

The 21st century: ideological convergence

OUTLINE

5.1 The much-heralded Millennium Summit	139	5.5 The GMO backlash	144
5.2 World food summit: 5 years later	140	5.6 2010 UN summit on MDGs	145
5.3 The Earth to support close to 8 billion	143	5.7 Food crisis and financial chaos	145
5.4 The World Bank and nutrition	143	5.7.1 <i>Financial crisis</i>	146
		References	149

We now arrive at the 21st century; it was a new decade, more than that it was new millennium, and with it came a renewed sense of belonging, an increased awareness, and a renewed interest in issues of social welfare. Indeed, the new millennium began with a seminal summit (the Millennium Summit) that aimed to tackle these very issues. On top of this, there was also a rallying call to arms against all things antisocialist and an open backlash against genetically modified organisms (GMOs) as people fought toe to toe whether in the courts, on the streets, or at the front line. This decade also had to deal with a global financial crisis, the likes of which had rarely been seen before, and it came hot on the heels of a food price bubble, which gave governments, organizations, and humanity in general a very timely wake-up call.

5.1 The much-heralded Millennium Summit

As mentioned, the new millennium kicked off with the Millennium Summit, which lived up to the occasion with the sheer volume and number of world leaders, dignitaries, and

officials in attendance. In its sights the agenda comprised a range of sweeping social objectives representing many of the pressing issues of the day. Setting the mood for much of the Summit was a growing sense of social responsibility to present day and future citizens of the Earth. Goals ranged from reducing poverty, tackling malnourishment, a more equitable sharing of resources, and the natural environment which played a large part in the momentum for change. Gone were the days when the environment could be plundered without consequence, instead a new system of ecological accounting made it easier to promote accountability vis-à-vis the resource base. Among other considerations too was the role and direction of the United Nations in the new millennium. In the end, the Summit came to a close with its principal delegates ratifying the United Nations Millennium Declaration emphasizing that

... only through broad and sustained efforts to create a shared future, based upon our common humanity in all its diversity, can globalization be made fully inclusive and equitable. [UN \(2000c\)](#).

In achieving such an important set of aims required a fundamental and ideological shift in values to include (and not just for the developed nations) the notion of equality, tolerance, freedom, solidarity, and respect. Furthermore, the Summit agreed a set of eight time-bound measurable goals in achieving the end of poverty; universal education for all; equality including gender equality; improved child health care; maternal health care; and combating HIV/AIDS, focusing on environmental sustainability and finally global partnership. Collectively, these goals are known as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which further broke down into 21 quantifiable targets, fully measured by 60 indicators (appendix Table A5.1) ([UN, 2000a](#); [UN, 2006](#); [UNDP/MDG, 2010](#)).

Incidentally to the United Nations definition of food security was also the focus of modification and in 2001 the Committee on Food Security included a social component to the concept when it suggested

Food security [is] a situation that exists when all people, all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life. [FAO \(2001\)](#).

This new focal point or other points talking of safe and nutritious foods, as well as social aspects of food preferences and access brought into sharp focus and ever-growing concept that ultimately became interpretable to the point that it can be made to fit specific needs and agendas. Other events around this time are highlighted in the table below ([Table 5.1](#)).

Hot on the heels of the Millennium Summit, the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) of the United Nations held another food summit 5 years after the first World Food Summit (WFS).

5.2 World food summit: 5 years later

As the Millennium Summit was still being set up, in 2002, the FAO convened another WFS 5 years after the original. This was put together to assess progress made in the promise toward eliminating or more precisely halving hunger to 400 million by 2015. The Summit met amid disappointing data that offered an annual reduction of only 6 million well below the proposed yearly target of 22 million. Indeed, considering only 32 of the 99 developing

TABLE 5.1 Key dates of the period: 1996 to 99.

