

Mike McFaul:

My name is Mike McFaul. I am the director of the Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies. Thank you all coming here for the 2018 Payne Lecture. Let me tell you a little bit about this lectureship, in fact I am obligated to do so. The Payne Lectureship is named for Frank E. Payne and Arthur W. Payne, brothers who gained an appreciation for global problems through their international business operations. Their descendants endowed the annual lecture series at the Freeman Spogli Institute, FSI, in order to raise public understanding of the complex policy issues facing the global community today and to increase support for informed international cooperation. You don't have to talk about that but that's what they were aspiring to do, okay.

The Payne distinguished lecturer is chosen for her or his international reputation as a leader with an emphasis on visionary thinking, a broad practical grasp of a given field, and the capacity to clearly articulate an important perspective on the global community and its challenges. Previous Payne lecturers include Joschka Fischer, Mohammed L. Baradi, Jorge Costenaga, Bill Bradley, Bill Gates, Bob Gates, Kofi Annan and others. We are thrilled to add Ertharin Cousin to this incredible list.

To do a proper introduction, I'm gonna turn the microphone over now to Professor Roz Naylor. I'm sure most of you here know Roz is the director of the Center on Food Security and the Environment at FSI, where she is also a senior fellow. She's also a professor in the School of Earth Systems Science and a senior fellow at the Woods Institute. Roz, the floor is yours. Thank you all for coming.

[Applause]

Roz Naylor:

Thanks, Mike. It's been such an honor, actually it's the Center on Food Security and the Environment's first Payne Lecture. Ertharin Cousin *[applause]* has been with us for the year and it's such an incredible honor, as you'll see by her remarks which will come up very shortly. Before I get started, I just wanted to give you a sense of the afternoon.

Ambassador Cousin will give her remarks for about 45 minutes and then she'll have a brief discussion up here with Steve Stedman and myself, and then we'll open it up to audience questions and then there will be a reception outside. So please join us if you don't get your questions in there will be plenty of time for personal conversation.

Steve Stedman is a close collaborator and friend of mine. He is also a senior fellow at FSI and is the deputy director of the Center on

Democracy, Development and the Rule of Law, and also professor by courtesy in political science. He and I teach a course on food and security together and it's through this avenue, actually, that we met Ertharin Cousin several years ago. And Steve has a long history also working at the United Nations with Kofi Annan, his right-hand person, and so brings in a strong governance aspect to your conversation.

So let me just start by introducing Ertharin Cousin, and I will start by saying Ambassador Cousin but quickly devolve to Ertharin because she has become such a close friend and colleague during this time here. She's the Payne Distinguished Lecturer and visiting fellow here. She is also a distinguished fellow in global agriculture at the Chicago Council of Global Affairs and so she is a busy woman, and in addition to many international talks and meetings and everything that she is running.

Her history in public service, though, goes way, way back. It's not the recent ambassadorship that really marks her history in public service. I think she once told me that as soon as she could walk and talk her mother and father basically pushed her out into the street in Chicago where she grew up and started knocking on doors and doing volunteer work, and she and her sisters were doing volunteer work and public service from as old as they can remember. So this is what her family did, really, and it's no surprise that she's had such an illustrious career.

Ertharin was trained, went to the University of Chicago for her Bachelor's and then was trained in law at the University of Georgia, where she studied international law under Dean Rusk, who was then the US Secretary of State. She then went on to work as the Illinois Attorney General and then also served as the deputy director for the Chicago Ethics Board. And so she has had – went right into public service.

It was really in the 1990s that she got into politics in the Clinton Administration. In '93, prior to the Clinton Administration, she was the deputy chief of staff for the Democratic National Committee and then was pulled in to the Clinton Administration as the White House liaison to the US State Department, where she received numerous awards. She is a liaison, as you will see in a minute. She's a very good communicator. And later she was appointed by the Clinton Administration to be on the board of the International Food and Agricultural Development, IFAD, board, which really brought her into the global food and agricultural realm where she began to focus on hunger.

Though she did quickly bring herself back to the states and said we've got global hunger but we also have hunger in the United States, and she has served a strong course in addressing this problem as well. On the private sector side, she worked as the VP for Public Affairs for Albertsons, which is a private retail chain, where she was really addressing this food desert issue, trying to get grocery stores and food into unserved communities, underprivileged communities.

And then went on to America's Second Harvest where she became the executive VP and the chief operating officer and was dealing with a number of chronic as well as emergency situations, including Hurricane Katrina. So she was in the thick of it early on there. And then went out beyond that to work as the president for the Polk Street Group, which is a public affairs group.

So it was in this setting and her history in Chicago, her history with the Democratic Party, her history in public service that Barack Obama really seized the opportunity to appoint her as the ambassador to the United Nation Agencies for Food and Agriculture in Rome. And she did – in this, IFAD is one of these agencies as was, you know, several others, including World Food Program. And then she went on to actually run the World Food Program in this next term and that was from 2012 to 2017. This was the period where we met her.

So we've asked Ertharin to talk about this period, because as many of you know, during this period, actually hunger started ticking up, the rise in conflicts, particularly in Africa and the Middle East, made governance issues particularly tricky, there were a number of natural disasters, and the confluence of all of these emergencies at the same time as the chronic needs of hunger and malnutrition continue to mount, these were issues that Ertharin had to deal with.

And so we've asked for some personal comments on this. What's it like to be running an agency with such huge responsibility? When Steve and I first met her in 2014 I was so unbelievably impressed by this woman, her strong presence. It was an incredible disaster in Syria, in particular, South Sudan, following Somalia, you know, and she maintained poise and energy, unbelievable energy and creativity in dealing with disasters. So we look forward to having you see that in her. It's no wonder the Forbes listed her as one of the world's most powerful women, 100 Powerful Women in the World, and we're lucky to have her among us. So, Ertharin, we're happy to have you.
[Applause]

Ertharin Cousin: Well, thank you. First of all, Mike, thank you very much for the opportunity to serve here as the Payne distinguished lecturer. This has been an amazing year and FSE, I am proud to be your first Payne lecturer, but I want to thank Mike and all of the colleagues at FSI for being so welcoming to me over the past six months, and as this year has gone really fast. Roz, thank you for that introduction. It's – when I get introduced like that I'm always wishing my mother was in the audience because – but for your mother, you don't get those kinds of introductions, so thank you, Roz.

