

# SUSTAINABLE DIETS FOR ALL

Policy Influencing  
Case Study

End-Term Evaluation of the  
Citizen Agency Consortium  
Sustainable Diets for All Program



**END-TERM EVALUATION OF THE SUSTAINABLE DIETS FOR ALL PROGRAMME  
IMPLEMENTED BY CITIZEN AGENCY CONSORTIUM**

**Report of the Case Study on policy influencing at  
international level and in The Netherlands**

June 2020

**By:**

Pol De Greve – I&SConsulting, Mechelen, Belgium

## CONTENT

List of abbreviations.....	3
1. Introduction .....	4
1.1. Objectives of the evaluation .....	4
1.2. Methodology of the evaluation .....	4
2. Brief description of the programme .....	4
3. Programme achievements.....	6
4. Analysis of the level of effectiveness .....	8
4.1. Policy changes.....	8
4.2. Contribution to policy debate at international level and in the Netherlands.....	10
4.3. Capacity development / organisational development.....	13
4.4. Research .....	14
4.5. Gender and Youth.....	14
5. Analysis of the relevance .....	14
5.1. Relevance of policy changes .....	15
5.2. Citizen agency in local - national - global linkages .....	15
6. Analysis of the sustainability.....	16
7. Analysis of efficiency.....	17
8. Conclusions and lessons learnt .....	20
Annex – Persons met / interviewed.....	24

## List of abbreviations

10YFP	10 Year Framework Programme on Sustainable Consumption and Production
APF	AgriProFocus
CD	Capacity development
CFS	Committee on Food Security
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
F&BKP	Food and Business Knowledge Platform
FSD	Food Systems Dialogue
HLPF	High-Level Policy Forum
L&A	Lobby and Advocacy
MAC	Multi-Actor Committee of SFS
MAI	Multi-Actor Initiatives
SD4ALL	Sustainable Diets for All
SFS	Sustainable Food Systems
SFS	Sustainable Food System
SME	Small & Medium Enterprise
ToC	Theory of Change
UNEA	United Nations Environment Assembly
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
WBCSD	World Bank Council for Sustainable Development
WEF	World Economic Forum

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Objectives of the evaluation

The objective of the evaluation is to assess the effectiveness, relevance, sustainability and efficiency of the SD4All programme. These evaluation criteria relate to the changes that the programme has contributed to:

- in capacities for Lobby and Advocacy of (Southern) partner organisations,
- in agendas, policies and practices of government and market actors (and possibly other actors, depending on the specific ToC of the programme).

### 1.2. Methodology of the evaluation

Four country-based case studies and one case study on international and Netherlands lobby and advocacy work constitute the backbone of the evaluation of the SD4All programme.

The case studies are built around the research matrix that was developed during inception. The matrix is structured along 5 topical questions covering the aspects of: effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability and relationships.

For the international and Netherlands-based policy case, the methodologies used for exploring key programme-related processes and outcomes and assessing the programme's contribution to stated outcomes included<sup>1</sup>

- Attendance as observer at the annual global reflection meeting with IIED and Hivos staff,
- Face-to-face interviews with core staff<sup>2</sup> of the global team,
- Semi-structured interviews with informants from UN agencies, Southern CSOs, INGOs, and governments,<sup>3</sup>
- Work session efficiency analysis using a method based on the *multi-attribute decision making* approach with 5 staff (3 from Hivos and 2 from IIED).

## 2. Brief description of the programme

The SD4All programme's international advocacy efforts connect national advocacy agendas in Bolivia, Indonesia, Kenya, Uganda and Zambia to global policy forums that improve diets, tackle malnutrition, and address the need for sustainable consumption and production. The programme seeks to engage with national and international decision makers via multi-stakeholder collaboration, to create policy environments that accelerate the shift to more sustainable food systems and facilitate the promotion and uptake of sustainable diets for all.

The Hivos global SD4All international advocacy team has been acting as a co-lead of the Sustainable Food Systems (SFS) Programme of the UN 10-Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production (10YFP) since early 2016 till end of 2019. As food systems reform is a key priority for SD4All, the SFS Programme was identified as the most important international platform for the SD4All Programme to engage with on an international policy level. Acting as a co-lead provided the opportunity to steer and actively contribute to the Programme's strategic direction and profiling. In its role as co-lead, Hivos:

---

<sup>1</sup> See annex 1 for the itinerary and annex 2 for persons met

<sup>2</sup> Frank Micheilsen, SD4All programme coordinator and Nout van der Vaart, Advocacy Officer Sustainable Food

<sup>3</sup> See annex for list of interviewees

- ✓ supported the preparation and organisation of the two global conferences of the 10YFP SFS programme one in Pretoria, South Africa in 2017 and the 2<sup>nd</sup> in Costa Rica in 2019 including side events such as workshops and a food waste dinner (Pretoria) and networking dinner (Costa Rica);
- ✓ facilitated the organisation of the meetings of the SFS Programme’s Multi-Stakeholder Advisory Committee (MAC);
- ✓ facilitated different sessions at the global conferences and sat in different discussion panels;
- ✓ contributed to the preparation of the displays at the “Camp One Planet” exhibition space at the 2018 HLPF Forum
- ✓ engaged in two SFS core initiatives namely on healthy and sustainable gastronomy and ‘setting the table for our children’;
- ✓ raised interest in the sustainable food systems approach among the wider and high-level policy-making community through side events with the Committee for Food Security meetings in Rome in 2017 and 2018; at UNEA in Nairobi in 2019 and at the 2019 EAT forum in Stockholm;
- ✓ supported the development and publication of the *Collaborative Framework for Food Systems Transformation*; a guideline for policy makers as a part of the bigger *SFS Toolbox*;
- ✓ actively engaged in preparing and facilitating SFS side events with the Committee for Food Security meetings in Rome in 2017 and 2018, at UNEA in Nairobi in 2019 and at the EAT Forum in Stockholm also in 2019.

In the Netherlands, as an active member of the *AgriProFocus Food & Nutrition Security Advocacy Group*<sup>4</sup>, the global team engaged in policy influencing through several activities that included:

- ✓ recurrent lobbying via letters, blogs, op-eds, and other formats / channels to different ministries and members of Parliament on food system transformation and related areas;
- ✓ initiation and co-authorship of the 2017 ‘**Food Transition Manifest**’ addressing Dutch Parliamentarians and relevant civil servants pleading for a prominent place for food security on the international development agenda and for leadership by Netherlands in realising transition of SFS worldwide;
- ✓ lobbying for the uptake in international settings of *circularity in agriculture* (a central concept adopted by the Dutch Ministry of Agriculture) with a view to sharpen international food security policies;
- ✓ lobbying to influence the drafting of a joint letter by Ms. Schouten, Minister of Agriculture and her colleague Ms. Kaag, Minister for Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation on the Netherlands food security policy towards 2030.