2000 International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR)	In response to the rise of increasing natural disasters around the world, the UN leaned upon the (UN/ISDR) to build upon the work of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR) in response to the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction 1990–99 (UN, 2000b).
2000 The International Food Relief Partnership Act	The International Food Relief Partnership Act was a US initiative to increase international food-aid programs through the use of grants to nonprofit organizations that would then stockpile food; and further allowing the authorization of the USAID to procure and store commodities overseas in expectation of future emergencies (CBO, 2000).
2000 EC-FAO Food Security Information for Action	The Information for Action Program provided countries undergoing crisis or those transitioning economically, the assistance to formulate more effective policies with the aid of among other things, early vulnerability mapping, warning systems, nutritional surveys, needs assessments; policy analysis and statistical databases et cetera.
2000 UN Millennium Summit	The Millennium Summit was held at UN's New York. The summit looked at the multi-various challenges facing humanity in the 21st century. At the meeting, world leaders ratified the UN Millennium Declaration. The Declaration's eight goals were outlined as a way for achieving the stated aims (UN, 2000c).
2000 The United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDG)	Extensive consultation of the challenges facing humanity was established by the many Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). These were enshrined in a set of quantifiable time-bound (2015) targets addressing such challenges (UN, 2000a; <i>UNDG, 2009</i>). The Millennium Declaration was the working document which set out a framework in tackling these challenges.
2001 Chief Executives Board (CEB) for Coordination	In 2001, as a result of a 2 year review the previous Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC) became the United Nations System Chief Executives Board (CEB) for Coordination (Mezzalama et al., 1999; CEB, 2010).
2001 The Earth Policy Institute (EPI)	The Earth Policy Institute (EPI) was founded by former president of the Worldwatch Institute - Lester Brown who worked tirelessly toward sustainable environmental policy solutions (EPI, 2010).
2001 Global Environmental Change and Food Systems (GECAFS)	GECAFS launched a 10-year program in 2001 of multi-faceted research focusing on understanding the links between food security and environmental change (GECAFS, 2010).
2001 EuropeAid	In 2001 EuropeAid's goal was to combine the EU Commission's external aid into one centralized body. Consequently, as a result the EU, through its combined bi- and multi-lateral donations effectively became the world's biggest donor of humanitarian aid (ODI, 2000; Mousseau, 2005; EuropeAid, 2009).
2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD)—Earth Summit_2002	Known as the Johannesburg Earth Summit, the meeting aimed to continue and where possible build on the efforts of the 1992 Earth Summit and to adopt concrete steps and identify quantifiable targets for implementing Rio's 'Agenda 21' (UN DESA, 2006).

(Continued)

TABLE 5.1 Key dates of the period: 1996 to 99.—cont'd

2002 World Food Summit +5	Amid calls for the renewal of the World Food Summit the working group also proposed the acceleration of effort to reduce world hunger (FAO, 2002b).
2002/4 Water Footprint Network (WFN)	The water footprint is a form of Environmental Accounting popularized by Arjen Hoekstra which uses the idea of virtual water (the water footprint) to calculate global water use on a per item or per person basis (WFN, 2009).
2003 The Global Footprint Network (GFN)	GFN is a kind of think tank that promotes and develops instruments of environmental impacts on various issues based on the concept of Ecological or Environmental Accounting (GFN, 2009).
2003 International Alliance Against Hunger (IAAH)	Established on World Food Day 2003, the IAAH in the fight hunger and poverty helps facilitate action through partnerships of civil society and government (FAO, 2003; IAAH, 2009).

Sources: Compiled From Multiple Sources Mezzalama et al. (1999); CBO (2000); ODI (2000); UN (2000a,b,c); FAO (2002a,b); FAO (2003); Mousseau (2005); UN DESA (2006); EuropeAid (2009); GFN (2009); IAAH (2009); UNDG (2009); WFN (2009); CEB (2010); GECAFS (2010).

countries showed a reduction in numbers of undernourished people, disappointing results led to the consideration of other ways to accelerate global efforts and once again delegates vowed to renew their commitment to the goals and resolved to meet the stated 1996 target by 2015 (FAO, 2002b).

In parallel to the WFS, there was a separate conference, a non-governmental NGO/CSO Forum for Food Sovereignty¹. In attendance were NGOs, civil society groups, and farmers' organizations. They were collectively scornful and united in their condemnation of inaction to date. They had previously pointed out many concerns pertaining to the 1996 WFS and the proposed action plan. After the details mentioned previously, the collection of stakeholders was feeling vindicated. However, rather than being smug, they were more interested in finding out what the problem was. For the parallel conference, it had been suggested that the output goals were fundamentally flawed as, instead of mutual cooperation between the worst affected areas of food insecurity, decisions seemed to be made unilaterally and it was questioned that such policies were forced onto aid packages in the developing countries while the developed countries insisted they maintained the status quo of high support policies themselves. The NGO and CSO also strongly wondered whether the WFS+5 was in fact watering down pledges of the proposed Code of Conduct on the Right to Food to a simple set of voluntary guidelines. Further criticisms focused at the promotion of genetically modified (GM) foods as a panacea by certain governments and transnational corporations (NGO/CSO Forum, 2002). In the WFS+5s view, there were more than enough resources as well as a growing political will to tackle the problem. Yet they appeared united in the causes of widespread hunger and malnutrition and suggested that "... international trade led hegemonic economic model" This, it was claimed, took away a country or

