advance their cause. We should not be surprised that they would weaponize food.

I guess my question to both of you is how are we developing a war-type strategy to counter Russia's use of food as a weapon? I recognize that the United Nations plays a critical role. The World Food Programme plays a critical role within the United Nations. USAID plays a direct role also. We have non-governmental partners that help us. I am proud of the Catholic Relief Services, which is headquartered in Maryland, the role that they play.

Can you tell me how you are developing a strategy to recognize this is not just a traditional problem of food insecurity, which is an area we have to deal with, but we have to be mindful that we are working in a war environment with Russia using this as a tactic. How do we organize our allies around the world to respond in a way that is commensurate with the problem Russia is creating?

Ambassador THOMAS-GREENFIELD. Let me start, just to say that we really have worked hard to mobilize a broad coalition of allies and countries using diplomacy. It started in New York with Secretary Blinken calling his first ministerial to bring the world together in May, where he laid out, very, very clearly, the Russian objective and the false narrative that the Russians have been pushing forward. One hundred countries then signed on to the roadmap that we put together.

We extended that diplomacy in the G7, in the G20, and, as well as during the President's recent visit to the Middle East. Samantha, as you heard, is going out to Africa tonight. I am leaving in about 10 days to do the same thing, to engage with these countries, help them to come to grips with the disinformation campaign that the Russians have initiated. I think they are not being fooled, and then we are galvanizing more donors to make contributions.

Senator CARDIN. Let me interrupt for a moment because I am pleased that you are visiting the sites that need attention and need to understand the causes and need to know the tools that are available to help. My concern is that we have our so-called allied countries that are part of our alliance in our support for Ukraine. I do not necessarily see them recognizing the same degree that food is being used as a weapon of war.

My concern is do we have a strategy to engage our supportive countries to be more participatory in dealing with the challenges that we have and recognizing this a Putin strategy and therefore, as we provide weapons to defend Ukraine, as we provide direct support, we also need to be providing help in regard to the problems Russia is creating with food insecurity.

Ms. POWER. Could I give a few examples, maybe, Linda? First, again, I think we are all in violent agreement that the response needs to be more multilateralized, that those who are lagging need to step up. It is something that Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield is working every day in New York, that Secretary Blinken is working around the world.

I will say, Senator, of the European countries, again, they have opened their doors to the refugees. That is not without cost. European Commission President von der Leyen has just also announced more than \$6 billion toward reconstruction. They are also thinking ahead.

If I could answer your question in a slightly different way, but in parallel to Linda's comments, I think one of the answers to your questions comes down to the word "resilience." What we are doing, what we, USAID, on the ground, thanks to the infusion of resources from you, but also our preexisting programs which were heading in this direction anyway, is building Ukraine's capacity not to be dependent, for example, on everything from the Russian export market to Russia's actions in the Black Sea. We are now working to ensure that they have the barges to use the rivers, that they are able to modernize their rail lines so those can connect with Europe. This is not to say that we anticipate their being a Black Sea crisis every year for the rest of time. This war has to end. Putin has to end it, but it does mean that diversification is really important.

In Africa it is the same issue. Linda knows well from all of her time there, the dependence that so many countries have, for example, on Russian fertilizer. It is the number one fertilizer exporter in the world, and that is not a reliable source of fertilizer. We are seeking to diversify and also to ensure that there is in-Africa production of fertilizer as well as food sovereignty in countries that are too import dependent.

Senator CARDIN. Make Black Sea security part of our strategy.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Shaheen.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to follow up a little bit on Senator Cardin's questions about the U.N. and what more can be done and whether there is any appetite at the U.N. to take on Putin and to basically take the grain out of Ukraine, assuming that the Ukrainians agree, and get it out to the rest of the world. I think we are not only losing the battle in terms of feeding people who need it, but we are also losing the information war, because what Putin is doing is convincing people all over the world that we are the reason that millions are food insecure.

What can we do to take a more robust approach to how we deal with Vladimir Putin at the U.N., and is there any willingness on the part of the Secretary-General or our allies there to really make him more of an issue here?

Ambassador THOMAS-GREENFIELD. Thank you, and I think we have, the U.N. has, the numbers have taken a very proactive approach to condemning Putin, to calling Putin out, to isolating Russia in New York. We kicked them off of the Human Rights Council. They have tried to regain a seat on ECOSOC. They have not been able to win that vote. We have succeeded in convincing enough countries to vote against them. We are succeeding in exposing their behavior and condemning their actions in the Ukraine.

I would say that we can do more. I certainly hear your frustrations. It is the same frustration I feel every day when I have to put so much effort into engaging with countries to help them to understand how important it is that we not allow Russia to get away with what they are doing in Ukraine. That effort is a daily effort on the part of me and my staff in New York, but also across the entire Administration, from the President to the Secretary as well as others like the Administrator, who are engaging with these countries, to ensure that they understand that we are all fighting the same fight and they have to be part of it.

Senator SHAHEEN. Senator Cardin also talked about the importance of the Black Sea. Senator Romney and I just introduced legislation to require the Administration to develop an interagency strategy around the Black Sea. It was pointed out to me by one of the representatives of one of our allies that we would have been better off had we had U.S. and other allied ships in the Black Sea region when Putin invaded Ukraine, that it would have been harder for him to so totally control what is happening in the Black Sea.

Can you both speak to why that would be important and how you see that kind of a strategy helping us as we look at the future and ensure that we are not in this situation again in another 5 or 10 years?

Ambassador THOMAS-GREENFIELD. We share your goals in terms of making sure that the Black Sea remains open, and I know that the Department of State and the Administration is looking forward to engaging with you on the legislation and how we might move forward to pursue those goals, but I do agree with you that we absolutely have to have a strategy and be more proactive in ensuring that this does not happen again in the future.

Ms. POWER. Maybe just if I can build on this point about resilience, I mean, one of the things that the Ukrainians have been doing, in addition to planting, wearing flak jackets, and having

demining equipment so that they can have a harvest also for next season, is they have been hustling in a whole bunch of ingenious ways to try to get the food that is trapped out through other means while the negotiations that the U.N. is undertaking and some of the other options that are being considered are pursued.

Just the stats on this, Senator, I think are pretty staggering. Two hundred thousand metric tons of trapped produce and crops moved in March, 600,000, they found ways through road, rail, barges, rivers, Danube, port in Romania, up to the Baltics, et cetera, 200,000 in March, 600,000 metric tons in April, 1.1 million metric tons in May, and then just around 2 million metric tons in June. Now we are talking about 5 million that we are trying to chip away at here, and as others have indicated, every metric ton or fraction of a metric ton that does not reach its desired end state is driving up prices and potentially contributing to the hunger crisis that we face.

We are very focused, with the European Union, who have been doing a huge amount to create these so-called solidarity lanes, to ease the customs flow, the border checkpoints, to secure insurance both for what moves in the ways that they are able to move, but also critically the insurance that is going to be needed once the demining has occurred, if some deal has been struck or if the Ukrainians decide to move, and the private sector decide to move the trapped grains in other means.

There is a lot of infrastructure investments that we are making now, collectively, to deal with this crisis that are going to put Ukraine in such a stronger position to be integrated into the European Union as they pursue that path toward accession.

Then the only other thing I would add is that I know that there is some consideration of changing the law to allow U.S. soldiers to train Ukrainian forces in demining, and certainly it would seem given the amount of demining that is going to be needed to get the Black Sea up and running again that that kind of adjustment to the law would be warranted.

Senator SHAHEEN. Well, thank you both very much for all of your efforts, and Governor Beasley, thank you as well.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Romney.

Senator ROMNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to both the Ambassador and the Administrator for the work that you are doing. Is Russia trying to starve the world? I mean, are they intent on causing pain in Egypt and Lebanon and throughout North Africa and the Middle East? I mean, is this part of their intent or are they simply intending to starve Ukraine and willing to ignore the fact that what they are doing in starving Ukraine is also starving the world? Do you have a sense of what their intent is, what they are thinking?

Ambassador THOMAS-GREENFIELD. I cannot speak for what is going on in Putin's mind, but I think at the start of this they thought they were going to have a quick war, bring Ukraine to their knees in 2 weeks, and have them waving the white flag and that would be the end of it. That failed. They are continuing this effort to starve the people of Ukraine and in the process starve the rest of the world, and they do not care, which is why it is so impor-

tant that we have gotten the support, bipartisan support, from this Congress to provide for people in the rest of the world.

What the Russians are now doing is blaming us, that our sanctions are responsible for what is happening in the rest of the world, when, in fact, there are no sanctions on their agricultural products, there are no sanctions on their fertilizer. They can move their agricultural products. They can move their wheat if they wanted to do it, but they would prefer to blame the rest of the world, thinking that that will get them more support from the world. I think they failed.

Senator ROMNEY. Ambassador, why is it they are so effective at spreading lies and we are so terribly ineffective at telling the truth and having the world understand what is going on? I would think the leaders of Egypt and Lebanon and other places that have seen astronomic increases in prices would be yelling about what Russia is doing? I do not see that. Why are we so incapable of making sure the world understands Russia's malevolence, the impact they are having on the world, and creating, if you will, global pressure not just from the nations of the West, but global pressure on Russia? Why are we so ineffective?

Ambassador THOMAS-GREENFIELD. I would not say we are ineffective. I think we certainly have to ramp up our efforts, but this is something that we all work on every single day to counter Russia's disinformation. We do it in the United Nations and in meetings and we do it in our travels around the world. I think countries are hearing it. They are hearing it, but they are also dealing with other issues. They are dealing with not only Russia's disinformation, they are dealing with Russia's intimidation. We know that when we have to vote in the U.N. that the Russians actually sent written correspondence to countries to say if you vote against us, this will affect our long-term relationship.

These countries are dealing with these other efforts, but I think, again, to have 141 countries condemn Russia, they are resisting that pressure and they do understand that Russia is responsible for this war. Now that does not mean Russia does not have its friends, the four or five countries that voted with them, including China. The friends are always there for them, but they are few and far between.

Senator ROMNEY. Administrator Power, what other nations are stepping in to make sure that the food crisis being created by Russia and its blockade, if you will, on Ukraine is in some respects getting some relief? Is India stepping up to the extent they should? Are other parts of the world making the kinds of efforts they should? Are we, as a nation, stepping in, we and Canada and others that have bountiful agricultural resources?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, Senator, and if I may just pick up on your exchange with Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield, I would just note that the Belt and Road Initiative and China's investments throughout sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, the Caribbean, the Pacific have gotten a lot of attention. I do not think that the RT penetration and the Russian disinformation media machine have received the same attention nor, I think, would we say that we are resourcing our information efforts as a country, as we did during the Cold War, for example, or not even close to how they resource

them. That is not the only answer. Again, we are blasting our message out as many places as we can, and I think probably the only reason Putin is in those negotiations with the U.N. in Turkey right now is the number of African countries that privately, not publicly in the way that we do, have either paid trips to Moscow to appeal for those grains to be released so the prices go down or that wheat arrives, and I think that pressure has brought him to the table. Whether it will be enough to bring him to actually allow the grains to go—

Senator ROMNEY. I just want to say I fully agree with you that we are not paying the kind of attention or devoting the kind of resources to communicating the truth to the world, as Russia is spending to communicate—

Ms. POWER. To lie.

Senator ROMNEY. —lies.

Ms. POWER. I agree completely. To your question, just on sort of division of labor and so forth, I would say you mentioned India specifically, which has not come up yet at the hearing. India has been very responsive to the complete economic collapse in Sri Lanka, extending grants and mainly loans to a government that, of course, fell, but now a new government that is in great economic peril. That is a country that has defaulted on its debt payments for the first time in its history, and it is probably just the first of at least several, and maybe many governments that are likely to fall by virtue of these higher prices, particularly fuel prices, as we head into winter.

With regard to some of what we have been talking about, I did want to call out and commend some of the very discrete efforts on actually dealing with the trapping of Ukrainian grains. Japan has chipped in \$23 million to help the Ukrainians buy storage bags. The European Commission has provided direct cash grants to farmers, around \$53 million. The U.K., which has dramatically cut, unfortunately, its foreign assistance budget at the worst possible time, but has contributed \$12 million to help rebuild the railways that are being attacked, which helps get the food out.

These kinds of modest efforts, but as I mentioned, I think before you got here, if you look at the response, for example, to the potential famine in the Horn of Africa, other countries, our friends, who stepped up the last time there was a very severe drought, are right now, many of them, at about 8 percent of what they funded before. Now some of that is because they are funding so generously inside Ukraine and, of course, to Ukrainians who are coming into Europe, but this burden, also this privilege of helping people in their hour of need, is being borne very disproportionately by the United States right now.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Coons.

Senator COONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you and the Ranking Member of this committee for holding a full committee hearing on this remarkable, grave, global crisis in food security, and the attendance here and your engagement as senior administration representatives is important.

I thought it was striking at the outset, Ambassador Thomas Greenfield, when you said you have never seen a food crisis like this in your career, and I expect that Administrator Power and

Mr. Beasley would both agree with you. We first met in Liberia. You have been to tough places. You know what food crisis looks like. It is striking to me that at exactly this moment, when we have a bitter cocktail coming together of a conflict and COVID and climate that the United States is stepping up in a massive way. Each of the descriptions that Administrator Power just gave of this ally, this ally, this ally, was billions from the United States, millions from this ally and partner.

One of the things I am most concerned about is the lack of engagement and presence by the PRC, yes, by our Gulf partners, absolutely, and the ways in which our European partners and allies are providing, yes, support for refugees, but modest support for the development, the urgent food security and development needs of sub-Saharan Africa.

Administrator Power, thank you for outlining in your speech at CSIS the actions we need to take in response to this food security emergency, and I am encouraged by the plan for a \$1.3 billion surge for the Horn of Africa, where you are about to travel, as well as the \$200 million in ready-to-use therapeutic foods which are used for children in starvation. I would be interested in hearing concisely where you see funding gaps and what more we can do to mobilize the donor community, both through the U.N. and through USAID? I will also be asking Mr. Beasley about his particular brand of effective and forceful personal engagement with those who still sit on the sidelines.

Ms. POWER. Thank you. Well, let me just say that I think President Biden took advantage of his trip to the Middle East to engage the Saudis, the Emiratis, the Qataris. I think there is a lot of room for growth in terms of those contributions, and particularly in fulfilling pledges that have been made publicly, but not yet delivered upon. Money is fungible for an organization like the World Food Programme, and so if, for example, Gulf countries were to concentrate their resources, for example, on Yemen, that would free up resources for other countries to be able to use in the Horn of Africa or in South Sudan, and so forth.

So, too, it has to be said again that European commitments and contributions inside Ukraine are very important, and it is very important that the U.N. appeals for inside Ukraine be met with the same kind of urgency and the same kind of resources as the needs of refugees that passed into Europe have been given.

Senator COONS. A number of us are eager to work with you in coordination on pressing our closest allies and partners to meet their commitments and to be a part of this global moment. I am struck, Ambassador, by the anger, frankly, the breadth and depth of anger in the developing world at what many of our longstanding partners, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, see as an abandonment of their public health and humanitarian and hunger needs in the face of what has been year after year after year of drought.

I would be interested in your thoughts on both what we can most do to help with opening up the Black Sea ports—I met with the Secretary-General recently. I am encouraged the U.N. is at the table—and I frankly think we should focus on this like it is the Berlin Airlift, that it could be an opportunity to show the U.N.'s engagement and relevance in a critical moment. I am also won-

dering where you see the U.N. going. We are behind in our commitments. We are billions of dollars behind in our dues obligations, our commitments to the U.N., although we are billions ahead in our contributions and support to UNICEF and UNHCR and World Food Programme. How does it hurt our standing at the U.N. when we are billions behind in our commitments?

Ambassador THOMAS-GREENFIELD. Thank you so much for that question, Senator, because that is really the crux of the challenge that I face in New York every single day as we are put in a position of having to compete with our adversaries on being able to influence the U.N. action, putting staff who are capable in the United Nations. We are reminded publicly, and attempted to shame, but we do not feel shame, that we have such a large debt, such large arrears in the United Nations. We really do have to address that issue if we are going to be able to compete.

Senator COONS. Does that create an opening for countries like China and Russia to influence the U.N. system despite our significant leadership in our contributions?

Ambassador THOMAS-GREENFIELD. Every gap that we leave is an opening for the Chinese. They flow into every open space that we leave. That means staffing in the U.N., it means funding for junior professional officers. These are young people like we have around in this room who we would like to see working at the United Nations. The way they get in is through a professional program that is funded by their government. The Chinese have more than 400, if not more, of those young people inside the United Nations. We cannot compete.

Senator COONS. As we work on the SFOP's appropriations bill this year, we will keep both of those things in mind. I am mindful I am out of time and many of my colleagues have gone over.

I will just conclude by saying, if I can, Administrator Power, I am interested in hearing from you about our investment in food storage to help the Ukrainians, but frankly, also globally, and in programming your launching around food waste. We do not have any extra food to waste in this world. Then last, I want to continue engaging with you, Ambassador, on the SDRs, on the IMF, and the ways in which international financial institutions can help stabilize some of the countries we are most concerned about. If the Chinese keep piling on the debt and we do not fund the Development Finance Corporation as our alternative that is more transparent and more sustainable, we will continue to go in the wrong direction in the developing world.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. I am mindful that the Chair has been very lenient in this process because a good amount of the time has been taken over by the witnesses in response, but we have a vote at 11:30. There are members who have the desire to see the Ukrainian First Lady speak, which I think is happening about now. I would just remind everybody to try, and with respect to their fellow colleagues, try to meet the succinct questions with succinct answers.

