

Food and Nutrition Security Exchange Days March 16 - 23, 2016

External Report



Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the
Netherlands



Ministry of Economic Affairs
of the Netherlands



External Report
Food and Nutrition Security
Exchange Days
March 16 - 23, 2016

Colophon

The organizers of the Food and Nutrition Security Exchange (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Food & Business Knowledge Platform, Wageningen UR Centre for Development Innovation) have compiled this report based on the contributions of several colleagues within these organizations. We thank them all for their contributions.

Food & Business Knowledge Platform

Bezuidenhoutseweg 2
2594 AV The Hague
The Netherlands
T: +31 (0)70 3043 754
E: info@knowledge4food.net
W: www.knowledge4food.net
Tw: @foodplatform



Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	3
Summary.....	4
1 Opening Food and Nutrition Security Exchange.....	5
2 Dutch Food and Nutrition Security Policy: main topics	6
2.1 Changing the food game. Presentation Lucas Simons	6
2.2 Result reporting	6
2.3 Future implementation of FNS policy.....	6
2.4 Central vs Decentral programming	7
2.5 Communication of results	7
2.6 Regional cooperation.....	8
3 Thematic workshops Wageningen Day	9
3.1 The availability of practical and (locally appropriate) Dutch expertise for agriculture and food security	9
3.2 How can Dutch Embassies support horticulture sector development in their country?	10
3.3 Public-private actor support	10
3.4 From aid to trade in the food and nutrition security agenda.....	11
3.5 Drivers for change. Postharvest losses	12
3.6 Effective approaches for youth employment in agribusiness	12
3.7 Scaling up Good Practices	13
3.8 Resilient Farming Systems (FRS) – Myanmar case	14
4 Conclusions.....	15
Participants FNS Exchange days 2016.....	17

Summary

Work more in alignment with partner countries, make better use of opportunities to link aid, trade and investment, and put into practice our policy of “no one should be left behind”. One of the real challenges of the Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) policy is working on sustainable food systems: both in terms of production, social and ecologically sound results. The Networks of Foreign Affairs and Economic Affairs are intertwined and the staff involved are becoming One Team, including central (i.e. HQ The Hague) & decentral (i.e. Embassies) departments. But, it all depends on the results we achieve and the way we communicate these results.

These are some of the conclusions of the Food and Nutrition Security Exchange days 2016 among food security experts and agricultural attaches from 11 partner country Embassies, policy makers in The Hague and food security and agricultural sector partners in the Netherlands (further abbreviated as FNS Exchange).

The FNS Exchange days 2016 were a five-day event from the March 17 till March 23, 2016 organized by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in collaboration with the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Wageningen UR/CDI and the Food & Business Knowledge Platform. Its purpose is to bring Food and Nutrition Security policy staff working on the headquarters in The Hague (at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as well Economic Affairs), Dutch Embassies and on UN Permanent Representative positions in Rome and New York together to create and facilitate knowledge exchange and dynamic discussions on FNS relevant topics.

This report is aimed to give a brief insight in the dialogues, debates and discussions which have taken place in the multiplicity of presentations and visits during the FNS Exchange. The structure of the report is based on the chronology of the event. A brief summary is made from each presentation, activity and workshop to generate a comprehensive overview of the topics addressed during the FNS Exchange.

The FNS Exchange in short:

- Dutch Embassies and policy staff at the HQ in The Hague shared their experiences and views on central and decentral programming, on regional cooperation in Africa, on measuring and communicating FNS results and the future implementation of food and nutrition security policy by showing inspiring examples from Bangladesh, Ethiopia and Rwanda.
- At the Wageningen UR Campus, a full day of interactions took place with the broader network of stakeholders from the private sector, civil society, and knowledge institutions. Thematic expert sessions were held with partners on a range of FNS topics indicated by Embassies as priority learning themes. These sessions were followed by a lively market with intensive networking with and among FNS actors from NGOs, companies and knowledge institutes, larded with short pitches.
- A full day was dedicated to visit the Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (NVWA) and the Wageningen UR Greenhouse Horticulture location in Bleiswijk. This program was combined with the exchange days organized for the Agricultural Counselors.
- The provoking key-note speech of Lucas Simons, author of “Changing the Food Game”, was followed by an animated debate with the participants about the current Dutch FNS policies.
- The final day of the program was about “seeding” the plans for the future, while wrapping up the discussions on the previous days by Reina Buijs, Deputy Director-General for International Cooperation at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.



1 Opening Food and Nutrition Security Exchange

Coordinators of the interdepartmental Food and Nutrition Security cluster Marcel Beukeboom (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and Johan Gatsonides (Ministry of Economic Affairs) opened the meeting and gave an overview of current matters in The Hague.

Marcel Beukeboom mentioned that we are in the last year of this cabinet and that the harvesting time has started. The report on results later this year has therefore a high priority and it is important to share a common understanding on the indicators. Communicating the achieved results towards parliament and the broader society is also an increasingly important issue. Besides harvesting, we also have to sow new seeds: we need to start programming for the next years in order to have our budgets committed in time.