But as Roz said to you, my commitment to service, particularly as a hunger warrior, began long before being sworn in as an ambassador. And in fact, fighting hunger is simply part of my DNA, service is part of my DNA, as you heard. My grandfather, Arch Harris, was a field laborer. My mother doesn't let me say he was a sharecropper, so my grandfather was a field laborer. And after farm mechanization, when large numbers of laborers were no longer needed, and the government in Washington, Georgia, where he lived, planted trees across these longtime cotton fields, and there are cotton fields somewhere, there they are, my grandfather went to work in the mill and he worked there for the balance of his life because, as he said, he loved my grandmother with every bone in his body but if he had to stay at home with her every day he probably wouldn't make it. So he worked in that mill until he couldn't anymore.

And one day, when my family took a long drive between Georgia and Chicago, because that was what my father considered a vacation, was to pile all of us into a station wagon and drive cross country, and my grandparents were with us, we stopped for gas and my grandfather asked me to walk with him through a field of corn. And he smiled as we walked through the field of corn, and he told me it felt good to know that even though he was no longer farming that America could still feed its people.

So working to ensure that every child has access to nutritious food, it runs in my blood. And for many years this passion was my avocation and not my vocation, but as a lawyer practicing on Chicago's south side, I recognized early on that most legal problems were symptoms of economic problems and that access to economic opportunity is vital, even, of course, in the United States for allowing a family to feed themselves. And as result, when I began my law career, I was fighting for affirmative action and working to ensure that women and people of color had equitable access to contracts as well as county and city jobs. I must admit the statutes and the regs that I

helped to write during that period have now since become unconstitutional but we had to start somewhere.

So when the Clinton Administration, as you heard from Roz, appointed me to serve as the member of the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development, I learned from giants in the field, including Stanford's own Walter Falcone, about the opportunities that sustainable agricultural development could provide for developing countries and the poorest people around the world.

But you heard from Roz, I later pivoted from my private sector work and public sector work into the private sector and started working in the retail food industry. And in this experience it taught me finance but also supply chain, production and operations, and all of this is important to the story of my time at FAO and WFP, as the representative of FAO and as the executive director of WFP because all of these experiences gave me the skills that were necessary to lead in those operations.

So when I was at Albertsons, as you heard, we – my colleagues and I did work to build stores in underserved rural and inner city communities. And while many more stores are needed because we still have too many food deserts in America, the ones we did create provided many, not just in inner cities but also in rural areas, with access to otherwise inaccessible nutritious food.

But I left retail, and I left retail to pursue an opportunity that would allow me to more directly provide food to those in need and that is when I went to work with America's Second Harvest, and as you heard from Roz, we did work there during Hurricane Katrina and raised more money than the organization had ever raised before, and served as the leaders for ensuring that the first line responders had access to the food that was necessary for those across the Gulf Coast who had been affected by the hurricane.

While still addressing the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina here in this country, what most Americans didn't know was that a dramatic spike in world food prices began in 2007 and lasted through the first and second quarters of 2008. This spike created food riots around the world because it caused a global food crisis, causing political and economic instability as well as social unrest across fragile and developing nations.

So in 2009, when the newly elected president Barack Obama made his opening inaugural address, he pledged to those affected poor

nations that the US would work alongside them to make their fields flourish and that same year President Obama nominated me for the role of US Ambassador for Food and Agriculture, the Senate confirmed me, and I am proud to say I was sworn in by my friend, Ambassador Susan Rice, who is here with us today. *[Applause]* That was a good day.

Serving as the permanent representative to the Food and Agricultural Organization, the FAO, and the other Rome-based agencies, since all of the food agencies are in Rome that also included WFP, offered an opportunity to represent the United States during a food crisis that many argued was years in the making. We had reduced the development, investment in agriculture, some say from 17 percent down to 9 percent over a ten-year period before the food riots began.

But the debate regarding the actual cause of the global food price spike continues today. Some arguments include drought in grain producing nation, rising oil prices that triggered an escalation in prices for fertilizer and fertilizers and food transportation, as well as increasing biofuel usage, food export embargos in key countries. And as the FAO has suggested, hedge agricultural futures, hedge fund speculation was also probably part of the reason.

But as any first year Stanford economics students will tell you, correlation is not causation, and so to date, the data fails to sufficiently support any of these reasons as the singular cause of the food price crisis. It was a perfect storm, when they all came – all of these issues came together simultaneously to affect food prices. What we do know is that riots across more than 20 countries did occur.

So in 2009, in response, the London G20 and the G8 L'Aquila Summit, world leaders committed to urgently overcoming the longstanding, underinvestment in agriculture and food security. Countries at L'Aquila pledged their support of \$22 billion over a three-year period for this new global partnership for agriculture and food security. This new global partnership agreement generated excitement across the globe, \$22 billion in three years.

And so the FAO convened a World Food Summit where the principals of the agreement at the G8 were then adopted by all nations of the world, and from this summit came what has been commonly known as the Rome Principles, and these principles include strategies coordination of assistance, that we would work together to ensure that we would not have overlapping programs but that we would have activities coordinated to achieve outcomes. That

instead of donor-led investment, we would have country-led investments, where the countries would develop plans and programs that would support the long-term agricultural development in context for each of their own countries. That we would have a comprehensive approach to food security, no more silos of humanitarian aid and assistance and performance of projects, development and nutrition, that we would bring it into a continuum from humanitarian to development and include nutrition.

And I'm sure you won't be surprised to hear, some of you may be, that the nutrition community and the agricultural community prior to this time rarely ever even talked to each other. So in addition, the principles also required a strong role for multilateral organizations, not just the UN organizations, like WFP and FAO, but the World Bank, the African Development Bank, the regional organizations like the AU and Asion would also partner with the governments to help develop and implement these plans.

And finally, that the world would work together to make accountable investments sustainable or make sustainable investments accountable for long-term resource commitments, because I'm sure Walter Falcone will tell you, you do not make progress in agricultural investment in one growing season, but unfortunately, donors make investments for one growing season. But what the world now committed to was that they would make the long-term resource commitments that were required.

And these principles actually did begin to lay the foundation for all humanitarian and development operations after their implementation. And as a US representative during the World Food Summit, I could not have been prouder of my country. As a matter of fact at one particularly thorny session, a Venezuelan representative came over to me and hugged me, Venezuela, United States, okay, saying it was good to see the US leading for poor people around the world.