¹Food sovereignty is a country's right to define its own policies vis-a-vis agricultural, pastoral, fisheries and food according to their own socioeconomic and cultural ideologies. The notion promotes the rights of food to everyone through small and medium-sized agricultural enterprises that respect different cultures and diversity. Decentralization and democratization are key principles of this movement (NGO/CSO Forum 2002).

communities' control over their own destiny inter alia economic and natural resources. In response, the NGO/CSO Forum offered that Food Sovereignty as one method of socio-economic development tool over other more familiar alternatives (NGO/CSO Forum, 2002).

Seemingly, on the surface the 21st century was little different from previous decades as the specter of growing population was never far from people's thoughts. Once again, the notion of a carrying capacity of the Earth populated the minds of many. One particular study is worthy of note.

5.3 The Earth to support close to 8 billion

In 2004, likely the most important study on the Earth's ability to sustainably provide for a growing population, i.e., the carrying capacity, was undertaken. The study by Van Den Bergh and Rietveld (2004) looked at 69 historic studies—many previously scrutinized by Cohen (1995) in which estimated population figures ranged between 0.5 billion and 1021 billion. One important difference in Van Den Bergh and Rietveld's study compared with Cohen's in 1995 was the use of metaanalysis in the methodology. Indeed, benefits of metaanalysis over primary research per se are particularly useful when comparing a range of similar studies. Furthermore, metaanalysis gave Van Den Bergh and Rietveld the opportunity to look beyond the output alone instead allowing it to examine the mechanics of the studies (Van Den Bergh and Rietveld, 2004). By doing so, researchers Van Den Bergh and Rietveld asked some important questions about the comparative similarities and differences within the studies that might shed light on any new or overlooked consensus. In this respect, the researchers were fruitful in their analysis discovering that sustainable population limitations were several and included among other things limitations of energy, water, natural resources, and land among other things. However, the two most often quoted limitations were land and limited food resources, which accounted for 71 of the 94 collected estimates. This, however, cautioned Van Den Bergh and Rietveld and was perhaps subject to change as the Earth carried ever-increasing population figures. In this way, truer and more reliable resource limitations other than the ones currently stated could possibly emerge as more important variables in the future (Van Den Bergh and Rietveld, 2004). In the end, discounting erroneous; speculative; or insufficiently rigorous studies by Van Den Bergh and Rietveld concluded that a best estimate of a sustainable carrying capacity of the Earth, based on a median value, was 7.7 billion.

In other news around this time, the World Bank too came under fire for its less than stellar performance.

5.4 The World Bank and nutrition

The World Bank's (WB) admission into the field of nutrition during the early 1970s was not without scornful criticism from the likes of the WHO, FAO, and UNICEF. The main defense of the bank was that issues of nutrition were such that only large-scale interventionist policies would or could make any real difference. And the World Bank (in its view) was uniquely positioned to offer such scaled-up assistance. However, in a timely review of the Banks' progress, Richard Heaver consultant to the Health, Nutrition, and Population Family (HNP) of the

World Bank's Human Development Network paradoxically summed up the work of the WB to date when it suggested:

... the Bank has developed the economic justification for large-scale investment in nutrition, and has the experience needed to scale up, it has failed to do so. [Heaver \(2006\)](#).

Furthermore, Heaver also noted that the WB spent a trifling 2.5% of its human development lending budget on nutrition. This was in blunt contradiction of the initial calls made by the organization in the early 70s. An inconsistency which incidentally defied the WB's own research whereby it had noted that nutrition alone was perhaps "one of," or even "the," best economic investment that could be made in a country's program of development. The review further questioned the incongruent manner in which the Bank's different departments worked in a vacuum where the left hand did not know what the right hand was doing. However, while the review was scathing of existing practices, it did offer a reprieve in the form of future direction.