The FNS policy letter has been discussed in parliament and resulted in lots of interest, questions and motions. Before summer a follow-up letter will be sent to parliament. Migration is currently a priority topic which also puts a major strain on ODA budgets. FNS in all its aspects is relevant for migration.

Johan Gatsonides refers to the New Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Martijn van Dam, who wants to highlight four topics:

- Better food: what are we eating? transparency, fair pricing
- Better life: animal welfare, higher quality products
- Better knowing: export of knowledge, technology, innovation, golden triangle, Holland branding
- Natural Holland: protecting nature, landscape approach, national parks



The Ministry of Economic Affairs' (EA) work on FNS evolves around 4 strategic lines: climate smart agriculture, food losses and waste, healthy ocean's and blue growth and genetic resources.

Investing in knowledge and innovation is crucial. EA does that through the Global Research Alliance (GRA), the CGIAR, F&BKP and others. It is important to adapt innovation to the local situation and local capacities and financial possibilities.

The Dutch FNS policies should link to the overarching framework of the SDGs and the Paris climate agreement. And the major challenge for the future is scaling up!

2 Dutch Food and Nutrition Security Policy: main topics

2.1 Changing the food game. Presentation Lucas Simons

Lucas Simons was invited to the FNS Exchange days to give a presentation about his experiences and ideas about the “Food Game”, and especially, how we can transform the current food game into a more market oriented game. Lucas Simons is a former director of UTZ Certified and author of the book “Changing the food game” which is published in 2015.

He advocates for a different mindset in solving the puzzle how to produce enough food in the next 40 years because of the growing population and changing consuming patterns.

Although agriculture in many developing countries is important for its contribution to employment and total GDP, the number of investments stay low. He argues that the food challenge to create sustainable agriculture and food production can only be solved by effective market transformation and systemic changes. Simons referred to examples of transformations which are taking place in the palm oil and cacao sector.

During his presentation he explained five different sector archetypes (Bottom of pyramid, Pyramid, Hour glass, Diamond and Top of pyramid). For example, the cacao sector is the least potential archetype to become sustainable: ‘the bottom of the pyramid’ archetype where a competition on poverty is going on instead of the desired competition on quality. Lucas Simons explained the four main forces that determine the outcome of the game and the phases where these transformations are going through. From pilot projects, through the first movers phase and the institutionalization phase towards the level playing field.

The discussion following his presentation was lively and interactive. On some of the questions posed by Lucas Simons, Embassy staff stepped forward to give their view on the “food game” in their country. Many participants agreed that the current focus of policy, programs and projects is too much directed to sustaining the smallholders instead of creating an enabling environment for the “first movers”, as happened in for example The Netherlands. Another discussion resulting from Lucas’ presentation addressed the simplified model of this transformation. In the analysis of Simons, only four forces influenced the market and this four phases model simplified the process in the involvement of actors in each phase.

Overall, the presentation was very informative and enlightening on the way the current “food game” is played.

2.2 Result reporting

Marcel Beukeboom (IGG, Foreign Affairs) and Jeroen Rijniers (IGG, Foreign Affairs) presented a draft FNS results framework, including key indicators, to be underlying the coming reporting over the year 2015. BIS (Office for International Cooperation, Foreign Affairs) participated in this session to give some comments on the political context and the process. In small groups the draft framework was analyzed and comments and suggestions for improvement were produced and shared in the plenary. These were integrated in a new proposal that was presented on Wednesday 23 March, as part of the policy guidelines for future programming. This led to additional comments that were also taken into account. Meanwhile, the resulting framework has been included in the results fiches for the 2015 result reporting that BIS sent to Embassies and departments in the first week of April.

2.3 Future implementation of FNS policy

Jeroen Rijniers presents the additions to the guiding framework for the result reporting after the previous discussions on result reporting. He mentioned that we have to find ways to report on e.g. resilience and to learn from different contexts on the ground.

There have been motions from Parliament that aim to focus the policy more on the following topics: educational and vocational training in agriculture, land rights, nutrition, smallholder agriculture, climate smart agriculture, gender, food losses, landscape approach used in food security, policy coherence, and to be inclusive (e.g. disabled farmers). These topics link to the SDG agenda and inclusiveness letter of Minister Ploumen (Minister for Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation).

Examples from the Embassies in Bangladesh, Rwanda and Ethiopia were shared on how the three components of the FNS policy are implemented in their portfolio. They all had a different focus (points/budgets) resulting from the past when they started food and nutrition security policies (e.g. Ethiopia has the longest history).

2.4 Central vs Decentral programming

Jan Willem Nibbering (First Secretary Food Security, Embassy Ethiopia) shared the process of the Embassy in Addis Ababa in which they have been engaged to achieve more concerted actions between the Embassy and the Ministries to improve coherence between centrally and decentrally funded activities with the ultimate goal of achieving better results in our work.