However, the enthusiasm across the developing world quickly faded, faded fast. When most countries realized that the \$22 billion included previously earmarked or already allocated funds and that there was little new money available, and while these countries had pledged to provide new money there as very little for the really ambitious plans.

We told countries to lead and they did, they developed plans, very expensive plans and that required international investment that wasn't available. But this disappointment did not infect US relations because our country delivered on our \$3.5 billion commitment of

new money and launched the Feed the Future program to support the implementation of new agricultural development initiatives. And in addition to creating Feed the Future, alongside Spain and Canada and the Gates Foundation, we also created a new window for investment at the World Bank for public-private sector investments.

So we had created the right programs and we were moving in the right direction, and agriculture was prioritized. But while we were doing all this, the reality is that creating the right , even when strongly supported by country policy and action, was often insufficient to address the immediate challenges of food insecurity and nutrition. Handling protracted or long-term humanitarian needs were even more challenging in fragile states and fail states, which often lacked basic government systems, and in fact, of course, were not part of developing these new country led plans that we talked about.

But I can tell you that after my time leading the World Food Program, I learned many lessons but one lesson in particular with which most operators will agree and that is addressing disasters and complex emergencies requires five essential conditions to enable humanitarian actors ability to provide an adequate and timely response.

These elements include presence, you need to be there. If you're not there you can't perform. Access, which means you're not in the capitol, you're in the deep field, and it means that you have access to supporting the affected population in need. Adequate and timely donor funding; when the money doesn't come in, even if you're there, if you have the access, the best laid plans, you can't make it happen. Operational capacity, you must have the ability to perform.

And I say – I will underscore operational capacity because – and the Haiti response is a great example of the need for operational capacity, where there were between 10 and 14,000 NGOs operating in Haiti at any given time, and many of them, some would say most of them did not have the operational capacity that was necessary to support what was required. So operational capacity is a key tool and a key factor that must be met.

And then legal as well as de facto protection for humanitarian actors, and I'll spend a bit more time talking about this issue in a minute, but the reality is humanitarians don't sign up like the military, knowing and thinking and believing that they're putting their lives in jeopardy. But as we lose more humanitarians in responses it is becoming almost as if you need to know that you are – maybe potentially

putting your life in jeopardy as a humanitarian when you are performing in the field.

And so as we go through these five factors there is no better case study for me during my time both as ambassador then as WFP executive director, to help understand the importance of these five key tools or key factors that you need, conditions that are required, than Somalia. In the months and years before the 2011 Somalia Famine, each of these issues presented severe challenges to WFP and the entire humanitarian community. Drought created a severe food shortage across the entire horn of Africa, including Somalia, Djibouti, Ethiopia and Kenya.

In fact, the drought in Kenya was the most intense because it covered a greater geographic area and affected more people than the Somalia drought. But in Kenya all five of the aforementioned conditions, presence, access, adequate funding, operational capacity and humanitarian safety, were met. They were met in all the countries, Djibouti, Ethiopia, as well as Kenya, except Somalia. And as a result of being met in those other countries, there was severe hunger but there was no famine in any of those countries, only in Somalia was there famine, a famine that ultimately caused the death of 260,000 people, over half of whom were children. Many lost their lives on the road from Somalia to Kenya, and many, like the severely malnourished children, I witnessed in Kenya's Dadaab Refugee Camp, received treatment from Médecins Sans Frontières MSF but were too weak to survive when they did make it to Kenya.

And when the UN declared a famine, in 2011, WFP was no longer operating inside Somalia. WFP had been forced, before the famine was declared, to suspend its Somalia operation in early 2010, after receiving death threats and untenable demands from Al-Shabaab and Al-Qaeda affiliated group, who controlled Somalia's drought affected areas. And when WFP announced that they were suspending their operations because of these conditions and the death threats, how did Al-Shabaab respond, they respond by denouncing WFP as a spy agency and formally expelling them from the country.

So many critics blamed WFP and other humanitarians for failing to see warning signs, failing to act fast enough and failing to save innocent lives. On the contrary, early warnings from across the humanitarian community were sufficient, timely and robust. In fact, in late 2008, Josette Sheeran, then the WFP executive director, appealed to the international community for \$300 million. She requested that \$300 million for what she described as a silent tsunami of hunger gathering across Somalia.

Nevertheless, her appeals for funds and support were seemingly ignored. In my first board meeting as US representative at WFP, I remember clearly an hour long presentation in 2009 on the gathering challenge, on the growing challenge inside Somalia. And in 2000, USAID, the largest donor to the Somalia organization, for those who don't know, USAID, the United States Agency for International Development, that's us, you all, they are the largest donor, both then and now, delayed and some say suspended \$50 million food assistance out of fear that it would feed terrorists. Because Al-Shabaab had set up checkpoints where they would charge fees to everyone who was bringing supplies, whether food supplies or other humanitarian supplies into the territory they controlled which was the territory affected by the drought.

But the US was not alone in delaying assistance. Throughout all of 2009 and early 2010, contributions to Somalia from donors were drastically reduced, from donors across the globe. And to compound this, in 2008, the Treasuries Department – our Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control, or OFAC, listed Al-Shabaab as a terrorist group and because of this, many US NGOs during 2009 and 2010 were too afraid of potential prosecution to work inside Somalia.

The State Department at USAID's urging sought confirmation that OFAC, the Office of Foreign Assets and Control, would not seek enforcement against, or not seek enforcement or in other words prosecute any US government employee, grantees or contractors if accidental, unintentional or incidental benefits flowed to Al-Shabaab. If you paid a minor – what they were looking for was that if you paid a minor checkpoint fee that you would not be prosecuted by your government. Unfortunately, the final resolution of this issue did not come before the July 11th famine declaration, which was issued – that famine declaration was not issued until after the death of 30,000 Somalis, half of whom were under 5.

But after the famine declaration, contributions from around the world poured into WFP and other humanitarian organizations, and after OFAC issued the license, USAID created an acceptable reporting system that tracked tolls and other fees paid to Al-Shabaab and their representatives, and as a result, US NGOs and humanitarian organizations no longer feared prosecution and everybody got onboard and got inside, including WFP returned to Somalia.

Al-Shabaab received lasting blame for those living under their

control, for the famine. But on the other hand, the rest of the world continues to disproportionately attribute failure to humanitarians, and I could spend all afternoon trying to give you reasons why and more reasons why the humanitarians were trying to do their best in this circumstance but the most important thing is that we did learn lessons from 2011.