With improved cohesive policies and the timely dissemination of information to the public as well as within its own corporate body, Heaver also suggested that if the Bank wanted to place more importance on nutritional programs, a branch-wide reevaluation of performance within the specific nutritional departments would need to be accepted ([Heaver, 2006](#)).

At about the same time, the GMO backlash was beginning to find common ground.

5.5 The GMO backlash

Regarding the "de facto" European Union (EU) ban on GM foods during the 1990s, the US along with several other countries made an official complaint to the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 2003. The complaint was regarding the EU's de facto violation of international trade agreements. At first the EU was going to fight the accusation; however, political diplomacy quenched a potentially difficult situation by ratifying a UN biosafety protocol that essentially regulated all international trade in genetically modified foods. The protocol, however, still allowed countries to act by banning imports if they felt there was insufficient scientific evidence regarding a particular products safety. By July of the same year, two further European instruments were put in place that between them essentially ended the controversial moratorium. The first was legislation requiring the labeling of food containing more than 0.9% of GMOs which applied to both animal and human food (although this did not apply to animals fed on GM crops). The second legislation ensured the mandatory labeling of any food containing (contaminated) by nonauthorized GMOs of over 0.5%. This was enacted solely for a period of 3 years only after which all nonauthorized GMO foods would be banned. Together both laws sought to safeguard the traceability of GMO products. While such laws essentially ended the embargo in 2004, the WTO ruling of 2006 was found in favor of the United States. The ban had indeed violated international trade agreements. Having said that though, the ruling did not query the future rights of EU member states of any future bans if there was enough evidence to warrant such a measure. While the ruling of the WTO essentially took the middle ground, this left both sides claiming a win while a few environmental groups suggested it in fact changed very little it achieved little or no real change ([EC, 2003](#); [Reinhardt and Ganzel, 2003](#); [FOE, 2006](#)).

5.6 2010 UN summit on MDGs

A full decade following the ground-breaking Millennium Summit and its stated goals and objectives (MDGs), a Summit was convened to explore the progress of the target goals. Pre-Summit reports, however, indicated mixed outcomes in terms of successes, failures, and progress, which were ultimately discussed at length in the Summit plus in many of the parallel events. In fact, it was not looking good for the goals as with only 5 years left to go, many observers and officials alike felt that the goals were drifting away, slipping further out of reach. In one particular side event entitled “Raiding the Public till,” general consensus was reached in reference to the resources required for achieving the MDGs by 2015. In the parallel event, it was indeed understood that such resources would not be out of reach if

... governments were willing to reverse the process of socializing losses and privatizing gains – a process that characterizes the current model of globalization. [Caliari \(2010\)](#).

Finally, the outcome document of the main conference, called “Keeping the Promise - United to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals,” outlined yet another Action Plan for the achievement of the MDGs by 2015. It was also further accepted that the MDGs were intertwined and mutually reinforcing. In sum, the Action Plan adopted the view that without a single panacea, member countries were encouraged to implement specific country or regional development strategies personalized to their own situations. Even President Obama got into the nitty-gritty when emphasizing a departure from established development strategies. Obama suggested refocusing the way in which the MDGs were measured, i.e., to pull back from long-held metrics of resource and financial inputs to be replaced by a more result-oriented output. This, in many peoples view, would effectively take out, in theory at least, the politics from the stated targets leaving the results to speak for themselves ([UNDP, 2011](#)). The MDGs were replaced in 2015 by the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

5.7 Food crisis and financial chaos

During the period between 2006 and 2008, a great upsurge in global food prices took the world by surprise. Triggered by several coincidental factors arising from around the world resulted in price rises of 150% for rice, 75% for corn, and 35% for wheat. This state of affairs came about as a result of multiple factors that began with a drought in Australia—the worst in a century, this effectively halved Australia’s wheat production for 2007. Adding to this was a decline in demand with increasing economic growth in countries such as Brazil, Russia, China, and India, in which individuals started to eat less cereals and more meat and dairy-based foods. Furthermore, as oil prices increased and ended up spiking at \$60 a barrel, biofuels² became more competitive. This put pressure on food versus fuel. Take the

²Biofuels derive from corn, sugar cane or sugar beet and cassava among others. These are then converted into ethanol as a greener alternative to fossil-based fuels. The industry is massive and leading the vanguard was Brazil who currently has the longest-running commercial biofuel programme - since the 1970’s. Indeed, in 2007/8 the Committee for Food Security (CFS) estimated that a significant proportion (4.7%) of Brazil’s annual national cereal production was diverted into bio-fuel production (CFS 2008).