A review of the Embassy's food security portfolio in 2015 proved to be instrumental in this process. As part of this review, a full inventory of central and decentral activities was carried out and potential complementarities and overlap between projects were mapped. The review culminated in a videoconference between the Embassy and the Ministries. Two questions were addressed: where and how can the Ministries improve coherence, synergy and collaboration between projects funded by the Embassy and the Ministries and how can they improve communication to enhance coordination and collaboration between centrally and decentrally funded projects?

The first question - a number of actual examples were discussed here - was meant mainly to set the stage for the second question which was the principal theme of the conference. Main conclusions were:

- better communication and consultation between the two sides will ensure that country specific knowledge from the Embassy and the policy and global insights from the Ministries are effectively combined;
- joint discussions at a strategic level before deciding on the needed particular activities; thematic networks could be suitable vehicles for such discussion;
- different arrangements for consultation and communication in the various stages of an activity (formulation, assessment, monitoring) are needed for different categories of (de)central activities, to be laid down in a set of guidelines.

The Embassy made a first attempt at formulating these guidelines in the form of a matrix, which was later on improved upon by BIS. Jan Willem Nibbering emphasized that the guidelines are a matter of common sense: the point is that it is done. For each activity both sides should agree on what the working arrangement should concretely be like, while taking into account staff capacity. He also emphasized the need for documenting consultations and their outcome. He concluded by putting up a number of statements for discussion.

Some Embassy staff reacted that in their countries they signal much fragmentation of effort and overlap between centrally and decentrally funded activities and even competition for the same partners. From another country an experience was shared with programmatic planning involving Dutch private sector players. There was also a suggestion that tenders for public-private partnerships could be put out by Embassies rather than centrally. On another note it was argued that we need to have thematic guidelines for our work as well. The session ended with a remark that in all this we should not lose sight of the Paris Agenda.



2.5 Communication of results

Wijnand van IJssel (IGG, Foreign Affairs) opened the session by referring to the SG who opened the FNS Exchange two years ago with the appeal to communicate more. That appeal was triggered by severe institutional budget cuts and the report by Docters van Leeuwen stating amongst others: "Foreign Affairs stands with its back to society". Making marginal extra efforts is not sufficient and a fundamental change in our communication is needed.

Three presentations set the scene and were followed up by a plenary discussion. Henny Gerner (IGG, Foreign Affairs / former coordinator Agri and Economic Cooperation Embassy Uganda). introduced the approach for result

reporting in Uganda. The “Status report” of the Embassy is updated on a regular basis. This report is short (10 pages), has a mix of information on overall progress and individual projects and has pictures of the people involved. Furthermore, in 8 video clips people tell their stories (next to 4 thematic clips). See link: <http://www.eyeopenerworks.org/en/creativemonitoring/>

Kees Oude Lenferink (IGG, Foreign Affairs) shared his experiences in publishing the online water-aid portfolio. At the front this links to the corporate DGIS-wide policy of starting results reporting in IATI (International Aid Transparency Initiative). The digital standardized information enables: “Publish Once, Use Often”. The department IGG works with AKVO to link this (IATI) technical data to storytelling using AKVO’s app Really Simple Reporting. AKVO offers a Facebook-like interface with shiny information, feeds, twitter messages. Combining and linking data sources makes data easier to find. Kees will start working with more Embassies to bring their portfolio’s online (e.g. Bamako, Maputo, Dhaka). See link: <http://iggwater.akvoapp.org/>
<http://nlambassykenya.akvoapp.org/>

Rolf Wijnstra (BIS/, Foreign Affairs) explains that the general audience does not have a clue of what the Ministry is doing. Development Cooperation seems to be linked more to NGOs. He emphasizes that the Ministry should tell the story (the menu, the ambiance in the restaurant) and not present the instruments (the kitchen). Effective communication requires experts. Be good and let other tell it, is an important principle, but also listen to your audience and define what’s in it for them. Politicians are “ordinary” people from the perspective of communication.

2.6 Regional cooperation

Ariane van Beuzekom ((Ministry of Economic Affairs) opened the session and stated that there are advantages of regional cooperation for value chains (e.g. aquaculture) localizing different components of the value chain in different countries plus reaching a large market. Larger regional market also works in favor of attracting (Dutch) investment.

Example of dairy sector development in East Africa demonstrates the value of exchanging knowledge, skills and experience. By coincidence NABC was able to combine two missions (Ethiopia, Kenya) focusing on dairy development.

Some points discussed in this session about regional trade:

- Major challenge in West Africa as opposed to East Africa (TradeMark East Africa) is the existence of a large number of competing corridors.
- Marcellin Nonfon (Embassy Benin) presented the challenges of informal trade between Benin (agric. production) and Nigeria; a.o. different currencies, corruption etc.
- Q&A: although the NL is taking the lead in designing the West Africa trade promotion program (together with Denmark) there is a need to attract more donors and designate a champion with some political and economic clout both among donors as well as at the local level. Also there is a need to focus on a limited number of countries where opportunities exist.

