

FOOD SECURITY GOVERNANCE

Integrative Strategy Facing Global Food Crisis



By: Rudy C. Tarumingkeng

Rudy C Tarumingkeng : *Food Security Governance: Integrative
Strategy Facing Global Food Crisis*

By:

[Prof Ir Rudy C Tarumingkeng, PhD](#)

Professor of Management NUP: 9903252922

Rector, Cenderawasih State University, Papua (1978-1988, dan
Head, AGRO Manokwari Campus, (now Universitas Papua Manokwari)

Coordinator, CIDA/DIKTI SFU Burnaby BC Canada 1988-1991

Rector, Krida Wacana Christian University, Jakarta (1991-2000)

Chairman, Board of Professors, IPB-University, Bogor (2005-2006)

AI - Data Analyst, dan Chairman Academic Senate, IBM-ASMI, Jakarta 2024-

© RudyCT Academic Series

rudyct75@gmail.com

11 Maret 2026

FOOD SECURITY GOVERNANCE: INTEGRATIVE STRATEGY FACING GLOBAL FOOD CRISIS

Abstract

This paper examines food security governance as a central policy challenge in an era of compound global crises. It argues that the contemporary food crisis is not only a matter of insufficient production, but also a governance failure involving weak coordination across agriculture, trade, logistics, nutrition, climate adaptation, social protection, and multilevel decision-making. Using a qualitative policy-analysis approach grounded in recent official evidence, the paper synthesizes global and Indonesian developments to explain why food security governance must become more integrative, anticipatory, and system-oriented. The conceptual basis of the analysis rests on the widely accepted four dimensions of food security—availability, access, utilization, and stability—while extending them into a governance framework that emphasizes institutions, rules, actors, and coordination mechanisms across scales. ([World Bank](#))

Recent global evidence underscores the urgency of this shift. FAO's 2025 report on food security and nutrition shows that about 673 million people experienced hunger in 2024, while around 2.3 billion people faced moderate or severe food insecurity. In parallel, the World Bank's nutrition affordability data indicate that around 2.6 billion people could not afford a healthy diet in 2024, with the global average cost of a

healthy diet reaching \$4.46 per person per day in purchasing-power-parity terms. The World Food Programme's 2025 Global Report on Food Crises adds that more than 295 million people across 53 countries and territories faced acute food insecurity in 2024, largely because of conflict, economic shocks, and climate extremes. These developments show that food insecurity today is being driven less by simple aggregate scarcity than by fractured governance of prices, diets, logistics, and resilience. ([FAOHome](#))

For Indonesia, the paper finds a mixed but strategically important picture. National rice production for food consumption rose to 34.69 million tons in 2025, poverty declined to 8.25 percent in September 2025, and stunting fell to 19.8 percent in 2024. Yet annual inflation still reached 4.76 percent in February 2026, rural poverty remained substantially higher than urban poverty, and the government continued to rely on strong public reserves and food-price management to maintain stability. These patterns suggest that Indonesia has improved the supply base, but still confronts structural governance challenges in territorial distribution, producer protection, diet quality, and shock response. ([Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia](#))

The paper concludes that an integrative food security governance strategy should rest on eight pillars: whole-of-government coordination, territorial logistics integration, climate-resilient production, strategic reserve management, nutrition-sensitive policy, adaptive social protection, data-driven early warning systems, and renewed multilevel and international cooperation. For Indonesia, the main lesson is clear: food governance must move from a commodity-centered approach toward a resilience-centered food systems approach if it is to protect both national stability and household welfare in an increasingly volatile world.