Senator Hagerty.

Senator HAGERTY. Your point is well taken, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for that preface and thanks to our witnesses for being here.

Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield has articulated this is the worst food crisis that she has seen in her long career. I have been talking about this since March, the concerns that we have about a global food crisis. Administrator Power, you have articulated a number of activities that are underway that you are pursuing to try to address the crisis as it exists.

It seems to me that we should be doing everything in our power to address this global food crisis. When I talk with farmers in my home state of Tennessee, they are very clear about what is happening to them there. I think about American agribusiness. It is a great industry. We can be a great exporter and relieve a lot of the pain that is being felt around the world, but what is happening here, at home? Diesel prices are through the roof. Farmers are having a very tough time making ends meet economically. Fertilizer prices, we have talked about, are through the roof. Energy is a major input into fertilizer manufacturing.

My view, and my question to you is, should we not be doing everything that we can, including getting back into the oil and gas business and stopping the war on American energy so that we can bring those prices down and we can make the economics work better here in America to solve the world's crises?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, Senator, and let me just say that especially given our last exchange at a prior hearing on fertilizer, just seeing firsthand the good that our farmer-to-farmer program has done and all the training that we have provided, that the fertilizer and other sort of seed inputs that the United States has provided, drawing on research in states represented by many of you, this is mission critical on the ground, and we will not be able to feed the world's people unless we get fertilizer into people's hands. I am going to get to your question, but just being—

Senator HAGERTY. No, I agree with you fully, but it seems to me that we should be doing everything in our power right now, given the size of the crisis that has been articulated.

Ms. POWER. Yes. Well, I think what you are seeing—

Senator HAGERTY. We should do everything we can to bring prices down—

Ms. POWER. I understand.

Senator HAGERTY. —and the war on the oil and gas industry is taking prices the exact wrong direction. I am interested to hear you—

Ms. POWER. I understand.

Senator HAGERTY. —do you believe that we should get back into the oil and gas business, bring these costs down, and make farmers more productive here?

Ms. POWER. What I believe is that we are seeing—well, not only what I believe—what I see is that a number of countries that have large fertilizer production capacity are trying to expand that capacity. It is challenging because of the energy prices, but more supply is going to mean lower prices. We are already seeing that in the wheat space as prices have come down just a little bit over the last few weeks.

You are seeing countries where we have missions and that have been making transition to renewables having to pause some of the work that they were doing. For example, I met yesterday with the Moldovan Prime Minister, who I think will see some of you. They have a big reforestation agenda, but because Putin has turned off the gas they are needing now to cut down much more timber than they had intended to this year.

You are certainly seeing tradeoffs around the world being expressed.

Senator HAGERTY. I think you have chosen a good term, “tradeoffs,” and the tradeoffs that are happening here in America are basically putting Putin in power, giving him a lot more leverage, because he is now the source of oil and gas, when we were a net energy exporter just 2 years ago. I see the war on oil and gas making us weaker as a nation, making us less capable of supporting our allies. I would again implore every one of the policymakers in this Administration to look at this and the tradeoffs that we are making, and take seriously into account that the transition that has been forced upon America is costing us in many, many ways, whether it be the food crisis that we could be alleviating, whether it be our national security, whether it be emboldening and empowering and funding Putin. All of these concerns are very real.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Senator Kaine.

Senator KAINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to the witnesses, fine public servants. There is a phrase in the Ukrainian language, “Holodomor” that was created in the 1930s. It is a combination of two words, one meaning hunger and one meaning plague. In the current Ukrainian dictionary this is the definition of the phrase: “Artificial hunger organized on a vast scale by a criminal regime against a country’s population.” That is from a 2004 dictionary.

The phrase comes, as you both know, from the forced famine that was visited upon Ukrainians and others by Stalin in 1932 and 1933. We are in the 90th anniversary of that catastrophe. The English language does not have a word for that because we have never lived under that, and I think the Irish language may have a word for that because Irish have lived under it. We have not lived under it, but there is a word for it, and this Congress has recognized the Holodomor, and many other nations have as a forced genocide using hunger as an artificial weapon.

Vladimir Putin has aims to be a great Russian leader. He probably thinks of himself in the Peter the Great category, but the real analogy is Stalin, and in this instance he is probably surpassing Stalin because the death toll from the hunger that he is forcing on Ukrainians is not just felt within Ukraine. The estimates of the Holodomor in the 1930s, probably conservative estimates, about 3 million Ukrainians and folks in other Russian republics as well died, but the effects of it were not felt so broadly on the globe.

We have seen this before. We have seen it before and we have to be vigorous about it. I want to switch gears in a second, but many of my colleagues have kind of focused on the disinformation side of Russia. One of you indicated that while they are engaging in disinformation you do not think the world is being fooled, but

they are saying some things that make me wonder if they are being fooled.

On June 3, the African Union Chair and Senegalese President Macky Sall had a meeting with Vladimir Putin and said, “The crisis and sanctions create serious problems for weak economies,” seeming to put the problem on the sanctions and the crisis as if it is kind of a natural phenomenon.

I am glad you are both going to be in Africa. I hope you can get particularly Africa nations that are suffering the most, or more than many parts of the world, I hope you can get those nations to just speak the truth. It is one thing to speak the truth to power, but how about speaking the truth to evil. It would seem like you would be willing to speak the truth to evil. I understand, Administrator Power, when they are dependent on Russia for fertilizer, et cetera, et cetera, that it is easy for me to ask that, but when leaders in regions of the world who are so suffering because of this deflect blame I have got to believe it is an intentional deflection and not a naïve deflection, and I hope you will challenge them on that.

The title of the hearing is “Global Food Security Crisis,” and we have really focused on the effect of the Ukrainian illegal war on the world. I want to give you a chance just to talk about, in a minute and 40 seconds, what is the U.S. doing to deal with the climate realities of the global food security crisis? One of our Democratic colleagues, Senator Tester, whose family has farmed in Montana for four generations, and he has farmed the land for 44 years, told us yesterday in a luncheon that he was normally bringing in about 28,000 bushels in a harvest every year and last year it was 1,600, and it is likely to be that this year.

What is the U.S. doing, USAID, you mentioned resilience, what are we doing at the U.N. to try to deal with the climate emergency component of a long-term global food insecurity challenge?

Ms. POWER. I can start briefly and just say I had an exchange earlier, with Senator Cardin, where I stressed the word “resilience,” and our *Feed the Future* program, for years, even though not branded as a climate program, has been about getting to farmers and trying to get at scale to farmers drought-resistant seeds that have been developed in labs in this country or all around the world that have been funded by USAID since the last walloping food crisis at scale occurred in 2007, 2008, and *Feed the Future* was created by you all and by President Obama thereafter.

That is part of the answer. It is also just a sad fact that you see embedded in the growing emergency needs and the growing Bureau of Humanitarian Affairs budget, thanks to you all, but it is exponential. It is not only because of conflict, although it does not help that there are 35 conflicts on the continent of Africa, but it is for circumstances like what we are experiencing right now in the Horn of Africa, which is, for the first time in history, the fourth straight dry rainy season, and we are expecting, the meteorologists are expecting a fifth. The fourth never happened before in history, and they are already looking ahead and expecting low rainfall for the fifth, that is approaching.

The PREPARE initiative that President Biden has announced, the more, again, that we can resource—developing countries are angry. One of the reasons that President Sall even, I think, was re-

ceptive in some fashion, at least to make the statement that you described, is the countries are now clamoring for losses and damages, and we are trying to do adaptation programming that helps them withstand floods, droughts, through emergency assistance, but also to things that allow them to continue to grow their agricultural sectors against the odds.

Senator KAINE. There is much I want to talk about in this space, but I am over time. I will yield back. Thanks.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Senator Murphy.

Senator MURPHY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It is really hard in one hearing to categorize all the ways in which the Russians are using starvation as a deliberate tactic, not just in Ukraine, but all over the world. Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield, I wanted to sneak in two questions, one for you and one for Administrator Power.

To you I wanted to talk about the crisis in Syria. Today, WFP estimates you have got about 12 million people who are food insecure, starving. That is an increase from last year—it is hard to believe—but it is getting worse inside Syria, not better. Yet, during the last several years we, of course, have gone from four crossings to bring humanitarian aid down to only one crossing. There is only one reason for that, and that is Russia's decision to try to use starvation as a tool to benefit Bashar al-Assad.

You were able to win a 6-month extension of the one crossing, but that is all that Russia will agree to. Just tell us very briefly what the consequences are, going from four crossings to one crossing and now having only a handful of months' certainty that you will even have that available for humanitarian relief getting into Syria.

Ambassador THOMAS-GREENFIELD. Senator, thank you for that question. I was in the region earlier in the year and I saw the desperation not just among the Syrians, but the desperation of the humanitarian workers who will see the impact of this directly, in January, when this border crossing closes in the middle of winter. What we expect will start to happen is more people will start to move. People will not sit and allow themselves and their children to starve to death. We will have to possibly prepare for more migrations of people across the border and support to those people where they are sitting.

We worked desperately to get this border crossing extended for a year. The Russians were obstructionist, as they always have been. We spoke to the NGOs who said, yes, 12 months is the minimum we need, but 6 months is better than nothing, and that is why we came away with the 6 months that you just spoke about, but we are still working in the Security Council to try to get that extended at the end of the 6-month period and get more border crossings open, because the situation, the humanitarian situation, is increasing, not decreasing.

Senator MURPHY. Well, we appreciate your herculean work trying to keep that crossing open. Tell us how we can continue to help.

Administrator Power, I wanted to ask you to drill down a little bit more on the commitments that we need from our Gulf allies. I am very glad to see that in coordination with the President's visit the Saudi's announced that they would be depositing \$2 billion into

Yemen's central bank. That is really important because the food crisis is exacerbated by the broader economic crisis inside Yemen, and that funding will help to free up some capital and resources for Yemeni families and public employees to buy food.

Every single year the Saudis, and the Emiratis in particular, make these big, public pledges as to how much they are going to support food assistance and humanitarian aid in Yemen, and then every single year it is like pulling teeth to get both of these supposed allies to deliver on those pledges. The Saudis have pledged \$300 million for food, aid, and humanitarian relief inside Yemen so far this year, but so far they have delivered about \$85 million. The Emiratis have delivered \$23 million. I mean, the Emiratis sneeze \$23 million every morning when they wake up, and yet we cannot get more than \$23 million to support humanitarian relief.

How critical is it for the Gulf countries that are participants in the war inside Yemen to be active partners in delivering aid to what continues to be the world's worst humanitarian disaster? We are doing the most, but it seems that the participants in the war need to be at least meeting our commitment.

Ms. POWER. Thank you. Yes, Senator, I cannot put it better than you have put it, but would only start by saying the truce needs to be preserved, because the only thing worse than the food conditions pending right now in Yemen—and David Beasley can speak to this—imminently is that food crisis plus the resumption of the war. That is, I think, why the diplomacy that President Biden did on his trip to the Gulf around the Yemen war and extending the truce is so, so very important.

I would add that Qatar, in the past, has made fairly important contributions to previous crises in Somalia. One of the things that I will do in the wake of my trip to the Horn here in the coming days is engage with them. We have a conversation underway, but I think that is an area for growth as well.

I would say again the Saudis have provided some capital and liquidity, I think, to the Egyptians to help shoulder this crisis, but just as I indicated in my opening, we have got to pursue emergency aid at the same time we make these longer-term investments. It really is not enough just to provide loans, even though that is an incredibly important piece of the puzzle. Organizations like the World Food Programme and other international NGOs and other U.N. agencies need big money just to keep people alive so that we can then, again, look at the kind of political reforms and economic reforms and growing the economy and growing the agricultural sector that we know, in the long term, is the only way that we are not going to avoid coming back and having hearings like this every season.

Senator MURPHY. Lastly, the ceasefire is so important. I am glad the Administration made that a priority, but the ceasefire has to be a mechanism to a political dialogue that eventually gets a return of the Yemeni Government to the Yemeni people.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Just for the members' awareness, I am going to call Senator Young and Senator Van Hollen, and then I am going to call Governor Beasley who has a hard stop at

12 o'clock. We invited him here and I also want to hear from one of the largest entities to provide food relief to the world.

Senator YOUNG.

Administrator Power, good to see you. Last week, USAID announced that it was distributing \$4 billion to Ukraine for additional direct budgetary support. That covers, as I understand it, only 3 weeks of the government's current deficit. Today the government, it is reported, is further considering declaring default on its international debt obligations. I know this is a concern of yours. It is certainly a concern of mine.

In your view, is the Government of Ukraine's financial situation sustainable if the war continues for months or even years?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, Senator, and first thank you for the resources to be able to be in a position to provide direct budget support. We have provided three tranches of that support so far, with another very large tranche on the way.

I met with Madam Zelenska yesterday. This was issue number one on her mind, as the latest person to engage us on the fiscal crisis that they face. It is a very, very difficult situation and it is why there is such urgency around putting sufficient, out of my lane, but military pressure on the Russian Federation so that negotiations can go further than they have up to this point. It is why the conversation we were just having about other donors, particularly questions of whether the Europeans can come forward with comparable direct budget support alongside all the other contributions they are making in other sectors—

Senator YOUNG. That is key, is it not?

Ms. POWER. It is key. Then questions around the World Bank and the IMF and others, and whether other actors can be brought to the scene. I mean, you have allocated \$8.5 billion in direct budget support. If we do that all at once, that is not going to bode well for a matter of weeks or months from now.

Senator YOUNG. How does European support collectively compare to American support right now?

Ms. POWER. In the area of direct budget support specifically?

Senator YOUNG. Yes.

Ms. POWER. My understanding—but I would want to revert—is that the European Commission has either provided or committed \$500 million in direct budget support, but again, that is on top of also sheltering, no questions asked, 6 million refugees with all the social service, education, health, and so forth, and all the other emergency humanitarian assistance, which is a very different order, that they provide to international organizations along with us.

Senator YOUNG. Okay. Well, it sounds like the Administration owes us a little more on that, what you see as we head into the future in terms of whether or not Ukraine's financial situation is sustainable, so that I can approach my constituents and say, "Listen, this is going to be a long haul. It is going to be very expensive." These are equities that we will have to weigh.

Ms. POWER. That is very fair.

Senator YOUNG. Because I can tell you, back home in Indiana, our hearts go out to the Ukrainians, and there is a certain understanding of the economic implications, but people are also weary.

They are weary after Iraq and Afghanistan. They understand the economy is precarious right now. This is the sentiment from the heartland, and our policy needs to be connected to those individuals. Otherwise, we are going to lose support and make impulsive decisions.

I look forward to working with you on that. I do not feel like we have really fully answered the question, and I do not feel like you have evaded the question, but I do not feel like we have fully answered it. Let's continue this conversation in a very serious way with the Europeans as well. All right?

Does USAID and the Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance, in particular, have the staffing and capacity to manage the supplemental funding that it has received, Administrator?

Ms. POWER. I think we would not have been able to obligate over \$11 billion for Fiscal Year 2022, which is 40 percent more than last year, which broke a record last year, if we could not manage. That said, when I first came up to this committee and to our appropriators, I made a fervent appeal to address staff depletion, particularly among contracting officers. We are surging contracting officers to be able to manage the flow of these big awards, but also smaller awards, if we want more local organizations.

Senator YOUNG. Thank you. I am going to lob a question to Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield because I do want to get to this, at least get the question on the record, and it pertains to the Black Sea ability to deliver food. I know that was asked earlier.

I want to know if there are additional options to help get food into and out of Ukraine. Okay? If you can say yes, there are—

Ambassador THOMAS-GREENFIELD. There are additional options that are being pursued. They will never be big enough to deal with the quantity of food. There is 20 million tons sitting to be moved out of the Black Sea. We have been able to move about 2.5 million tons through land and rail crossings, and we are trying to expand that as Administrator Power mentioned earlier, and contributing to the European Union effort to do that, to fix the rails, but it cannot account for the amount of food that will be required to move outside of Ukraine.

Senator YOUNG. Okay. We will follow up. Thank you so much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Senator Van Hollen.

Senator VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank both of you for your service. Governor Beasley, it is great to see you as well.

Just to pick up on that final point of my colleague, Senator Young, I think the testimony we have received in a number of hearings, including Appropriations Committee, has been exactly as you said, Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield, which is that we are trying to be creative in getting some of that grain out, but the reality is when you have got 20 million tons, we have got to get it ultimately out through the Black Sea.

I just want to echo what my colleagues have said and what you all agree with, which is we need to do a much better job of letting the world know that Russia is using food as a weapon of war. It is actually doing a double-edged sword here because they are withholding grain, corn, and wheat from Ukraine, but as I understand it, Russia is expecting a bumper wheat crop of over 40 million tons

themselves. Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield, those shipments are going out through the Black Sea, are they not?

Ambassador THOMAS-GREENFIELD. Russian agricultural products are not being blocked. They are not shipping them out as rapidly as they could, for a number of reasons of their own making, but it is not because of sanctions. We are working on the Black Sea option to help get Ukrainian food out. The Russians could be moving their food, and that is a message that I think we need to be really highlighting much more loudly.