3 Thematic workshops Wageningen Day

A series of eight workshops was organized at Wageningen University Campus, during which Embassy staff had the opportunity to meet with experts from academia, private sector, civil society. After the workshops, a network market took place with key stakeholders' pitches and lots of opportunity for informal exchanges.



3.1 The availability of practical and (locally appropriate) Dutch expertise for agriculture and food security

This workshop addressed to what extent Dutch knowledge and expertise is used and could be better used to address the challenges related to food security.

Melle Leenstra (First Secretary Food Security, Embassy Kenya), (see his discussion note "[Excellence: Expertise and Exchange](#)"), started with an introduction and stressed that focus needs to be on people in order to bridge the current knowledge gap in food security. He addressed the technology gap and the fact that Dutch expertise is "getting grey". We need to ensure technology is suitable for the local context; to build-up our expertise again, with the aim to share it; include the private sector, with its knowledge; and admit that food security is both a private and a public problem. Besides the fact that our expertise is not adjusted to African realities, programs focused on expertise are dispersed and fragmented. This is caused by the way programs are set up (tendering, calls, proposals) and by the competition between knowledge institutes. Leenstra presented the strengths and weaknesses of current programs and organizations (e.g. Nuffic, YEP, PUM, Agriterro, Knowledge Platforms, 2G@ThereOS, bilateral programmes). A number of opportunities could be explored to find synergy by building a structure of people and organizations that fosters exchange of knowledge and expertise.

The exchange between participants thereafter led to the following conclusions and recommendations:

Green education (this discussion included expert advice from Joep Houterman, Aeres Group)

- Green education actors must be seen as strategic partners, amongst others by Dutch government. The knowledge base of Dutch expertise should be guaranteed and at the same time we need a market-based approach to deliver our services.
- Tendering could be problematic in this context since tendering promotes competition on price and including Dutch expertise/students is more costly.
- Focus is now more on higher professional education and university (HBO/WO) exchange and not on secondary vocational education (MBO) while private sector (Dutch and local) are seeking capacity at MBO level.
- MBO-institutes have to work together, be complementary to each other. Institutes are no players on the market and should not be seen as such.
- A clause within ToRs could demand inclusion of young experts and students.
- Develop capacity in countries is key, besides the international exchange of expertise.

Where and how do we tackle fragmentation?

- Tackle fragmentation at the country/Embassy level. On decentralized levels we can work more programmatically, and it caters for diversity in contexts and Embassies.
- Develop integral programmes around concrete challenges and include capacity input by "green education" similar to the involvement of Dutch Diamond partners.

- Using hub-ideas on decentralized level (Centres of Expertise, Dairy training institute).

Other ideas to include Dutch knowledge/expertise

- Farmer-study groups, exchange between farmers.
- Dialogue with public sector on price setting.

Concluding remarks

A core assignment for the green education sector to jointly foster and make available knowledge and expertise in LMICs would make the sector a strategic partner and prevent competition and fragmentation. Involving “unusual suspects” will also contribute to the public support needed for ODA spending.

3.2 How can Dutch Embassies support horticulture sector development in their country?

This session on the horticultural sector started with a brief presentation of the [SMASH/SMART Horticultural programme](#) in Rwanda, by Teddie Muffels (Agricultural Counsellor, Embassy Rwanda). This multi-stakeholder project aims to enhance and improve the horticultural sector and to develop sustainable greenhouse systems. It has resulted in so-called “screenhouses”, greenhouses from plastic specially designed for the climate in Rwanda, in which the high value crops tomatoes and sweet pepper are grown.

Caro Pleysier (First Secretary Economic Affairs, Embassy Rwanda) linked the project with the broader Embassy programme on food and nutrition security and private sector development: the example of the SMASH/SMART horticultural programme can work in a broader context as a model for private sector development, lessons can be learned from the high clarity on actors, the [training](#) aspects, the focus on value chain development and its nutrition-sensitive agriculture aspects.

The discussion that followed highlighted the differences between countries and continents which require different approaches. The example project requires the need for specific local capacity development, investors for the technology, the need to look at inputs and to find an appropriate market. The project is still in an early stage, therefore it still has to show whether the price-quality relation is going to work. Crop management is another issue, since often farmers are not used to apply strict hygiene discipline with entering a greenhouse. Furthermore, in the context of food and nutrition security, it is important to consider awareness raising for vegetable consumption and the appropriateness for the local market as well. In addition, greenhouse technologies are very specific while currently most vegetables are still grown in open field. It was commented that it could be promising to develop these technologies further to include a wider public, which could also make this sector more attractive for the growing youth population. FDOV or other instruments are of much importance to start such projects.