And as a result, in 2017, when drought again affected Somalia, there was no famine. The drought has been going on now for three years and that's in 2017, and it again plagued the region that's controlled by Al-Shabaab. WFP and the humanitarian community working inside the country, prepositioned supplies, donors invested early and with the protection of the AU and government forces, we have so far averted another Somalian famine.

But all I can tell you is that we are not at the end of this story for Somalia, and I ask you all to continue to watch your newspapers and stay alert because again Somalia is facing a drought for the fourth year. This time there are 270,000 living inside an island of protection in the middle of Al-Shabaab controlled area, inside Somalia that will require the international community during this year, 2018's hunger season, to again ensure that we don't face a famine inside Somalia.

But last year, in 2017, Somalia was not the only country threatened by famine. Armed conflict also expose the most vulnerable in Yemen, northeast Nigeria and south Sudan, to potential famine. But in 2017 – and in 2017, south Sudan was in the midst of a conflict driven severe food security crisis, which affected over half the population. Refugees flowed from south Sudan into Darfur. Okay, let me stop there.

How bad is it that you seek refuge in Darfur? But if you look at the northwest corner of south Sudan, that was an area that humanitarians could not access, but because there was an opportunity for the south Sudanese to seek refuge I Darfur, there was assistance. It was only in one county in Unity state as you see on the map, in 2017, where, in fact, because of ongoing conflict that humanitarians could not reach and as a result famine was declared.

And the one thing you should know when you hear famine declared, that means babies have already died. When we say we want to avert a famine or we're on the brink of famine, it means that we're in those orange areas or the red area, but not the dark red and we were able to avoid it again in 2017 in most of the country except Unity state.

But one of the saddest times that I ever experienced as the executive

director of WFP was visiting a refugee camp in Ethiopia, with women coming from south Sudan. And I met a mother who had walked with her three children, and her husband and her son were part of the combatants, were members of the combatants inside south Sudan, so they sent them to the refugee camp for safety and for food in Ethiopia.

And when I met this mother, she was standing outside an MFS tent where the doctors asked her to come inside. And I don't know if I will ever forget the sound as she went back inside that tent and the doctors informed her that her youngest, a 6-month-old, that she had carried for the week and a half that it took her to walk across south Sudan from her village to the refugee camp, eating water lilies along the way, had died. And the sound of that mother's cry was heard across the entire camp as she lost her child that she had tried so hard to save.

Food security crises induced by conflict were a part of my entire experience as executive director at WFP. In fact, on my first day in April of 2012, as executive director, I signed my first amendment to the Syria emergency operation plan. On that day, on April 4th on 2012, we increased the number of conflict affected people WFP would provide food assistance to inside Syria each month from 25,000 to 250,000. But by September, after an escalation in violent attacks, we were serving nearly a million people and those numbers continue to grow.

So by July 24th, once – when the UN Security Council unanimously approved a resolution to allow aid convoys to go into the opposition controlled areas of Syria, WFP was feeding three million people inside Syria and 1.5 million Syrian refugees across Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq and Egypt, every month. But despite the UN resolution, the Syrian government continued to require notice of the arrival and departure of each humanitarian convoy and continually refused access into areas that they or their checkpoint guards deemed unsafe.

So between 2013 and 2017, with support from their allies from Russia and Iran, the Syrian government periodically besieged the opposition held areas of Aleppo, Homs, Eastern Ghouta, Idlib and all around rural Damascus. As a result, food and medical supplies were severely limited from reaching some 400,000 people every month. But in my meetings, in my many meetings with Syrian government officials, I was always told the Syrians were protecting us, the WFP, from what they call the terrorists, the opposition. But every time we'd meet them to quiet complaints from humanitarian, each visit would result in what was always access – always

temporary but access to at least one area.

So when I gave you those five conditions that are necessary and we didn't have access, you ask, so why, despite the fact that there was no access was there no famine or has there been no famine inside Syria? A cross-border operation was implemented by several donors, including the US, which delivered aid through local and international NGOs into many of these besieged and hard to reach areas.

And the other reason why is that I have never met a community of people more entrepreneurial than the Syrians. The black market inside these hard to reach and besieged areas will openly sell you anything for a price. But the reality of it is everything from bread to medicines was and still is on sale at often ten times their market value inside each of these besieged areas. What the system did was left women, children, the elderly, disabled constantly on the move and terribly vulnerable. Negative coping strategies by families to deal with trying to scrounge together enough resources to feed their families inside these besieged areas. The stories we heard, I can't even tell in polite company.

So in 2014, that was when I first met Roz and Steve, the Syria operation was costing us \$32 million per week, and donor contributions were beginning to diminish because the donors told me this was a protracted crisis, Ertharin, and you know what happens in a protracted crisis, you begin to target down, you reduce the number of people that you're serving, you only serve the most vulnerable. But the reality of it was, for us who were working, everybody was vulnerable because the bombs were still falling inside Syria, and outside Syria people had left with nothing in the neighboring countries where they were refugees.

And the governments at that time, it's changed some now, but the governments at that time in Jordan and Lebanon and Iraq prohibited Syrian refugees from working because the local host governments feared the impact of working refugees, the impact that it would have on their own poor populations. So we kept feeding, 'cause I believed the donors would not let us run out of money, but in fact, in December of 2014, the money ran out.

So I made what I thought was a necessary but unpopular and now I will acknowledge, regrettable decision to suspend operations, and we went to the world and begged. *[Video playing.]*

So we decided we would run a 72-hour blitz, everything all-out campaign, doing media around the world, putting this ad on social

media, and it worked. In 36 hours, after suspending operation, donor contributions came forward, led by Saudi Arabia, who had previously rejected our request for a donation. And this social media campaign raised millions of dollars, and of course the US was the number one country where we received individual donations, but the third largest – the country with the third largest number of donations coming in was from inside Syria, where people used their cell phones to donate a dollar. Those who had little and some who had nothing, who wanted to make sure that we could continue to feed.

So not even 72 hours but 48 hours after our initial suspension, we resumed operations both inside and outside Syria and we loaded the monthly financial allotment on refugee benefit cards because outside Syria, in Jordan and Iraq, people were not receiving food aid, they were receiving food assistance in the form of cash that they could spend in local grocery stores. And so we were able to give them that cash within 48 hours.

For many, it was too little, too late, they had lost hope, and these were the days when many began the perilous journey across the Mediterranean into Europe, because people will not stay where they have no hope. And so when I first began my service at WFP, 80 percent of our humanitarian response work was quick onset emergencies, floods, earthquake, drought, and 20 percent was conflict related. When I left, 20 percent of our work was responding to quick onset emergencies and 80 percent was related to conflicts.