Senator VAN HOLLEN. Right. I think that, again, they are raising pressure on food supplies and prices by blocking the Ukrainian grain. They also have this storage of grain, which they are then using to pressure countries.

Senator Kaine, I heard, referenced the statement by the President of Senegal after he met with Putin, sort of buying into the sanctions narrative. Are you seeing, at the U.N., Russia's effective use of this false narrative in terms of getting countries to vote their way or abstain?

Ambassador THOMAS-GREENFIELD. I am absolutely seeing the Russians use their false narrative to pressure countries. They have not succeeded, however, in getting those countries, in large numbers, to vote with them. In the Security Council vote that we had recently on Syria, 13 countries supported the resolution, Russia vetoed, China abstained. In the General Assembly we get large numbers of votes, but Russia is using pressure tactics. More than 17 African countries abstained for fear of Russian intimidation tactics against them.

We have to be conscious of that. These countries are desperate. They are afraid, but I think they also understand what is happening, and we just, again, have to work with them to address those issues. I have had a conversation with President Macky Sall. I am having listening sessions with the Africans to hear their concerns, but also to address their concerns.

Senator VAN HOLLEN. Well, I appreciate it. I know that you are working hard to make sure the truth gets out at the U.N. and make sure that people vote not based on misinformation, but based on principle.

Let me very briefly, because I do have a question for Administrator Power, in terms of these discussions that are ongoing with the U.N., Turkey, Russia, and Ukraine, there have been some reports that are heralding a possible breakthrough. What is your current assessment of the prospects of those?

Ambassador THOMAS-GREENFIELD. I am hopeful, and as I heard Administrator Power say, hope does not always get us what we need. We are very supportive of the process because this is a process that will allow 20 million tons of Ukrainian grain to get out to the market. We are encouraging the U.N. in these efforts, but we will also be watching the Russians and hold them accountable for any agreement that they should make with the U.N. We thought we might even hear that an announcement would happen today. So far, it has not happened.

Senator VAN HOLLEN. All right. Administrator Power, thank you for all your efforts in getting the emergency funds, including the food assistance, out the door. I know it is a big task. The World

Food Programme is obviously a trusted partner, and I guess we will hear later about their capacity to absorb more. How do you think about the distribution between the World Food Programme versus other trusted NGO partners? Senator Cardin mentioned the Catholic Relief Services that has got its home in Baltimore. How do you think about that in terms of the goal, which is to get food where it is needed, as quickly as possible?

Ms. POWER. Is the question specifically in Ukraine or globally as well?

Senator VAN HOLLEN. Globally, but focusing primarily on what is happening as a result of what has happened in the Ukraine conflict.

Ms. POWER. Okay. Thank you. I would just note, per your exchange with Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield, that in addition to having a bumper crop, Russia is also stealing Ukrainian grain. It is not just blockading. It is actually stealing and selling grain that Ukrainian farmers planted and harvested. More than \$100 million worth, at least, which is outrageous in every respect.

The CHAIRMAN. If you could, Administrator, succinctly answer this question because I need to get to Governor Beasley.

Ms. POWER. Indeed. Let me say that we are already funding 46 local partners in Ukraine. I think that is very important, over time, and I think David Beasley agrees. We have had a lot of conversations about that, to transition to the Ukrainian Red Cross, other local organizations that can carry this work on when the international community, hopefully, will be able to leave at some point.

We cannot just focus only on food. Obviously the World Health Organization, given the disruption of health facilities is very important. International NGOs like CRS, Mercy Corps, IRC, and others are critical partners on the ground.

I think what is unique about the World Food Programme is their ability to scale speedily. I know there were frustrations at the beginning because they were not operating in Ukraine when the war started, but if you look at—and David will speak to this—just the amount of reach that WFP has and the ability to get cash and food to people quickly, there is nothing quite like it, but over time we will need to round out and make sure that all other sectors are covered and that we have something sustainable.

Senator VAN HOLLEN. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. With the thanks of the committee to both of you for both your work and your testimony here today. You are now excused. We look forward to continuing to engage you.

Governor Beasley, come on up. Your full statement will be included in the record, without objection. I know you have a hard stop at 12. Hopefully there is a little flexibility, but having heard members' questions and the testimony that has taken place, any insights you can give us as the largest provider, as an entity, would be very helpful. The floor is yours.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. DAVID BEASLEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME, ROME, ITALY

Mr. BEASLEY. Senator, thank you. I know we are pressed for time so let me dispense with any statement and just talk really very directly about the situation. I think everyone is gravely concerned.

When I took this role 5 years ago, over 5 years ago, there were only 80 million people, as we would say, marching to starvation. That is different than chronic hunger. You were citing that number at the beginning, of 800-and-some-odd million people. That acute hunger went from 80 to 135 million right before COVID, driven by man-made conflict along with climate shocks. COVID comes along and creates economic devastation in nations all around the world, particularly the poorest of the poor. That number then went from 135 million to 276 million people. You see, over time, the situation is getting more fragile, particularly in the poorest of the poor countries.

Well then comes Ethiopia, then Afghanistan, and when you think it cannot get worse, the breadbasket of the world, a nation that produces enough food to feed 400 million people [Ukraine], is taken out of the global food market. The devastation is real. It is going to be long sustaining. It is also going to be immediate, as we are already seeing pricing in commodity markets spiking and skyrocketing.

The number of 276 million has now jumped to 345 million people that do not know where their next meal is coming from. Unprecedented numbers, but the even more concerning number, Senator, is within that are 50 million people knocking on famine's door in 45 countries. If you want to know which 45 countries very well could be destabilized, in addition to famine and mass migration, those are the 45 countries to start with immediately.

Now, when we compound the fact that grains cannot get out of Ukraine, coupled with the droughts, the heat that we are facing, along with fertilizer pricing, fuel costs, and food costs, you begin to see we have got two looming problems ahead. First is going to be a food pricing problem over the next 6–12 months among the poorest of the poor, and even Americans are feeling the pressure, as we know, but number two, I am very concerned next year that we may have, on top of that, a food availability problem, and that is going to be a crisis beyond anything we have seen in our lifetime.

In 2007 and 2008, when inflation in food pricing hit then, we had 48 nations which saw civil unrest, riots, and protests. The situation today is much, much worse, and we already are beginning to see destabilization take place in many countries. In Sri Lanka, we saw what happened in Mali, put that back together, Chad, Burkina Faso. We are seeing protests and riots in Kenya, Pakistan, Peru, Indonesia, and I could go on and on.

Senator, what the United States has done in stepping up is absolutely extraordinary. I know the Republicans and Democrats seem to be fighting on about everything else, but by God, the American people can be proud of the United States Senate, the United States House, the Republicans and Democrats coming together on food security around the world. It has absolutely set the stage for the rest of the world to follow.

Unfortunately, the rest of the world is not stepping up like it should. As we heard, China has only given us \$3 million. The Gulf states, with unprecedented oil pricing, which is compounding the food crisis, should be stepping up in ways beyond anything we have seen before. I think Samantha, Administrator Power, mentioned the fact that at least if they could contribute to the humanitarian

crisis in their own neighborhood, like Yemen, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, Afghanistan it would take immense pressure off of the traditional international donors that are struggling right now.

I can get into the details of that as we need. I know we are short on time. There is a lot more I would like to say, but let me stop it right there, Senator, and answer any questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Beasley follows:]

Prepared Statement of Mr. David Beasley

This brief is being provided on a voluntary basis and should not be understood to be a waiver, express or implied, of the privileges and immunities of the United Nations and its officials under the 1946 Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations.

INTRODUCTION

Chairman Menendez, Ranking Member Risch, members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, thank you for convening this hearing on the current global food crisis and the urgent need to address the growing threat of starvation around the world.

I want to thank the United States Congress and this Committee for the unstinting bipartisan support shown to the United Nations World Food Programme (WFP). The United States is WFP's most generous and longstanding partner. Last year, the United States provided a record \$3.86 billion in financial support to WFP.

I commend the Biden administration for its approval of the recent supplemental funding package which includes \$5 billion to address the destructive impact the conflict is having on global food security, and we appreciate the chorus of support from lawmakers on Capitol Hill which made that possible. I would also like to thank the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) for its excellent cooperation and partnership, especially in this time of exceptional need.

WFP is particularly grateful for the initial tranche of supplemental funds that USAID has advised we will receive from these new resources. Knowing these funds are coming has already helped us resume support for millions of the most vulnerable in nations across the globe.

The United States has responded swiftly and generously to the looming humanitarian disaster that threatens famine and starvation on a worldwide scale. It is vital that others in the donor community now bring forward similar support and play their part to stop this crisis from spinning out of control.

Today, I will outline the state of global hunger in the context of the war in Ukraine, provide you with an update on WFP resourcing and the impact U.S. supplemental funds are having, and share our latest analysis of how the hunger crisis may develop should humanitarian responders like WFP not receive the scale of resources required from donors to contain its effects.

STATE OF GLOBAL HUNGER

Progress toward achieving Zero Hunger, the second of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals, had stalled even before the COVID-19 pandemic produced economic turmoil and eroded food security, with increased conflict and climate change the principal obstacles. In early 2022, on the eve of the war in Ukraine, acute food security in the 82 countries where WFP operates had risen to 276 million people. These are people in need of urgent food, nutrition, and livelihoods assistance. This number was a record high, and more than double the 135 million people living with acute hunger before the COVID-19 pandemic.

WFP's latest analysis reveals that this number has now risen to 345 million as a direct result of the Ukraine crisis and its damaging impact on global food commodity prices and availability, with the bulk of the increase being seen across sub-Saharan Africa.

Among the 345 million, there are 50 million people living in 45 countries in even graver danger. They presently face severe hunger emergencies (IPC/CH Phase 4)—just one step from falling into famine. This number has almost doubled from 27 million over the past 2 years, an alarming situation. To put the severity of these numbers into context, people in IPC 4 are in a state of “emergency conditions” where they are acutely hungry and are liquidating their final assets to do whatever they can to get food. They are exceptionally fragile, and many die from the impact of their hunger. Thirty percent of their children are wasting and many are now permanently stunted, undermining their ability to ever achieve their potential. This is not

just a critical moment of hunger; it is a generational impact that will have consequences for decades to come.

And finally, there are 882,000 people languishing in IPC 5, a catastrophic condition of hunger which is the highest number on record since the 2011 famine in Somalia. Some 401,000 of these people are in Tigray in Ethiopia; 213,000 are in Somalia; 161,000 in Yemen; 87,000 are in South Sudan; and 20,000 are in Afghanistan. While famine has not officially been declared in these places because the technical thresholds have not yet been verified, the people living in them are experiencing the same horrific conditions. The very real risk that famines will be declared in 2022 is an admission of failure at a time when the world has enough resources, food and money to reach them.

While all of this is very bad news, the situation will deteriorate further in the months ahead unless the international community mobilizes the resources required to mount a comprehensive humanitarian response.

THE UKRAINE CRISIS

We cannot adequately speak to the current global hunger crisis without addressing the conflict in Ukraine and the ripple effects it has produced across the globe.

Last year, Ukraine grew enough food to feed 400 million people, but the profound disruption to centers of population, food production and supply chains caused by the war mean that the food grown in the country is no longer able to sustain a significant proportion of its own people. Ukraine has gone from being a global breadbasket to being on the breadlines. About 35 percent of the remaining population inside Ukraine have resorted to missing meals, restricting adult consumption to feed children or borrowing food. WFP is currently targeting 4.7 million people inside Ukraine with food or cash assistance.

Even greater concerns lie beyond Ukraine's borders. Global food markets have been plunged into turmoil, with soaring prices, export bans and shortages of basic foodstuffs spreading rapidly. Nations across Africa, the Middle East, Asia and even Latin America are feeling the heat from this conflict.

An estimated 20 million tons of wheat, barley, maize and vegetable oil produced by Ukrainian farmers are trapped in ports, silos and warehouses—threatened by the destruction of the infrastructure to get them to market and the blockade of ports in the Odesa area of southern Ukraine.

We urgently need a political solution to reopen these ports so the food being produced in the country can flow freely onto global markets once again. If they are not reopened, Ukrainian farmers will have nowhere to store the next harvest in July and August. The result will be mountains of grain going to waste while WFP and the world struggle to deal with an already catastrophic global hunger crisis. WFP urges all parties involved to allow this food to get out of Ukraine to where it is desperately needed so we can avert the looming threat of famine.

In recent years Ukraine and Russia became major engines for feeding the world, serving as critical suppliers to global markets for wheat, maize and other food commodities, as well as energy and fertilizer. This conflict has rocked global food and energy markets as exports from Ukraine have been halted by this war. Steep rises are occurring in international prices for basic staples—notably wheat, maize and vegetable oil—creating a food price environment that resembles the 2008 and 2011 crises.

Food prices have risen by at least 15 percent in 53 countries over the past year, rendering essential purchases unaffordable for many. This includes four countries—Lebanon, Zimbabwe, Venezuela and Sudan—which have seen three-digit rates of food inflation. Given heavy reliance on world commodity markets by numerous countries, prices are rising even in places that do not source their wheat or maize directly from Ukraine or Russia. So in truth, instead of exporting food to help feed entire countries, the conflict means that Ukraine is now being forced to export hunger.

In the case of a prolonged conflict, we should expect the destruction of the commodities currently trapped in storage, worsening declines in Ukraine's upcoming grain harvests and severe limits on its capacity to supply global markets. Countries that rely heavily on grain imports from the Black Sea, like Egypt, Lebanon and Yemen, will be greatly affected.

The threat to global food security is being exacerbated by the upheaval in worldwide fuel and fertilizer markets, as shortages and price spikes sharply reduce access to these vital inputs for farmers on every continent. Some 25 countries—ranging from Honduras and Guatemala to Mozambique and Sierra Leone—depend on Russia for 30 percent or more of their fertilizers. Meanwhile, fertilizer prices have risen by a staggering 231 percent over the past 2 years. Without urgent action, global food

production and crop yields will be slashed. This raises the frightening possibility that in addition to today's food pricing crisis, the world will also face a genuine crisis of food availability over the next 12–24 months—and with it, the specter of multiple famines.

Let me be crystal clear: Conflict in Ukraine is quickly transforming a series of already terrible hunger crises into a global food crisis that the world simply cannot afford. A crisis of this scale will destabilize many parts of Africa, the Middle East, Central and South America and Central Asia.

RESOURCING AND EARLY IMPACT OF U.S. SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS

This unprecedented crisis leaves WFP in the position of serving the greatest number of people in its 60+ year history. In the face of COVID–19, multiple conflicts and climate-related crises, we aim this year to assist 152 million people. This is after reaching a record-breaking 128 million beneficiaries in 2021.

Unfortunately, we are doing this in a time of dramatically insufficient resources. WFP's assistance this year will cost approximately \$23 billion. To say that our needs outstrip our funds would be a significant understatement—today WFP faces a funding gap of over 50 percent, even after the generous supplemental funds provided by the United States. While WFP has historically faced funding shortfalls, they have not been as great as this in the past or surfaced in such a complicated environment. As other UN agency and government budgets are similarly under strain, many responders are forced to cut assistance at the same time. This makes cuts in WFP's assistance much more painful for recipients than in prior years.

The Ukraine conflict has further added to the funding gap by increasing WFP's operational costs and constraining its response at a time when it is needed the most. While other exporters of staple food commodities should—at least partially—be able to make up for the shortfall in supplies from the Black Sea region, these commodities are higher priced and moving them comes with significantly greater operational costs; shipping costs are now 4 times what they were in 2019. WFP's operational costs are now \$71 million more per month than they were just 2 years ago, an increase of 44 percent. This is enough to feed 3.8 million people for one month.

Because of these increased costs, we have had to cut rations to our beneficiaries. In recent months we have had to reduce rations to 8 million individuals in Yemen who are already in IPC 3 and 4. We are being forced to make the terrible decision to literally take food from hungry children to give it to starving children. This is also true for many of our beneficiaries in Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Haiti, Honduras, Mali, Niger, Somalia, South Sudan, Syria, and sadly the list goes on.

This is why the generous supplemental funding provided by the United States comes at such a critical juncture. Already, working together with USAID, WFP is using these resources to have a tangible and positive impact on reducing the damaging impacts of these ration cuts.

- In Yemen, WFP received \$114 million and has been able to provide increased rations from 50 to 75 percent to 4.7 million people for up to 4 months.
- In Afghanistan, WFP received \$190 million and has been able to provide partial rations for 5 million people from August–October and to begin prepositioning commodities in areas that will be isolated during the winter months.
- In South Sudan, WFP received \$101 million and has been able to assist 2.4 million people with 50–70 percent rations for the remainder of the year.
- In Ethiopia, WFP received \$262 million and has been able to expand programming in northern Ethiopia to 3.4 million beneficiaries and an additional 2.4 million in other parts of the country.
- In Somalia, WFP received \$106 million and has been able to assist 4.1 million people with full rations through October. In addition, WFP will be able to scale up its nutrition program for 444,000 children and mothers through October.
- In the Sahel, U.S. supplemental funding has allowed WFP to scale up from 5.6 million people to 8.2 million people. In Niger, specifically, we were able to increase to full rations from 65 percent rations. And in Chad, beneficiaries are receiving cash assistance as early as this week.
- In Haiti, the U.S. supplemental will allow WFP to increase its cash assistance to 150,000 people, providing critical support against rising food prices.