United States for instance—in an effort to reduce dependability on oil producing exporting countries (OPEC), the United States had for years now increased the volume of their corn and other crops into ethanol and biodiesel. However, rather than importing the crops for bio-fuels, the United States instead attempted to be self-sufficient and diverted about 30% of its corn crop for biofuel production. On top of this, a relatively recent phenomenon of food commodity speculation was contributing to the rising prices in both food and fuel. Indeed, it was noted at the time when Frederick Kaufman, contributing editor of *Harper's Magazine*, wrote an article entitled “How Wall Street starved millions and got away with it” in 2010 in which he concisely summed up the large speculative banks’ role in artificially inflating food prices (Phillips, 2008; Valley, 2009; Kaufman, 2010).

Collectively, the above factors ended squeezing the price of wheat and other cereals considerably upward. Simultaneously, especially in the low-income countries, increased import bills in turn could cause inflationary pressures on the domestic. Moreover, as prices rose, political instability took hold while other governments were forced to take control of some of the prices of basic staples. In Russia, for example, companies were readily forced to arrest and freeze bread and milk prices, while in Argentina people shunned fresh tomatoes when they eventually became costlier than meat. In Italy too, the home of pasta embarked on a 1-day boycott of pasta which was organized in objection to continued rising prices. In other areas, food riots and the threat of food riots occurred in such places as India, Yemen, Burkina Faso, Mexico, and others as shortages and food price inflation were almost out of control (Vidal, 2007).

In the midst of all of this, a global financial crisis exacerbated by unchecked banking operations filtered through eventually affecting ordinary people and coupled with the previously mentioned food price spikes they collectively exacerbated conditions of poverty and hunger.

5.7.1 Financial crisis

The financial crisis of 2007 and 2008 began with, among other financial institutions, high street banks who, in pursuit of ever-increasing revenue, moved into investment banking and began trading risk. Simultaneously, investment banks are also not happy with their lot moved into the home loan market. Book-held risks were increasing, while multifaceted, cleverly created, and vastly complex financial instruments effectually encountered a massive crisis of confidence. Trust in the system began to wane and the whole house of cards began to fall apart. Not surprisingly, the US subprime mortgage market collapsed, in turn creating a chain reaction of no confidence on a global scale. All this came at a time previous to an extended period of economic growth. Moreover, the investment banks that entered into the mortgage arena and that created some of the most complex financial instruments of the time had a knock-on effect in the housing market, which in many industrialized economies simply collapsed. The effect was not localized either, instead the cause and effect seemingly rippled throughout the world. Furthermore, lending slowed to the point where it almost dried. As all of this was happening, financial lenders, fearing their exposure to the problem, began calling in loans. This in turn further affected financial confidence whereby runs on many financial institutions were swift and brutal. In turn, some institutions, lacking sufficient financial support, or reserves quickly went bust while others turned to governments for financial aid. The injection of new government capital and promises of guaranteed

capital security did little to assuage the frontal assault. As the crisis began to slow down and subside, banks and other financial institutions went to the other extreme with lending policies becoming so strict; they were counterproductive. The culmination of the above events tightened the liquidity of global financial markets and led to widespread financial and social disorder that had abrupt and overwhelming impacts on the global state of food, hunger, and malnutrition (Rudd, 2009).

As mentioned, the financial crisis profoundly affected many developing countries ability to feed the poor or the hungry and malnourished people. On top of this, as was illustrated in the oil crisis, provision of energy relied too heavily on the OPEC countries and the diversion of crops for bioenergy became questionable. Furthermore, the challenges of climate change and other social ills as outlined in the Millennium Summit became more and more pressing in light of the recent financial crisis. Consequently, the UN called for a High-Level Conference on World Food Security and the Challenges of Climate Change and Bioenergy in 2008.

Before the proposed conference, however, a meeting chaired by the then UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon along with other UN agency heads strategized a multitude of ideas to redress the global food crisis. The result was to put together a High-Level Task Force (HLTF) with the sole remit of understanding and advising on the Global Food Security Crisis. The HLTF was chaired by Ban Ki-moon and also included the heads of the IMF, the World Bank, the World Food Program, the IFAD, the FAO, and the WTO, who between them jointly and cooperatively established an action plan for discussion at the forthcoming conference.