Note: as far as the policy influencing on Netherlands food and nutrition security is concerned, the goal of Hivos / the APF group was to better integrate this policy with other related policy areas (policy coherence) and strengthen policy framework, more specifically:

- ✓ take food systems as the point of departure in policy development rather than production systems;
- ✓ focus on interest of smallholder farmers and local SMEs in the South making use of knowledge and expertise of the Dutch agrifood sector (in a fit-to-purpose application):

---

<sup>4</sup> Often called the AgriProFocus Policy Advocacy Group

- ✓ adjust and diversify policy and programme interventions to different smallholder categories<sup>5</sup>;
- ✓ pay more attention to consumer interests, nutritional aspects next to agricultural issues, climate resilience, the position and role of (rural) women and youth, and rural entrepreneurship & capacity development /knowledge.

In other initiatives Hivos:

- ✓ acted as member of the steering committee supporting the *Food Cabinet* in the organisation of the Netherlands **World Food Day** event,
- ✓ sensitized the Dutch public and relevant allies and stakeholders in the Dutch food policy environment of the necessity to diversify food production, supply and consumption with different contributions in World Food Day events, such as the **Eenheidsworst** ('One-size-fits-all sausage') mini-campaign on World Food Day, 2016 and the 2018 WFD session which was built around the study on True Cost of Maize,
- ✓ engaged in lobby and advocacy through the **Transition Coalition on Food** with actors from different sectors who are jointly working on new solutions to the current agricultural and food system,
- ✓ collaborated in a project / event with Slow Food International and its Youth Network whereby 100 young grassroots civil society representatives from around the world discussed and emerged themselves in the thick problems of the global food system, co-creating and pitching solutions at the end of the day. A *change makers guide for future food leaders* was produced as a concrete output of this event.

### 3. Programme achievements

Since its inception till present, the overall SD4All programme has initiated multiple initiatives to address challenges faced by actors in the food system - from producers to consumers - to promote sustainable food systems and improve access of people to sustainable, diverse, green, affordable, healthy, and nutritious food. Many diverse outcomes were realised in different domains in different countries and at international level related to changes in agendas, policies or practice of Governments, multilateral agencies, private market actors and their networks and alliances. In this section we focus on a selection of achievements in the area of international advocacy and advocacy in the Netherlands as claimed by Hivos. Some of these outcomes were realised in collaboration with or with support of staff of IIED and country-based staff of Hivos and partners.

Hivos as co-lead of SFS programme as well as through other activities at international policy level claims to have contributed to

- ✓ presenting and establishing the One Planet network as a meaningful, inclusive and credible voice in the international food policy debate;
- ✓ more wide-spread understanding of the concept of Sustainable Food Systems among national governments and international agencies and networks;

---

<sup>5</sup> IOB referred to the 'DFID' classification developed and documented in Andrew Dorward, Simon Anderson, Yolanda Nava Bernal, Ernesto Sánchez Vera, Jonathan Rushton, James Pattison & Rodrigo Paz (2009) *Hanging in, stepping up and stepping out: livelihood aspirations and strategies of the poor*, *Development in Practice*, 19:2, 240-247, DOI: [10.1080/09614520802689535](https://doi.org/10.1080/09614520802689535)

- ✓ pushing the agenda setting for a transformation towards sustainable food systems with more actors, particularly governments as well as with global level players and networks;
- ✓ widening the international debate on food beyond food security, advocating for more inclusive and participatory food policy making with special attention being paid to women and youth inclusion;
- ✓ Increased membership and participation of civil society in the 10YFP Sustainable Food Systems programme;
- ✓ bringing the voice and experiences of civil society to two Global Conferences, as well as to several side-events in the margins of other international conferences, with Southern representatives presenting stories and evidence of how local and national civil society organisations in the global South work towards food systems transformation on the ground,
- ✓ core initiatives of SFS such as *Setting the Table for our Children* with UNEP and BioVision; aimed at engaging multiple actors at different levels in building a community of practice on food systems;
- ✓ stronger consideration of systems thinking and stakeholder engagement in SFS as well as development of a conceptual transformative framework on sustainable food systems that was inspired by the work of Hivos with food labs in Zambia and Uganda.

Hivos claims that advocacy in the Netherlands policy arena resulted in

- ✓ stronger and more permanent dialogue with relevant officials in the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Agriculture about priorities and directions for food security/food systems, collaboration with Southern civil society organizations, and general issues of development cooperation (ODA) allocation.
- ✓ Mobilising a large number of Dutch CSOs, private and public sector organisations and knowledge institutes to support the policy demands as presented in the *Food transition Manifesto*.
- ✓ Contribution to change in narrative with the Ministry of Agriculture and Foreign Affairs in prioritising food systems as a main framework in which to embed policy development on food and nutrition security
- ✓ Spreading and propagating the understanding and adoption of the concept of food systems among (interested) public and stakeholders in the Dutch agri-business and food sectors through active support and participation in the organisation of annual World Food Day events bringing the voice and story of the South to this platform.

Furthermore, the programme contributed to

- ✓ Building leadership capacity of over 100 young civil society representatives, and strengthening Slow Food Youth Network as an inspiring and capable grassroots civil society actor for bringing about change in the global food system.

In general, from the above succinct summary of achievements, one may conclude that CAC consortium (claims to have) realised a wide variety of outcomes that contribute to the stated objectives of the programme. Obviously, the programme also faced a number of challenges that may have hampered or slowed down the realisation of outcomes. Claims to achievements as well as challenges will be discussed in the following chapters.

#### 4. Analysis of the level of effectiveness

Evaluation Question 1:

Which changes have occurred in agendas, policies and practices of targeted social actors and in the L&A capacities of participating organisations (effectiveness)?

##### 4.1. Policy changes

As presented in the previous section, the co-leadership of the 10FYP Network SFS programme was a key component of Hivos' international advocacy programme. In the self-evaluation exercise, the international advocacy officer observed that, *whereas at the start (2015) the SFS programme was one of the few international initiatives to promote sustainable food systems, since then more multiple like-minded networks and initiatives have popped up*<sup>6</sup>. There is indeed ample evidence that more governments, donor agencies and investors are adopting a food system's narrative and approach. Available (primary and secondary) sources provide insufficient evidence on whether, and if so, to what extent the SFS programme (or the 10YFP for that matter) has contributed to a wider adoption of the food system concept among international actors. While many of the reported changes and developments with respect to adoption of the food systems concept are well grounded in evidence, the evidence of contribution by the programme therein is hard to establish. Some rival / complementary explanations (like initiatives by WEF or the multi-actor dynamics towards the 2021 UN Food Systems Summit) are equally – or possibly even more - valid in explaining positive trends in adoption of food system concepts among a wider audience of international actors.

