



5-1. G7 Progress on Food Security and Nutrition

G7 countries have made substantial and continuous contributions in agriculture, food security and nutrition during the period of the MDGs. In the last decade (2005-2014), the amount of G7 countries' commitments aiming at food and nutrition security increased by 48% from USD 3.7 billion in 2005 to USD 5.5 billion in 2014¹.

Although the proportion of undernourished people in the developing regions has fallen by almost half since 1990¹, 795 million people are still suffering from undernourishment (chronic hunger) globally, and the majority of them, 780 million people, live in developing regions in 2014-16². The number of children under five years old affected by stunting in the world has been on the decline, but it still remains around 159 million in 2014³. Against this background, the G7, recognizing that ending hunger and achieving food security, as well as ending all forms of malnutrition, are essential to the fulfillment of the 2030 Agenda, will further accelerate its efforts based on the progress made.

5-2. G7 Progress on L'Aquila Food Security Initiative

The G7 and other donors have made good progress on the L'Aquila Food Security Initiative (AFSI), which was launched as a global effort in 2009 to respond to the 2007-08 spikes in food prices. By the end of December 2015, the G7 and other AFSI donors delivered USD 23.4 billion in support of bilateral and multilateral agriculture and food security programs. As a result, the committed amount, USD 22.6 billion, was achieved collectively (Table 5.1).

5-3. G7 Progress on New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition

The G7 has also contributed to the overall progress of the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition launched in 2012, which is chaired by the AU Commission. In addition, New Alliance partnership includes African governments, Grow Africa (which facilitates and convenes –private sector representatives), civil society and development partners including G7 donors. The New Alliance aims to accelerate implementation of key components of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development

¹ OECD

² FAO, IFAD and WFP. 2015. *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2015. Meeting the 2015 international hunger targets: taking stock of uneven progress*. Rome, FAO.

³ UNICEF, WHO and World Bank Group. 2015. *Levels and trends in child malnutrition. UNICEF-WFO-World Bank Group joint child malnutrition estimates. Key findings of the 2015 edition*.



Programme (CAADP) by leveraging responsible private investment and policy reform in support of the development goals. The development partners have disbursed USD 3.2 billion, or 75% of expected funding by mid-2015, of which 96% came from G7 members (Table 5.2). The number of participating African countries has increased from the initial three, Ethiopia, Ghana and Tanzania, to 10 countries, including Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria and Senegal (Figure 5.1). Private sector companies including 161 Africa-based companies have signed 292 Letters of Intent (LOIs) (Table 5.3), committing to invest a total of USD 10.2 billion in African agriculture. Of the committed amount, USD 684.2 million was invested in 2014, resulting in creation of 21,366 jobs, a little lower than in 2013, while slightly more jobs were created for women (51%) than for men (49%) in 2014 (Table 5.3). These companies are part of the New Alliance and Grow Africa partnerships, which include figures from two additional countries: Kenya and Rwanda. The African governments have advanced or completed 91% of their policy commitments scheduled for completion by mid-2015. Some G7 members (France, Germany, the UK, the United States) contributed to the design of an Analytical Framework on responsible

land-based investments based on the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT) and the Guiding Principles on Large Scale Land Based Investments in Africa (LSLBI).

5-4. G7 Progress on Broad Food Security and Nutrition Development

At the Elmau Summit in 2015, as part of a broad effort involving our partner countries and international actors and as a significant contribution to the 2030 Agenda, the G7 committed to aim to lift 500 million people out of hunger and malnutrition in developing countries by 2030.

In the following scorecard, the G7 shows the indicators for evaluation to be used in future monitoring.



Commitment 26 New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition

We commit to launch a New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition to accelerate the flow of private capital to African agriculture, take to scale new technologies and other innovations that can increase sustainable agricultural productivity, and reduce the risk borne by vulnerable economies and communities. This New Alliance will lift 50 million people out of poverty over the next decade and be guided by a collective commitment to:

- invest in credible, comprehensive and country-owned plans,
- develop new tools to mobilize private capital,
- spur and scale innovation,
- and manage risk;
- and engage and leverage the capacity of private sector partners – from women and smallholder farmers, entrepreneurs to domestic and international companies.

Camp David 2012, Declaration, para.18

**Score
(Collective)**



Indicator(s)

Baseline: 2012

Indicators:

The assessment is based on the New Alliance's own accountability process, which has assessed

the Alliance's progress since its launch in 2012, as summarized in its Progress Report 2014-2015.