Notwithstanding these significant gains supported with U.S. supplemental funding, it is clear that the United States alone cannot fully meet the needs in all crisis countries. Other donors, governments, the private sector, billionaires, etc., must all step up now to do their part to meet these unprecedented needs.

Of the 68 countries for which WFP requested supplemental funding from USAID, only 31 received support. Critical funding gaps remain that must be filled urgently by the broader donor community if we are to avoid a further deterioration of food security and stability in many countries. A few examples include:

- In Sudan there is a \$263 million funding gap for the balance of the calendar year that is limiting the assistance that needs to be provided to 6.24 million beneficiaries.
- In Afghanistan, WFP's shortfall for the next 6 months is \$926 million.
- In Yemen, beneficiaries are only receiving 50 percent rations and the rations will be cut off completely in January if new funding is not received.
- In Somalia, WFP expects a \$132 million shortfall beginning in October that will force the reduction in both relief and nutrition assistance.
- In west Africa, more than \$594 million is needed for crisis response activities through the end of the calendar year.
- In Central America, WFP projects as many as 3.2 million people may migrate due to severe food insecurity.

IMPLICATIONS FOR GLOBAL STABILITY

We have long known that war produces hunger; that has been true of every major conflict in human history and the world is seeing this dynamic unfold in real time in Ukraine today. But we have also observed that hunger itself can produce conflict and instability, creating a vicious cycle of deepening hunger fueling increasing conflict. This is what we should be afraid of today—the further weaponization of food.

One of the most predictable ways that food insecurity can produce instability is through unexpected, rapid spikes in food prices or a lack of access to food. As prices of grains, oils and other basic commodities suddenly spike in countries around the world it is important that we realize the risks this portends. Recent history serves to warn us.

In 2007–08, a rapid increase in prices for major food staples produced social unrest in at least 40 developing and middle-income countries, and regime change in at least one. We saw food-related instability strike again in 2011 with a second wave of price spikes linked to the Arab Spring in the Middle East, which created social upheaval in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, and especially Syria.

The links between food insecurity and instability often produce spikes in migration. Food insecurity in Middle Eastern countries during the Arab Spring led to an increase in refugee flows and asylum seeking in Europe. WFP's own research into the causes of migration, based on data from 88 countries, found that a 1 percent increase in food insecurity fueled a 2 percent increase in migration. More recent surveys across Central America have produced similar results—a 1 percent increase in hunger leads to a 2 percent increase in migration.

The bottom line is that people do not stand idly by when they cannot feed themselves or their families. Already in recent weeks, we have seen social unrest triggered by food price spikes in Pakistan, Indonesia, and notably Sri Lanka. This is likely just the beginning: the conditions for food-related instability today are far greater and the risks of social upheaval are much higher than they were a decade ago.

First, in 2008, the world was more stable than it is today. Several major conflicts have erupted since that time. The civil war in Ethiopia began in 2020, the Yemeni civil war in 2014, the Syrian civil war in 2011; while the conflict in Northeast Nigeria began in 2009 and in Central Sahel in 2017. Furthermore, we are experiencing exceptional, persistent droughts across the Horn of Africa, central Asia and the Dry Corridor, which have already created millions of additional migrants. The combination of conflict and drought has created fragility in multiple regions impacting hundreds of millions of people.

Second, the world has still not fully recovered from the ripple-effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, leaving it ill-equipped to cope with yet another crisis. In low- and middle-income countries especially, incomes are still depressed from COVID-19, labor markets are struggling to recover, and debt is at record levels. With rising interest rates, the costs of credit further limit the options for governments to respond to these difficulties.

Third, city dwellers are facing increasing obstacles to accessing affordable food due to reductions in incomes and closures of informal markets, combined with price surges due to COVID-19 containment measures. While hunger has long been associated with rural areas, COVID-19 has created a growing class of hungry people: city dwellers in low- and middle-income countries. This matters as food price riots occur overwhelmingly amongst urban populations, particularly in relation to food products

of cultural significance, and among countries with a strong reliance on agricultural imports. For example, Egypt, the most populous country in the Middle East and Ukraine's top wheat customer, will struggle to maintain existing subsidies on bread—a staple of the Egyptian diet—in the face of rising global wheat prices.

The combined effects of these factors, exacerbated by the war in Ukraine, have created a perfect storm that threatens to unleash an unprecedented global wave of food insecurity and instability.

CONCLUSION

A swift resolution to the crisis in Ukraine appears unlikely. Therefore, its global repercussions for food security and stability will become progressively more dangerous in the months ahead. As humanitarian needs soar our ability to respond is diminishing due to the lack of funds. While global food supply chains are stressed, there are enough resources available in the world to feed everyone; the issue is one of cost and allocation.

The costs of humanitarian *inaction* are tremendous, especially for people in need, who in the worst cases pay with their lives. Failing to mobilize sufficient and timely funds for humanitarian assistance will not spare national budgets, it will only delay how and where they are spent.

The United States has shown global leadership with its allocation of \$5 billion to address the impact of the food security crisis sparked by the war in Ukraine. WFP is grateful for the initial monies allocated, and I sincerely hope that further tranches of funding will be forthcoming for our most urgent and underfunded operations.

But this crisis is very far from over and much more needs to be done—especially by our friends and partners in the donor community. If a decisive, coordinated response is not mounted—and soon—we will see mass starvation, migration and destabilization on an unprecedented scale, at a far greater cost. A massive influx of refugees to Western countries could soon become a reality. As soon as they arrive, the host governments will start paying the price—literally—for not having acted earlier. Germany's recent experience of absorbing Syrian refugees in the aftermath of the civil war is a case in point. It costs less than 50 cents to feed someone for a day in Syria. It costs almost \$70 a day in Germany to provide a refugee with the humanitarian support they require.

The U.S. has shown leadership again and we must bring pressure to bear on all other potential donors around the world. Modern famines are man-made—but this also means the international community has the ability to avoid them. As starvation tightens its grip on dozens of nations, we must not allow the war in Ukraine to overwhelm millions of families already trapped in a deadly struggle against hunger. They are relying on us for survival, and we must not let them down.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. That is a very succinct, but nonetheless powerful impact.

Let me ask you, you say food availability. Are you suggesting that there will not be enough food production in order to meet the demand?

Mr. BEASLEY. Yes, sir. Let me get into the weeds of that just a little bit. In Africa, where there are 1.4 billion people, the fertilizer crisis, along with the droughts and all of the fuel costs and other issues, led the African Development Bank to project, just recently, that you could see a 20 percent reduction—which I think could be very low—in food production across Africa. WFP supports about 69, 70 million people in Africa. When you look at the African agricultural community, 70 percent of the people in Africa are fed by 33 million smallholder farms. If those 33 million smallholder farms do not get the fertilizer they need, you can only imagine what might happen. That is 980 million people that depend on the food from smallholder farms and the fertilizer to reach them. We are working on these issues as we speak.

Imagine we are only reaching 65 million. You can begin to do the numbers and realize we have got a catastrophe looming before us. This is why these grains from Russia and Ukraine need to be mov-

ing quickly, and we are working on that as well. I hope we have a solution on the Odessa ports in the next couple of days.

Now let me add, on top of this, I just left India yesterday, meeting with the Indian leadership, and India had anticipated substantial opportunities to work with us on providing grain, but you cannot believe what the heat has done in India just in the past couple of months. It literally has devastated their wheat production. We now have that on hold because, obviously, they have got to feed Indians first. We understand that, but this heat is also impacting farmers in the United States. It is impacting the Horn of Africa, Western Africa, Eastern Africa, and places around the world. We very well could have an availability of food problem next year, Senator.

Now, while I was sitting here I just got a text from the president of Niger. He said they are actually getting more rain right now in the Sahel than they were anticipating. I do hope that that will relieve some of the pressure, particularly in Mali, Niger, Chad, Burkina Faso, and Mauritania.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you this. In South Sudan, 8.3 million people are experiencing severe food insecurity, including 2 million children under the age of 5 facing acute malnutrition. There have been a number of announcements by the World Food Programme about where they have had to cut rations in places like South Sudan. How does the World Food Programme make decisions about which countries to fund and at what levels? Does World Food Programme ever cut rations in one response to increase them in another?

Mr. BEASLEY. Senator, the way our system works, we work with the donor nations who direct, generally speaking, which countries receive funds and the prioritization. Unfortunately, because of the lack of funds that we were faced with in the last few months, we have been having to take food from the hungry children to give to starving children, which is a situation that none of us like to be in.

Fortunately, because the United States Senate and the U.S. House stepped up with unprecedented funding that is going to alleviate some of the pressure, allowing us to move the ration supply back up for people, whether it is in South Sudan or wherever the case may be, but we work closely with USAID. For example, we requested, in this particular package of supplemental appropriations of about \$5 billion, about \$2.6, \$2.8 billion to begin immediate movement. We have received, as of today, I think about \$1.4 billion. Out of the 68 countries we have requested funds for, that \$1.4 billion will go to 31 countries. That still leaves 37 countries that we have not received additional supplementation appropriations for.

Now what we are trying to do is work with Germany, the EU, and other donor nations—I was just in Japan and Korea, trying to convince their parliament to step up with more money to fill in those gaps. Obviously, we would like to see the United States do as much as possible, but where there are gaps, as I am talking with Germany, the European Union, member states, and other donor nations that have great alliance, particularly with the United States to fill those gaps.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Risch.

Senator RISCH. I know you have got a hard stop and we have got a vote too, and I want to give a shot to Senator Coons.

Let me just say this. David, you are a great spokesman for America and for these kinds of things. I would urge you, in the strongest possible terms, to not only talk about these issues—they are huge issues. The world you live in, I do not know how you do it, how you get up every morning and deal with this, but I think when you speak, every time you speak, you really ought to underscore one of the major problems here, and that is Russia.

This is their fault. It is no fault of the Ukraine or any other country. Russia made this decision by itself, and that decision is going to cause the starvation of millions of people on this planet. It is not right, it is not fair, and humanity ought to recognize this atrocity for what it is. I hope you will underscore that every time you speak about this.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BEASLEY. Senator, if you go back in the record, it was a few weeks after the initial invasion at the end of February that I went on record and actually went to Odessa. I have been in Ukraine multiple times, but I went to the Odessa port and met with the military officials as well as the leaders in that particular area, making it very clear that these ports have to open for the world. This is not just a Ukrainian matter.

Obviously, as you understand the economy of Ukraine, 40 to 50 percent of their economy is based on exports. You can imagine when you have the port shut down, what that is going to do inside Ukraine, not to mention what it is going to do outside of Ukraine. Fifty percent of the grain WFP buy around the world comes from inside Ukraine. Our operational cost now is over \$70 million more per month because of what we are facing in this world crisis because of what Russia did.

I began tweeting, actually, and messaging about Putin personally. I said, look, Mr. Putin. Regardless of your views on Ukraine, if you do not open up these ports, it is a declaration of war against food security. If you want to bring famine to the rest of the world, keep that port shut. Otherwise, open up the port. Have some degree of heart for the rest of the world.

I met with Minister Lavrov last week and talked quite extensively about this matter. I said, look, it is not complicated. Let's get these ports open. Let's get those supplies moving.

We are out there messaging and we will continue to do so. I sort of have a rule of thumb, that is one of the advantages of not wanting a job in the United Nations. You can say what you think, what you believe, and let the chips fall where they may, Senator.

Senator RISCH. Well, I appreciate that, and again, I think you have succinctly said what Putin knows, and that is he has closed the Odessa ports and those ports in the Black Sea—

Mr. BEASLEY. Clear and simple.

Senator RISCH. —knowingly, willfully, intentionally, with malice aforethought, with a black and abandoned heart, and with the full intention of murdering people by starvation. It is awful.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Coons.

Senator COONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member. David, it is so great to be with you. You have been a fierce, faithful, effective leader of the World Food Programme. I know it is the men and women around the world in whose name you accepted the Nobel Peace Prize, but I think it is important to emphasize that the whole world community recognizes the urgent need for the World Food Programme. I know that you have carried a message personally to world leaders to demand that others deliver the support that the United States does for the World Food Programme, and to call out, as the Chair and Ranking were just engaging with you on, the aggression by Russia that has shut the Black Sea ports of Ukraine and that threaten starvation to millions of others.

I am going to make a point you do not need to respond to, but I think it worth making.

When I led a delegation to Rome and we had the opportunity to meet with the head of the FAO, who just happens to be a PRC Chinese national, and we met with you and your team, and I pressed the head of the FAO on Russia's responsibility for this food crisis because of its aggression in Ukraine, we cannot get a similarly clear and forceful answer. I can think of no more stark example of the consequences of our failing to pay our arrears at the U.N. and then creating an opening for PRC leadership on different multilateral agencies and entities of the United Nations.

Let me ask something that I think you should answer which is the operational challenges and the costs. The Ranking Member reference cargo preference in his opening. I am concerned about skyrocketing costs operationally because of what Russia is doing in Ukraine. What are you seeing around the world? How can we help you with the increasing costs you are seeing, and how have your cash-based interventions helped in some way circumvent the operating costs of delivering millions of tons of food around the world?

Mr. BEASLEY. I think the greater flexibility we can get from the United States Government, will help, in my opinion, sway European nations and other nations to give us greater flexibility in how we can use our funds, the different modalities.

When I arrived in this role, Senator Corker used to really hit me hard about cash-based transfers, and at first I was not quite so sure, but once I realized the mechanisms and the systems we had in place, and seeing the support that we did have from the Democrats and Republicans in the United States Congress, we have actually moved our cash-based system, Senator, up to now over \$2 billion. Like in places in Ukraine where there is some degree of market operating, if we can bring in cash it actually helps local economies.

One of the things that we are doing with cash-based transfers is helping stimulate local economies in Africa, as opposed to just bringing food in from the outside. That helps smallholder farmers, and it particularly helps women, because we actually empower women to take more responsibility in the villages, in the communities, and particularly in countries where women are oppressed.

Senator COONS. Let me just make sure I am being specific. You do not actually deliver cash. You use essentially credit card, EBTs—

Mr. BEASLEY. We do multiple things—

Senator COONS. —for transparency and accountability. I have visited the Bidibidi refugee camp in northwestern Uganda, exactly that kind of a setting. The surrounding community, women are now bringing food for sale to folks who are refugees. They welcome refugees because they are a source of revenue and income for the local farmers, and it does not crash the local agricultural economy.

I have also visited, in South Sudan, a refugee camp where World Food Programme was air-dropping food into a place where there was no other food available. There was no other way to keep starving people alive.

Last, if I could target you back to, what do you see in terms of the increased costs of delivering food, and what can we do to help be most relevant and helpful in that?

Mr. BEASLEY. The increased cost of delivering food is now almost \$74 million more, Senator, per month. Our expense is now over \$850 million this year, and I actually think it is going to get even higher. I do not see things curbing. We are having four times the cost of shipping, because you can imagine shipping costs, fuel costs, fertilizer costs, all these different factors are quite unprecedented.

We would need \$850–\$900 million, additional dollars, just to stay even. Like last year we reached 130 million people. This year we plan to reach 152 million. Then the question is, how much is it going to cost in buying food? As, Senator Menendez, you were alluding to earlier, we had to cut rations because of lack of money. The amount of money it is now costing to acquire the same amount of food is going up so high we are having to cut rations from 100 percent to 75 percent to 50 percent. For example, in Yemen we have actually cut—now we are going to scale back up because of your appropriation, but we have still got gaps. Thirteen million people, for example, that we feed in Yemen, 5 million we had already cut down 50 percent, and those were the 5 million at IPC Level 4, which is knocking on famine's door, 8 million at IPC Level 3 we had cut down to 33 percent of the rations they need. We hope to begin to scale that up, but this is where the Gulf states need to step up.

This increasing cost is forcing us to decrease the rations per child, per person, and as I said, in some places we are actually taking food from a hungry child to give to a starving child. That is why the United States leadership is saving lives and is going to help stabilize countries around the world, but we have got to get more countries to step up in ways like the United States has.

Senator COONS. Thank you for your leadership. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Two quick takeaways. I am concerned about your statements about food availability. That is an incredibly compounding factor.

Mr. BEASLEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Secondly, the statement of the 40-some-odd countries that could easily transition into collapsed nations. Not only is hunger a human tragedy, but it is also the breeding grounds for mass migration, which causes conflict, and, at the same time, to avail those who seek for purposes like terrorist actors, to avail themselves of recruiting those who, in fact, are facing hunger. If that is my way of solving my family's problem, I am afraid that

there are those who will take it. The world needs to step up, in its own interest as well as a humanitarian response.

With the thanks of the Committee for your testimony. We got you close to your drop-dead time, but we very much thank you for your and your colleagues' work.

The record of this hearing will remain open until the close of business tomorrow, Thursday, July 21. Please ensure questions for the record are offered by that time. This hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:04 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

RESPONSES OF AMBASSADOR LINDA THOMAS-GREENFIELD TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ROBERT MENENDEZ

Question. Ethiopia: For more than a year, the Ethiopian Government's cruel blockade of Tigray has deprived millions of Ethiopian citizen's access to fuel, food, medicine, and life-saving humanitarian assistance.

Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield, in which regions or countries are you observing food availability and price spikes feeding rising social instability?