Hivos as well as the other co-leads in the SFS programme assume that the programme indeed succeeded in raising awareness of the food system concept and approach among key actors within the UN system<sup>7</sup> and with some Governments. This claim is likely to be legitimate as reach-out of the programme has been confirmed, i.e. to UN agencies, governments and bilateral agencies, international development NGOs and –presumably more modestly – to private sector actors. This reach-out was realised thanks to SFS conferences and (side-)events, and contributions to international initiatives such as of CFS, WEF, UNEP, EAT, UNEA, Food System Dialogues, and others.

At the same time, SFS stakeholders that were interviewed, indicated that the SFS programme's initial ambition to become a *global point of reference for effective and successful food systems reform* has not been realised (see section 5.1 for discussion on possible future pathways to realising such an ambition). Lack of funding for the SFS Programme was mentioned as a major reason (and challenge) but lack of funding could also be considered as evidence of it's the programme's modest impact so far among key international players and funding agencies. A few informants thought that the fact that SFS is embedded in the UN might have been a disadvantage for raising support (and funding) among those governments and agencies that are somewhat wary of UN's bureaucracy and high-cost functioning.

More critical outsiders pointed out that despite having a UN signature itself, the SFS programme outreach to and influence on influential global bodies as well as on governments (including the Netherlands government) has been rather limited throughout. They also indicate that, in recent

---

<sup>6</sup> Quote – Hivos 2019 self-evaluation of SFS programme

<sup>7</sup> *ibid*

years, more and more key players in the global food and agriculture sector are picking up on food systems approaches without truly linking or referring to the (potential) role of the SFS as innovator, interlocutor, broker and/or knowledge platform on sustainable consumption and production. Hence in their view, the impact of the programme on other policy makers has been rather moderate.

All external as well as internal resource persons agreed that the achievements of the overall SFS programme may have been less decisive or meaningful than initially hoped for. While evidence is there to support Hivos' claim<sup>8</sup> that the *SFS programme successfully contributed to agenda setting and promoting the concept of sustainable food systems as a policy priority* in international circles, it was also acknowledged that *concrete change in practice* [say: with governments supporting food system transition] *is still hard to identify*.

A challenge that the SFS programme has faced was in trying to increase programme ownership with Southern actors / governments. Hivos (with support of WWF and Switzerland) took the forefront in pushing (and supporting) the South-African government to organise the first SFS global Conference in 2017. In doing so, Hivos was instrumental in having the South African Government take a more active leadership role in the programme. The conference was successful as it gathered over 150 participants from over 27 countries. Hivos also facilitated the participation of a Zambian government representative in this conference, but this did not result in a sustainable and enduring engagement of the Zambian government in the SFS Programme. Despite these and efforts to have more Southern actors engage pro-actively in the programme, it was observed that *no meaningful additional African or Asian involvement has been realised over the last few years*<sup>9</sup>. Overall, the SD4ALL programme seems to have reached the best results in engaging national governments in the South, by working its way up from the local level (citizen and local governments) in the countries themselves and / or engaging directly in-country with national government. The other way around, i.e. SD4All working through international platforms to promote food systems approaches and food system transformation with different national authorities apparently has yielded less meaningful results.

In the self-evaluation of the SFS co-leadership, it is acknowledged that *a lack of meaningful participation and buy-in from (major) private sector has always been a weakness to the programme. As a precondition to tick the inclusivity box, private sector engagement has been necessary but lacking in this UN initiated multi-stakeholder platform. Meanwhile, it has been observed that (major) private sector actors use other channels or establish similar initiatives to influence global food policy making (e.g. WBCSD). That raises the question to what extent MAIs like the SFS Programme are effective vehicles to enforce/advocate for change?* Private sector participation in the SFS policy debate has been a challenge in the entire One Planet Network. To some extent, Hivos was bringing in this dimension through their involvement with multi-stakeholder initiatives that in some cases, had private sector representation but mostly of SMEs and not of larger commercial players. One informant argued that (1) private actors will first seek to connect with each other before linking to other players and (2) private actors are often not 'UN-minded', hence their low interest in SFS and similar initiatives. It must be noted, however, that Hivos itself decided quite early in the programme,

---

<sup>8</sup> Self-evaluation of the Hivos SFS-programme co-leadership (May 2019, N. van der Vaart)

<sup>9</sup> *ibid*

to drop the pathway of change targeting private sector actors from the ToC of international advocacy primarily because this would stretch necessary efforts beyond available resources.

In conclusion: after further exploration of facts and perceptions of internal and external stakeholders, the evaluator endorses the overall findings and conclusions of the self-evaluation of the SFS Programme Co-Leadership. The engagement of Hivos has had its benefits in terms of *increased visibility and acknowledgment of Hivos as a credible actor in the policy field*. Moreover, it has *facilitated new relationships with key stakeholders (donors, governments and CSOs)*. However, the modest realisations and impact of the SFS programme may not sufficiently warrant the efforts and resources that have been invested in the co-leadership of SFS programme over the last 4 years. The SFS programme remains relevant, though, provided it can be stronger linked to new and powerful dynamics in the international policy setting (see 5.1 for more discussion). If this move succeeds, the continuing contribution of Hivos as MAC member may bring new opportunities for effectively influencing the policy debate focusing more strongly on the content of the debate and less (or no longer) on management and organisation of the platform.

As indicated earlier focus in policy influencing in the Netherlands was on adoption and ownership among Dutch government officials of the food system concept and approach in policy making as well as on the broader theme of the Netherlands' international food security policy. External resource persons confirmed what members of the AgriProFocus Advocacy Group argued: namely that working in group provided a firm basis for joint advocacy by key civil society organisations and knowledge institutes on food and agriculture in the Netherlands. It can be safely concluded that this (the APF group) was a better and more effective approach to influence relevant policy makers than individual advocacy actions. There are mixed perceptions among policy makers of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and of Agriculture of the influence and impact that the advocacy of Hivos (either through direct action or via APF) may have had on the adoption by Government officials of the food system concept in policy making as well as on the 2019 revisit of the Dutch international policy on food security (i.e. as presented in the letter of Ministers Kaag and Schouten). Most resource person agree that Hivos and the APF group have contributed to sharing information on food systems concepts with a wide audience of policy makers and other stakeholders in the sector and therefore influenced awareness of the concept among this audience. Similar dynamics have been observed in the Netherlands as in the international arena, namely: an increase in interest in food systems among key policy makers. This is evidenced in the Netherlands by the active engagement of both the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Agriculture in the preparations towards the UN Food System Summit in 2021. However, whether policy influencing by civil society organisations has contributed to this development cannot be firmly established. One official rather considers this (CS advocacy + changing attitude among policy makers) to *be a case of correlated events/trends without causality*.

#### **4.2. Contribution to policy debate at international level and in the Netherlands**

##### **International levels**

Most external resource persons indicated that Hivos is a rather small organisation when looking at the global policy arena on agriculture and food. This is not necessarily a disadvantage, it was

observed, provided that Hivos can position itself in relevant niches of the policy debate and use its knowledge and experience of programme practice to inform and enrich higher-level policy debates.