Keywords: food security governance, global food crisis, national resilience, healthy diet affordability, food systems transformation, Indonesia

1. Introduction

Food security has become one of the most revealing tests of state capacity in the twenty-first century. A government may appear strong in macroeconomic planning, infrastructure investment, or diplomatic positioning, but if it cannot secure affordable and nutritious food for its population during periods of turbulence, then its resilience is incomplete. The classic definition of food security—physical and economic access for all people at all times to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food—remains analytically useful because it captures the multidimensional nature of the challenge. It tells us that food security is not fulfilled by national supply alone. It also depends on access, nutrition, and stability over time. ([World Bank](#))

This multidimensional understanding matters because the global food crisis is no longer reducible to crop failure or temporary market imbalance. It is increasingly shaped by interconnected disruptions: inflation, conflict, climate shocks, trade instability, displacement, and the rising cost of healthy diets. FAO's 2025 food security report explicitly emphasizes how elevated food-price inflation has undermined purchasing power and especially low-income populations' access to healthy diets. This means that the contemporary food crisis is as much a crisis of governance and affordability as it is a crisis of production. ([FAOHome](#))

Governance therefore becomes central. A food system may produce enough grain, yet still fail if transport networks break down, social protection is too weak, or policy institutions act in isolation. The UN Food Systems governance brief states directly that governance is at the core of food systems transformation, and FAO's governance gateway

shows that effective agrifood governance spans global, regional, national, and community levels. Food security governance, then, refers not merely to government intervention, but to the structures, rules, participation mechanisms, and institutional relationships through which food systems are managed.

Indonesia offers a particularly valuable setting in which to examine this issue. It is a large archipelagic state with considerable agricultural potential, significant policy ambition, and persistent inequalities across regions and social groups. Indonesia has recently recorded stronger rice production, lower poverty, and declining stunting. Yet it also continues to face price sensitivity, logistical disparities, and nutritional challenges. These contradictions make it clear that governance—not production alone—is the central analytical problem. ([Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia](#))

This paper therefore asks: what does food security governance require in a period of global food crisis, and what are the main lessons for Indonesia? It answers that question by first clarifying the concept of food security governance, then reviewing the current global crisis context, and finally proposing an integrative governance strategy relevant to Indonesia's evolving food systems agenda.

2. Conceptualizing Food Security Governance

Food security governance can be understood as the set of institutions, rules, policy processes, actor relationships, and accountability mechanisms that shape how a society secures food availability, access, utilization, and stability. This concept moves beyond the narrower question of whether agriculture ministries perform well. It directs attention to how multiple domains—agriculture, health, social protection, trade, transport, climate policy, finance, and local administration—interact or fail to interact. FAO's governance framework presents agrifood governance as a multi-level phenomenon, with action

at global, regional, national, and community levels, while the UN food systems policy brief emphasizes that governance is essential for moving from high-level commitments to real implementation. ([FAOHome](#))

A governance lens also changes the unit of analysis. Instead of asking only how much food a country produces, it asks who has authority to coordinate reserves, how risks are monitored, how public and private actors interact, how producers are represented, how diet quality is prioritized, and how national commitments are translated into subnational action. This is especially relevant because food systems are inherently cross-sectoral. Production, prices, and nutrition do not move independently. A rise in food prices may reflect not only supply stress but also transport bottlenecks, weak data systems, poorly designed trade responses, or insufficient household protection. Governance determines whether these linkages are understood and managed. ([World Bank](#))

The global governance architecture around food also illustrates this complexity. FAO highlights the role of intergovernmental and multistakeholder dialogue in generating norms, standards, and voluntary guidelines. The Committee on World Food Security and related processes show that food governance increasingly requires multi-actor engagement rather than simple top-down control. A 2025 CFS policy-recommendation process on urban and peri-urban food systems explicitly recognized the need for a systemic, territorial, multi-sectoral, multi-level, and multi-actor governance approach. That language is highly relevant beyond cities; it captures the broader direction food governance must take in the face of systemic stress. ([FAOHome](#))

From this perspective, food security governance is not a technocratic add-on to food policy. It is the architecture that determines whether food policy functions under normal and crisis conditions. Good governance does not eliminate risk, but it improves anticipation,

coordination, adaptability, and fairness. Poor governance, by contrast, turns manageable shocks into social and political crises.

3. The Contemporary Global Food Crisis as a Governance Crisis

The recent global food picture demonstrates that food insecurity is increasingly driven by failures of coordination and resilience rather than by simple global scarcity. FAO's 2025 report indicates that global hunger fell only modestly to 8.2 percent of the world population in 2024, leaving about 673 million people hungry, while around 28 percent of the global population still experienced moderate or severe food insecurity. At the same time, the report highlights that high food-price inflation has undermined purchasing power and healthy-diet access, especially for low-income groups. This means that even where supply exists, governance systems are failing to protect access and diet quality.