The conference was a timely meeting which emphasized concerns over the recent food price debacle, the implications of a runaway biofuel industry, and its effects on global prices of feed fodder and food crops (Campbell-Platt, 2008).

It was also noted that the effects of climate change on the design and supply of global agricultural production might well turn out to be one of the biggest challenges that the world would face over the coming decades. Challenges in the face of changing weather patterns could also uproot certain traditional crops replacing them with new and unfamiliar harvests. This could also mean a radical change in traditional trading partners too. In sum, the conference, recognized the fragility of the world's food supply system and its vulnerability to both known and unforeseen shocks and challenges. In this, questions would need to be answered on how to improve the resilience of worldwide food production in the face of adversity and a lack of biodiversity, etc. Indeed, recommendations of investment, technological development, financial instruments, and dissemination of knowledge should all come together to support adaptation and mitigation of an ongoing change of climate (Campbell-Platt, 2008). Despite such commitments from this and from numerous other conferences, high-level talks, ministerial meetings, etc., the situation was still dismal a year or so later when the report the "State of Food Insecurity" was published announcing that over 1 billion around the world were still undernourished. Alarm bells rang from the rooftops of governmental, humanitarian, and other institutions alike. It seemed that the situation was rapidly failing and in 2009 the Third WFS was held.

Once again heads of state met to reaffirm their commitment and to work on ways to mitigate the worst effects of the financial crises vis-à-vis food and food security. Also, on the agenda was the reformation of global governance. Not helping the cause was the absence of Jacques Diouf—the then Director-General of the United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organization plus other key leaders in the field. This was attributed to a general lack of

interest in the global issues of hunger and malnutrition problems. However, more than this, of greater importance appeared to be one important viewpoint, never previously expressed at such a high-level meeting. This was the notion of lost confidence in a global market trading system as a means of ensuring food security. While Venezuela put this down to fundamental problems of the capitalist system, it seemed others downplayed the crisis suggesting that it was just in fact a one-off glitch precipitated by food shortages. Whatever the reason, these jitter. Such feelings and comments put the issue of food self-sufficiency back on the table, which was both welcomed and opposed in equal measure (Christiaensen, 2009; IISD, 2009).

The end of the first decade of the 21st century once again brought with it reflection (Table 5.2) and a renewed promise of achieving the MDGs by 2015.

TABLE 5.2 Key dates of the period: 2000 to 03.

2004 UNU Institute for the Environment Human Security (UNU-EHS)	The UNU-EHS is the UN University Institute for the Environment Human Security (UNU-EHS). Programs focus on all things—environment whether environmental hazards, degradation, and vulnerability, as well as societies coping capacities to such disasters (UNU-EHS, 2005).
2004 Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC)	The MCC is an independent US foreign aid agency offering grants to poor countries to help in the fight against poverty and economic development (MCC, 2010).
2004 The Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (ICP)	Calls for improved analysis, increased rigor, better comparability, and improved transparency of evidence in food security analysis led to the creation of the IPC. Developed as an add-on to existing frameworks, it helps in the classification of the severity of food security situations (IPC, 2007; FSAU, 2010).
2005 The Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)	There are numerous shortcomings that exist in the UN emergency relief model. Responding to such problems, the UN in 2005 set up CERF, the Central Emergency Response Fund replacing the older Central Emergency Revolving Fund with a remit to speed up the process and reliability of humanitarian aid (CERF, 2007).
2005 UN World Summit	A summit discussing among other things progress to do with the Millennium Development Goals and the world's recommitment to them (UN, 2005).
2008–2013 Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance II Project (FANTA-2)	The second FANTA, FANTA-2, extended the work of the original project of refining nutrition, policies, strategies, and programs of food security (FANTA2 2010).
2008 The Special Unit on Commodities	Under the Aegis of UNCTAD, the Special Unit on Commodities helps developing countries to respond to the challenges of commodity markets (UNCTAD, 2009).
2009 FAO World Summit on Food Security	The seemingly deteriorating global food security situation and fear that high food prices would push the undernourished over the one billion mark led to an emergency food summit. The Summit once again reenforced the idea that poor countries drastically needed economic development to boost agricultural production. The Summit recognized too the continual lack of international coherence in global governance (FAO, 2009a,b).