Several knowledge questions came forward, such as whether or not women are empowered in this type of horticultural agriculture when (high-)technology is required. Reference was made to a [recent explorative study](#) conducted by LEI Wageningen UR within the Food & Business Knowledge Platform on the potential of the fruits & vegetables sector for food and nutrition security. The study shows promising positive impact on FNS, including job opportunities for male and female workers, increased levels of income and less nutrition-related health problems.

For those interested, in the recently launched [IATI database](#) of RVO, current projects and programs on this topic that are funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs can be found. Further, they can contact F&BKP or use its website for further knowledge sharing: <mailto:info@knowledge4food.net>; www.knowledge4food.net/fruits-vegetables. In East-Africa/Tanzania, AgriProFocus will co-organize a second regional horticultural event late 2016, following the successful [event in Rwanda of 2015](#).

3.3 Public-private actor support

Several policy instruments exist that support private or public actors. Increasingly, policy instruments aim to facilitate collaboration between actors such as business, non-profit organizations and public agencies. The [Facility for Sustainable Entrepreneurship and Food Security](#) (FDOV) for instance, has been set up to stimulate inclusive and innovative solutions to urgent development challenges through collaboration.

First experiences with this instrument as well as insights from Dutch PPPs outside of FDOV were presented by the [PPPLab](#). The potential of PPPs in various stages of the value chain, the challenges of “partnering” and the engagement of public actors in PPPs were highlighted. These insights were discussed and enriched based on experiences from a FDOV project that aims to [stimulate the potato value chain in Kenya](#).

Three key issues to live up to the potential of PPPs were brought to the fore in this case study and further elaborated on during the general discussion. Firstly, the structure of PPP instruments such as FDOV challenge the “official” active involvement of in-country public actors and the active engagement of Embassy staff in the project. Without the engagement of the local public P there is no guarantee of success and sustainability of the project. Though, public P commitment does not have to be formalized in a partnership. Public involvement is often not part of the official project budget. Consequently there is no clear overview of all the costs involved and there is a risk of the PPP becoming a private actor project. Secondly, the participants agreed that the capacity, skills and contacts of public actors (e.g. Embassy staff) are important for actively engaging in a PPP. Finally, it was stated that political realities have important implications for a PPP project in regards to what it can do, e.g. rules and regulations; whom to involve, e.g. national or local public actors; and its underlying accountabilities – e.g. reporting towards the Dutch government.

One of the participants provided an example of setting up a collaboration between Dutch and Chinese public, private and knowledge actors; the [Sino-Dutch Dairy Development Centre](#). This case presented some key lessons and recommendations for public private actor support. The case highlighted on the one hand the importance of formulating a joint objective between project partners and on the other hand leaving enough leeway for the partners’ own interests. Having commitment from top management proves to be an additional success factor, and applying a network instead of a project approach can support flexibility.

Recommended reading: <http://www.ppplab.org/explorations-03/> ; [website PPPLab](#), [website Food & Business Knowledge Platform](#), [MSP Guide: How to design and facilitate multi-stakeholder partnerships?](#)

3.4 From aid to trade in the food and nutrition security agenda

Mariska Lammers (Policy Officer Food security, Embassy Ghana) introduced the background of the food security program of the Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands (EKN) in Ghana. The program focuses on palm oil, fruits, agricultural products, cocoa and poultry. Ghana will no longer be a partner country of the Netherlands by 2017; the food security program will end through a gradual transition, with a budget extension until 2020.

The strategy of this food security program focuses on value chain development, engaging private sector, supporting small and medium enterprises. Three cases were presented by Lammers. The first case was about the cocoa rehabilitation and intensification program which aims to increase cocoa productivity, rehabilitate non-productive farmers, and increase income of cocoa farmers. There were 14 rural service centers that provide various services such as financial service, labor service, seeds, and so on. The program aimed to establish 20 rural service centers by 2020. The government of Ghana was involved. The second case was about the sustainable palm oil program, which aims to increase palm oil productivity in order to increase income of palm oil farmers. The program targeted mainly commercial farmers. The government of Ghana was less involved in this case. The third case was [GhanaVeg](#) that focused on commercial vegetable production. The focus of the program was to support business platform meetings that engage and do multi-stakeholder match-making and provide training to the trainers.

Célia Jordão (Local Theme Expert Food Security, Embassy Mozambique) introduced the background of the food security program of EKN in Mozambique. One of the main targets of EKN was to increase local agricultural production and with good quality. EKN’s strategy focused on relationships with strategic partners that support small commercial and smallholder farmers’ development. She showed a case of the soy bean multiplication program. EKN supports [TechnoServe-Mozambique](#) to develop and implement a private sector led model linking Small Commercial Farmers with Small Holder Farmers via technologies and services. In this program good quality seed has played an important role in increasing yield. There are expectations that improving fertilizer usage might increase yield too.