[\(FAOHome\)](#)

The affordability challenge confirms this diagnosis. The World Bank's Food Prices for Nutrition DataHub reports that the global average cost of a healthy diet reached \$4.46 per person per day in 2024 and that around 2.6 billion people could not afford such a diet. It also notes that progress has been uneven, with worsening trends in low-income countries and parts of Sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East and North Africa region. These figures show that food governance today must address not only staple supply, but also the pricing, distribution, and social accessibility of healthier foods. [\(World Bank\)](#)

The WFP's crisis reporting sharpens the point. More than 295 million people in 53 countries and territories faced acute food insecurity in 2024, with conflict, economic shocks, and weather extremes as major drivers. This is not simply a matter of local agricultural failure. It reflects institutional fragility, disrupted trade and transport, weak humanitarian access, poor coping capacity, and insufficient systems for protecting livelihoods under stress. Acute crises expose the failure of governance to

connect early warning, response, and resilience. ([World Food Programme](#))

World Bank food-security monitoring adds a further layer. Its December 2025 update notes that global wheat and rice prices had fallen year-on-year and that markets appeared relatively well supplied, yet high input costs still constrained lower-margin systems. This is a crucial observation: a food crisis can persist even when aggregate markets appear calm. Farmers may still face unaffordable inputs, poorer consumers may still face unaffordable diets, and fragile countries may still face acute food stress. Governance failure lies precisely in this mismatch between aggregate supply indicators and lived access outcomes.

Climate change intensifies the governance challenge. WMO's January 2026 statement that 2025 was one of the warmest years on record underscores that extreme heat, rainfall variability, and climatic stress are no longer exceptional disturbances. Food governance must therefore become climate-aware in routine policy design, not just in disaster response. Systems that assume stable seasons and predictable supply patterns are becoming obsolete. ([Bank Indonesia](#))

4. Why Integrative Governance Is Necessary

An integrative food security governance strategy becomes necessary because food systems are governed by interdependencies. Food production depends on climate, land, water, energy, and finance. Access depends on income, transport, market regulation, and social protection. Utilization depends on nutrition policy, health services, education, and sanitation. Stability depends on reserves, risk monitoring, institutional coordination, and crisis response. Any governance system that handles these domains in isolation will struggle when shocks become compound. ([World Bank](#))

FAO's governance support framework emphasizes coherence across sectors and levels, while its Indonesia-focused governance initiative explicitly states that better coordinated interventions, policy integration, and stakeholder participation are necessary to advance food systems transformation and healthy diets for all. In Indonesia's case, that initiative sought to strengthen both central and regional institutions, with evidence-based planning tailored to local contexts. This is precisely the kind of governance innovation required under global crisis conditions. ([FAOHome](#))

Integrative governance also means balancing short-term stabilization with long-term transformation. The World Bank highlights that its global food security work spans both short-term interventions such as expanding social protection and longer-term resilience such as boosting productivity and climate-smart agriculture. This is an important governance lesson. Countries cannot choose only one horizon. A governance strategy that focuses only on emergency relief becomes permanently reactive, while one that focuses only on long-term reforms may leave households unprotected during immediate shocks. The challenge is to bridge the two. ([World Bank](#))

Another reason integrative governance is necessary is territorial diversity. Food systems do not operate uniformly across space. Regional production conditions, transport constraints, dietary patterns, and social vulnerability differ widely. The CFS policy language on systemic and territorial governance is relevant here: food governance should not assume that national averages accurately capture local realities. A country such as Indonesia, with major geographic and socioeconomic diversity, needs governance that can align national direction with subnational flexibility. ([FAOHome](#))

5. Indonesia's Current Governance Situation

Indonesia has recently demonstrated meaningful progress in several food-related indicators. BPS reported that rice production for food consumption rose to 34.69 million tons in 2025, based on 60.21 million tons of paddy production and harvested area of 11.32 million hectares. This is a substantial increase and provides a stronger base for domestic supply. Such performance matters for governance because it expands the room for reserve building, market stabilization, and crisis preparedness. ([Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia](#))