2010 UN Summit on MDGs	United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon hosted the High-level Plenary Meeting of the MDG Summit with the goal of accelerating progress toward all the MDGs by 2015.
2010 FAO Working Group on Animal Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture	FAO held a meeting to discuss and assess the importance of genetic diversity of livestock at the regional and global levels (FAO, 2010).
2011 FAO and German Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection IMCF Conference	An FAO consultation was held on improving the dietary intakes and nutritional status of infants and young children in Asia. This was to be achieved through improved food security including complementary feeding in young children combining food security and nutrition interventions.

Sources: Compiled From Multiple Sources: UN (2005); UNU-EHS (2005); CERF (2007); IPC (2007); FAO (2009a,b); FAO (2010); FSAU (2010); MCC (2010).

References

- Caliari, A., 2010. MDGs Still Achievable, but Role of Public Sector is Key. Retrieved 21st Feb 2018, 21st Feb 2011, from. <http://www.socialwatch.org/node/12245>.
- Campbell-Platt, G., 2008. Report on high-level conference on world food security: the challenges of climate change and bioenergy. In: High-Level Conference on World Food Security. FAO, Rome.
- CBO, 2000. H.R. 5224: International Food Relief Partnership Act of 2000 Congressional Budget Office, US Congress.
- CEB, 2010. The Chief Executives Board (CEB): Overview. Retrieved 23rd March 2018, 2018, from. <http://www.socialwatch.org/node/12245>.
- CFS, 2008. Agenda Item II: Assessment of the World Food Security and Nutrition Situation. Committee On World Food Security: Thirty-fourth Session, Rome, Food and Agriculture Organisation.
- CERF, 2007. Central Emergency Response Fund: What is the CERF? Retrieved 12th June 2019, 2019, from. <https://cerf.un.org/event/high-level-conference/cerf-high-level-pledging-event>.
- Christiaensen, L., 2009. 2009 World Summit on Food Security. Our World.
- Cohen, J.E., 1995. How Many People Can the Earth Support? W.W. Norton, New York and London.
- EC, 2003. Press Release: European Commission Regrets US Decision to File WTO Case on GMO's as Unnecessary. Brussels, European Commission.
- EPI, 2010. The Earth Policy Institute: About. Retrieved 21st May 2018, 2018, from. http://www.earth-policy.org/index.php?/about_epi/.
- EuropeAid, 2009. About EuropeAid. Retrieved 13th Feb 2018, 2018, from. https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/historical-overview-eu-cooperation-and-aid_en.
- FANTA2, 2010. About Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance II Project (FANTA-2). Retrieved 15th July 2019, 2019, from. <https://www.fantaproject.org/>.
- FAO, 2001. The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2001. Food and Agriculture Organisation, Rome.
- FAO, 2002a. Report of the world food summit: five years later. In: World Food Summit: Five Years Later. Food and Agriculture Organisation, Rome.
- FAO, 2002b. World Food Summit: Five Years Later Reaffirms Pledge to Reduce Hunger. Summit News.
- FAO, 2003. FAO urges international alliance against hunger on World Food Day. FAO Newsroom.
- FAO, 2009a. Declaration of the world summit on food security. World Summit Food Secur. Food Agri. Organ.
- FAO, 2009b. Secretariat Contribution to Defining the Objectives and Possible Decisions of the World. Summit on Food Security on 16, 17 and 18 November. Food and Agriculture Organisation, Rome, p. 10.
- FAO, 2010. Status and Trends of Animal Genetic Resources – 2010. Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Animal Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. FAO, Rome, p. 89.
- FOE, 2006. Looking behind the US spin: WTO ruling does not prevent countries from restricting or banning GMOs. Briefing Paper. Amsterdam Friends Earth Int.
- FSAU, 2010. Food Security Analysis Unit for Somalia: FAQ. Retrieved 8th May 2018, 2018, from. <http://www.fsau.org/>.
- GECAFS, 2010. Global Environmental Change and Food Systems. Retrieved 23rd June 2018, 2018, from. http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=15559&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html.