In the discussion that followed it was mentioned that the Food and Nutrition Security policy is the best example for the aid, trade and investment agenda, according to Minister Ploumen. A participant said the workshop introductions focused only on primary production and related entrepreneurship while the aid to trade agenda had much more opportunities like technology and knowledge. This was supported by another participant who said the trade focus should not be too narrow, focusing on agricultural production only, but that it should look at the whole value chain with forward and backward linkages.

Mariska Lammers explained in the discussion that a challenge in Ghana was that other donors were not moving from aid to trade. The Netherlands can be seen as the frontrunner of the aid to trade agenda. USAID and DFID had an enormous amount of development cooperation focusing on increasing productivity, not so much linking with

markets and involving the private sector. From the perspective of the Ghanaian government it was sometimes hard to understand what we actually want to achieve.

To conclude:

- It's the aid, trade and investment agenda. Not from Aid to Trade.
- Not every private sector involvement means that it's connected to the aid and trade agenda.
- We are already doing a lot around aid and trade in the FNS agenda.
- We have to look broader than farmers when looking at market opportunities.

3.5 Drivers for change. Postharvest losses

This workshop presented the draft study "[Drivers for Change](#)" that identifies six drivers for change to limit post-harvest losses. The study is based on 15 case-studies and will be published on [the Food & Business Knowledge Platform](#) website soon. The aim is to improve the success ratio of future projects and as such contribute to food security.

Drivers for change are "those factors, forces or events which may be amenable to changes according to one's strategic choices, investments, R&D activities or foresight knowledge and strategies. They are both presently accessible and future relevant." The six most important drivers identified in the study are: 1) existence of incentives for all value chain actors to contribute; 2) policy environment that matches intended value chain change; 3) involvement private sector; 4) personal involvement of a visionary; 5) taking local context into account; and 6) availability of new technology.

The discussion between participants highlighted the following:

- A focus on export and to adhere to related quality standards could actually lead to more losses when the produce does not adhere to these standards. There is a need for a business-case for produce "below standard" (e.g. pulping).
- Consumer awareness changes over time and influences the local market. The solution is to develop a product that links with different consumer preferences and structures of the local markets.
- Technology is often too expensive for farmers (example: cold storage in Bangladesh). Solution: focus on middle-men/traders to invest in cold storage, since they would benefit most from this and can better afford the investment (participant shared a case from Albania, where a vegetable trader got a loan for cooling container and later on for cold stores).
- Need for regulation of production to avoid overuse of natural resources? (Example fish production in Ethiopia). However, regulation by (e.g. Ethiopian) government not likely to happen.
- Need for "fit to purpose" strategy (adjust to local context; no copy-past of Dutch solutions).

3.6 Effective approaches for youth employment in agribusiness

The position of youth in agriculture has become a much debated topic. The strong population growth in developing countries, combined with an ageing population of farmers can lead to food and nutrition security deficits in local, regional and international markets in the near future. There is a need for a new generation of farmers. This workshop started with an introduction by Dutch dairy farmer [Nils den Besten](#) and was followed by an interactive group discussion moderated by Cees van Rij from [Agriterra](#).



Den Besten shared his own experience as a farmer in the Netherlands, and from his broader work activities as member of the [Members' Council](#) of Friesland Campina and partner of [KnowWhy](#). Contrary to the current (policy) focus, he stressed that what many see as a problem – namely that young people are not interested in farming – could well be part of the solution. He highlighted that people who are passionate and have entrepreneurial skills make for the most successful farmers. What is often seen is that when the economy grows, the share of agriculture declines. However, the farmers who are left are able to create more successful businesses. This can apply to developing countries as well, provided that sufficient productive jobs in the processing, manufacturing or services sectors are created.

Thereafter participants were challenged to choose a side to the statement: “Take it as a fact, youth of today are not the farmers of the future”. Participants agreed that it is about targeting those who are willing and able to become a farmer as well as creating other agricultural employment. The institutional context needs to be in place for that. The Netherlands can play a key role by sharing its technical know-how, as well as by providing legal and administrative advice. In particular the importance of role models was stressed.

The next question for the group was whether there should be youth specific programmes, or whether the youth should be mainstreamed throughout agricultural policies. A significant part of the participants feared that when the youth is not specifically targeted, they will be forgotten. Others stressed that for policies to be effective, a comprehensive approach is necessary in which the youth are targeted within all key aspects of agricultural policy. Some concluded that it is not an either/or question. Rather, some challenges require policies targeted specifically at the youth, while other challenges require that the youth-lens is integrated throughout other related policy areas as well.

Technical know-how and role models might not be enough however. As participants stressed, in order for youth to be engaged in agriculture, they need to be capitalized and empowered, and above all, they need to be involved in policy-making. Melle Leenstra concluded: *“It is important to engage with [medium sized farmers](#), those who are doing well in the cooperatives, and those who demonstrate willingness to make farming a success. I would like to share more stories of passion of farming from people like Nils den Besten. Share the passion for farming as a business!”*

For further reading and contact:

- A blog about this workshop was published too: <http://knowledge4food.net/passionate-youth-agricultural-development/>.
- Please find here an [inventory](#) of the ambitions of key organizations engaging with youth in food systems.
- Dutch agencies will explore a knowledge Community of Practice in this field (meeting planned on May 12 by F&BKP and AgriProFocus, contact info@knowledge4food.net).

