

Updated June 25, 2026

## U.S. International Food Assistance: A Primer

Global food insecurity generally refers to varying degrees of hunger and malnutrition among populations worldwide, stemming from a lack of regular access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food. In 2026, an estimated 363 million people globally face acute food insecurity, which is also frequently linked to systemic health and other challenges. The drivers of food insecurity are often interrelated, far-reaching, and lasting; they include conflict, displacement, natural disasters, climate change effects, economic downturns, high prices, and public health events.

Congress has authorized and appropriated funds for international food assistance for over 70 years. In FY2024 (the latest comprehensive data available) such assistance totaled nearly \$5.5 billion. The United States has provided international food assistance for a range of reasons, including to respond to global humanitarian crises, support international development, and serve strategic interests, such as promoting political stability and strengthening agricultural markets. In addition, the purchase of U.S.-sourced commodities (e.g., beans, corn, vegetable oils, wheat) and absorption of food surpluses through in-kind food assistance programs have directly benefitted U.S. agriculture. Many U.S.-funded international food assistance programs are implemented through partners, including multilateral entities, such as the UN World Food Program (WFP), and bilateral contracts with nongovernmental organizations. The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) historically administered U.S. international food assistance programs. The Trump Administration's decision to shutter USAID as of July 1, 2025, shifted administration of USAID-led programs initially to the Department of State (State) and then also to USDA. These structural changes may affect the delivery of international emergency food assistance, the scope and funding of programs, and program efficiency and effectiveness.

### Food Assistance Programs

Statutory authorities for international food programs are found in the Food for Peace Act (FFPA, 7 U.S.C. §§1691 et seq.) and related agriculture legislation, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (FAA, 22 U.S.C. §§2151 et seq.), and the Global Food Security Act of 2016 (GFSA, 22 U.S.C. §§9301 et seq.). The House and Senate Agriculture Committees have jurisdiction over programs authorized by the FFPA and related agriculture legislation, while the House Foreign Affairs and Senate Foreign Relations Committees have jurisdiction over programs authorized by the FAA and GFSA. Key programs are described below.

### Farm Bill-Authorized Programs

International food assistance programs authorized by the FFPA and related agriculture legislation are generally

amended and reauthorized by periodic farm bills, most recently by the 2018 farm bill (P.L. 115-334). Subsequent legislation has extended the authorizations through FY2026. These programs are usually funded by Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Acts (Agriculture appropriations) or from USDA's Commodity Credit Corporation's (CCC's) borrowing authority. Most of these programs require the use of U.S.-sourced commodities and are subject to cargo preference laws.

**Food for Peace Title II Grants (FFP, 7 U.S.C. §§1721 et seq.).** Under FFP, the U.S. government provides U.S.-sourced commodities to food-insecure populations overseas via qualifying implementing partners. Historically, USAID administered FFP and allocated the majority of FFP funding for emergency food assistance, with a required minimum of \$365 million made available each year for nonemergency assistance. FFP derives its authority from Title II of the FFPA and receives funding from Agriculture appropriations acts. For FY2026, Congress appropriated \$1.2 billion for FFP. In February 2026, USDA announced it will administer FFP.

**Farmer-to-Farmer Program (F2F, 7 U.S.C. §1737).** F2F is to fund short-term technical assistance from U.S. volunteers to farmers, agribusinesses, and other agricultural institutions in developing and transitional countries. Minimum funding for F2F is to be the greater of \$15 million or 0.6% of funds appropriated for FFP programs. Although not a food-distribution program, F2F derives its authority under FFPA Title V. The program does not appear to be active and was previously administered by USAID.

**McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Nutrition Program (McGovern-Dole, 7 U.S.C. §1736o-1).** The USDA-administered McGovern-Dole program is to advance food security, nutrition, and education for children—especially girls—by providing mostly U.S.-sourced commodities for school meals in priority countries. McGovern-Dole has received funding from Agriculture appropriations. Up to 10% of annual funding may be used for local and regional procurement (LRP) rather than procuring U.S.-origin commodities. For FY2026, Congress appropriated \$240 million for McGovern-Dole.

**Food for Progress (FFPr, 7 U.S.C. §1736o).** The USDA-administered FFPr is to sell U.S. commodities, usually in aid-recipient countries' local markets, and is to use the proceeds to fund agricultural development projects. FFPr has received mandatory funding by CCC financing or discretionary funding under FFPA Title I. The program is required to annually provide a minimum of 400,000 metric tons (MT) of U.S. commodities but is also restricted from paying more than \$40 million annually for freight costs. In

FY2025, USDA procured 460,000 MT of U.S. commodities, valued at \$148 million, for FFP.

**Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust (BEHT, 7 U.S.C. §1736f–1).** BEHT is a commodity and/or monetary reserve maintained by USDA that may be released if FFP funding for emergency food situations is deemed inadequate. In 2022, for example, \$282 million was released to procure U.S. commodities in response to Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. BEHT funds may be replenished from funds available to FFPA programs or directly by appropriations.

