Food for Peace Program

Concerns and Areas for Improvement: 2013 Senate Farm Bill (S. 954)

The proposal includes numerous provisions which direct additional funds to administrative activities, at the expense of the core mission: Purchasing and delivering life-sustaining food aid commodities to the food insecure throughout the world.
Following fresh increases for administrative costs for PVOs ("202(e) expenses") in the 2008 Farm Bill, the new Senate proposal would provide another increase <i>of</i> 2% diversion of funds, diverting up to 15% or \$219 million of program funding based upon the FY 2012 appropriation of \$1.46 billion. (Section 3001)
In Sections 3008(c) and 3201(c), provides <i>additional</i> authority to divert funding away from commodity procurement to pay "the costs of up to 20 percent of activities conducted in recipient countries" incurred by PVOs and the UN World Food Program. The potential diversion of funding here is open-ended and a concern.
Section 3207 includes a new, permanent Local and Regional Purchase ("LRP") program authorized at \$240 million over the term of a four-year Farm Bill (\$60 million annually):
■ LRP programs are cash transfers overseas, in lieu of exported U.S. food aid.
 Already, \$300 million or more is consistently available through the Emergency Food Security Program (EFSP), funded under the Foreign Operations Disaster Assistance Account, for LRP.
■ There is no reason to divert Agriculture funding away from U.S. food aid programs to duplicate the authority that already exists for foreign cash give-away programs already up and running in the EFSP.
Each of the foregoing proposals diverts precious funding away from the core mission of getting wholesome U.S. commodities to those in need, while also decreasing the benefits for U.S. farmers that participate in the program and cutting cargoes badly needed for the sustainment of the U.Sflag merchant fleet.
The Senate proposal would also undermine the important Food for Peace "Developmental" or "Non-Emergency" Programs by permitting the Administration to again divert the majority of Food for Peace funding to from them toward Emergencies and imposing unrealistic cost-recovery requirements on the Developmental Programs. (Sections 3007, 3011, & 3201).
■ The Food for Peace Developmental programs are essential to making Food for Peace a "hand up, not a hand-out."
■ Emergency funding is already available through the EFSP/Disaster Assistance Account and

Developmental cargoes are also very important to the U.S.-flag fleet because they provide a steady, reliable source of cargoes that maintain both the merchant mariner and vessel

capacity in a way that sporadic surges of "emergency" cargoes alone cannot.



the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust (BEHT).