Data Sources:

New Alliance reports to Leadership Council

Assessment

According to the New Alliance Progress Report 2014-2015, G7 members and other donors have disbursed USD 3.2 billion, or 75% of the expected funding to date. While Canada, Japan and the United States disbursed beyond their respective funding targets in 2014, other G7 members were still in the process of fulfilling their disbursements (Table 5.2). The G7 funding intention, which accounts for 94.0% of the aggregate of development partners' contribution and 95.9% of the aggregate of disbursement by the end of 2014, were pivotal for the overall progress of the New Alliance during the same period. As of the end of 2014, the number

of participating African countries has increased from 3 to 10. African and international companies have also signed 292 Letters of Intent (LOIs) to invest about USD 10.2 billion, of which more than USD 684.2 million had been invested in 2014. The investments created 21,366 jobs (Table 5.3). The UK and the United States are also pioneering the piloting of the Analytical Framework of land-based investment. The G7 recognizes the need to scale-up piloting jointly with partners to enable further adoption of responsible investment practices in the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition.



Annex B – Methodology for Assessment and Evaluation

1. Overview

Accountability and transparency are core principles for the G7 to maintain the credibility of the decisions of G7 Leaders. The Ise-Shima Progress Report, in principle, follows the assessment methodology applied in the Lough Erne Accountability Report published in 2013. There are 51 commitments to be assessed and evaluated in the Ise-Shima Progress Report. Progress on the G7's commitments is assessed with indicators, baseline and data sources that have been agreed by the G7 Accountability Working Group.

2. Objectives of Assessment and Evaluation

The objectives of assessment and evaluation are (i) to monitor progress on development and development-related commitments with the aim of clearly communicating progress and achieving a wide readership in both G7 and partner countries, (ii) to support the G7's ability to deliver on the commitments made at the Summits, and (iii) to promote mutual accountability. The G7 Progress Report assesses the implementation of development and development-related commitments made at G7 Summits, using a five-tier signal.

3. Methodology

The Ise-Shima Progress Report adopts the following methodology for making assessment and evaluation for each of the 51 commitments:

First, to identify and validate the indicators of progress for each commitment. Each indicator has been agreed upon by the Accountability Working Group and consists of quantitative and/or qualitative measures, which are weighted equally.

Second, to measure progress on the indicators set by the Accountability Working Group according to pre-determined data sources.

Third, to assess the factual finding of progress, including factual changes, comparisons and cause-result relationships, and to make narrative assessments.

Fourth, to evaluate the progress of indicators. Evaluation is made on the basis of assessment of information and data collected from the baseline year to the latest year (when updated information is available).






Fifth, to determine scoring by a simple average of evaluation of equally weighted indicators.

The process also takes into consideration a set of five widely recognized criteria – relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability – released in the OECD-DAC evaluation principles in 1991.



Word	Definition
Assessment	Analytical work for factual finding of progress on the G7 commitment. The facts include the following but are not limited to: (i) description of a factual change between before- and after-values/situations, (ii) comparison between a target- and current-values/situations, and (iii) cause-result relationship.
Evaluation (Scoring)	Systematic determination of value (merit, worth or significance) of the G7 commitment. The evaluative conclusion is indicated by value-laden word: Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, Below Expectations and Off Track.

The proposed scorecard approach and a five-tier signal are to be applied with a set of narrative definitions for quantitative and qualitative assessment/evaluation.

Scoring Mark	Verbal Scale	Narrative Definition
	Excellent	The commitment was fully achieved or almost achieved; the targeted situation was fully realized or almost realized; or the pace of improvement was excellent. The progress of achievement is equivalent to a numerical basis in the range between 81-100%.*
	Good	The commitment was mostly achieved; the targeted situation was mostly realized; or the pace of improvement was good. The progress of achievement is equivalent to a numerical basis in the range between 61-80%.*
	Satisfactory	The commitment was satisfactorily achieved; the targeted situation was satisfactorily realized; or the pace of improvement was satisfactory. The progress of achievement is equivalent to a numerical basis in the range between 41-60%.*
	Below Expectations	The commitment was not satisfactorily achieved or below the expectation stated; the targeted situation was not satisfactorily realized or below the expectation stated; or the pace of improvement was below the expectation stated. The progress of achievement is equivalent to a numerical basis in the range between 21-40%.*
	Off Track	The commitment was not or barely achieved; the targeted situation was not or barely realized; or the pace of improvement was off track. The progress of achievement is equivalent to a numerical basis in the range between 0-20%.*
N/A	Unable to Judge	No information was available for judgment/determination.

* In the case of quantitative assessment/evaluation, a respective numerical scale is used.

Verbal and weighting scales are based on the methodology applied in the Lough Erne Accountability Report, p.138.

Note: Under Germany's presidency in 2015, there were 14 new commitments that require monitoring. As the baseline year for their monitoring was 2015, the Ise-Shima Progress Report does not give the score for Elmau commitments.