But here is the not so secret fact that you all should understand, climate change could again alter these percentages. Today, the majority of the world's poorest, most food insecure people live in climate vulnerable places. The FAO and WFP project that the risk of hunger could increase by up to 20 percent due to climate change by 2050 unless increased efforts are made to enable the world's most vulnerable communities to better adapt to extreme weather events.

And some say, well, we have weather events every year. You're right, historically we have always had El Nino and La Nina weather patterns, they're regular climate conditions, but in 2015 and 2016, these regular weather patterns became more erratic and more intense, creating first droughts and then in some places storms and floods and the weather systems ravaged, again, the horn of Africa but also southern Africa, Central America, Haiti, and parts of Asia.

Presence, access, quick donor response allowed humanitarians, including the team at WFP, to adequately implement effective disaster risk preparation and successful response and recovery

activities. And while everyone did not get as much food as we wanted, we had no famine and children received assistance until their families could recover from the storm activities. Because the question is not where droughts and floods have become more frequent and severe but rather where has and where will impact from droughts and floods most affect livelihoods and ultimately food insecurity, which is why I have Haiti up here, because this is the country that will continue to see the effects of and feel the effects of climate with a government that does not have the ability, as not, to date, demonstrated from past actions, the ability to, without international assistance, provide the support that is necessary.

And beyond Haiti, the anecdotal data suggests that the most climate vulnerable people include people in fragile states, like Haiti, but the rural poor in many of the places around the world that are – some of them are even middle income countries but – or developed – they're lower middle income countries beginning to develop, but they're rural poor, susceptible to the impacts of climate change. Small island inhabitants and many of the small islands, and I've met with them about their food security, disaster risk preparation plans, their plans are to move their people off the island because they know that in many cases their islands may be washed over. And, of course, coastal fisher folk, who depend upon the oceans for their livelihoods.

But the poor are not sitting idly waiting. Every month more climate refugees are joining conflict refugees, fleeing to Europe and other places where they believe there is hope. When given the opportunity to talk to mostly these men and boys on the move, I have learned they don't want to leave home, in fact, they want to return home, but because of droughts and floods, their land is no longer providing enough money to earn even a subsistence living. The young were running away from the struggling lives that they watched their parents lead, now even more challenged by climate's unpredictability.

But as we sit in this room, many of you participated, when leaders across the global community committed to providing the technical and financial assistance needed to create the opportunity and possibility for prosperity across a developing world so no one need to leave their home to find hope. And in addition to the Global Partnership for Food Security that I talked about, the 154 nations of the UN General Assembly, in 2015, unanimously agreed to work together towards achieving the sustainable development goals, to provide universal opportunity for every person to live her life to the fullest potential by 2030.

This was followed by the entire world coming together in Paris for the Climate Summit, where the world also unanimously agreed to support and help finance the adaptation and mitigation work required to make the poor more resilient to the impacts of the affected world. We should begin because the first two years after these documents were all agreed to, these commitments were made, the assessments tell us, again, the money has not come, the support has not been present, the commitments are not being met.

So where should we begin? There are currently 570 small holder farmers worldwide. Countries just develop sustainable and durable food systems from farm to fork. The international donor community must offer adequate technical and financial assistance. Country level policy and regulatory frameworks must welcome private sector investments and partnerships, because today private investments in developing countries, particularly in the agriculture sector, are ten times greater than government foreign assistance.

And many donors, including the Gates and the Rockefeller Foundations have made large investments in more drought resistant and drought tolerant seeds as well as better fertilizers. Food system innovation for long-term results should drive public and private investments.

In Tanzania, WFP together with the African Green Revolution, Robba Bank, Cargill and others are working to support 50,000 farmers from seeds in the ground, cropping practices, loans for small holder farmers, logistic support through reliable fair market – and through providing reliable and fair market access and it's working.

In the 2016 and 2017 planting season, the Farm to Market Alliance successfully helped those farmers in the program increase their maize yields by up to 50 percent and increase their income by as high as 83 percent. The Farm to Market Alliance plans by 2022 to increase the number of countries to ten involved in the program and the number of farmers to 1.5 million. Not enough when there are 570 million small holder farmers.

But we know that all countries will not move forward at the same pace, but what we can't achieve shouldn't limit our efforts to achieve what we can. What we can in the countries where governments provide the policy framework and the governance necessary to support the predictability that private sector requires to invest and farmers need in order to prosper.

But we know we're still going to have challenges, and challenges we

don't expect that may come out of left field as we continue to perform this work. So before I close, I'd be remiss if I didn't mention the lessons we learned from the Ebola response, because in February of 2014 my team in Guinea first reported during a weekly conference call deaths from the Ebola virus so you wrote it down, three deaths in this particular area from the Ebola virus.

But by March, WHO reported to the world a major outbreak of Ebola, in Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leon. By July, thousands of people would die, farms were abandoned, communities quarantined, the healthcare system in each nation completely overwhelmed by the Ebola outbreak. Ebola quickly became not just a health crisis but a food and a logistics crisis.

The US military deployed in Liberia, building hospitals and emergency treatment centers. The UK provided similar assistance in Sierra Leone and the French in Guinea. In addition to devising a creative food distribution system which allowed those who were distributing to provide the food in quarantined areas without actually having contact with each of those that they were serving, and I had the opportunity to visit the distribution and it was quite elaborate, but people got food and none of my people got sick.

So in addition to providing the food assistance, after the suspension of the commercial air services, WFP provided air transport for the humanitarians into the affect countries through the United Nations Humanitarian Air Service, which is also run by WFP. WFP also provided the supply chain and logistics support for the nonmedical items, including such things as ambulances and body bags. WFP constructed emergency treatment facilities and warehouses and storage facilities across the three affected countries. Because the response scaled too slowly, though, tens of thousands of people died before the Ebola virus was brought under control.

But again the reality was, when donors invested and humanitarians, particularly health workers, mobilized from across the globe, and access was given and capacity was there, the dire projections from many across the World Bank and other health communities of hundreds of thousands of deaths never materialized. And so we know, though, that because of the paucity of access to healthcare systems in fragile states across the globe, another pandemic could again pose a humanitarian crisis for those affected communities, and because of transportation from around the world potentially for all of us.