Answer. Problems of food availability and price spikes have been affecting the entire world, especially least-developed countries. About 60 percent of the world's food insecure people live in countries with active conflict, which is both cause and effect of food insecurity. Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Haiti, Somalia, Syria, and Yemen are amongst the direst of cases. The World Food Program lists food emergencies in 21 countries (in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, Europe, and the Middle East). Globally, up to 40 million people could be pushed into poverty and food insecurity by Russia's war in Ukraine, and 75–95 million more could be pushed into extreme poverty by the combined effects of the pandemic, droughts, other climate crises, and inflation.

Question. Have the effects of Russia's invasion on global food security provided China with new openings to further expand its influence in the Middle East and Africa? If so, what steps is the Administration taking to ensure that we have accurate assessments of any such developments?

Answer. The PRC propagates Russia's false narrative blaming Western sanctions for worsening global food insecurity since Russia invaded Ukraine. In doing so, the PRC continues its efforts to drive a wedge between partners in the Middle East and Africa and the United States.

The United States and our allies and partners publicly and privately amplify our collective efforts to combat food insecurity, and to counter Russian disinformation in International Organizations. We also remind foreign leaders and the world that we do not sanction Russian food or fertilizer exports and that the best way to improve global food security is for Russia to end its war.

As the world's leading humanitarian donor, the United States saves and uplifts human lives globally.

Question. Syria: Once again in Syria, the past is prologue for Russia's reckless brutality. Russia has hijacked U.N. processes to hold millions of desperate Syrians hostage in pursuit of its narrow self-interest as it now threatens to starve the Middle East and Africa in pursuit of its illegal invasion of Ukraine. Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield, when Russia vetoed a 12-month extension of the U.N. cross-border mandate for Syria you said, "We will take a hard look at our aid posture in Syria and do everything in our power to help those in need."

What will this "hard look" entail? Will it include standing up cross-border assistance mechanisms that are independent of the U.N.'s cross-border mandate?

Answer. The 6-month duration of the U.N. Security Council reauthorization of the cross-border humanitarian assistance delivery mechanism for Syria, forced upon the Council by Russia, needlessly complicates the U.N.'s planning, compromises supply chains, and increases costs. It also creates uncertainty around whether Russia will block further authorizations in the future. We will use all available means to advocate for and support the continuation of cross-border humanitarian assistance to the people of northwest Syria.

Question. Assuming Russia vetoes the cross-border mandate, we have less than 6 months to stand up alternative mechanisms. What challenges do you see in this

regard, aside from the time constraints? What steps can be taken to mitigate those challenges?

Answer. Nothing can replicate the scale or scope of the U.N. cross-border mechanism. If Russia blocks re-authorization of the mechanism in January 2023, the amount of humanitarian assistance reaching people in need in northwest Syria will decrease dramatically. Cognizant of previous Russian veto threats, we have been preparing for this possibility and will work with partners to demonstrate the value of the cross-border mechanism and lack of viable alternatives. This includes encouraging U.N. and NGO partners to pre-position supplies and expand alternative delivery approaches.

Question. Ethiopia: For more than a year, the Ethiopian Government's cruel blockade of Tigray has deprived millions of Ethiopian citizen's access to fuel, food, medicine, and life-saving humanitarian assistance.

Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield, what has the United States done to stop the Ethiopian Government from using assistance as a weapon of war in northern Ethiopia?

Answer. The United States has engaged at all levels—both in Washington and in Addis Ababa—with the Government of Ethiopia to press for unhindered humanitarian access to northern Ethiopia. The United States was a committed and energetic partner to the African Union-led process that resulted in the November 2, 2022 cessation of hostilities agreement. Since the signing of that agreement, humanitarian operations have scaled up across the post-conflict areas, reaching most populations in need.

Question. What steps have been taken to hold accountable Ethiopian authorities who are responsible for depriving the people of Tigray access to food, medicine, life-saving humanitarian supplies, and access to the outside world for what now amounts to more than a year?

Answer. The United States has used a variety of tools to impose costs on the Ethiopian Government and individual actors responsible for obstructing humanitarian access, including the suspension of trade benefits under the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) on January 1, 2022. One of the five benchmarks that USTR has specified for Ethiopia to regain AGOA eligibility is to “remove barriers to humanitarian operations, including by allowing the unimpeded import of fuel, medicine, food and other forms of humanitarian assistance” and to “restore basic electricity and telecommunication services.” Likewise, we have imposed visa sanctions on specific individuals deemed to be responsible and will continue to do so as more evidence emerges.

Question. Afghanistan: Afghanistan continues to face one of the worst humanitarian crises in the world. The combined shocks of severe drought, the COVID-19 pandemic, and the Taliban's forcible takeover and mismanagement of its government has left 23 million people facing severe food insecurity.

Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield, what is the U.N. doing to address the food security crisis in Afghanistan? How are we working with the U.N. and other donor governments to ensure that international aid gets to the places and people that need it?

Answer. As of May 2022, 18.9 million people in Afghanistan were acutely food insecure. The United States supports the U.N.'s humanitarian interventions in Afghanistan, including from the World Food Program (WFP) and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). We are the largest contributor to both organizations and stay tightly coordinated with the U.N. and other donors.

In 2021, WFP provided life-saving emergency aid to 15 million people in Afghanistan as well as millions of Afghan refugees. Iran and Pakistan currently host the majority of Afghans at 4.5 million and 3.7 million, respectively. Since the Taliban's takeover, FAO has concentrated on providing data, specialized seeds, livestock interventions, and vegetables, with a focus on women-headed households.

RESPONSES OF MS. SAMANTHA POWER TO QUESTIONS
SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ROBERT MENENDEZ

Question. We know that the unprecedented level of needs from the global food crisis will grow next year.

Administrator Power, given the rising level of need, what funding gaps does USAID anticipate facing? Do you expect funding shortfalls?

Answer. While generous supplemental resources allow USAID to meet the moment, we need to consider the out-year trajectory of the humanitarian and development accounts. USAID's Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance (BHA) anticipates obligating more than \$11.5 billion in humanitarian resources in FY 2022, and \$10 billion in FY 2023. USAID/BHA will program the balance of its supplemental International Disaster Assistance resources in early FY 2023 to sustain our emergency food security response through the end of the calendar year. Due to the anticipated carryover and expected appropriation levels for FY 2023, USAID projects a significant decrease in the resources available to support our humanitarian programming in comparison to this year.

The amount of unmet global humanitarian need in 2022 is greater than the entire global humanitarian appeal was in 2019, and additional support from all humanitarian donors will be necessary to avoid funding shortfalls in the future. Meanwhile, USAID anticipates greater needs to sustain current Feed the Future agriculture-food security investments and to continue the substantial progress being made in achieving long-term food security gains, especially in areas with high levels of chronic extreme poverty and malnutrition.

Nevertheless, USAID is anticipating an increase in overall populations falling into food insecurity and malnutrition due to the current crisis. The FY 2022 and 2023 request included requests for \$1.05 billion and \$1.06 billion for agriculture and food security programs respectively, \$40–\$45 million more than what was appropriated in FY 2021 and FY 2022. Regarding the ongoing global crisis, USAID is continuing to program FY 2022 Ukraine Supplemental funds as quickly as feasible to address the needs precipitated by the current situation.

Question. What is USAID's strategic plan for next year to address the ongoing crisis?

Answer. Our approach to combating this global food security crisis centers on actions to address the multiple causes of the crisis: climate extremes, COVID-19, and protracted conflicts, including the effects of Russia's ongoing invasion of Ukraine. USAID is providing record amounts of immediate emergency assistance to the food insecure and the severely malnourished, in order to save lives and alleviate suffering—assistance that will continue throughout FY 2023. We are rallying countries, international organizations, and the private sector to mobilize resources to lessen the burden on poor countries, and avoid export restrictions on food that exacerbate global prices and the crisis overall. USAID is also investing in global agriculture and food systems that will help farmers boost their harvests, provide people with more affordable, safe and nutritious food, and help food insecure regions to be more resilient to future shocks.

Question. An effective response to the global food crisis requires a coordinated effort from across USAID.

How are the Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance (BHA) and the Bureau for Resilience and Food Security (RFS) working together to strengthen humanitarian, development, and peace-building coordination as required in the FY 2022–2026 Global Food Security Strategy?

Answer. The FY 2022–2026 Global Food Security Strategy emphasizes strengthening humanitarian-development-peace coherence (known as HDP coherence) to promote complementary collaboration, coordination, and collective outcomes among humanitarian assistance, development assistance, and peacebuilding activities. The same concepts are also strongly emphasized in USAID's forthcoming Humanitarian Action and Resilience Policies. RFS, BHA, and the Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Stabilization (CPS) are working together at a number of different levels of planning and programming. For example, all three Bureaus have helped Missions develop integrated Country Development and Cooperation Strategies (CDCS) that include specific objectives on HDP coherence at the field level to respond to complex crises across different types of programming. Additionally, all Bureaus recently collaborated on the *Programming Considerations for Humanitarian-Development-Peace Coherence: A Note for USAID's Implementing Partners* (<https://www.resiliencelinks.org/building-resilience/reports/programming-considerations-hdp-coherence>) document, which represents USAID's best, most current thinking on HDP coherence and is based on extensive consultations with USAID staff and partners.

In the specific context of the global food crisis, RFS and BHA have coordinated closely on key aspects of USAID's response. BHA and RFS have: conducted joint data analysis that has informed program planning; co-developed program plans in countries that have both humanitarian and longer-term development needs related to the global food security crisis; and closely coordinated on all interagency strate-

gies, and communications materials, including guidance to field Missions—being careful to underscore the importance of the consistent coordination between humanitarian and development actors.

Question. What regular coordination mechanisms are in place to ensure that at the mission level and in DC, both bureaus are speaking with each other and working together to layer and sequence programs across the food assistance and security spectrum? How often and closely do BHA and RFS coordinate on the selection of priority countries?

Answer. There are various coordination mechanisms to ensure RFS and BHA are working together to layer and sequence programs both at the Mission level and in Washington. At the Mission level, USAID has found that formal coordination roles and structures can be effective at ensuring adequate cross-communication, coordination, and collaboration. For example, a dedicated USAID advisor or coordinator, such as the Resilience Coordinator position that has been established in USAID's resilience focus countries, can support partners and operate across the HDP nexus and sectoral programming. These roles build trust in coordination, creating a virtuous cycle. At the country and regional Mission level, USAID also invests in senior level decision-making bodies, such as the Strategic Advisory Group for Emergencies (SAGE) model in Ethiopia. SAGE meets regularly to share information about possible shocks and emergencies and advises if and how humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding programs should adapt in response to shocks. In Washington, BHA and RFS co-lead the Resilience Technical Working Group (RTWG), with active participation from CPS and other bureaus, which meets monthly to support Mission-led efforts to bridge humanitarian and development programs through a collaborative and multi-sector approach. Through the RTWG and the Resilience Leadership Council described below, BHA and RFS coordinate on the selection of priority countries.

Question. How are BHA and RFS working together outside of the context of Resilience Food Security Activities?

Answer. BHA and RFS regularly coordinate on issues related to strengthening coordination and cohesion across the HDP nexus, including bilateral engagement by BHA and RFS policy and technical experts on shared priorities. BHA and RFS staff also participate in a relief-development coherence (RDC) interagency working group, which has representation from BHA, RFS, USAID's Bureau for Policy, Planning, and Learning (PPL), and other USAID bureaus, along with the Department of State, to promote coherence and complementarity across humanitarian and development assistance for populations of concern. BHA also coordinates with RFS to lead USAID's participation in the Risk-Informed Early Action Partnership (REAP), which brings together the humanitarian, development, climate, and meteorological communities to increase investment in climate adaptation, early warning systems, and disaster risk reduction. In addition, RFS and BHA co-chair the Resilience Leadership Council (RLC), which was established in 2014 and is charged with the oversight of USAID support and investments made to build resilience to recurrent and protracted crises. Recently the RLC has been discussing emerging impacts and resulting needs from the Ukraine crisis directly with affected Missions in USAID's Resilience Focus Countries. The purpose of the RLC is to provide cross-bureau coordination at senior levels (AA and DAA) for multi-sector topic areas, such as HDP coherence, that require significant human and financial resources in more than one Washington operating unit. Lastly, RFS, BHA, and USAID's Bureau for Global Health (GH) also have an established approach to coordination around nutrition funding and programming. For example, in 2019, the Agency established the Nutrition Leadership Council (NLC). The NLC builds upon long-standing coordination and collaboration across GH, RFS, and BHA. The NLC elevates nutrition and strengthens nutrition results across USAID's multi-sectoral programming by optimizing and aligning resources, budget, technical leadership, policy guidance, programmatic oversight, and external engagement. Under the auspices of the NLC, RFS, BHA, and GH drove the Agency's Nutrition Priority Country selection process and implementation to ensure greater alignment and coordination of RFS, BHA, and GH nutrition resources and programming.

Question. Congress has begun work on the 2023 Farm Bill.

What reforms or additional authorities is USAID seeking in the 2023 Farm Bill to ensure international food assistance programs are able to respond quickly to the needs on the ground with the most appropriate form of assistance?

What additional flexibilities may be needed to improve USAID's response given the various compounding factors worsening the global food crisis?

Answer. The reauthorization of the Food for Peace Act as part of the Farm Bill, at this time of global crisis, provides an unparalleled opportunity for Congress and USAID to work together to ensure the U.S. Government has the best tools at its disposal to meet the humanitarian challenges of the day. Given the scale of global food insecurity and the dynamic nature of its causes, it is imperative for USAID to fully optimize its food assistance programs and be able to employ the best food assistance modalities to respond to each context. During this reauthorization process, USAID will pursue technical legislative fixes to the Food for Peace Act to reduce administrative burden for new, small, or local partners; allow USAID to support increasingly expensive emergency response operations and quality non-emergency program design with Food for Peace Title II funds; streamline the award-making process; and improve flexibility between humanitarian funding streams to ensure that the most appropriate funding tool is used for every crisis. USAID looks forward to collaborating with relevant Committees, including the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, during the reauthorization process.

Question. In addition to emergency aid to meet immediate food security needs, it is also critical that the United States invest in resilience building, in order to help communities around the globe become better able to withstand future shocks and stresses that may impact their food security.

How much of the Ukraine supplemental funding went specifically to resilience building?

Answer. The Additional Ukraine Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2022 (P.L. 117-128) (AUSAA) provides \$760 million in Economic Support Funds (ESF) to support global food security. USAID will manage \$655 million of this funding, in support of the following lines of effort:

- 1) Cushioning macroeconomic shock and impact on poor people;
- 2) Mitigating the global fertilizer shortage; and
- 3) Increasing investment in agriculture capacity and resilience.

USAID estimates that approximately \$150 million of USAID-managed AUSAA funding will support resilience activities under the lines of effort described above. These targeted, rapidly implemented, and system-strengthening elements preserve development gains, maintain the ability of smallholder farmers to produce, buffer key market and agricultural systems from long term damage while at the same time, supporting smallholder farmer resilience. Resilience activities are also strengthening the ability of households, communities and systems to better manage future shocks and stresses.

Since the onset of this global crisis, USAID has underscored the critical importance of close coordination between humanitarian and development efforts of this response. While the most immediate, life-threatening needs are humanitarian in nature and must be addressed with emergency assistance urgently, USAID is maximizing opportunities through its efforts to mitigate impacts and support recovery in ways that help people both weather this crisis and sustain their wellbeing. While USAID's Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance (BHA) leads on the emergency response and Bureau for Resilience and Food Security (RFS) leads on the short-, mid-, and long-term activities to mitigate the impacts of the crisis, these bureaus coordinate closely with each other. In addition, these bureaus coordinate with field missions and regional bureaus to ensure activities are appropriately tailored to specific country contexts.

BHA prioritized an initial \$2.2 billion in International Disaster Assistance (IDA) resources made available through the Ukraine supplemental to provide life-saving assistance in response to the global food security crisis. This influx of resources is supporting the scale up of response activities, and providing space for humanitarian and development partners to design resilience activities that BHA will support through both supplemental and core funding in FY 2023.

Question. Can you speak about how the USG/USAID is working to connect emergency and long-term food assistance programming, and ensure that they are working together in a complementary fashion to meet global food security needs?

Answer. In the context of the global food security crisis, USAID has worked closely with interagency partners as well as the National Security Council (NSC) to coordinate response efforts and messaging. Since the invasion began, the NSC has led regular interagency meetings to discuss U.S. Government (USG) efforts to address the food, fuel, and fertilizer price spikes. This process has resulted in the USG's Near-Term Plan to Address Global Food Security in Response to Russia's War in Ukraine, aligned USG messaging at high-level multilateral engagements, and implementation of the AUSAA. Additionally, USAID has worked closely with Feed the

Future (FTF) interagency partners to pivot existing long-term food security and nutrition programs to respond to the food security crisis and to expand the number of FTF target countries.

RFS and BHA have coordinated closely on key aspects of USAID's response. BHA and RFS have conducted joint data analysis that has informed program planning; co-developed program plans in countries that have both humanitarian and longer-term development needs related to the global food security crisis; and closely coordinated on all interagency strategies, and communications materials, including guidance to field Missions—being careful to underscore the importance of the consistent coordination between humanitarian and development actors.