On the social side, Indonesia reduced poverty to 8.25 percent in September 2025, equivalent to 23.36 million people, but rural poverty remained significantly higher than urban poverty at 10.72 percent versus 6.60 percent. This difference is central to food governance because rural producers remain more exposed to economic shocks even while they are expected to sustain national food output. A governance system that secures consumer prices while leaving producers structurally vulnerable cannot be considered fully resilient. ([Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia](#))

Indonesia also improved nutrition outcomes, with the Ministry of Health reporting that stunting fell from 21.5 percent in 2023 to 19.8 percent in 2024. The same release notes significant variation across provinces, districts, and socioeconomic groups, and stresses the value of open nutrition data for policy planning. This is an important governance signal: food and nutrition policy are increasingly being linked through data, planning, and targeted intervention. But the level remains high enough to show that food security governance still has unfinished business on healthy diets and household utilization. ([Kementerian Kesehatan Republik Indonesia](#))

Price stability remains a major governance test. Bank Indonesia reported that annual CPI inflation reached 4.76 percent in February 2026 and that food-related inflation pressures remained central to macroeconomic management. It also emphasized that implementation of the National

Food Security Program and coordination through central and regional inflation-control teams were important for keeping inflation within the medium-term target corridor. This shows that Indonesia already treats food governance as a cross-institutional issue, not merely as a ministry-specific matter. ([Bank Indonesia](#))

Public reserves are another relevant part of the governance picture. Bapanas reported in January 2026 that Bulog-managed rice stocks stood at 3.36 million tons, including about 3.23 million tons of government rice reserves, and stressed that the government's immediate focus was on maintaining smooth distribution and consumer price stability. This matters because reserves only strengthen food security when combined with credible release mechanisms, territorial targeting, and distribution capacity. Governance, not stock size alone, determines whether reserves actually enhance resilience. ([Badan Pangan Nasional](#))

There is also evidence that Indonesia is explicitly framing food policy as systems transformation. A May 2025 FAO-supported workshop with Bappenas and regional officials focused on improving governance for agrifood systems transformation, aligning decentralized planning with climate action, evidence-based policymaking, and local contexts. Officials described Indonesia's agrifood transformation as directed toward healthy, nutritious, inclusive, equitable, resilient, and sustainable food systems based on ecoregions and local potential. This is a strong institutional sign that the country is beginning to think in governance terms, not only in commodity terms. ([FAOHome](#))

6. An Integrative Strategy Facing the Global Food Crisis

6.1 Whole-of-government and multilevel coordination

The first pillar of an integrative strategy is stronger coordination across ministries and levels of government. Food security governance must link agriculture, trade, transport, health, climate, social protection, local

government, and macroeconomic management. The UN food systems governance brief argues that national governance is essential for translating commitments into implementation, while FAO's governance framework emphasizes action from global to community level. For Indonesia, this implies institutionalized cross-sector platforms that do more than exchange information; they must jointly plan, sequence, and evaluate action.

6.2 Territorial and logistics integration

The second pillar is territorial integration of food logistics. In an archipelagic country, governance fails when food remains plentiful in one region and unaffordable in another. Bank Indonesia's GPIPS places regional supply connectivity and market stabilization at the center of inflation control, which is an appropriate recognition of Indonesia's structural geography. An integrative governance strategy should therefore treat logistics infrastructure, interregional coordination, warehouse networks, and cold chains as food-governance institutions, not just transport matters. ([Bank Indonesia](#))

6.3 Climate-resilient domestic production

The third pillar is climate-resilient production. Food governance must protect supply not only through area expansion and input policy, but through adaptation to increasingly unstable weather conditions. Global temperature records and FAO's repeated attention to climate-linked food stress imply that climate resilience must be embedded in food governance routines. For Indonesia, this means that production policy should be integrated with weather services, seed and water management, and localized risk planning. ([FAOHome](#))