My experience suggests that conflicts will continue to occur and that

quick onset emergencies and other humanitarian crises, particularly in fragile states will continue to wreak havoc on the poorest and the most vulnerable. Therefore, I'm gonna take a bold step here and say that even though we can explore new ways – we must explore new ways to gain access to besieged and disconnected areas, through policy changes and technological solutions, but the bold statement is we must find a better way to fund humanitarian response.

During my last full year at WFP we raised over \$5.4 billion, solely from voluntary contributions. But organizations including the United Postal Union and the World Meteorological Organization receive assessed or required contributions from member nation states but not humanitarians. No humanitarian organization either with the UN or other agencies receive assessed or mandated contributions, mandated funds for their life saving work from any governments.

But with the US and global leadership recently leaning towards populism and xenophobia, I am not naïve enough to think that the global community would support an assessment or a tax for humanity today, but I remain hopeful, nevertheless, because I believe in the people, the people of this world, particularly the people in the United States, and that a solution does exist for financing humanitarian – an humanitarian action fund. If we had such a fund early warnings could trigger deployment of aid from such a fund and allow for more adequate and timely funding to support direct action, saving lives and ultimately saving money.

So, in addition to believing we can end hunger, I remain hopeful that we can raise the money to do the work. So I'll close here by saying my journey as a hunger warrior has seen more lives saved than lives lost, more fat, healthy babies than babies suffering from extreme malnutrition. I will tell you, during my time at WFP, I never let them take a picture of me holding a baby with flies on their eyes or with an emaciated belly. I said the world has seen enough of those babies to know we can fail. I want the world to know we can succeed. So I took pictures in the worst places in the world, in the toughest places with some of the most vulnerable people with beautiful smiling, healthy, clean, happy babies 'cause that's the way their mothers always brought them to me when they could.

And as I always responded when asked which country was my first priority I said no hungry child is more important than another. And as Nelson Mandela once said, which I believe, it always seems impossible until it is done. Ending hunger sometimes seems impossible even to me when I was working on it on a daily basis, but I do believe it can be done, that we possess the tools to get it done.

My grandfather was only content when he could feed his family and with the knowledge that we, as a nation, could feed our own people, and every father and mother everywhere ought to have the opportunity to share the same satisfaction, because every child everywhere deserves access to nutritious food that creates the foundation for a fully productive life and no child anywhere should ever go to bed hungry. Thank you very much. *[Applause]*

Roz Naylor: . . . questions and then open it up to the audience. So, Steve, why don't you go ahead and go first.

Steve Stedman: Sure. Great talk, and every time we talk I'm struck by the fact that what you're describing is, first of all, you're describing massive failures of governance –.

Ertharin Cousin: Mm-hmm.

Steve Stedman: I remember you telling a story about going to south Sudan and telling them you're in near famine and them telling you, yeah, and you'll take care of it and saying, no, no, it's your problem. No, no, it's not our problem, you'll take care of it. You deliver the food.

Ertharin Cousin: Mm-hmm.

Steve Stedman: What you're describing is a massive security problem, the fact that so many of these situations are the result of war. And then you have the insult to injury that you have governance failures and you have security failures and then they say, well, this is a humanitarian failure.

Ertharin Cousin: Mm-hmm.

Steve Stedman: I want to connect to something that you were getting into at the end when you said we're gonna need a lot more resources, we need a new funding model, we need something different, but now what's also – we're dealing with is that around the world you see the rise of populism, you see a lot of questioning about the value of international cooperation. I want you to – I mean when you were in Rome you had to work both sides of the aisle. You had to work in a bipartisan way to get support for humanitarian assistance and you did so very successfully. So can you share – was there something special about humanitarianism that allowed more bipartisanism? Are you skeptical that that's going to end or do you have some hope that your successor at WFP, for instance, even though comes from the

other side of the aisle, you know, will there still be support from everyone for humanitarian response in the United States?

Ertharin Cousin:

Sure, sure. Well, thank you, Steve, for that question. The \$5.4 billion that I talked about, 40 percent of that came and continues to come from the US government, and there has always been a bipartisan coalition in both the House and Senate for humanitarian assistance, particularly for food assistance, food aid, and we'll talk about the difference between food aid and food assistance. Because food aid and one of our colleagues, as you know, wrote a very good book on the history of US food aid and the farm lobby and the farm bill and the commitment that is made to food aid because much of it comes from Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska and places where you have early presidential elections and very strong lobbyists for providing that assistance.

It also goes out under US flags and one of the strongest lobbies are the Maritimers, who require that we use US ships for the movement of food aid because they receive support, financial support for moving that food assistance.

So you ask what's the future? We know that in a lot of places where there is food available bringing in food can make the situation even more difficult for those who are affected. And so it is better that we provide financial assistance when they are functioning markets but the people who are affected by whatever the crisis is do not have access to the cash and financial resources that are necessary to purchase the food in the market.

And so if you want the community to recover quickly, if you want to see the economies grow then you should bring cash. Every donor in the world today provides WFP with cash except the United States. The United States is the only donor that provides food aid, and now provides cash for a local regional purchasing program as well as for us to provide direct cash assistance. That came through the Obama Administration and it was hard fought to get food assistance passed in this Congress.

I remember clearly, as WFP executive director, I never lobbied, I educated members of Congress, and I remember clearly having a conversation with a member of the republican leader and the republican caucus who looked at me after I went through my Ertharin spiel, and you can imagine, I'm standing there and I'm telling him all the reasons why they need to support cash and the difference it was going to make for small farmers in developing countries around the world and for poor people to provide

opportunity. And he looked at me and he nodded his head and nodded his head and he said, you tell me the argument, and that's not it, that I can use inside this republican caucus that will get them to vote for farmers over there instead of farmers in Nebraska and Iowa and Kansas here, and I said I see your problem.

But the reality of it is that that is more of a challenge in longer-term, particularly in development areas than it is in humanitarian today, thank goodness. And David Beasley, who is my successor at WFP, is actually the best person to be in that chair right now with this Administration and this Congress. And when there were four famines, on the verge of four famines in 2017, David was able to get the Congress, after the president's budget had zeroed out food assistance for humanitarian, to increase their contribution to WFP in 2017.

And so again, going back to that bipartisan coalition for humanitarian assistance and just focusing on humanitarian assistance, not those kind of programs that I talked about for Tanzania or Feed the Future or other things, but focusing on saving lives, he was able to get the votes that were necessary to ensure that people would be fed.