Members of the One Planet Network and its secretariat expressed appreciation for the role and contribution of Hivos to the SFS programme. They appreciated Hivos for bringing the voice of the South to the global policy debate and for more strongly integrating developmental aspects and social dimensions (inclusiveness) in the conceptualisation and operationalisation of the food system's approach. There was also appreciation for Hivos' contribution to the identification and development of focus themes and core initiatives of the SFS programme. In addition, it was indicated that as an INGO, Hivos could be more assertive and critical than established bodies of UN or governments which according to some co-leads, helped to sharpen the policy debate. Co-leads and members of the MAC also indicated that they also appreciated Hivos' ability and experience in transposing the narratives on food systems to practice in local situations in the South e.g. through its food labs. UNEP for instance indicated that they picked up new insights from Hivos about food system assessments and the approach of food labs in Zambia and Uganda. UNEP also indicated that they were very much in line with Hivos on promoting a more innovative systems' approach to food security. WWF mentioned that they were inspired by and learned from Hivos on the integration of health and nutrition aspects in a food system approach.

A few external informants indicated that the effectiveness of policy influencing by Hivos especially so at international level (but also somewhat in the Netherlands), was hampered by the fact that Hivos is / was not very well-known in international circles as a key player or thought leader on food system transformation. As a matter of fact, Hivos took on the co-lead in SFS exactly with a view to build up track record, visibility and reputation and to establish international network contacts and linkages to meaningfully engage in policy influencing in high-level institutional settings (as well as to access institutional funding). Hivos in fact succeeded in strengthening its reputation in this respect, but mostly so among those already directly or indirectly involved in the One Planet network and presumably less so with outsiders. IIED was a valuable partner in the programme but was itself not principally engaged in international policy influencing, hence it did only contribute indirectly to strengthening Hivos' position and standing in the international policy arena on food and agriculture.

Finally, informants unanimously stated that the Hivos global team has performed very well as a co-lead among (more) powerful and globally influential players like FAO and UNEP or national governments (Switzerland, South Africa, Cost Rica). The co-leads as well as the secretariat commended Hivos staff for their high professional standards. They indicated that the Hivos staff were able to facilitate and moderate complex interactions in high-level policy settings<sup>10</sup> very well while at the same time *'bringing in some fresh air to the room'*. There was also general appreciation among external resource persons for the clear and appealing way in which SD4All is communicating through various media and in different forms about concepts and practice of food systems. This has inspired others (co-leads) in their communications as well.

Resource persons (internal and external) indicated that the challenges that Hivos faced in its co-leadership were to some extent caused by lack of (programme) resources that did allow only for a

---

<sup>10</sup> E.g. in hosting a strategic reflection on the role and functioning of the SFS programme Network

(roughly) half-time deployment of a staff member for the co-leadership. This limited Hivos' ability to contribute to certain processes related to resource mobilisation or to development of advocacy strategies for the SFS programme. A few external resource persons also had hoped that Hivos' active role would have helped to mobilise and engage 'fellow' INGOs<sup>11</sup> in the SFS programme. It must be noted, however, that this has never been a formal objective for Hivos and therefore no specific actions were taken in this respect.

Finally, some (2) resource persons questioned the relevance and value added for Hivos of being co-lead of the SFS programme. They wondered whether it wouldn't have been more beneficial if Hivos would have redirected time, energy and resources spent on co-leadership to more content-related activities such as further exploring how to strengthen local-national-global linkages, how to embed evidence from programme practice into international policy agendas and dynamics, or how to strengthen social dimension (inclusiveness) of the food system concept and approach. On the other hand, it was said that the role of Hivos as a co-lead was valuable and important especially in the early years of the SFS (before WWF actively joined in) for reasons stated earlier (e.g. Southern voice, social dimension, inclusiveness, system's approach, concretisation of FS approach, local-global linkages etc.). One resource person stated this as follows: *Hivos stepping down as co-lead will take some steam off the programme*. One external resource person raised the question whether it wouldn't have been a better option for Hivos to opt out as co-lead after 2 years in order to focus thereafter on matters of content rather than organisation? However, the co-leadership was a four-year commitment which Hivos did subscribe to, and besides after two years (following the 1<sup>st</sup> Global Conference) the prospects of the network looked fairly promising.

### **Policy influencing in the Netherlands**

Over the last 4 years, Hivos played a pro-active role in the APF Advocacy Group as well as in the World Food Day steering committee. There was quite some appreciation for Hivos' role in both settings by other members / stakeholders.

The APF Policy Advocacy Group derives its relevance and value from having a good representation of some of influential Netherlands development NGOs (and knowledge institutes) active in food and nutrition security and agriculture. The group has been active for quite some years in a fairly steady constellation which definitely contributed to effective internal communications and deliberations (knowing each other's positions, goals and strengths quite well). The group claims to be one of the few influential actors in the policy debate on the Netherlands' international policies in food and agriculture (including agribusiness and trade). Other players reportedly focus more on specific policy themes such as nutrition as a stand-alone domain or on technical / economic dimensions of agricultural production or value chain development. In the group, Hivos has a relatively strong position (knowledge and expertise) compared to other members in matters of sustainable diets and consumer representation in food systems. These happen to be two areas of increasing importance and relevance in contemporary policy debates on food systems nationally but also (or even more so) internationally.

---

<sup>11</sup> Such as other members of the AgriProFocus Advocacy Group

According to other members of the group, the added value of Hivos representation was in its proactive contribution to agenda setting and positioning, analytically strong evidence-based contribution to discussions, pro-active scouting of opportunities for policy influencing, and willingness to contribute to external communications on behalf of the group. Having the Southern voice and opinion reflected in the group's work and output remains a challenge but often issues at stake are primarily connected to Netherlands-based policy dynamics (even though these will eventually have repercussions for the Global South).

For Hivos, the World Food Day offered an opportunity to reach out to a wider public with messages and narratives related to food systems approach. In the steering committee, Hivos reportedly contributed with constructive and creative notions about purpose and agenda for the annual initiative and as such influenced the selection and content of themes and issues that were taken on the agenda of the event. Hivos thereby succeeded in drawing attention to issues such as local food culture, green, fair and affordable food, and the consumers' perspective (as a counterweight to the production and trade perspective that very often prevails in Dutch agrobusiness policy frameworks). Furthermore, the role of Hivos in the steering group was well appreciated as a reliable partner with extensive network contacts, linkages with programme practice in the South, and a pro-active transparent attitude bringing innovative / creative inputs and suggestions in matters of content.