### FAA/GFSA-Authorized Programs

International food assistance programs authorized by the FAA and GFSA have been amended and reauthorized by periodic GFSA reauthorization acts, most recently in December 2022 as part of P.L. 117-263. These programs have been funded through Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs (SFOPS) Appropriations Acts, retitled in FY2026 as the National Security, Department of State, and Related Programs (NSRP) Appropriations Act. They employ *market-based* food assistance—such as LRP, food vouchers, and cash transfers for food—along with selected nonfood assistance in emergency and nonemergency settings.

**Emergency Food Security Program (EFSP, 22 U.S.C. §2292(c)).** EFSP provides global food assistance to vulnerable populations using market-based approaches. Though its general authority under the FAA was used as early as FY2010, EFSP was authorized in the GFSA in 2016; Congress authorized appropriations of up to \$1.8 billion annually through FY2028. USAID previously administered EFSP; for FY2024 (the most recent data available) it programmed \$2.9 billion. The State Department’s Bureau of Disaster and Humanitarian Response (DHR) currently administers EFSP using International Humanitarian Assistance (IHA) funds through the NSRP Appropriations Act.

**Community Development Fund (CDF, 22 U.S.C. §§2151a et seq.).** CDF has funded, either solely or in conjunction with FFP nonemergency funds, development programs aimed at addressing the root causes of food insecurity. Though it derives its authority from the FAA and has received funding from SFOPS Appropriations Acts, the CDF, per the FFPA, may be counted toward the FFP \$365 million nonemergency requirement. USAID previously administered CDF; for FY2024, \$80 million was programmed.

**Feed the Future (FtF, 22 U.S.C. §§9301 et seq.).** FtF is a development initiative to provide food security and agricultural resources in selected “focus” countries. Congress authorized FtF programs under the GFSA; the current authorization of appropriations is \$1.2 billion annually through FY2028. Congress has directed funds for FtF programs in annual SFOPS Acts under the heading “food security and agricultural development.” In the FY2026 NSRP Appropriations Act, Congress designated not less than \$720 million for such programs. DHR appears to be responsible for FtF.

## Recent Developments

USDA has begun administration of the FFP program, though questions remain about the role of the State Department. State now leads most U.S. foreign assistance programs—having assumed certain former USAID functions—with DHR leading both the emergency and nonemergency food assistance programs.

In the FY2026 NSRP Appropriations Act (Division F; P.L. 119-75), Congress appropriated \$5.4 billion in international humanitarian assistance. In keeping with past practice, Congress did not specify funding for international emergency food programs. As noted above, the FY2026 Agriculture Appropriations Act (Division B; P.L. 119-37) included funding for FFP and McGovern-Dole.

The Administration’s budget request for FY2027 does not include funding for the McGovern-Dole and FFP programs. The Administration requests \$4.0 billion for IHA, a portion of which could be used for EFSP.

## Issues for Congress

Congress may consider amending, reauthorizing, or deauthorizing international food assistance programs in a potential farm bill and/or stand-alone legislation, and adjusting funding levels and oversight requirements.

**Program Administration.** While USDA and State now administer programs formerly under USAID, questions remain about what interagency agreements are in place, whether these agreements align with legislative authorities, and whether there is administrative capacity (e.g., staffing and expertise) to meet program objectives. There are also questions about the scope of global food assistance disruptions. Congress may consider whether to amend the existing statute referencing the role of USAID, or seek to alter the Administration’s plans for international food aid programs. The House-passed Farm Bill (H.R. 7567; §§3101 et seq.), for example, would legislate a move of USAID FFPA functions to USDA.

**Funding and Allocation.** Outlays for international food assistance have fluctuated since FY2010, when EFSP was established, but have trended upward as global food insecurity increased. EFSP has grown from comprising approximately 10% of international food assistance outlays in FY2010—the first year in which it was used—to more than half in FY2024, while FFP has provided approximately \$2 billion per year (in nominal dollars). Congress may debate overall funding for these programs. Considerations may include the balance of funding between commodity-based and market-based programming and support for U.S. agriculture. Congress may also consider the Administration’s recent realized and proposed program and budget cuts as it determines funding levels to meet congressional priorities or address the current structure of international food assistance.

**U.S. Foreign Policy.** More broadly, Congress may examine the role of international food assistance in U.S. foreign policy, the focus of which could include cost sharing with other donor countries, bilateral relationships with recipient countries, food assistance-implementation strategies, global food insecurity levels and impacts, and U.S. leadership in global food security fora.

---

**Rhoda Margesson**, Specialist in International  
Humanitarian Policy

**Emily M. McCabe**, Specialist in Foreign Assistance and  
Foreign Policy  
**Benjamin Tsui**, Analyst in Agricultural Policy

**IF13162**

---

## Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.