- GFN, 2009. Global Footprint Network: At A Glance. Retrieved 20th June 2018, 2018, from. http://www.footprintnetwork.org/en/index.php/GFN/page/at_a_glance/.
- Heaver, R., 2006. Good Work—But Not Enough of It: A Review of the World Bank's Experience in Nutrition. World Bank: Health, Nutrition and Population Department, Washington, D.C., p. 89
- IAAH, 2009. The International Alliance Against Hunger: History and Vision. Retrieved 6th June 2018, 2018, from. <http://www.fao.org/english/newsroom/news/2003/20846-en.html>.
- IISD, 2009. Summary of the world summit on food security 16–18 November 2009. World Summit Food Secur. Bull. 150 (7).
- IPC, 2007. The Integrated Food Security and Humanitarian Phase Classification System: Technical Manual Version 1. Rome/Somalia. FAO/FSUA, p. 47.
- Kaufman, F., 2010. The Food Bubble: How Wall Street Starved Millions and Got Away with it. Harpers Magazine. The Harper's Magazine Foundation, New York, 8 pp.
- MCC, 2010. The Millennium Challenge Corporation. Retrieved 23rd March 2018, 2018, from. <https://www.mcc.gov/>.
- Mezzalama, F., et al., 1999. Review of the Administrative Committee on Coordination and its Machinery. UN Joint Inspection Unit, Geneva, p. 31.
- Mousseau, F., 2005. Food Aid or Food Sovereignty? Ending World Hunger In Our Time. Oakland Institute, USA.
- NGO/CSO Forum, 2002. An Action Plan of the NGO/CSO Forum for Food Sovereignty. 2002 Rome NGO/CSO Forum for Food Sovereignty. International NGO/CSO Planning Committee, Rome.
- ODI, 2000. Reforming Food Aid: Time to Grasp the Nettle. Briefing Paper. Overseas Development Institute, London.
- Phillips, L., 2008. Senators Hear Testimony on Legislation to Reduce Food and Energy Prices by Curbing Excessive Speculation in the Commodity Markets. Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, Washington.
- Reinhardt, C., Ganzel, B., 2003. A History of Farming. Living History Farm.
- Rudd, K., February 2009. The global financial crisis. Monthly 20–29.
- UN, 2000a. Millennium Summit: The UN Millennium Declaration. The Millennium Assembly of the United Nations, New York, United Nations.
- UN, 2000b. United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction Secretariat (UNISDR). Retrieved 21st Jan 2018, 2018, from. <http://www.unisdr.org/>.
- UN, 2000c. United Nations Millennium Declaration. United Nations, UN. A/RES/55/2.
- UN, 2005. 2005 World Summit Outcome. Fact Sheet. United Nations Department of Public Information, New York.
- UN, 2006. The UN Millennium Project. Retrieved 12th Feb 2018, 12th FEB 2018, from. <https://www.unsystem.org/content/2005-world-summit-outcome-factsheet>.
- UN DESA, 2006. What is Johannesburg Summit 2002? Retrieved 23rd July 2010, 2010, from. http://www.un.org/jsummit/html/basic_info/basicinfo.html.
- UNCTAD, 2009. The Special Unit on Commodities. Retrieved 21st June 2018, 2018, from. <http://www.unctad.info/en/Special-Unit-on-Commodities/About-the-Special-Unit-on-Commodities/Who-we-are/>.
- UNDG, 2009. The Millennium Declaration and the MDGs. Retrieved 19th June 2018, 2018, from. <http://www.undg.org/index.cfm?P=70>.
- UNDP, 2011. UNDP Millennium Development Goals. Retrieved 12th Jan 2018, 2018, from. <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals.html>.
- UNDP/MDG, 2010. Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Retrieved 24th June 2018, 2018, from. <https://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/>.
- UNU-EHS, 2005. Human Security in a Changing World. UNU-Institute for Environment and Human Security, Bonn, Germany, p. 33.
- Vallely, P., 2009. The Big Question: Why is so Much of the World Still Hungry, and What Can We Do About it? the Independent. London.
- Van Den Bergh, J.C.J.M., Rietveld, P., 2004. Reconsidering the limits to world population: meta-analysis and meta-prediction. Bioscience 54 (3), 195–204.
- Vidal, J., 2007. Global Food Crisis Looms as Climate Change and Fuel Shortages Bite: Soaring Crop Prices and Demand for Biofuels Raise Fears of Political Instability. Guardian online. London, Guardian News and Media Limited, 3 November 2007.
- WFN, 2009. Water Footprint Network: Why a Water Footprint Network? Retrieved 13th July 2018, 2018, from. <https://waterfootprint.org>.