Finally, the impact of the Hivos interventions on policy development in the Netherlands is hard to establish. Policy makers may at best acknowledge that Hivos has drawn their attention to specific dimensions of the food system (as discussed above) but will not easily state being influenced by Hivos in their policy work. They would rather state that the contribution by Hivos did help to reaffirm their own policy position which (in their eyes) had been very much in favour of a comprehensive food system approach for quite some time already. Civil society actors (including Hivos) have doubts about this latter claim. As a matter of fact, in 2017 a high-level representative of the Dutch Government was publicly still quite sceptical about the food system approach, while one year later the same person expressed himself in much more positive terms about the need to work together towards more comprehensive food systems. This appears to support claims that the Government's change in positioning on food systems happened only in the last 2-3 years and may thus have been influenced by civil society action (even though robust evidence of such contribution is lacking)

#### **4.3. Capacity development / organisational development**

The interactions at and engagement in international advocacy networks and initiatives not only contributed to the visibility of Hivos in international arenas but also strengthened the organisational capacity to deal with and be engaged in high-level dynamics of international policy development and policy influencing. Staff members (of Hivos and partners) indicated that their participation in and contributions to events like CFS, Global SFS Conference or World Food Day not only strengthened their understanding and knowledge in policy matters at international levels but also strengthened their capabilities to engage in such policy fora.

As far as organisational development is concerned, Hivos itself observed that: *due to the polemic and polarized nature of food and agriculture as topics in itself, these bureaucratic hurdles and structures [in relation to One Planet network and SFS programme – note of the evaluator] were unfortunately inevitable, and sometimes even necessary to prevent the programme and its operations from*

*derailing. Dealing with multiple differing voices and interests within the Programme has proven to be a tricky, but worthy and informative exercise.* Other informants, however, did somehow question the relevance and value added for Hivos of being co-lead of the SFS programme (see section 4.2).

#### **4.4. Research**

Even though IIED was not directly engaged in international advocacy, it provided scientific support and evidence for national- and global-level advocacy e.g. by developing synthesis / position papers as well as through (support in) developing focused evidence-based communications through columns, opinion editorials, videos, popular brochures, tweets, blogs and so on.

In the SFS Global Conferences in South-Africa and Cost Rica presentations were made of materials developed by IIED or derived from their research. Position papers developed by IIED in collaboration with Hivos and its partners have been used internationally and nationally by staff and partners to contain and sharpen the programme focus over the years and thus served mutual capacity building. At country level partners appreciated the quality and outcomes of research by IIED (often done in collaboration with partners). Finally, IIED played an active and well-appreciated role in aspects of capacity development of programme staff and partners especially through the advocacy toolbox that was developed and rolled out in all programme countries.

#### **4.5. Gender and Youth**

Inclusion was not a specific theme or focal point in international advocacy. There have been some initiatives in having the voice of women and youth heard at national (World Food Day in Netherlands) and international fora (SFS Global conference). There was also an initiative in collaboration with Slow Food Youth Network and Food Hub to create a *Change Makers Guide* inspired by activities co-organised at the 2016 Terra Madre Salone del Gusto (one of the largest food and wine fairs in the world). The guide offers tools and inspiration (mainly for youth) to accelerate the *transition towards a good, clean and fair food system*. Inclusion, however, was not taken up as a key issue either in one of the SFS work areas or in the work done by the APF Advocacy Group. Nevertheless, inclusion-related concerns were often given direct or indirect attention in related discussions and reflections. Programme staff indicated that there certainly more has been happening with regard to inclusion in the numerous policy settings that SD4All is engaged in especially at country level than what is being reported, but then it proved difficult to find precise and concrete evidence. Admittedly, Hivos has promoted and ensured gender inclusion when facilitating the participation of SD4All representatives in global network meetings and conferences, such as on World Food Day 2017, when Hivos facilitated the participation of two young women (a farmer from Zambia and a gastronomy representative from Bolivia) in the Dutch world food day event. Nevertheless, there appears to be a need to develop more specific strategies and pathways of change to guide programme interventions in international advocacy in support of inclusiveness as well as to identify and introduce appropriate monitoring indicators that better capture targets, developments and outcomes with respect to gender and diversity inclusion in international advocacy.

### **5. Analysis of the relevance**

Evaluation Question 2:

How relevant are the changes in the context in which the programme is operating?

### 5.1. Relevance of policy changes

Using the global SFS forum to inspire and mobilise national and local level policy makers proved to be difficult to realise. More governments are adopting the food system concept but so far few have actually gone further in putting in place and enforcing concrete policies to support and accelerate transition to green, fair and sustainable food systems.

The Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (IGG Department) has embraced a food system approach but remains somehow hesitant about the relevance and influence of the SFS programme in the global setting. Foreign Affairs felt that the One Planet Network and SFS programme may not be sufficiently *seasoned*<sup>12</sup> in the international dynamics on food system transformation and therefore choose not to put its full weight behind the network in recent years.

In the Netherlands, Hivos has focused on working with like-minded organisations to influence relevant ministries to adopt a food systems approach to food and agriculture (including trade policies) and improving policy coherence among departments<sup>13</sup>. Doing so largely through the APF group was a good and effective choice.

The Ministry of Agriculture has adopted transition towards *circular agriculture* as its core policy objective for the future of the sector. This according to Hivos advocates, offers opportunities for lobbying towards the adoption of similar principles for the Netherlands international policy on food and agriculture as the concept of circularity connects well with that of Sustainable Food Systems and Diets that Hivos is promoting in international advocacy. The linkage between two approaches is indeed relevant and possibly mutually reinforcing from a Dutch as well as the international policy perspective.

### 5.2. Citizen agency in local - national - global linkages

Meaningfully connecting the local/national SD4All agendas and experiences to the SFS Programme has proven to be a challenge. It took a while before Hivos could meaningfully customize/feed in their local SD4All experiences into the global policy debate, but eventually they reportedly managed to enrich every SFS Programme engagement or event with relevant experiences from the global South. Hivos acknowledges that *although it has helped SD4All partner CSOs in some cases to further advance their national advocacy efforts, the 'sandwich approach' of pushing nationally and using the SFS Programme as an international mechanism/lever to push for domestic change has remained somewhat of an artificial construct*. In interviews in-country as well with the global team, respondents confirmed that stories from practice not only added flavour to the Hivos' policy messages and demands but in a number of cases also reinforced and enriched the conceptual argumentation that Hivos and its partners presented for promoting food systems approach.

Nevertheless, it was felt by partners, staff and external informants that mutuality between local and global policy dynamics is often hard to capture or translate into concrete action points at either level. Alignment of priorities between these levels is by no means an easy task. More research and reflection might be needed to pinpoint and select relevant policy issues and developments at either level (global, national or local) that might have a relevant bearing on other levels. One resource person suggested that the apparent complexity of the food systems thinking (where multitude of

---

<sup>12</sup> Translated from Dutch: *niet voldoende doorgewinterd in het internationale gebeuren*

<sup>13</sup> outcome as defined in the 2019 ToC of international advocacy

factors and actors are at play and interact with each other) makes it difficult to position contextual dynamics (say: lessons learnt in working with food vendors) in a broader (let alone global) food-system-related policy perspective. Similarly, global perspectives (say: on circularity in global chains) do not easily translate into concrete policy settings or policy demands at local level.