More specifically, BHA has been closely coordinating with RFS to define a shared set of indicators that would allow the Agency to assess the location and severity of emergency and long-term food security needs globally. Using data from the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and the Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET), BHA and RFS use vulnerability and exposure as their two primary indicators to understand which countries would be most severely impacted by the crisis. Vulnerability was defined as underlying poverty, hunger, and malnutrition along RFS and BHA have also worked together closely on country risk analyses and a series of synthesis reports for USG officials which document available information on the impacts of the Russian invasion of Ukraine on global food security.

For countries receiving both IDA and food security funding under the AUSAA, it is important for Mission Feed the Future (FTF) teams to coordinate closely with Mission and Regional Humanitarian Assistance Offices, as well as colleagues from BHA and the Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Stabilization (CPS) in Washington and in the field.

Close coordination between BHA and RFS, and consultation with CPS, is important for the success of both efforts, especially within the conflict-affected and fragile environment that characterizes the focus countries in this effort. To this end, all three Bureaus worked together to create guidance for Missions receiving EG.3 Ag ESF supplemental funds, emphasizing the importance of collaboration at the Mission level and noting how funding could be used in a complementary manner. BHA assistance is aimed at saving lives and alleviating human suffering. It funds activities that target the most vulnerable populations in need of lifesaving assistance.

One of the most important aspects of USAID's response to this crisis is the significant expansion of FTF countries, which represents a major investment in resilience and food security programs across the globe. FTF is delivering on President Biden's commitment by expanding its global footprint in new countries and building more sustainable, equitable and resilient food systems in an effort to end poverty, hunger and malnutrition. In May, the USAID Administrator approved the following additional FTF Target Countries: Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Zambia.

In addition, RFS and BHA co-chair the Resilience Leadership Council (RLC), which was established in 2014 and is charged with the oversight of USAID support and investments made to build resilience to recurrent and protracted crises. Recently, the RLC has been discussing emerging impacts and resulting needs from the Ukraine crisis directly with affected Missions in USAID's Resilience Focus Countries.

Currently, USAID has 15 Resilience Focus Countries: Burkina Faso, DRC, Ethiopia, Haiti, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Nigeria, Niger, Somalia, South Sudan, Uganda, and Zimbabwe. These countries were selected because they have areas of recurrent crises that result in large-scale, repeat humanitarian emergencies. All are FTF target or aligned countries and receive support from RFS. FTF funds are an essential element of USAID's, long-term, multi-sectoral investments to strengthen resilience in these areas of recurrent crises.

Question. We know that WFP is one of USAID's most important partners in responding to global food insecurity, but an effective response requires engagement by multiple actors.

How is USAID using funds from the supplemental to support other U.N. agencies and NGOs who have the expertise to provide comprehensive programs in key response areas such as nutrition, protection, and health?

Answer. USAID is taking a decisively multi-sectoral approach in its response to the global food security crisis. When communities face crisis levels of acute food insecurity, it not only impacts the amount of food they can eat, but it affects the health of their families, the nutrition status of their children, and it changes the types of protection risks that women and girls face in their communities. In order to address these compounding needs, USAID provides a comprehensive package of

assistance when responding to severe food security crises in addition to food assistance: treatment for acute malnutrition, health services, clean water, safe shelter, and protection programs that aim to prevent and respond to gender based violence. USAID is working both with U.N. agencies that have the capacity to scale quickly and with NGOs to design essential multi-sectoral programming. USAID has now already programmed more than \$2.1 billion from the second Ukraine supplemental, across 32 countries and through over 115 awards, in just 2 months since the bill was enacted.

The global food security crisis is having a visible and catastrophic impact on children. Specifically, rates of wasting in children are reaching unprecedented levels around the globe, and costs are increasing for the vital commodities necessary for treatment. To respond to these trends, USAID is scaling up its ongoing support to its partners the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the UN World Food Program (WFP) for the treatment of both severe and moderate wasting in priority countries.

In July, USAID announced an unprecedented \$200 million global award to UNICEF to respond to extraordinary levels of severe malnutrition in children. This funding includes support for the procurement and delivery of Ready-to-use Therapeutic Food, the lifesaving product needed for treatment in the countries experiencing the most severe levels of food insecurity. USAID is also leveraging this commitment to increase resources from other philanthropic donors. Following USAID's announcement, several partner philanthropies announced a commitment of another \$50 million to address wasting globally. At the same time, the Administrator issued a call to action to additional donors to raise \$250 million by September.

Data demonstrates that women and girls are disproportionately impacted by food insecurity—they account for 60 percent of the 193 million people who are food insecure worldwide. There is a direct correlation between food insecurity and increasing cases of protection violations, as women and children are disproportionately affected and most at risk of being impacted by negative coping strategies. USAID considers protection services an integral and life-saving part of the food security response, including gender-based violence (GBV) prevention and response, child protection, and psychosocial support.

A key aspect of this response is addressing the gendered impacts of food insecurity by ensuring that GBV programming is prioritized from the outset of the response. USAID and the Department of State's Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM) made a commitment in 2013 with the *Safe from the Start initiative* to ensure that GBV is central to our efforts, as part of immediate and life-saving activities and during all humanitarian interventions, including famine and drought response. In addition to our lifesaving protection sector programming, USAID also has systems and protocols in place to ensure programming across all sectors is designed and delivered safely, to protect beneficiaries from sexual exploitation and abuse.

Question. Administrator Power, food security was a large focus of President Biden's recent trip to the Middle East. I welcome the Administration's recent partnership with India, Israel, and the UAE through the newly created I2U2 Group to combat growing food insecurity in the Middle East and beyond.

Administrator Power, given the rising level of need, what funding gaps does USAID anticipate facing? Do you expect funding shortfalls?

Answer. While generous supplemental resources allow USAID to meet the moment, we need to consider the out-year trajectory of the humanitarian and development accounts. USAID's Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance (BHA) anticipates obligating more than \$11.5 billion in humanitarian resources in FY 2022, and \$10 billion in FY 2023. USAID/BHA will program the balance of its supplemental International Disaster Assistance resources in early FY 2023 to sustain our emergency food security response through the end of the calendar year. Due to the anticipated carryover and expected appropriation levels for FY 2023, USAID projects a significant decrease in the resources available to support our humanitarian programming in comparison to this year. The amount of unmet global humanitarian need in 2022 is greater than the entire global humanitarian appeal was in 2019, and additional support from all humanitarian donors will be necessary to avoid funding shortfalls in the future. Meanwhile, USAID anticipates greater needs to sustain current Feed the Future agriculture-food security investments and to continue the substantial progress being made in achieving long-term food security gains, especially in areas with high levels of chronic extreme poverty and malnutrition. Nevertheless, USAID's Bureau for Resilience and Food Security (RFS) is anticipating an increase in overall populations falling into food insecurity and malnutrition due to the current crisis. The FY 2022 and 2023 Request included requests for \$1.05 billion and

\$1.06 billion for agriculture and food security programs respectively, \$40–\$45 million more than what was appropriated in FY 2021 and FY 2022. Regarding the ongoing global crisis, USAID is continuing to program FY 2022 Ukraine supplemental funds as quickly as feasible to address the needs precipitated by the current situation.

Question. What is USAID’s strategic plan for next year to address the ongoing crisis?

Answer. Our approach to combating this global food security crisis centers on actions to address the multiple causes of the crisis: climate extremes, COVID–19, and protracted conflicts, including the effects of Russia’s ongoing invasion of Ukraine. USAID is providing record amounts of immediate emergency assistance to the food insecure and the severely malnourished, in order to save lives and alleviate suffering—assistance that will continue throughout FY 2023. We are rallying countries, international organizations, and the private sector to mobilize resources to lessen the burden on poor countries, and avoid export restrictions on food that exacerbate global prices and the crisis overall. USAID is also investing in global agriculture and food systems that will help farmers boost their harvests, provide people with more affordable, safe and nutritious food, and help food insecure regions to be more resilient to future shocks.

Question. I’m extremely concerned about the devastating impact the global food crisis is having in Sri Lanka and the resulting political fallout.

What lines of support is the Administration considering to alleviate the immediate-term fuel and food shortages in the country?

Answer. USAID shares your concern about the worsening food security situation in Sri Lanka, particularly the agricultural situation and the decreasing purchasing power of Sri Lanka’s most vulnerable due to the economic crisis. In June, USAID provided approximately \$32 million to support Sri Lankans affected by the crisis, split in several categories detailed here.

On June 16, USAID provided \$6 million in emergency assistance from the Complex Crises Fund (CCF). Of that total, \$4.85 million will go toward providing technical assistance to Sri Lanka to implement economic and financial reforms designed to stabilize the economy, and support the implementation of an anticipated IMF Extended Fund Facility (EFF). The remainder of the funding, approximately \$1.15 million, will be provided to USAID Social Cohesion and Reconciliation activity (SCORE) to support small-scale agricultural productivity and microenterprises in communities that traditionally experience high poverty rates and are especially impacted by the crisis.

On June 21, USAID provided \$5.9 million in humanitarian assistance to provide emergency cash assistance and critical support for livelihoods and agriculture for approximately 125,000 people. With this funding, two of USAID’s NGO partners will implement programs to address needs that have been created and exacerbated by this complex emergency, while building the resilience of vulnerable communities by supporting disaster risk reduction and agriculture.

On June 28, USAID provided \$20 million to strengthen food security in Sri Lanka. This includes \$7 million for agricultural inputs and a school feeding program that will benefit more than 1 million Sri Lankan children; another \$7 million to support the nutrition of more than 110,000 pregnant and lactating women with food vouchers; and \$6 million in cash assistance and agriculture support—including the procurement and provision of fertilizer—to benefit nearly 30,000 farmers and increase food production in vulnerable Sri Lankan communities.

Fuel access remains a critical challenge, including for humanitarian relief organizations. While greater availability of fuel countrywide would support humanitarian operations in Sri Lanka, USAID’s humanitarian partners are still able to operate on the ground and provide assistance.

Question. Has the Administration determined yet whether the situation in Sri Lanka should result in a disaster declaration? What additional activities can the Administration undertake once a declaration is issued?

Answer. Following reports of rising humanitarian needs, including increasing food insecurity, USAID deployed a Humanitarian Advisor to Sri Lanka in mid-July to assess humanitarian conditions, coordinate with relief organizations and the Embassy, and determine next steps. The requirements for a Declaration of Humanitarian Need/Disaster Declaration (DHN/DD) are that: 1) there are significant unmet humanitarian needs in a country; 2) U.S. Government assistance will save lives or reduce human suffering; 3) the host country requests or will accept aid; and 4) responding to the disaster will fulfill both U.S. Government and humanitarian objectives. As of July 20, the U.S. Mission in Sri Lanka had not certified that the situa-

tion in Sri Lanka had met these criteria; however, if a DHN/DD is issued to provide additional humanitarian assistance, USAID's Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance (BHA) will work together with the Mission and other stakeholders to determine the best response option, which could include additional funding for humanitarian programs or technical assistance.

RESPONSES OF AMBASSADOR LINDA THOMAS-GREENFIELD TO QUESTIONS
SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JAMES E. RISCH

Question. Food as a Weapon: Putin has used food as a weapon by deliberately destroying agricultural goods and infrastructure, manipulating markets, blocking access by humanitarians, and ultimately starving innocent civilians to death in an attempt to advance his political and military objectives. The Hague Convention explicitly prohibits starvation of civilians as a method of warfare.

Should Putin be held accountable for his war crimes under the Hague Convention?

Answer. As Secretary Blinken has said, anyone and everyone responsible for war crimes committed in Ukraine should be held to account. There is a chain of command when it comes to any military, including Russia's. Assessing individual criminal liability is the responsibility of courts. In international criminal law, superiors may be responsible for crimes committed under their command. Criminal law tools could be used by a court that's able to exercise jurisdiction in this particular case. All of Russia's forces—from soldiers on the ground to generals giving orders to senior political and military leadership—must abide by their international humanitarian law obligations. There are doctrines under international law and many domestic laws that are able to reach up the chain of command.

President Putin and his government must be held to account for their actions and systematic abuses. For this reason, we are supporting Ukrainian and international efforts to collect, document, and preserve evidence of atrocities. At the recent G7 meeting, members spoke with one voice condemning Vladimir Putin's illegal war and noted, "Indiscriminate attacks on innocent civilians are war crimes. Russian President Putin and others responsible will be held accountable." We and our partners are committed to holding perpetrators of war crimes and other atrocities accountable.

Question. Please describe the specific actions you have taken at the U.N. to encourage member states to condemn Putin's war crimes and increase support for the Ukrainian people.

Answer. I have been proud to work in lockstep coordination with Ukraine, Allies, and partners to advance efforts across the U.N. system to expose and condemn Russia's actions and call on the international community to address the suffering caused by Russia's full-scale invasion. After Russia vetoed our U.N. Security Council (UNSC) resolution on Ukraine, we immediately called for an Emergency Special Session of the U.N. General Assembly (UNGA), which resulted in 141 countries voting to condemn Russia's illegal invasion of Ukraine on March 2. In early April, after I announced our support for suspending Russia's rights of membership in the U.N. Human Rights Council (HRC), the UNGA successfully passed the Ukraine-led resolution to do just that. The HRC adopted a resolution establishing a Commission of Inquiry (COI) into violations and abuses of human rights and violations of international humanitarian law in the context of Russia's aggression against Ukraine. Furthermore, the United States was part of the Core Group for the UNGA resolution on the humanitarian consequences of Russia's aggression and has tirelessly used its position on the UNSC to call out Russia and mobilize support for Ukraine.

Question. What efforts have you taken at the U.N. to counter Russian messaging and misinformation on the causes of the current food insecurity crisis?

Answer. The United States has seized multiple recent opportunities at the U.N. to counter Russia's false narrative that sanctions imposed by the United States and our allies are to blame for the global increase in food prices.

Global food security was a key priority of the U.S. Presidency of the U.N. Security Council in May, during which Secretary Blinken hosted over 40 countries for a Global Food Security Call to Action Ministerial. Senior U.S. officials, including U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack, U.S. Special Envoy for Global Food Security Cary Fowler, and Ambassador Jim O'Brien, Head of the Office of Sanctions Coordination, also continue to engage actively at the U.N., in capitals, and in the press to make clear that—contrary to Russia's claims—U.S. sanctions do not target Russian agri-

cultural or fertilizer exports. Our non-food sanctions will remain in place until Putin stops his brutal war of aggression against Ukraine.

Question. Humanitarian Corridors: As negotiations to reopen humanitarian corridors to Ukraine continue, including in relation to the Black Sea ports, do you commit to ensuring that Putin's efforts to leverage access to food for sanctions relief are unsuccessful?

Answer. I confirm that Russia will receive no sanctions relief from the United States in exchange for cooperation under the U.N.-led initiative to enable the safe export of grain from Ukraine. We will hold Russia accountable for its commitments under this agreement. Our outreach is making clear to the world that Russia's war on Ukraine, and Russia's self-imposed export quotas and restrictions, are what is keeping food and fertilizer from reaching the world's hungry.

Question. Please describe your efforts to secure additional humanitarian corridors.

Answer. The United States actively coordinates with partners to support the safe transit of civilians out of conflict areas, and the movement of humanitarian actors and supplies to areas in need. This includes the humanitarian notification system facilitated by U.N. OCHA, which notifies parties to the conflict of humanitarian missions into a conflict area.

The United States supports the EU's initiative to expand overland export routes for Ukrainian agricultural products, as well as re-establishing maritime grain exports, which began on August 1. Despite attacks on Odesa, we understand signatories of the July 22 arrangement continue to open Ukraine's Black Sea ports. The United States will hold Russia accountable for its commitments, and we will continue to work with international organizations and partners to secure additional humanitarian corridors.

RESPONSES OF MS. SAMANTHA POWER TO QUESTIONS
SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JAMES E. RISCH

Question. The President's budget proposal to reduce food aid at a time when needs are the highest in recorded history was accompanied by a vague reference to reforming the Food for Peace program. Food for Peace has served as America's flagship food aid program since 1964, but its success is hampered by arcane shipping requirements that unnecessarily drive up costs and slow deliveries.

Specifically, what reforms do you intend to propose to make the Food for Peace program more efficient and effective?

Should those reforms include a change to U.S. cargo preference requirements, which have outlived their useful purpose? If not, why not?

Do you commit to working with your authoring committees, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to socialize, negotiate, and enact urgently needed food aid reforms?

Answer. The reauthorization of the Farm Bill, at this time of global crisis, provides an unparalleled opportunity for Congress and USAID to work together to ensure the U.S. Government has the best tools at its disposal to meet the humanitarian challenges of the day. Given the scale of global food insecurity and the dynamic nature of its causes, it is imperative for USAID to fully optimize its food assistance programs and be able to employ the best food assistance modalities to respond to each context. During this reauthorization process, USAID will pursue technical legislative changes to the Food for Peace Act that will reduce administrative burden for new, small, or local partners; allow USAID to support increasingly expensive emergency response operations and quality non-emergency program design with Food for Peace Title II funds; streamline the award-making process; and improve flexibility between humanitarian funding streams to ensure that the most appropriate funding tool is used for every crisis.