3.7 Scaling up Good Practices

The Dutch Embassy in Indonesia introduced the discussion, explaining that they would like to see a number of focus projects go to scale. The institutional encasing of the projects in Indonesia was well thought through, but still challenges regarding scaling up remained. The Indonesia case was used as a stepping stone toward broader discussions. Other participants recognized the challenges: “If you want to scale up something good there is often a lack of institutional instruments”. They mentioned the variety of contexts of specific scaling processes, which makes it difficult to use examples for providing more general methods for scaling up.

Several examples were shared of how scaling could work, amongst which the case of the [sesame sector](#) in West Africa. A number of “ingredients” appeared to help unlock the potential for scaling: a particular (farmer) training methodology and multi-stakeholder collaboration. Already during the course of the programme scaling happened, a/o. through buy-in of grass roots actors, which continued after the formal end. One of the lessons from this project: design for something that continues, i.e. with future scaling in mind.

Based on research on scaling initiatives, the following lessons were shared: The introduction of something new already sets the direction and its specific choice may limit opportunities for scaling from the onset. This underscores the importance of designing with future scaling in mind. Furthermore, assumptions underpinning many scaling initiatives are not appropriate. Common assumptions include: “find out what works and do more of the same”, and “what is good in this contexts and for these people, will also be good elsewhere and for other people”. Hence the core assumptions are often flawed, which sends the scaling initiative off on the wrong course. A simple 1-2-3 (linear) approach to scaling up is often inappropriate! Another issue relates to the question: what exactly needs to go to scale? Often there are particular principles which are scalable, but which need to be repackaged (adapted)

to become attractive in other contexts and for other groups of people. Finally, there are many options in terms of scaling strategies. Trying to “push” something to go to scale is but one option. Many, more indirect, strategies are possible. This will also reveal that many processes which we do not refer to are actually scaling processes, such as in the case of government subsidies and regulations. Connecting to ongoing dynamics may be a different strategy.

Another case on food supply to cities highlighted the role of demand for certain products which can trigger scaling processes. If you can connect to market/consumer demand, scaling may happen more easily and in a more “organic” way. “There needs to be a business case upfront rather than doing lots of great things and then hoping that it will go to scale”. The role of seed money is critical in this context: seed money initiatives may help explore innovations, after which the business sector takes over. In other contexts, working through the government may sometimes be more effectively, e.g. through regulatory frameworks.

Final discussions related to the role of pilots. In many cases, so much is invested in a particular pilot, that is difficult to let it fail. Even if officially that is an option, the tendency will be to plan a pilot and then not be too critical about feasibility and appropriateness of helping that go to scale.

Further reading: [Planning the unplannable: Planning the unplannable: designing value chain interventions for impact @ scale.](#)

3.8 Resilient Farming Systems (FRS) – Myanmar case

Geert Westenbrink (Agricultural counsellor, Embassy Myanmar) gives a brief introduction in which he highlights recent agricultural developments in Myanmar. The country is considered the last green field in the fastest growing region in the world and Westenbrink explains the ample opportunities for the Dutch sector as well as for the development of Myanmar. Emerging issues are climate change and agricultural diversification. So far, the agricultural sector has been dominated by rice. Now, new programmes come in, which are almost always value chain projects; interaction and cross-cutting themes are underrepresented. Geert makes a plea for putting ourselves in the “shoes” of the farmer family and work with them to make their farms ecologically and economically robust.

Subsequently, Christy van Beek (WUR) explains a specific project proposal on Resilient Farming Systems which WUR/Alterra, WUR/PPO and RNE are preparing together. The aim of the current project is to design an integrated programme on sustainable agricultural intensification. The proposal for the integrated programme is due by the end of 2016. The project is related to track 3 of the [letter to parliament on Food Security](#). Mixed, smallholder farming systems are very complex and ignoring this complexity may result in (unnoticed and/or unwanted) trade-offs. The project proposal consists of 3 parts:

1. Inventory of typologies (Agro-ecological zoning, MonQI)
2. Design of more competitive and sustainable farming systems (MSP)
3. Identify feasible change pathways

Then, Paul van Hofwegen (Advisor Water and Food Security, Ministry of Economic Affairs), gives a more detailed overview of the agro-environmental situation in Myanmar. Basically, there are 3 Agri-ecological zones:

- Ayeyarwady Delta – much variation - Lower, middle and upper delta – crop choice determined by access to water and energy; increasing aquaculture.
- Central Dry Zone – irrigation essential, various systems; land management - consolidation; scope for diversification in monsoon, cool, and summer seasons.
- Shan Plateau; favorable climate, rice and horti in valleys and hill slopes; erosion competition for water; access to Chinese and Thai Markets; pesticide use.