## **6. Analysis of the sustainability**

Sustainability of international and Netherlands-based advocacy is not so much related to the question of whether policy changes that have been realised can and will be sustained and be brought to practice (as few policy changes have been realised) but rather whether the mechanism of policy influencing at global level (i.e. mainly SFS) and at Netherlands level are sufficiently grounded to be sustained.

With the increasing adoption of the food systems approach by relevant national and international development agencies and networks (among which Rome-based UN agencies and WEF play an increasingly important role), the international arena is becoming more crowded and new food-system-related dynamics outside the One Planet Network are increasingly taking shape.

In its 2019 half-yearly report, Hivos global team acknowledges that other global initiatives around food systems are gaining ground rapidly, notably the dynamics around the UN Food System Summit in 2021 are attracting attention from influential actors including the Netherlands Government. In the past, SFS Programme may have been a leading voice on food systems but it has never really managed to position itself truly as the thought leader and principal policy platform in this field. The Network may therefore need to collaborate skilfully with other major actors to remain relevant at international level.

Despite its own UN-embeddedness, the One Planet network so far has realised relatively little leeway into the ongoing dynamics around the Food Systems Summit 2021. As indicated above, the challenge of SFS will be to position itself more proactively and prominently in the international arena on food systems that is rapidly evolving with many new and often influential newcomers on the scene (like the World Bank). After some internal reflection, the SFS has now picked up the intention to work together closely with the lead actors behind the UN Food Systems Summit given that both initiatives have very similar ambitions and objectives. For the FS Summit, the SFS Programme is now eager and committed to positioning its 3rd Global SFS Conference<sup>14</sup> as a (the) preparatory meeting (with UN mandate) for the larger 2021 Summit and formal linkages have been established with WEF, IFAD and FAO in this respect.. If this linkage truly succeeds, this may boost chances of sustainability and relevance of the SFS Programme.

Hivos – in the evaluator’s opinion: rightfully so - decided not to continue its position as co-lead in the future SFS programme. Other directly involved stakeholders do hope Hivos will be able to continue serve as MAC member and in this position, contribute to the future policy debates at international level based bringing in evidence but also policy demands that emerge from local / grassroots levels. Last year, Hivos had indicated that it would adjust its international ToC (in November 2019) to

---

<sup>14</sup> Note: Hivos will play a role in the committee that is preparing the 3<sup>rd</sup> Global SFS Conference.

acknowledge and accommodate other global players and to reposition the SD4All advocacy in the evolving international field. This still needs to be done though.

New dynamics are taking shape in the Netherlands as well with the establishment of the *Netherlands Food Partnership* (a merger of AgriProFocus and F&BKP) that is earmarked as the new hub for knowledge sharing and innovation on food and agriculture receiving direct support from the Government. Apparently, discussions are still ongoing about the implications of this new NFP for the existing AgriProFocus Advocacy group. As will be argued in the next session (efficiency analysis), the advocacy work in the Netherlands and notably through this advocacy group is considered to be an efficient mechanism to influence policy making at national level, with some likely implications and impacts at international levels as well.

## 7. Analysis of efficiency

Evaluation question 4:

What has the programme done to ensure proper use of available / limited resources? What was learned from this?

In the evaluation's approach two perspectives were adopted to look at efficiency.

The first one is organisational efficiency and looks at strategies, procedures and norms that the organisation (Hivos) and/or the CAC consortium is using to maximise returns on resources used in the programme. This dimension of efficiency is situated at the organisational level and falls beyond the scope of the country case study.

A second dimension is programme efficiency, whereby a link is established between programme effects and the use of resources. The approach used for learning on programme efficiency is inspired by the Multi-Attribute Decision Making (MADM) method and basically let programme stakeholders assess the 'usefulness' of a number of interventions in realising programme outcomes (from the ToC) against the amount of resources (time, money, effort, energy) needed to implement said outcomes.

The exercise was done in a meeting in The Hague attended by the overall programme coordinator, the international advocacy officer and the JPO SD4All and joined over Skype by IIED colleagues Natalie Lartey, communications and advocacy officer, and Constanza de Toma, her temporary replacement in 2019.

The participants identified six different interventions – see top row in matrix below.

These interventions were assessed against 9 criteria of 'usefulness' – see first column of matrix. The group assigned weights to the different criteria, reflecting an intuitive ranking of the relative importance of the corresponding outcomes. The latter means that some intermediate outcomes (like *reach-out to certain groups*) are assigned lower weights than higher-level outcomes such as *source of evidence in policy debate*. In addition two specific criteria were given relatively heavy weight namely

- Linking local to global levels – as this was seen as a particularly challenging but important objective / outcome for the global team,
- Mutual capacity development in-country (Hivos and partners) and at global level – because, after all, capacity development is one of the two principal outcomes of the overall

programme (next to changes in agendas, policies and practices of government and market actors).

The ‘cost’ of each intervention is taken as a comparative estimate of the resource intensity of the different interventions, that is: the total use of resources in an admittedly intuitive total of financial costs, time and effort to prepare and carry out the stated interventions.

The outcome of the analysis is presented below.

Interventions	Organise side events	Videos	Publications and policy briefs	Dutch APF lobby network	Global SFS platform	Advocacy learning & future food	Weight
<b>How useful is the intervention to</b>	1 = low 5 = high						
Reach out to media (journalists, online, influencers)	1	5	2	2	3	1	5%
Reach out to policy makers	4	5	5	5	4	2	5%
Change the narrative in policy debate (use of content)	3	3	4	4	5	2	5%
Influence policy makers (= agenda setting)	2	4	3	4	3	2	5%
Source of evidence for L&A (policy change)	4	2	4	2	3	0	15%
Follow-up on policy implementation	1	2	4	2	2	1	15%
Link local to global	4	5	4	3	4	3	20%
Mutual CD in countries and at global level	3	4	5	2	4	5	30%
<b>Weighted Score of Effectiveness</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>2.55</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>2.60</b>	100%
<b>Cost 1= low / 5 = high</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>Efficiency ratio (effect per unit cost)</b>	<b>0.98</b>	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>1.28</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>1.30</b>	
Ranking 1 = most effective to 6 = least effective	4	2	1	6	3	5	
Ranking 1 = most efficient to 6 = least efficient	3	4	5	2	6	1	

#### Note on terminology used

In principle, the term **efficiency** is used to indicate the extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way. In this analysis, we did not (for reasons of methodological complexity) incorporate the time-factor. Efficiency in this analysis thus refers only to the “**economic**” dimension being the extent to which the program has converted its resources/inputs (such as funds, expertise, time, etc.) economically into results in order to achieve the maximum possible outputs, outcomes, and impacts with the minimum possible inputs.

