

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI)

Subject: Request for Information (RFI) – Non-Emergency Title II Food for Peace Program

Program Authority: Title II, Public Law 83-480, Agricultural Trade and Development Assistance Act of 1954, *as amended*, (7 U.S.C. §§ 1721, *et seq.*)

Date of Issuance: July 6, 2026

Response Due Date: 5:00:00 EDT July 24, 2026

Respond Via Email: **foodforpeace@usda.gov**

This is a Request for Information (RFI) for Food for Peace non-emergency programming. This is not a Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO)/Request for Applications (RFA), an Annual Program Statement, a Request for Proposal or Application, a Request for Quotation, or an Invitation for Bids. This is not to be construed as a commitment by the U.S. Government (USG) to issue a solicitation or Notice of Funding Opportunity, or to award any contract, grant, or cooperative agreement based on responses submitted. Responses to this RFI shall not be portrayed as applications and will not be accepted by the USG to form a binding agreement.

The RFI is a line of effort undertaken by USDA to solicit stakeholder input on Food for Peace non-emergency programming. The information contained within the RFI is intended solely as a thought-piece; ideas may change significantly during the program design and approval process.

Respondents are solely responsible for all expenses associated with responding to this RFI. This RFI is not to be construed as a commitment by the USG to pay for any information submitted because of this request. Responding to this RFI will not give any advantage to any firm or organization in any subsequent procurement and will not lead to an organizational conflict of interest.

Responses may be used by USDA without restriction; as such, respondents to this RFI should not submit proprietary or confidential information.

Responses will be used for internal planning and program design purposes only and will not be attributed publicly. USDA will not share feedback on the responses of this RFI. This RFI is purely informational and non-binding.

Background

America's farmers and ranchers are the best in the world – blessed with the most bountiful land, armed with the most innovative techniques, and supported by an agricultural policy that encourages bold approaches but protects against risk. Since the advent of the Marshall Plan in 1945, it has been the policy of the United States to share its agricultural bounty with those less

fortunate around the world. The non-emergency Title II Food for Peace program will enhance and complement existing international emergency food assistance programs in recipient countries by targeting resources to increase food security, nutrition, and overall resilience. The non-emergency Title II Food for Peace program will operate through the procurement of 100% U.S. agricultural commodities programmed for use in destination countries. Specifically, under 7 U.S.C. § 1721 *et seq.*, the program supports non-emergency development activities aimed at:

- Enhancing food security while reducing the future need for emergency aid;
- Combatting chronic and acute malnutrition especially in children and mothers;
- Strengthening early recovery and resilience; and
- Supporting communities through multi-year, development-focused programming.

As global contexts evolve—driven by supply chain disruptions, global market changes, logistical constraints, and social and political contexts—USDA/FAS seeks stakeholder input on effective non-emergency program considerations as well as insights on commodity availability, packaging, shipping, handling, nutrition, costs, and operational realities affecting program performance.

Purpose

The U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) seeks public input to inform planning and potential updates to implementation approaches under the Non-Emergency Title II Food for Peace Program, authorized by 7 U.S.C. § 1721 *et seq.*

This RFI seeks stakeholder perspectives on:

- A. Resilience Program Design and Implementation
- B. Commodity Needs, Constraints, and Opportunities;
- C. Nutrition Considerations;
- D. General Programmatic Implementation; and
- E. Additional Relevant Insights.

The information collected may be used to support future program planning and help ensure U.S. in-kind food assistance effectively reduces food insecurity among vulnerable populations by addressing its underlying causes.

Submissions

Responses should not exceed 10 pages and should be typed in English using single spaced, 12 point font. Do not include proprietary information, proposals, or resumes. The USG will ****not**** pay for response preparation.

Submit responses via email to: foodforpeace@usda.gov

Subject Line: **RFI – Non-Emergency Title II Food for Peace Program**

Questions for Stakeholder Input

Within 10 pages, respondents may address any or all of the following:

A. Resilience Program Design and Implementation

USDA/FAS welcomes stakeholder input on the types of resilience-focused activities that could strengthen the effectiveness, sustainability, and long-term food security outcomes of the non-emergency Title II Food for Peace program while avoiding all adverse impacts to U.S. export markets. Respondents are encouraged to provide input on any of the following:

- What categories of activities (e.g., agriculture-led growth, natural resource management, livelihood strengthening, community-based disaster preparedness, malnutrition prevention and treatment, etc.) are most effective in supporting long-term food security in Title II operational contexts?
- Integration with In-Kind Food Assistance: How can resilience activities and U.S. sourced commodities be better integrated to improve nutrition, household stability, and shock responsiveness?
- Innovation: In what ways could USDA/FAS be innovative as it designs future non-emergency programming to meet its goals, especially in the areas of utilizing U.S. grown or produced commodities, leveraging strategic partnerships, or ways to reduce aid dependency?
- Strengthening Local Food Systems: What interventions are the most effective to strengthen local markets and reduce reliance on external food aid?
- Weather and Disaster Considerations: What resilience approaches best address land degradation, water scarcity, or extreme weather events in Title II operational contexts?
- Target Populations: What strategies ensure resilience activities effectively reach targeted beneficiaries, including women and children?
- Sustainability and Local Ownership: What models promote sustained behavior change, community ownership, and local institutional capacity?
- Measurement and Evidence Gaps: What performance indicators, evaluation methods, or evidence gaps should USDA address to better assess resilience outcomes in Title II non-emergency food programs? What are recommended methods for measuring resilience in Title II non-emergency operational contexts?
- Future Needs Reduction: What other resilience approaches could strengthen long-term food security, reduce vulnerability to shocks, support self-reliance, and encourage a reduced need for future aid in Title II non-emergency operational contexts?

B. Commodity Needs, Constraints, and Opportunities

- Appropriate Commodities: Which U.S. agricultural commodities could be most appropriate for in-kind donation or monetization within non-emergency Title II programming?

- Capacity vs. Absorption: How can USDA continue to balance current U.S. production and packaging capacities and seasonal availability considerations with absorption capacity constraints in recipient countries?
- Commodity Opportunity: How could USDA better utilize other commodity programming modalities (i.e. monetization, food for work, food for barter) to address the underlying causes of food insecurity while ensuring programming does not create a substantial disincentive to domestic production nor generate any negative market impact?
- Constraints: What could be some supply chain constraints affecting timeliness, food safety, storage, or delivery of commodities meant for in-kind donation or monetization?
- Other Commodity Factors: What are the programmatic, transportation, containerization, packaging or other factors that could drive decisions on commodities selected for programming?

C. Nutrition Considerations

- Nutrition: How should USDA plan to address nutritional benefits for adults and children within non-emergency Title II programming?
- Fortification: What types of fortification considerations (biofortification, post-harvest and industrial: large-scale, local, and household-level) should USDA consider?
- Targeted Ages: In addition to pregnant and lactating women, What age ranges of children should USDA target for usage of fortified products?

D. General Programmatic Implementation

- Efficiency: In what ways could USDA promote efficiency in the implementation of Title II non-emergency programming, including in the procurement and delivery of commodities?
- Field Level Challenges: What barriers or challenges have been faced in the field by past implementers of Title II non-emergency programming?
- Innovation: Are there innovative activities or approaches USDA could support to maximize funding and ensure the greatest impact?
- Lessons Learned: USDA welcomes past implementors' descriptions of key successes and lessons learned in building resilience, with a focus on leveraging emergency and non-emergency programming, public-private partnerships, and other resources for improved outcomes.

E. Additional Insights Relevant to Title II Programming

- Respondents may provide any other input relevant to the Non-Emergency Title II Food for Peace program.