But the reality so it is – we save the same lives every year, and so if we don't move from saving lives to changing lives, it is going to continue to cost us significant dollars. And so we must move towards providing people with the tools and the assistance that they require to feed themselves in the long-term. Recognizing that in their many failed states and we have fragile states, and I know many of you in here could name them off, that we are, for a very long time, going to need to provide assistance because of lack of governance, because of conflict, because of the effect of climate change and because we have too many leaders, like the one who said to me in south Sudan that this was the international community's problem that his people didn't have enough food to eat.

Steve Stedman:

Thanks.

Roz Naylor:

So one of the inherent struggles of your whole story is how do you actually deal with this pressure of having to deal with all these emergencies, the natural disasters, now conflict, and at the same time try to build resilience so that you don't have so many emergencies, at least from some of the natural disasters in the future. So I have having a conversation earlier today with somebody who is on the board of several leading companies about Larry Fink's announcement recently, out at Black Rock, where he said Black

Rock's not gonna take investments from any companies that aren't contributing to society, and it was sort of the 50,000 foot view of this, but now they're getting down to the 5,000 foot view of what does that mean, how do we tell if a company is contributing or not.

Certainly, this should have an effect on how private sector entities play into building resilience for climate change, building resilience for agriculture and food security. Give us a couple of examples of private sector initiatives. You know, you were in the private sector at one point. You know, real tangible private sector initiatives that could really represent hopeful change for building resilience to avoid some of these disasters in the future.

Ertharin Cousin:

Well, I'll start with the poster child that everybody always brings up and that's Unilever and Paul Polman at Unilever, and the leadership that he has provided to the global community, particularly to the global business community about what is possible. And he contracts with small farmers in Ethiopia, in Rwanda, as part of his supply chain, to ensure that he is providing opportunities for these farmers, not only to have access to the loans that are necessary for them to purchase the seeds and fertilizers that they need but a reliable market that is not a program but that is a sustainable, durable market that will ensure that they can sell not at the farmhouse gate but at a lower price but into a market.

Then I'll talk about – like, you know, I have my niece here who runs a company called Kuli Kuli and, yeah, I'm bragging on you, and she was a Peace Corps volunteer where she discovered, during the dry season, that women could still keep their children nourished because they fed them the leaves from moringa trees. And she took that moringa and created a product that is now sold through Walmarts across the country as well as through other specialty food stores. And she is providing a market, again, for these poor women inside Niger and now she is working to expand her supply chain to also include potential moringa farmers in Haiti and other parts of the world.

So we need both ends of the spectrums. We need large companies that are willing to take risks that are necessary to ensure that we can build supply chain, as well as small new businesses, both international. And we are seeing the development of a number of new small on-continent businesses that are beginning to develop opportunities for not just the supply chain but things like Hello Tractor, which is the Uber of tractors in Africa. Where this young African gentleman has purchased – probably leases more than he purchases tractors, and then the farmers can, just as you do with an

Uber, call up a tractor when they need to have their fields plowed. And he has created access to mechanization that no one farmer alone could have afforded but that provides an opportunity now for the entire community to benefit from this mechanization.

So we need those kind of new, innovative ideas that are going to be driven, I believe, primarily by private sector because that is what is going to make them sustainable and durable. But that will provide the kind of disruptive change that so many out here in Silicon Valley are accustomed to, that is necessary to move us and leapfrog us to those – providing the support for those 570 million farmers and to support what is necessary for adaptation and mitigation in those places to address what we can see coming from climate change.

Roz Naylor: Okay. One more question or open it up?

Steve Stedman: Let's open it up.

Roz Naylor: Yeah.

Steve Stedman: Yeah.

Roz Naylor: Questions.

Ertharin Cousin: Okay, guys, don't make it that easy. Go ahead, Eric.

Audience: Ertharin, thank you for a wonderful talk. I was struck by a data point in your talk that in the past WFP's operations included operations in 25 percent of its portfolio in conflict affected countries and how it's 80 percent in conflict affected countries. And I am asking you to look under the hood of the WFP, because it seems to me that there would be implications for operation staffing and the life when you're moving from point A to point B, and tell us a little bit about how WFP has changed in light of its increased portfolio in conflict affected countries and how might it change.

Ertharin Cousin: Yeah. Great question, thank you, Eric. What we found was that we have – WFP has 14,000 employees, and a bit over 11,000 – closer to 12, I guess, -000 of those employees are nationals, they are people living in the countries where we operate and the balance are international employees and consultants. And we have found that we're bringing on evermore consultants to give us the ability to shift portfolios as we need. And I, among some other humanitarian leaders, began a conversation that said that we need a humanitarian corps, much like the National Reserve Corps, that we have here in the United States. And the – if I had gotten a second term, we would

have tried to pilot this but I didn't so we'll move on.

But – because the International Red Cross and UNICEF were very interested in participating in a pilot program, to begin to develop a roster that we could keep trained and at the ready, that we could call up as needed but not keep on our books during period of time when we were not responding to quick onset emergencies. And so I believe that that's going to be the future.

No organization can afford to carry a full load of all of the different staff tools and characteristics that they need, and so I expect, despite the fact that I'm not there, I'm hoping, knock on wood, that these conversations are continuing to move forward about the development of at the ready – an at the ready workforce. And with communication and transportation expanding the ability for us to keep a team prepared, the possibility of this becomes ever more of a potential reality as time goes on.

Steve Stedman: Michelle.

Audience: Thank you for saying at the end that you have hope, because if you have hope I am gonna have hope too. Really appreciate all the stories from everywhere you've talked about all around the world. Can you share some of your perspective, insight on food insecurity in the United States and even here in the Bay area, surprisingly a lot?

Ertharin Cousin: Mm-hmm. Well, as you heard Roz say – and I spoke a bit about it, when I was at WFP, WFP feeds 49 million Americans every year. One in every four people in a food line in the United States is a child. The Backpack Program was created by WFP probably – WFP, I'm sorry, by America's Second Harvest, now Feeding America, probably 15 years ago, and what the Backpack Program does is you have some – 30 million or 25 to 30 million children who receive either free or very reduced lunches as part of the USDA's School Meals program in the United States.

But what that means is that on the weekend many of these children don't have access to nutritious food, and so what the Backpack Program does is those children who have been approved for school lunch – for reduced or free school lunch on Fridays will receive a backpack, and the reason they're given a backpack instead of a box of food is so they're not stigmatized. Everybody carries a backpack.