**Effectiveness** refers to the extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results (including any differential results across groups).

**Cost-effectiveness** is the extent to which the program has achieved or is expected to achieve its results at a lower cost compared with alternatives.

Sources: DAC Glossary and IEG (World Bank)

In terms of outcome of the analysis one can distinguish two levels, a first one that is called *weighted score of effectiveness* and reflects the perceived (average weighted) 'usefulness' of each intervention as against the stated outcome-related criteria. The second outcome is *efficiency ratio* and provides a reflection of the perceived effect of each intervention per unit 'cost', or in other words the return on investment in terms of effectiveness.

The exercise itself with the group of Hivos and IIED staff members was very interesting for its rich and diverse reflections on the different approaches and interventions used in the programme. Below are a few selected observations / assumptions that emerged from the discussion:

- Assessment of effectiveness and efficiency of stand-alone interventions is relevant but often a combination / integration of different methods and interventions (for example: the use of videos in side-events) creates added value which is not captured in the analysis,
- Videos are not only useful for external audiences but have helped Hivos and IIED in deepening their own positioning in policy matters.
- Videos as well as publications helped not only to present and explain linkages between local and international policy levels but also to strengthen these linkages.
- Using stories in national and international policy platforms was thought to be highly relevant and effective even though it may not always influence the narrative of policy debate,
- Some publications have helped influencing policy narratives and policy makers on food systems change e.g. the initial SD4A programme position papers outlining thematic priorities for international policy audience. Reportedly, these papers have helped contain and sharpen the programme focus and outlined the importance of citizen agency as an advocacy approach.
- Side-events are important and useful for reaching out to policy makers and influencing the narrative of the debate. Moreover, these events were certainly very useful for establishing linkages between different stakeholder groups and especially between local, national and global levels.
- Co-leadership of SFS was very useful for reaching out to and influencing high-level policy makers (e.g. with Rome-based UN bodies) and for changing the narratives on food systems. It created opportunity to put inclusivity more firmly on the global food system agenda and to bring the Southern voice and programme practice to the global level. It also was instrumental in capacity strengthening e.g. with the transformative SFS tool.
- Policy influencing with APF serves its purpose well i.e. reaching out to and influencing Dutch policy makers but still meets a challenge in follow-up on policy implementation, e.g. in follow-up to the Schouten-Kaag Letter.
- Finally, advocacy learning, quite logically, was instrumental in strengthening capacities of stakeholders at all levels but also strengthened linkages between programme actors. It had less direct use in policy influencing.

One of the conclusions of this analysis is that comparatively speaking effectiveness and efficiency of a specific intervention can be quite different.

Looking at the different interventions, it can be concluded (with some caution) that:

- The production and use of publications and policy briefs is perceived as being very useful and effective for realising many of the stated outcomes such as reach-out to specific target groups or changing the narrative in the policy debate but also for capacity development or

for linking local to global levels. However, given the relatively high cost of this type of activity, the same intervention ranks low in terms of efficiency.

- Lobbying in the Netherlands with the AgriProFocus Advocacy Group may seem less effective overall, among others, because it contributes less to capacity development in-country and globally (which has a substantial weight). However, given its low cost, it is a relatively efficient mechanism for policy influencing.
- The advocacy learning / advocacy toolbox ranks highest in terms of efficiency thanks to its direct impact on capacity strengthening (which was assigned a heavy weight) and its relative low cost but is only indirectly useful (or effective) for policy influencing, hence a lower score on overall effectiveness.
- Policy influencing through SFS ranks fairly high in terms of effectiveness (3<sup>rd</sup>) but because of its high cost, it may not be a very efficient mechanism.
- Finally, side events as well as videos are thought to be quite effective but also quite efficient having a good balance between their (expected) contribution to achieving the programme objectives and their resource -intensity.

The international advocacy officer drew the following conclusion from this exercise: *It seems that the most effective intervention is to organise a side-event with a low-cost network (such as APF), presenting strong evidence with capacity development of actors upfront (and afterwards). Not too surprising, but good to take into account for the food summits we organise the coming months.*

## 8. Conclusions and lessons learnt

Following is a concise listing of selected conclusions and lessons learnt that were either extracted from the annual progress reports or emerged from the present evaluation.

### Dynamics of policy influencing

#### *Dynamics*

- ✓ From a strategic and institutional positioning point of view, influencing policies and practices at an international level can be done best through strategic collaboration with likeminded and peer organisations rather than through traditional capacity building of partners.
- ✓ Achieving concrete outcomes such as high-level uptake of a food systems approach by other established actors and donor institutions is a long-haul effort and needs continued and long-term commitment.

#### *SFS Programme*

- ✓ This evaluation endorses the overall findings and conclusions of the self-evaluation of the SFS Programme Co-Leadership. The engagement of Hivos has had its benefits in terms of *increased visibility and acknowledgment of Hivos as a credible actor in the policy field*. Moreover, it has *facilitated new relationships with key stakeholders (donors, governments and CSs)*.
- ✓ However, the modest realisations and policy-related impact of the SFS programme over the years may not sufficiently warrant the efforts and resources that have been invested in the co-leadership of SFS programme over the last 4 years.
- ✓ Nevertheless, the SFS programme remains relevant provided it can be stronger linked to new and powerful dynamics in the international policy setting, especially the 2021 UN Food System Summit. Key to the future of the SFS Programme is that it is recognised and used as a

legitimate, democratic and participatory platform (with UN mandate) by stakeholders from different backgrounds and levels to reflect and discuss about how to shape food systems.

- ✓ If this move succeeds, the continuing contribution of Hivos as MAC member may bring new opportunities for effectively influencing the policy debate. It would allow Hivos to focus strongly on the content of the debate without the 'burden of co-leadership'.
- ✓ Hivos has contributed meaningfully (and as a member of the MAC can continue to do so) in bringing the Southern voice and citizen agency to high-level policy platforms, linking local and global levels, and strengthening / enriching the (debate on) the food systems concept and approach on inclusiveness and related social dimensions.
- ✓ There is some mixed perception (both internal and external) on the relevance and added value for Hivos' itself of committing to the co-leadership in the SFS programme. While its co-leadership has produced certain benefits for Hivos in terms of being able to influence high-level policy debates, as well as in networking and visibility, it also came with opportunity costs, especially in terms of less time and effort spent on content-related matters (see previous bullet point. But, as one resource person stated: Hivos stepping down as co-lead has taken some steam off the SFS programme.