Given record levels of global humanitarian need, USAID is supportive of all efforts to increase the speed and reduce the cost of providing life-saving assistance. While USAID is committed to compliance with all applicable U.S. laws and regulations, including the Cargo Preference Act (CPA), CPA requirements do increase the cost of life-saving emergency food assistance. For example, USAID pays approximately 25 percent more per metric ton (MT) to ship commodities on U.S.-flag vessels than foreign-flag vessels. To date in FY 2022, the average ocean rate per MT was \$182 for U.S.-flag vessels and \$147 for foreign-flag vessels. This is a significant cost differential, especially for a scaled humanitarian operation working to keep pace with unprecedented levels of global hunger. Additionally, in Fiscal Year 2021, USAID shipped 1.7 million MTs of food assistance overseas, with more than 75 per-

cent shipped on bulk vessels. However, USAID does not always receive offers from U.S.-flag vessels, in large part due to a lack of available ships that can meet the requirements of USAID's solicitations. There are currently only three eligible bulk vessels operating under the U.S. flag, and of the 1.7 million MTs of commodities that USAID solicited for in FY 2021, 42 percent did not receive a single U.S. flag offer. In these instances, USAID selects the best foreign flag bid to meet the needs of any given solicitation.

Yes, I commit to working with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and other stakeholders, to socialize, negotiate, and enact urgently needed food aid reforms.

Question. The U.S. signed the Lugano Declaration along with other governments in July 2022 to help Ukraine's reconstruction.

What is USAID's plan to partner with Ukraine to rebuild its agriculture sector and strengthen food security in the long-term?

Answer. Agriculture has been and still is the backbone of Ukraine's economy, accounting for nearly 20 percent of the country's GDP (once up and downstream sectors are accounted for) and more than 40 percent of total export revenues. The blockade of Ukraine's Black Sea ports, coupled with Russia's deliberate targeting of farms, grain storage facilities and machinery, has crippled Ukraine's farming and export economy—not only debilitating Ukraine's economy, but also worsening global food insecurity. In response to Russia's brutal invasion and reflecting the U.S. national interest in ensuring that Ukraine remains a sovereign, independent, and democratic state able to withstand Russia's aggression, USAID established the \$100 million Agriculture Resilience Initiative (AGRI) to respond to the decimation of Ukraine's agriculture sector, including the impacts to agricultural exports and help stabilize the global impacts to food security. USAID also seeks to raise an additional \$150 million for the Initiative from fellow donors and the private sector with an overall target of \$250 million.

AGRI-Ukraine was specifically designed to be flexible, fluid, and locally-led in a way that accounts for the rapidly evolving challenges facing Ukrainian farmers. We work with a range of agriculture associations, the Ministry of Agrarian Policy and Food and the Ministry of Infrastructure, and the farmers themselves to assess and respond to their needs, in addition to coordination with the private sector and other interagency and international partners. In responding to Ukraine's immediate agricultural export crisis, AGRI-Ukraine will act as a foundational building block for the preservation and reconstruction of Ukraine's agricultural sector.

USAID's other agriculture program, the long-term Agriculture Growing Rural Opportunities (AGRO) activity, takes a comprehensive, balanced approach that responds to the most critical sector needs to rebuild and strengthen Ukrainian farmers' abilities to increase global and domestic food security for years ahead. AGRO will ensure that Ukraine's agriculture sector is successfully integrated into competitive markets in Ukraine and internationally in the years to come. Among other activities, AGRO supports initiatives aimed at improving production; establishing partnerships among MSMEs (manufacturers and processors); and developing access to sales networks in domestic and foreign markets.

Question. Recognizing the acute need for shelter, medicine, and food both in and beyond Ukraine, Congress approved nearly \$10 billion in humanitarian and food aid through two separate emergency packages—one in March 2022 and another in May 2022—but the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) has failed to deliver aid quickly. USAID has not yet delivered or even committed all the funding from the first package, and has elected to hold more than half of the funding from the second package until the next fiscal year.

Please describe any roadblocks or impediments that contributed to the delayed implementation.

Answer. USAID is working at record speed and scale to move a historic \$7 billion in supplemental International Disaster Assistance (IDA) funding to address humanitarian needs from the global food security crisis and inside Ukraine. USAID staff are moving an unprecedented amount of funding as quickly, strategically, and responsibly as possible, consistent with U.S. law and policy. In the days leading up to the enactment of the second supplemental, USAID immediately began planning and prioritizing required actions for the additional funds. USAID made funding allocations within a week of the bill's signing and shared those decisions with program teams immediately so that they could solicit and process grant applications. To move funding as quickly as possible, USAID is infusing money into existing awards, with a focus on public international organization (PIO) partners that have the capacity to scale quickly. We are also working with non-governmental organizations

(NGOs) to design essential multi-sectoral programming. This type of programming is critical to famine prevention, but takes additional time to design. To date, USAID has already programmed more than \$2 billion from the first Ukraine supplemental and more than \$2.1 billion from the second Ukraine supplemental—nearly \$4.2 billion more than USAID’s baseline humanitarian programming—in just the few short months since the supplemental bills passed in March and May of 2022. USAID plans to program the majority of the remainder by the end of calendar year 2022, to enable a strategic, multi-sectoral, and sustained response to this long-term crisis.

Question. Please describe USAID’s intent and/or plan to utilize its existing authorities to hire more Contracting and Agreement Officers (CO) to expedite the movement of humanitarian aid to Ukraine and countries affected by Russia’s war in Ukraine.

Answer. USAID’s Office of Acquisition and Assistance (OAA) provides contracting officer support to the Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance (BHA) and all other USAID bureaus and missions. BHA does not make decisions about the allocation of contracting officers within the Agency. Over the past year, OAA has increased the number of contracting officers supporting BHA’s work from 2 to 5 and surged contracting officer staff to support the obligation of food security and Ukraine supplemental funding to help expedite critical humanitarian assistance awards. BHA continues to communicate with OAA on its anticipated workload and identifying where additional support is needed. BHA is also increasing contractor support so that it can process more awards more quickly. Given the supplemental funding that has increased BHA’s obligation level by 40 percent this year, USAID has surged additional resources to BHA to help ensure critical humanitarian assistance awards are completed before the end of the fiscal year.

Question. Please describe USAID’s efforts to mitigate the severe CO shortage within the Bureau of Humanitarian Affairs (BHA) and efforts to transfer or supplement BHA with more COs permanently.

Answer. To address the longer-term issue of OAA support to BHA, USAID is also engaging with the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to improve benefits to help recruit additional Contracting Officers. USAID is currently recruiting to fill additional CO vacancies.

Question. Please describe USAID’s timetable, in writing, to obligate and deliver Congressionally-approved commodity-based food aid, including accompanying data and an explanation of why such lifesaving aid may take 6–12 months to deliver.

Answer. After an award has been signed, USAID’s timeline for procuring and shipping Food for Peace Title II funded commodities is approximately 4–6 months. For packaged Title II commodities, it takes approximately 6 months from procurement to delivery to the discharge port. For bulk commodities, the total timeline ranges from 4–5 months. Packaged commodity deliveries take longer due to the time needed for manufacturing, packaging, and transportation to the U.S. load port. Commodity deliveries can sometimes be expedited when stocks are available in USAID’s food aid prepositioning warehouses. Stocks in the prepositioning warehouses are available for immediate release following signature of an award. Food aid prepositioning warehouses are located in Houston, TX; Djibouti, Djibouti; and Durban, South Africa.

Question. How much of the Ukraine supplemental funding has gone to long-term agricultural development and food assistance programming in Ukraine?

Answer. USAID will allocate \$128 million from the two Ukraine supplemental funding bills for agricultural development in Ukraine. Of this, \$28 million will go towards our long-term programs, which will rebuild and strengthen Ukrainian farmers’ abilities to increase global and domestic food security for years ahead by ensuring that Ukraine’s agriculture sector is successfully integrated into competitive markets in Ukraine and internationally. Among other activities, this funding supports initiatives aimed at improving production; establishing partnerships among MSMEs (manufacturers and processors); developing access to sales networks in domestic and foreign markets; and increasing MSME farmers’ access to finance. The remainder, \$100 million, will go to the immediate crisis caused by Russia’s war and Black Sea blockade, and will act as a foundational building block for the long-term agricultural development and reconstruction of Ukraine’s agricultural sector. Of the total \$128 million, \$49 million was notified through Congressional Notification (CN) #148; \$20 million through CN #177; and the remainder will be notified shortly in a new CN.

Through supplemental IDA resources, USAID is funding international NGO and U.N. partners to distribute in-kind food and cash assistance, which helps people fleeing active fighting, households who have lost income sources due to conflict, and

other conflict-affected populations access the food they need. BHA has provided nearly \$242 million in emergency food assistance funding towards the Ukraine humanitarian response. Between February 24 and July 1, USAID's partner, the World Food Program (WFP), has reached more than 8 million people impacted by Russia's War in Ukraine with emergency food assistance and multipurpose cash assistance. USAID is also funding WFP, the International Organization for Migration (IOM), and NGO partners with nearly \$343 million in multi-purpose cash assistance to help people meet their basic needs—including purchasing food—in areas where markets and banks are operational.

Question. Research and innovation are critical to enhancing food security.

As we work to reauthorize the Global Food Security Act, please describe how USAID is working to expand public-private partnerships that deliver enduring results, such as the Global Biotech Potato Partnership Activity.

Answer. Thank you for your leadership on the reauthorization of the Global Food Security Act. Through Feed the Future programming, USAID works hand-in-hand with the private sector to design, create and finance solutions that reduce poverty, fight hunger and improve nutrition across the globe. Our private sector partners are thought leaders who help increase country and market capacities, drive inclusive economic growth and achieve more sustainable outcomes at scale. By collaborating with the private sector, Feed the Future helps male and female entrepreneurs, especially small-to-medium enterprises and local business owners, generate income and opportunity in their communities.

USAID champions private sector engagement as a means to innovate and deliver value at scale. U.S.-based companies, like J.R. Simplot and Corteva Agriscience, provide proven innovations in partner countries that help solve practical problems and then work closely with local industry and partners to facilitate widespread adoption and agriculture-led growth. Under the Feed the Future Global Biotech Potato Partnership, for example, Idaho-based J.R. Simplot is sharing innovative technologies that increase potato disease resistance with a consortium of U.S. universities and public research institutes located across Southeast Asia and Africa to improve the productivity and resilience of potato farmers.

Building on a long track record of success, private sector engagement (PSE) has been elevated as an Agency-wide priority and implemented through a set of core principles and practices:

- Early and ongoing engagement with local and international private-sector actors is vital to achieving better outcomes. This allows us to benefit from the perspective and knowledge of private-sector stakeholders, identify market-based approaches, and understand the role of the private sector and its barriers to investment and greater collaboration with local stakeholders.
- Integration of private sector engagement throughout program planning and at every stage of product research, development and dissemination. While large companies have the capacity to work across the entire value chain, USAID focuses on strengthening markets that are less mature and connected. This requires us to engage many small producers and businesses and link them together to expand production and commercialization.
- Applying a broad range of approaches and tools to unlock the potential of the private sector in achieving more effective and sustainable outcomes. This ranges from information sharing; joint research and learning; harnessing private sector expertise, innovation and resources; and collaborating to strengthen the enabling environment, such as regulatory reforms, to make markets more transparent and predictable.
- In alignment with the Agriculture Innovation Mission for Climate (AIM4C), USAID is encouraging partnerships with the private sector that advance AIM4C's goal of increasing investments in research, development and deployment for climate-smart food systems. This includes working with U.S. companies and research institutions to advance climate-smart food systems, including partnerships with multinational companies to ensure improved rice seeds are used in developing countries or with fertilizer companies and research institutions to improve yields and decrease misuse of fertilizer.
- USAID collaborates directly with U.S.-based and multinational companies to provide customized technical assistance to strengthen the local food processing sector. This technical assistance is focused on working with small and medium enterprises, which are the backbone of local economies, to improve productivity, food safety practices, and nutritional quality of foods produced.

Through a collaborative relationship with the private sector, we are able to bring more resources, better solutions, and more sustainability and scale to the work we do. Regardless of the role, private sector considerations are part of every programming effort, as these partnerships are critical for delivery of enduring results. We have therefore institutionalized PSE as a core tenet of USAID's operating model.

RESPONSES OF MR. DAVID BEASLEY TO QUESTIONS
SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JAMES E. RISCH

Question. Director Beasley: In your written testimony, you said “we urgently need a political solution to reopen these ports” and “in truth, instead of exporting food to help feed entire countries, the conflict means that Ukraine is now being forced to export hunger.”

Do you acknowledge that Vladimir Putin is using food as a weapon in his war against Ukraine and, that by blocking the production and export of Ukraine's agricultural commodities, Russia is “exporting global hunger”?

Answer. I have said over and over that failure to open the Odessa Ports is a declaration of war on global food security and I have message clearly to President Putin that failure to open the ports will bring famine to nations around the world. It is clear that the conflict in Ukraine is having an extremely negative impact upon Ukraine's ability to feed its people and to produce and export agricultural commodities. It is also clear that the blockade of Ukrainian ports was depriving the global market of a significant percentage of global grains and oils thereby reducing global availability and raising global prices to an extent that was creating hardship and hunger in many countries. As I stated in my testimony, I have been clear with my Russian counterparts that, to ensure they are not perceived as using food as a weapon they should support the opening of the Odessa port. I was very pleased to learn that just 2 days after my briefing to your committee an agreement was reached to reopen the port. Already, global grain markets have stabilized and Ukrainian grain is now being exported.

Question. Do you also agree that using food as a weapon of war is, in fact, a war crime?

Answer. WFP works to combat hunger. I would defer to experts in international criminal law to determine what constitutes a war crime.

Question. The United States has provided robust funding in response to the global food security crisis. Please describe your efforts to increase other donor governments' participation in providing their fair share.

Answer. I have always believed that the donor community must work together to address global humanitarian needs—including by sharing the financial burden. I have traveled extensively throughout my tenure at WFP to all donor capitals to press for increased contributions to WFP from policy makers, private sector companies and from extensive media outreach. What we have proved is that as leaders understand the causes and effects of hunger, they have deepened their commitment to WFP.

During my tenure we have seen increased contributions from most of WFP's traditional government donors, even during the COVID-19 crisis. In addition to the generous support from the United States, Germany in particular has become a much more robust donor over the past 7 years, increasing their support from \$329 million in 2015 to \$1.4 billion in 2022. Attached is the record of all WFP's donors from 2017-2021 showing annual contributions by donor, along with 2022 grants received to date. The Gulf region should be given particular note and concern. With oil prices bringing record revenues and at the same time negatively impacting fertilizer costs and severe impacts on farmers, large and small, at a minimum the Gulf States should be funding the humanitarian needs of their region.

Over the past 5 years I have also prioritized diversifying WFP's revenues, knowing that we cannot end hunger without ending poverty, which requires deeper engagement and partnership with the private sector. To this end, I reorganized the management of our private sector team, and worked closely with business leaders to get them involved in this effort. The results speak for themselves: increases from \$80 million in 2017 to \$496 million in 2021. I am convinced that WFP's long-term success can only be achieved with deeper partnerships with the private sector.

Finally, we have significantly increased our partnership with International Financial Institutions such as the World Bank. We have seen contributions grow over the years from \$3 million in 2017 to \$478 million in 2021¹. We anticipate funding of \$1 billion by the close of 2022 and the trend to upward continue in the coming years.

Note

¹Contributions from the World Bank in some cases are given directly to host governments then channeled to WFP. For accounting purposes the contribution is credited from whichever entity make the direct payment, so within WFP's attached donor list, World Bank figures will appear differently.