6.4 Strategic reserves and market stabilization

The fourth pillar is strategic reserve governance. Public food reserves are useful not only as physical stocks, but as instruments for expectation

management and orderly intervention. Bapanas's January 2026 statement makes this explicit by linking strong reserves to stable prices and uninterrupted consumer needs. But reserves become resilience-enhancing only when governance ensures transparent stock monitoring, timely release, territorial targeting, and compatibility with producer incentives. Reserve policy must be predictive rather than purely reactive. ([Badan Pangan Nasional](#))

6.5 Nutrition-sensitive food governance

The fifth pillar is nutrition-sensitive governance. Global evidence now makes it clear that food security cannot be reduced to calories. With 2.6 billion people still unable to afford a healthy diet in 2024, governance must address the cost and accessibility of diversified, nutritious foods. Indonesia's stunting decline is encouraging, but it also reveals that nutrition remains structurally unequal across regions and social groups. Therefore, food governance should explicitly align production, price, and distribution policies with healthy diet outcomes. ([World Bank](#))

6.6 Social protection as food-system governance

The sixth pillar is adaptive social protection. The World Bank's food-security work explicitly includes short-term interventions such as social protection alongside long-term resilience measures. This is vital because households facing sudden price shocks or income loss cannot wait for structural reforms to take effect. Food governance that excludes social protection leaves the most vulnerable exposed precisely when resilience is needed most. Indonesia's own food-assistance and market-intervention practices suggest that this logic is already recognized, but it can be further institutionalized through more anticipatory targeting and integration with nutrition and poverty data. ([World Bank](#))

6.7 Data systems and early warning

The seventh pillar is data-based governance. Integrative strategy requires better information on prices, stocks, diets, climate risks, producer vulnerability, and territorial imbalances. FAO's Indonesia governance workshop emphasized evidence-based decisions and tailored interventions, while the Ministry of Health described open nutrition data as a foundation for stronger policy. In practical terms, this means that food governance should rely increasingly on integrated dashboards and early-warning systems rather than delayed administrative reporting. ([FAOHome](#))

6.8 Regional and international cooperation

The eighth pillar is renewed cooperation beyond the nation-state. FAO's governance framework highlights the importance of global and regional collaboration in generating norms and harmonizing common objectives. Since food crises now spread through markets, climate systems, and geopolitical disruptions, national food governance cannot be entirely domestic. Indonesia's strategy should therefore connect domestic resilience with regional coordination, international learning, and multilateral engagement on food systems transformation. ([FAOHome](#))

7. Main Lessons for Indonesia

The first major lesson for Indonesia is that food security governance must be treated as a resilience function of the state, not simply as agricultural administration. The strongest recent evidence—from inflation control, reserve management, poverty disparities, and stunting reduction—shows that food outcomes depend on cross-sector institutions rather than on harvest outcomes alone. Indonesia's recent governance innovations point in the right direction, but they must become routine and systemic. ([Bank Indonesia](#))

The second lesson is that local and regional diversity requires territorial governance rather than purely national averages. Indonesia's

archipelagic structure, regional inequality, and local ecological variation mean that resilience must be built territorially. The Bappenas-FAO emphasis on ecoregions and local potentials is therefore not a rhetorical flourish; it is a practical governance principle. Policies must be nationally coherent but regionally adaptive. ([FAOHome](#))

The third lesson is that healthy diets should become a formal governance objective. The affordability crisis documented globally and the persistent variation in Indonesian stunting show that nutrition cannot remain a secondary outcome. Governance that prioritizes only staple stability will remain incomplete. National resilience depends on food quality as well as food quantity. ([World Bank](#))

The fourth lesson is that governance reform must be anticipatory. The most expensive and socially damaging food policies are often those made late, after market stress has already become household distress. Better coordination, reserves, data, and social protection are all valuable because they allow earlier intervention. In a world of compound crises, anticipatory governance is no longer optional.