#### *Policy influencing in the Netherlands*

- ✓ The pro-active role that Hivos played in the APF Advocacy Group as well as in the World Food Day steering committee was appreciated by all relevant resource persons.
- ✓ In the Netherlands, working in the APF advocacy group was a good choice and a more effective approach to influence relevant policy makers than through individual advocacy actions.
- ✓ Hivos and the APF group have contributed to raising awareness and knowledge on food systems with a wide audience of policy makers and other stakeholders in the sector.
- ✓ There are however, mixed perceptions among Dutch policy makers on the influence that Hivos (either directly or via APF) may have had on the adoption by Government of the food system concept in policy making as well as on the Dutch international policy on food security.
- ✓ In APF group (and in the Netherlands policy setting in general), Hivos has a relatively good position (knowledge and expertise) in matters of sustainable diets and consumer interest in food systems. These issues happen to be two areas of increasing importance and relevance in contemporary policy debates on food systems nationally but also internationally. Advice is to keep focus and strengthen positioning in these areas based on evidence and knowledge from programme practice.
- ✓ The Ministry of Agriculture adoption of *circular agriculture* concepts offers opportunities for lobbying for similar principles in the Dutch international policy on food and agriculture. The linkage between two approaches is indeed relevant and possibly mutually reinforcing from a Dutch as well as the international policy perspective
- ✓ Having the Southern voice and opinion reflected in the work and output of the APF group remains a challenge but then often issues at stake are primarily connected to Netherlands-based policy dynamics (even though these will eventually have repercussions for the Global South).
- ✓ Netherlands Food Partnership is being shaped to become a key player in the policy arena. It will therefore be necessary to revisit position, role and objectives of the present APF group and the role and contribution of Hivos therein especially vis-à-vis expected positioning and role of NFP.

### **Citizen agency and local-national-global linkages**

- ✓ The programme demonstrated that Citizen Agency is / can be key to identifying opportunities and bottlenecks (especially for low & middle income people) in the food system dynamics at local level and instrumental in developing policy interventions around such themes.
- ✓ The challenge of SD4All was to develop lobby and advocacy plans / campaigns to address these issues to national, regional and where possibly global policy levels.
- ✓ Some examples that emerged from programme practice that have proven to be (or possibly are) worth exploring as strategic themes at meso and macro levels are: urban food governance, informality in food systems, true costing of common staple foods like rice or maize, and using the entry point of gastronomy for food system transition, among others.
- ✓ For some of these themes further research may be needed, while in other cases evidence is (to some extent) available but partners may still lack sufficient skills and knowledge to develop and implement effective campaign strategies and plans.
- ✓ Mutuality between local and global policy dynamics was often hard to capture or translate into concrete action points at either level. Alignment of priorities between these levels was by no means an easy task.
- ✓ Global policy influencing, however, does not need to wait for themes to 'ripen' at and emerge from grassroots agency but international policy work can be carried out simultaneously focusing at macro level dynamics e.g. promote the lens and concept of food systems in the global debate on food and agriculture, or to strengthen & promote national and international policy coherence such as in linking health & nutrition-related issues and actors better to agricultural dimensions and actors.

### **The concept of food systems and programmatic approaches to promote sustainable diets**

- ✓ Explore/ revisit strategies (conceptually as well as for feasibility of implementation) on how to engage with private sector actors (those that are not incorporated as yet in the programme) towards food system transformation.
- ✓ Suggested by stakeholders in SFS: to connect more to WWF to explore / exploit potential for synergy and added value in a more comprehensive food systems approach that integrates social (inclusiveness) and environmental / climate dimensions.

### **Organisational development / capacity development**

- ✓ Traditional capacity strengthening of partners has not received much focus in the programme's component of international advocacy as this is considered less effective than working in alliances with peer organisations.
- ✓ Participation in and contributions of Hivos in international policy settings and events not only improved the understanding and knowledge of policy matters at international level but also strengthened their capabilities to engage in such policy fora.
- ✓ Some more capacity building of Hivos and partners may be needed to build stronger linkages between local, national and international levels.
- ✓ The effectiveness of policy influencing by Hivos globally (and to some extent also in the Netherlands), was somewhat hampered by the fact that Hivos is not (yet?) very well-known in international circles as a key player or thought leader on food system transformation. Hivos' pro-active engagement in international and national policy arenas and debates over the last 4 years has contributed to an improved visibility and recognition of the organisation

as a respected and knowledgeable actor in these fora. This recognition is mainly by 'insiders' and probably still less so among actors not actively engaged in the said fora (SFS Programme and AFP Policy Advocacy Group)

- ✓ Through SD4All Hivos succeeded in building up its reputation and profile in this respect, but mostly so among those already involved in the SFS network and less so with outsiders. In case Hivos would continue engaging in policy influencing on food system transformation at national and global levels, it would be advantageous to work on a stronger national and external profile and reputation.
- ✓ Finally, even though IIED was not directly engaged in international advocacy, it provided scientific support and evidence for national- and global-level advocacy e.g. by developing synthesis / position papers as well as through (support in) developing focused evidence - based communications.

### **Gender and youth**

- ✓ Inclusion was not structurally embedded as a core theme or focus area in SFS programme work nor in the work done by the APF Advocacy Group. No specific targets or intended outputs or outcomes were indeed formulated on this topic
- ✓ Nevertheless, Hivos has always been stressing (and acting upon) the importance of gender and youth inclusion in SD4All's general narrative on sustainable food systems and diets, as well as in the various interventions and activities at international and Dutch policy level e.g. by bringing SD4All partners to Dutch/international events.
- ✓ There is a need to develop more specific strategies or (where applicable) pathways of change to guide programme interventions in international advocacy in support of inclusiveness
- ✓ There is also need for appropriate indicators and more focus in outcome harvesting to capture targets, developments and achievements with respect to gender and diversity inclusion in international advocacy.

## Annex – Persons met / interviewed

### Global team

Frank Mechielsen	Senior Programme Manager SD4All – Hivos
Wenny Ho	DMEL officer Hivos
Nout van der Vaart	International advocacy officer – Hivos
Maria Gomez	JPO Sustainable Diets for All – Hivos
Aurora Stobbelaar	IIED
Costanza De Toma	Communications & Advocacy Officer IIED (temporary 2019)
Natalie Larrey	Communications & Advocacy Officer IIED

### SFS Programme

Charles Arden-Clarke	Head of 10YFP Secretariat, UN Environment, Economy Division
Patrick Mink	Policy Advisor, Federal Office for Agriculture, Swiss government
Michael Mulet,	WWF France
Marina Bortoletti	UNEP

### Nederlandse L&A

Bente Meindertsma	Agriprofocus
Jeroen Reyniers	Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Inclusive Green Growth Dept.
Sebastiaan Aalst	Strategic Director, Food Cabinet
Kim van Seeters	LNV
Marijke de Graaf	ICCO
Madelon Meijer	Oxfam-Nobib
Lucie Wassink	Policy Coordinator LNV (Formerly Landbouwraad Jakarta)

### Southern voice

Mohammed Shariff	Programme Director, Kabarole Research Centre, Uganda
Jane Zulu	CUTS Zambia
Silvana Paath	Regional Advocacy Officer Food
Biranchi Upadhyaya	Regional Director Southeast Asia Hivos