Contributions to WFP: Comparative Figures (Ranked by 2022)

As of 09/08/2022

		Contributions from 2017 to 2022					
		(all figures in US\$)					
2022 Rank ¹	Donor	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
1	USA	2,509,840,729	2,534,393,472	3,366,678,334	3,654,938,484	3,786,049,659	4,704,887,502
2	Germany	916,664,496	849,087,647	886,654,000	1,179,734,139	1,413,997,468	440,413,639
3	European Commission	376,781,794	1,111,644,672	685,890,294	537,303,487	497,938,815	370,908,732
4	Canada	195,771,336	218,317,147	189,743,634	244,020,238	313,342,498	359,881,571
5	" Private Donors	84,019,349	83,512,455	100,983,818	160,664,796	493,695,029	353,660,821
6	United Kingdom	587,703,048	615,431,020	696,351,632	548,971,792	376,260,054	272,786,254
7	Japan	175,670,017	130,057,648	157,578,035	196,129,647	226,187,020	215,580,885
8	Sweden	115,834,702	145,460,993	158,727,778	194,938,628	173,500,864	179,463,905
9	UN Other Funds and Agencies (excl. CERF)	85,550,661	151,435,292	158,381,909	201,203,531	149,487,387	148,188,885
10	UN CERF	143,190,918	138,632,047	148,646,783	243,514,113	115,224,117	141,402,040
11	Asian Development Bank	-	-	-	-	-	135,000,000
12	Norway	99,940,123	90,103,024	88,677,480	98,375,104	162,903,799	124,703,790
13	World Bank	3,150,000	299,729	270,000	3,353,548	272,581,274	100,250,000
14	Australia	65,137,854	71,018,161	72,693,507	53,202,279	105,337,156	90,602,738
15	Switzerland	69,401,318	80,225,737	79,604,267	94,193,986	112,572,109	82,879,830
16	United Arab Emirates	5,114,296	226,215,581	272,012,640	4,266,468	18,310,317	72,358,775
17	Republic of Korea	33,839,341	68,071,925	74,955,057	88,608,313	83,568,649	68,396,051
18	France	32,789,882	27,121,738	21,687,830	32,502,071	83,759,498	60,225,724
19	Denmark	68,309,978	56,201,038	69,379,943	55,968,631	55,898,134	45,876,226
20	Haiti	-	-	-	60,202,519	23,945,127	42,000,000
21	Italy	35,509,512	35,565,478	30,852,940	37,080,474	58,614,693	32,120,554
22	Bangladesh	4,370,704	154,027	3,914,540	43,219,008	3,417,542	30,007,010
23	Ireland	32,430,259	28,191,994	34,183,610	35,870,557	45,390,186	29,841,949
24	India	1,006,389	1,006,389	2,002,111	989,662	1,205,089	20,710,613
25	Burkina Faso	-	-	-	-	5,036,220	20,000,000
26	Finland	24,988,609	16,127,967	15,472,960	28,523,703	31,336,168	19,099,382
27	Colombia	20,476,922	462,123	31,148,489	13,720,888	21,913,612	14,890,692
28	Pakistan	19,625,573	15,624,259	5,323,326	13,606,005	204,118,483	14,801,942
29	Congo D.R.	-	-	5,146,451	3,000,000	-	14,364,977

30	Honduras	4.223.965	26.853.243	19.672.789	342.460	4.810	13.337.556
31	New Zealand	7.540.879	5.661.439	5.398.751	7.607.612	9.605.789	11.135.887
32	Russian Federation	33.700.000	44.882.539	36.943.000	72.655.611	62.590.000	10.560.006
33	Netherlands	80.325.978	71.577.851	59.150.234	66.265.789	53.958.609	10.541.783
34	Luxembourg	9.125.818	11.318.615	11.124.225	12.148.957	16.783.104	9.478.537
35	Gambia	91.517	-	1.840.000	1.344.303	3.118.797	7.483.256
36	Belgium	23.135.920	16.053.224	24.336.131	32.412.033	30.736.714	6.067.981
37	Saudi Arabia	8.300.087	247.907.959	396.676.344	150.005.814	114.800.081	5.673.338
38	Qatar	2.505.973	3.242.000	3.363.050	-	90.000.000	5.239.550
39	Peru	-	494.603	602.188	293.627	1.130.255	4.750.348
40	The Central African Republic	-	-	-	-	3.500.000	4.100.000
41	Iceland	2.634.361	1.544.686	1.852.473	2.384.261	2.243.426	3.359.625
42	China	73.907.376	32.644.030	30.544.781	11.649.031	26.455.992	3.160.181
43	Spain	4.703.247	6.010.271	6.378.680	6.793.673	6.654.836	2.738.226
44	Philippines	10.000	36.911	3.926.740	3.233.821	50.000	2.050.000
45	Kuwait	5.500.000	51.000.000	31.375.084	100.000	200.000	2.000.000
46	Cambodia	1.227.000	1.227.000	3.335.500	-	-	1.754.907
47	Cote D'Ivoire The Republic Of	248.202	-	1.500.000	1.500.000	1.661.001	1.612.138
48	Timor Leste	-	210.000	-	121.786	100.000	1.500.000
49	Monaco	911.412	719.693	888.421	1.536.609	1.491.986	1.432.361
50	El Salvador	331.644	-	752.476	1.438.000	910.000	1.335.900
51	Malawi	4.629.723	-	-	295.000	-	1.325.000
52	Lesotho	-	6.408.237	-	-	-	1.300.000
53	Czech Republic	381.632	189.573	607.013	747.789	722.874	1.128.283
54	Malaysia	1.000.000	1.000.000	1.000.000	1.000.000	1.000.000	1.000.000
55	Bolivia	-	200.000	-	946.928	325.850	972.834
56	Zimbabwe	-	-	-	-	-	825.718
57	Poland	1.095.085	397.709	249.095	383.248	548.550	624.811
58	Tajikistan Government of the Republic of	-	-	-	-	-	444.580
59	Guinea Bissau	240.339	264.232	-	-	6.765.343	410.950
60	Kyrgyzstan	-	-	-	-	-	400.000
61	Egypt	386.958	-	386.000	3.057.926	388.633	384.484
62	Brazil	10.731.112	444.977	427.279	6.753.788	215.765	306.306
63	Liechtenstein	401.879	401.242	352.217	535.585	279.159	283.924
64	Slovenia	102.734	57.248	56.117	85.708	325.327	264.741
65	The Togolese Republic	-	-	-	-	1.080.038	157.736
66	Slovakia	15.000	261.914	15.000	15.000	15.000	136.674
67	Panama	135.750	179.199	179.199	179.199	178.198	135.750

68	Greece	-	-	10.516	35.842	116.550	133.929
69	Cyprus	4.269	4.717	4.510	79.140	82.888	129.032
70	Micronesia Federated States	-	-	-	-	-	100.000
71	Estonia	230.541	151.564	167.630	59.737	445.889	56.306
72	Bulgaria	59.032	-	61.422	65.336	162.073	54.348
73	Thailand	205.871	101.165	274.164	162.024	269.840	45.059
74	Malta	-	28.409	22.548	70.146	42.157	26.399
75	The Kingdom Of Eswatini	-	-	-	463.890	15.756	24.731
76	Development Bank of Latin America	-	-	-	-	-	24.000
77	Hungary	1.147.656	10.000	10.000	120.000	20.000	20.000
77	Armenia	101.996	95.135	44.506	40.672	89.567	20.000
77	Chile	20.000	20.000	-	20.000	20.000	20.000
80	Mexico	1.000.000	-	-	-	-	5.805
	Somalia	-	-	-	92.000.000	158.694.834	-
	Benin	5.899.081	44.965.084	18.823.293	13.204.033	8.833.442	-
	Green Climate Fund	-	-	-	21.156.459	28.952.600	-
	Mozambique	12.140.000	-	16.000.000	11.804.354	8.000.000	-
	African Dev Bank	3.000.000	43.400.944	-	-	686.000	-
	South Sudan	25.750.000	5.066.242	-	-	-	-
	Liberia	-	-	-	30.000.000	-	-
	Austria	533.618	1.875.541	4.830.322	4.454.244	17.910.458	-
	Mali	2.732.281	-	1.316.790	12.500.000	11.495.510	-
	Chad	-	-	-	22.000.000	2.209.663	-
	Burundi	1.517.660	8.476.285	4.833.492	2.520.726	5.943.941	-
	Afghanistan	-	17.096.948	903.177	-	-	-
	Niger	3.512.081	2.516.992	1.108.255	-	2.646.770	-
	Nigeria	5.622.496	794.835	-	1.131.649	1.000.000	-
	Dominican Republic	-	2.087.225	-	919.012	5.285.412	-
	Sierra Leone The Republic Of	526.210	1.103.769	4.891.304	1.128.100	-	-
	Ghana	-	5.323.737	-	300.000	1.500.000	-
	South Africa	3.690.329	594.307	1.076.040	182.142	247.577	-
	Nicaragua	20.000	195.087	107.032	119.388	5.019.000	-
	Lebanon	-	-	-	-	3.787.416	-
	Senegal	-	-	-	1.003.111	2.763.000	-
	Angola	-	-	-	3.355.643	-	-
	Nepal	538.800	445.049	936.056	620.146	739.227	-
	Uganda	-	-	2.753.412	-	-	-
	Mauritania	-	-	-	-	2.391.304	-

Guinea The Republic Of	-	367.294	-	1.288.737	-	-
OPEC Fund for International Development	1.100.000	535.561	-	-	-	-
Cameroon	-	-	-	1.620.198	-	-
Republic of Zambia	1.124.466	273.128	-	-	4.361	-
Indonesia	-	-	-	-	1.198.061	-
Madagascar	800.000	394.661	-	-	-	-
Tanzania	360.378	-	386.422	-	312.778	-
Portugal	263.651	69.737	121.888	278.610	201.441	-
ECONWAS	565.000	-	-	-	355.200	-
Namibia	-	499.876	-	405.746	-	-
Ethiopia	742.359	-	-	-	-	-
Intl Committee of The Red Cross	582.537	-	-	-	-	-
Faroe Islands	200.000	-	-	-	309.153	-
Tunisia	-	-	-	493.091	-	-
Romania	-	60.386	-	119.474	291.134	-
Guatemala	150.045	151.187	149.932	-	-	-
Laos	-	447.880	-	-	-	-
African Union	-	-	440.000	-	-	-
Croatia	-	50.000	25.000	117.371	200.000	-
Korea Dpr	-	370.105	-	-	-	-
Republic of Congo	140.790	-	18.049	208.771	-	-
Andorra	48.655	58.766	62.532	41.525	61.846	-
Israel	20.000	20.000	20.000	170.000	38.000	-
Lithuania	50.113	35.088	-	27.996	116.279	-
Djibouti	-	217.000	-	-	-	-
Org Int Francophonie	-	-	-	-	200.000	-
Kenya	6.246	178.518	-	-	-	-
Sudan	180.000	-	-	-	-	-
Sao Tome And Principe	-	-	-	-	148.559	-
Paises De Língua Portuguesa	-	-	112.000	-	-	-
Türkiye	-	106.647	-	-	-	-
Inter American Dev Bank	100.000	-	-	-	-	-
The Republic Of Fiji	-	-	-	43.932	25.959	-
Argentina	50.000	-	-	-	-	-
Mauritius	-	-	-	-	50.000	-
Viet Nam	-	-	50.000	-	-	-
Kazakhstan	10.000	10.000	-	20.000	7.000	-
Sri Lanka	8.151	6.954	6.889	6.756	6.282	-

Holy See	-	-	-	27,996	-	-
Bhutan	5,056	-	9,958	4,000	-	-
ICRISAT	-	-	-	-	7,000	-
	6,059,430,750	7,363,735,784	8,049,481,292	8,438,345,612	9,546,335,031	8,325,357,406

Note: bilateral contributions are excluded. * Report is sorted by 2022 ranking, or in the case that no 2022 contribution is received, by total contributions since 2017. ** Private contributions do not include extraordinary gifts-in-kind.

RESPONSES OF MS. SAMANTHA POWER TO QUESTIONS
SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JOHN BARRASSO

Question. On May 11, 2022, I asked you why it has taken USAID, at that time, 2 months to get food assistance to Ukraine. USAID is taking months to deliver food aid to countries in need. There are estimates that the aid could take 6 months to deliver.

How much of the approved food assistance to Ukraine has been delivered?

Answer. Food is broadly available in Ukraine, and humanitarian intervention has focused on improving access to existing food since the onset of the crisis. To improve access to food, USAID has worked closely with implementing partners to ensure those impacted by Russia's war in Ukraine have access to food vouchers and cash. Additionally, some direct provision of food has been necessary in areas directly impacted by conflict where food is not available; however, the majority of that food has been obtained inside Ukraine. Externally sourced emergency food items, such as 239 metric tons (MT) of high energy biscuits (HEBs), were imported by the World Food Program (WFP) to supplement available food items in areas experiencing extreme duress.

Question. How long did it take to get the assistance to Ukraine?

Answer. Food was and remains largely available in Ukraine. Beginning in early March, NGOs were able to quickly distribute cash and vouchers to individuals specifically to acquire food inside Ukraine with USAID funding following Russia's invasion on February 24. USAID supports cash and vouchers for food assistance, which can often reach people in need much more rapidly than the importation of food commodities and is a more appropriate modality when food is available locally. In Ukraine, USAID has provided \$10.1 million in cash and voucher assistance specifically for food. Additionally, USAID made the 239 MT of HEBs available to WFP in late April and the biscuits began to arrive in Ukraine in early July.

Question. Why has the distribution of the aid been drawn out to this extent?

Answer. The distribution of humanitarian aid in Ukraine has experienced some delays, primarily resulting from active conflict impacting safe access to areas with people in need. In addition, many humanitarian organizations operating inside Ukraine continue to experience widespread staffing challenges for a variety of reasons, including a decreased pool of available qualified staff, the possibility of military conscription by the Government of Ukraine of Ukrainian men aged 18–60 who are employed by humanitarian non-governmental organization, and ongoing visa challenges for international staff due to the non-multiple entry 90-day visa restrictions. However, provision of food assistance via cash and vouchers as well as emergency food was an early successful intervention. USAID strives to provide timely humanitarian assistance through strategic partnerships to organizations able to provide consistent resources to those impacted by the conflict.

Question. When will the remaining allocations be delivered?

Answer. USAID expects any food imported to Ukraine via our programming will be to supplement the existing pipeline, therefore it is expected to arrive in several tranches throughout the conflict to ensure food is consistently available.

Question. Was the goal of the World Food Program reaching 7 million people in Ukraine met by the end of June?

Answer. WFP exceeded its goal, reaching more than 7 million people in Ukraine by late June.

Question. The Biden administration announced it was taking emergency measures to liquidate the \$282 million Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust to procure U.S. food

commodities for countries in need. In addition, USAID announced it will cost \$388 million to cover the transportation of the food aid to Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan, South Sudan, and Yemen. To be clear, the Biden administration is spending \$106 million more for transportation than they are spending on actual food.

What is this the quickest and most cost effective way to deliver food to those in need?

What are you doing to fix this?

Answer. The Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust (BEHT) allows USAID's Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance (BHA) to respond to unanticipated food assistance needs when other resources authorized under Title II of the Food for Peace Act are not available. Once released, BEHT resources take on the authorities of Title II funding, but they can only be used for the purchase of U.S. agricultural commodities. The balance of the BEHT was \$282 million when the drawdown occurred. Given rising fuel and transportation costs, partially driven by Russia's war in Ukraine and the lingering market impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, the total cost to move and distribute \$282 million worth of U.S. agricultural commodities from the United States to beneficiaries in Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan, South Sudan, and Yemen was \$388 million. The U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) financed these costs, per the provisions of the BEHT Act, which included ocean freight transportation, inland transport, internal transport, shipping and handling, and other costs associated with programming the BEHT commodities.

Transportation costs for commodities grown in the United States have always been a significant portion of the Title II food assistance program. There are opportunities to improve the cost effectiveness of U.S. food assistance. Specifically, the reauthorization of the Food for Peace Act as part of the Farm Bill, at this time of global crisis, provides an unparalleled opportunity for Congress and USAID to work together to ensure the U.S. Government has the best tools at its disposal to meet the humanitarian challenges of the day. Given the scale of global food insecurity and the dynamic nature of its causes, it is imperative that USAID fully optimize its food assistance programs and be able to employ the best food assistance modalities to respond to each context. During this reauthorization process, USAID will pursue technical legislative changes to the Food for Peace Act to reduce administrative burden for new, small, or local partners; allow USAID to support increasingly expensive emergency response operations and quality nonemergency program design with Title II funds; streamline the award-making process; and improve flexibility between humanitarian funding streams to ensure that the most appropriate funding tool is used for every crisis.

In addition to opportunities through the reauthorization of the Food for Peace Act, there are additional opportunities to maximize the reach of U.S. food aid programs through other legislative vehicles. As Russia's aggression in Ukraine drives up fuel prices, the cost of delivering humanitarian assistance continues to rise, particularly in terms of the cost of shipping aid overseas. Due to statutory requirements in the Cargo Preference Act (CPA), USAID is required to ship at least 50 percent of all tonnage on U.S. flagged vessels. While USAID is committed to CPA compliance, it does generate significant costs for life-saving food assistance. On average, USAID pays approximately 25 percent more per metric ton (MT) to ship commodities on U.S.-flag vessels than foreign-flag vessels. In addition, in many cases, the U.S.-flag fleet cannot currently meet USAID's needs due to a lack of available ships. In FY 2021, USAID shipped 1.7 million metric tons of food assistance overseas and more than 75 percent of those cargoes were shipped on bulk vessels. Today, there are only three U.S.-flag bulk vessels. These are significant inefficiencies, especially for a humanitarian operation working to keep pace with unprecedented levels of global hunger.

Question. An increase or fluctuation in the price of energy is a factor in the driving up of food prices and will lead to instability. The fallout creates higher costs for agricultural inputs.

To what extent is the energy crisis responsible for the global food security crisis?

Answer. When the crisis began to unfold back in March, USAID worked with the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and other partners to identify how high fuel, fertilizer, and fuel prices would impact our global food security work.

When examining the impact of high global commodity prices, a 19 country IFPRI study indicates that high fuel prices, like the cost of imported oil, and high fertilizer prices, rather than high food prices, are the primary drivers of increased poverty and hunger. This modeling concluded that across these 19 countries an additional 26 million people would be pushed into poverty and an additional 21 million would become chronically hungry. Meanwhile, high food prices, especially the high cost of

edible oils, are expected to drive significant declines in the quality of household diets. This analysis is publicly available *here* (<https://www.agrilinks.org/activities/ifpri-analyses-country-level-impacts-high-food-fuel-and-fertilizer-prices>).

Higher prices for food, fertilizer, and fuel have led to shortages. In the case of fertilizer, many farmers do not have access or the ability to purchase the fertilizer they need. This will only exacerbate the current crisis because this will reduce food production over the next harvest.

That is why, with the generous support of Congress, we are focused on three global lines of effort to help rapidly address the crisis: mitigating the global fertilizer shortage; increasing investments in agricultural capacity and resilience; and cushioning the macroeconomic shock and impact on poor people to ensure this crisis does not become locked in.