And I will never forget the first time that I went to a school when the children were receiving backpacks for the first time, and there was a 12-year-old who was getting a backpack and he had two younger

siblings at home. And when he unzipped it and saw all of the – there were snacks too, okay, so there was some good stuff in there for kids, but there – you know, he had things like – and all of you who are opposed to processed foods, stop, you know, macaroni and SpaghettiOs, things that children could eat that would keep them full but also fruit was in there. And he just looked at it and he said sweet, sweet and zipped it back up.

But what we found when we surveyed after the Backpack Program pilot began some years ago was that not only were children eating from this backpack, they were sharing with their families, their parents were eating from it too. Because the reason the food pantries and the food banks can serve 49 million people is because while we have increased the number of people who are receiving SNAP benefits, formerly known as food stamps, they don't – it doesn't last 'til the end of the month and so people are looking and they find assistance in other places.

And what we know is that if we cut the SNAP benefits, which is the suggestion that is on the table before this – as a part of this farm bill discussion that's happening right now, that those 70 plus million people, and many of them are working people who otherwise couldn't afford access to food, will be standing even sooner in the month in those food lines because we do have – in the United States it is not an availability problem. We have food available, it's an affordability problem. So it's an access problem.

Because while our economy has increased, wages have not increased, and you have many people who continue to struggle every month, and I'll stop there, 'cause you can tell I can go on on this –. I am so happy because in the last eight years I could not talk about US hunger when I was serving as ambassador, as WFP executive director.

One of the first things I said in the first speech when I talked about working to address food policy issues in the United States, which I'm also doing, is that I've been freed, that I could now begin to, again, address the issues right here at home. And because under the Obama Administration, when we agree to support the sustainable development goals, we made them universal, that means that we, as the United States, must also deal with our food insecurity and our nutrition problems right here at home.

Roz Naylor:

Michelle.

Audience: Thanks for a very sobering but inspiring talk. I have a question for you. We're sitting right now on the cusp of an agricultural revolution with CRISPR-Cas9 and gene editing, and given all the pushback with GMOs, globally, I'm curious as to your perspective as to how this will progress, 'cause this is a potential for feeding much larger part of the world?

Ertharin Cousin: So I was not very popular with the Europeans when I was ambassador, because the science tells us that there has never been a proven health challenge or problem from GMOs, and as you said, GMOs and particularly hybrids, which we've been doing forever, will change productivity, it will provide more drought tolerances, drought resistances. So the challenges that we're talking about, science is going to be part of the answer to adaptation. I'm not real popular in some audiences when I say that but I am realistic about what is required.

And while I believe in science, I also believe in trials and tests to ensure that things are safe and that we're making the right decisions as we move forward. But I say let the science lead us but make sure that we have appropriate regulations and policies to support the science as we move forward and today, we don't, and today, we don't.

Audience: Hi, great talk, really wonderful points you've made. And I wanted you to speak a little bit, if you could, a little more about climate change. I think it's the elephant in the room for everything, but for agriculture in particular, and if you see some – since you talked about hope, some solutions to what we're facing with climate change and how it affects agriculture.

Ertharin Cousin: Well, I could spend the next hour talking about this. We will – I'll talk a little and then we can talk 'cause you're around, so we'll talk. But let me say two or three things. First of all, I've talked about science and technology, which I believe are a significant part of the problem for us creating the kind of disruptive seed evolution or revolution that will provide for more – less risk in planting for small holders. But I also believe that we need to look at the issue of irrigation and small holder irrigation, not just big dams and projects but small holder led irrigation.

In India today, 43 percent of all small holder farms are irrigated, and there have been a lot of mistakes, I know that. We could have a long conversation about the Indian and – India and what's happening with the water table, et cetera, but we can learn lessons from that and create the policies and regulations that are necessary to support small

holder irrigation tools because there are tools out there now that will give small holders the ability to overcome the challenges of when the rains don't come or when the rains are not enough to support their crops. And those tools are becoming ever cheaper every year.

So providing the regulatory frameworks and, where necessary, the initial government subsidy support to assist farmers in acquiring the tools that are necessary to reduce the amount of risk in agriculture through irrigation. Because today 97 percent of all the agriculture in Sub-Saharan Africa is rain fed, and with 9.5 billion people that we're expecting and all the things that we know about climate change, we know we're going to need to increase the productivity of agricultural land not by expanding agricultural land but by intensifying the production in the agriculture in the areas where we're already operating and that requires both the seeds, the fertilizers and the irrigation that we just talked about.

But also, and I'll stop at this, we need insurance. We need insurance that farmers can afford around the world, and it's a market and there's lots of conversation going on but there's not enough happening. Lots of small pilots we need to scale them up, because every time the rains don't come, the crops fail, farmers start all over again and they're further back, because now they have loans, than they were at the last season. And there is not a farmer in the United States that would operate without insurance, but insurance is not available to most of the farmers who operate in other parts of the developing world.

So I'll stop there 'cause as you can see, I could spend a lot of time. But when we talk about adaptation and mitigation, the tools were all discussed in Paris, all of – everything I'm saying to you, there was at least one panel, probably three or four panels talking about it at the Paris Climate Summit, and everybody agreed these were the things that we need to do. The investments have not been made and the scale that is required has not occurred and we need to move forward because time is moving forward and climate is continuing to change.

And these people – you've seen the tip of the iceberg with population movements to date. We will continue to see population movement and challenges of that movement if we don't give people the support that they need to do what they want to do, which is stay home.

Audience:

I have a question. For those of us who found your talk very moving, compelling and motivating, how can we get involved, those of us who are not professors?

Ertharin Cousin: Well, I am actually speaking on March 16th at the Students Against Hunger, and Stanford is not a member of the National Organizations of Students Against Hunger. Every California school, U Cal, Berkeley, Davis, they're all members of the Students Against Hunger and will have representatives at the University of Illinois when they meet. Why isn't Stanford?

We need to take – with all of the – I have been so impressed with the student body here and the creativity and the ideas, and we need a chapter here at Stanford working to ensure that we are not only addressing hunger out there but hunger here at home as well. So that's what we can do.

Audience: Thank you.

Ertharin Cousin: Mm-hmm.

Roz Naylor: I think that's a great note to end on. And we have a reception here and let's thank – the reception is out there, sorry. And yeah, let's thank Ertharin for a great –.

Ertharin Cousin: Thank you, thank you so much.

[End of Audio]