8. Conclusion

Food security governance has become one of the central questions of contemporary public policy because the global food crisis now reflects failures of coordination, affordability, resilience, and inclusion as much as failures of production. Official evidence from FAO, the World Bank, WFP, and WMO shows that hunger, unaffordable healthy diets, climate volatility, and acute food insecurity remain widespread. The global crisis is therefore governance-intensive: it demands institutions capable of integrating short-term stabilization with long-term transformation. ([FAOHome](#))

Indonesia has important strengths: stronger recent rice output, lower poverty, reduced stunting, and increasingly explicit policy attention to

food-systems transformation. Yet these gains coexist with inflation sensitivity, rural vulnerability, and persistent nutritional inequality. The central implication is that food governance must move beyond commodity-centered management toward an integrative strategy that connects production, logistics, prices, nutrition, social protection, climate resilience, and data. ([Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia](#))

In that sense, food security governance is not a narrow development subfield. It is a practical expression of national resilience. A country that governs food well protects livelihoods, stabilizes prices, strengthens human capital, and preserves public trust under stress. A country that governs food poorly may continue to produce crops, yet still remain socially and politically fragile. For Indonesia, the lesson is not simply to produce more food, but to govern the food system more intelligently, more inclusively, and more strategically in the face of global crisis.

([World Bank](#))

Glossary

Food security

A condition in which all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food for an active and healthy life. ([World Bank](#))

Food security governance

The structures, institutions, rules, and coordination processes through which food availability, access, utilization, and stability are managed across sectors and levels. Supported by FAO's governance framework and the UN food systems governance brief. ([FAOHome](#))

Availability

The supply-side dimension of food security, determined by production, stocks, and net trade. ([World Bank](#))

Access

The economic and physical ability of households and individuals to obtain food. ([World Bank](#))

Utilization

The nutritional and health-related use of food, including diet quality and safe consumption. ([World Bank](#))

Stability

The persistence of food availability, access, and utilization over time, including during shocks and disruptions. ([World Bank](#))

Healthy diet affordability

A measure of whether households can financially obtain a diet that meets nutritional standards. ([World Bank](#))

Moderate or severe food insecurity

A condition in which people face uncertain, insufficient, or compromised access to food, ranging from reduced diet quality to more serious deprivation. ([FAOHome](#))

Acute food insecurity

A severe short-term crisis in which food deprivation threatens lives or livelihoods and typically requires urgent action. ([World Food Programme](#))

Multilevel governance

A governance approach involving coordination across global, regional, national, subnational, and community levels. ([FAOHome](#))

Territorial food systems approach

A governance approach that recognizes spatial diversity and the need to

align food policy with local contexts, ecosystems, and regional realities.
([FAOHome](#))

National resilience

The capacity of a country to absorb shocks, adapt to stress, and sustain essential economic, social, and institutional functions. In this paper, food governance is treated as one of its core pillars. Supported by the evidence synthesized throughout the article. ([World Bank](#))

References (APA 7 style)

Badan Pangan Nasional. (2026, January 12). *Swasembada beras tercapai, Bapanas pastikan stok awal 2026 aman dan harga terkendali.*

Badan Pusat Statistik. (2026, February 5). *In September 2025, the percentage of the poor population decreased to 8.25 percent.*

Bank Indonesia. (2026, March 2). *CPI inflation under control in February 2026.*

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2025). *The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2025: Addressing high food price inflation for food security and nutrition.*

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (n.d.). *Governance for agrifood systems transformation.*

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2025, May 5). *Indonesia's government and FAO hold training workshop to improve governance for agrifood systems transformation.*

Committee on World Food Security. (2025). *Policy recommendations on strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation.*

Kementerian Kesehatan Republik Indonesia. (2025, May 26). *SSGI 2024: Prevalensi stunting nasional turun menjadi 19,8%*.

United Nations Food Systems Coordination Hub, Scientific Advisory Committee. (2025). *Strengthening national governance for accelerating food systems transformation*.

World Bank. (2024). *What is food security? There are four dimensions*.

World Bank. (2025). *Food Security Update*.

World Bank. (2025). *Food Prices for Nutrition DataHub: Global statistics on the cost and affordability of healthy diets*.

World Food Programme. (2025). *Global Report on Food Crises 2025*.

World Meteorological Organization. (2026, January 14). *WMO confirms 2025 was one of warmest years on record*.

Copilot for this article - Chatgpt 5.2 Thinking. Access date: 11 Maret 2026
Prompting on Writer's account ([Rudy C Tarumingkeng](#))

<https://chatgpt.com/c/69b0de38-98a0-839c-82cd-fe88384118dc>