The potential for diversification depends very much on the water management situation and the land rights/consolidation.

The discussion that follows addresses the relations between the “new” value chain approaches (and its forerunners) and the “old” farming systems work. Van Beek explains that the project is not excluding value chain approaches, but rather complements the already existing projects by integrating the value chains at the farm level. Other remarks include the impact of climate change, capacity building, labour land use rights, diets/nutrition and the “One village – one product” policy in Thailand.

4 Conclusions

To wrap up the main findings and conclusions of the week, each of seven scouts were asked to come up with a buzzword which represents one of the main topics or insights of the week. The scouts had to present their buzzwords through a sort of contest, in where they all had to give a one minute pitch to explain why their word is the word of the event. After everyone presented their word, the applause of the audience would decide who had won. Reina Buijs (Deputy Director DGIS, Foreign Affairs) had to decide who had won but she mentioned that all words were important and gave a good reflection of the FNS Exchange.

The buzzwords of the FSE 2016 were:

Food Diplomacy (Pitch by Arman Khan, Policy Advisor Food Security, Embassy Bangladesh)

Pay more attention to what our partner countries are aspiring to. Work more in alignment with partner countries. Embassies want more input on country programming. Important subjects are budgeting, monitoring and reporting.

Food System (Pitch by Tjeerd de Vries, IGG, Foreign Affairs)

He attended a workshop from Celia on aid to trade where he thought of this word. FNS policy was result of aid, trade, and investment concept. Real challenge is working on a sustainable food system: both in terms of production and ecologically sound results. Presentation of Laurent (food system donut).

Inclusive (Pitch by Celia Jordao, Local Theme Expert Food Security, Embassy Mozambique)

We see there are opportunities to link aid, trade and investment, and put into practice our policy of “no one should be left behind”. We should start from focus of the farmer: facilitate opportunities for farmer to become entrepreneur to being an investor, leading to prosperity.

Sensitive (Pitch by Caro Pleysier, First Secretary Economic Affairs, Embassy Rwanda)

Our interpretation is not “touchy”... but that we care (accessible; open). Target the bigger picture but do not forget about these subjects: youth, gender, trade, nutrition. Also use this word for cooperation between EZ and BZ. Foreign affairs need to be economic sensitive and economic affairs need to be foreign sensitive.

One team (Laurent Umans, First Secretary Food Security, Embassy Bangladesh)

We started out as two teams: Food Security experts/Agricultural Councillors and BuZa staff. Now our networks are intertwined and we are growing to become one team. This also applies to: central & decentral. Way forward: we need network facilitation to become one team even more. The team itself has enough creativity and inventively to make this happen. If we become one team we will be able to fulfil the other points in this list.

Communication (Ernesto Sechene, Programme Officer Private Sector, Embassy Mozambique)

The question remains: what does it mean if we say that communication is not working well? Why do we communicate? We fund projects, but need to convince people that our results matter, and are of importance to the Netherlands and for partner countries. We need to communicate results in the right way to all the different types of public. We have to adjust our strategy to better communicate. Information is not communication: need two-way effort.

Results (Myrthe de Kock, (Permanent Representative UN, Rome)

The central word is results as this is where our discussions start, and end. Results at the beginning of what we do towards results at the end of what we do. Have we achieved them? Do we communicate about them?



Final words by Reina Buijs, Deputy DGIS

Reina Buijs reflected on the findings of the scouts and wrapped-up the FNS Exchange days. 'We have been able to bring the diversity together. We are able to bring together a diverse team and formed it in one team these days. This is a great achievement between Embassies and The Hague, as well as between Foreign Affairs and Economic Affairs.

The current top priority of Minister for Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation, Lilianne Ploumen, is gender. The result from a parliamentary discussion on "Leave no one behind" indicated that we should even do more. We have to make sure that gender analysis is done everywhere, in every activity.

One of the other challenges is how to motivate young people for agriculture and offer them a perspective. This is an issue in all countries where Foreign Affairs works. It has to be innovative, attractive and using new technologies to make it sexy (again) to be part of feeding your family and the world.

Reina Buijs also mentioned that FA has to communicate what they do in food and nutrition security, and how it relates to development and security issues. We need to have a clear story on this. FA also has to explain our Food and Nutrition Security activities to our voters in an understandable manner. We need to explain why we do have an important role and why we cannot leave this only to NGOs, etc. What's our added value compared to NGOs for example?

Reina Buijs recognizes all the seven buzzwords given above. It is important to know the different contexts of the different countries, because we are connected. Unfortunately, there is significant less budget for development cooperation in the years to come. Part of our budget is needed for example for the first year reception of refugees. It is important to have a good balance between the different skills and expertise that is needed to cover the different areas of food and nutrition security. We are trying to find ways to improve the exchange of knowledge. If we want to work on regional level, we have to work with regional institutions. For regional problems, you need regional solutions. The most important partners are often your neighbors (Netherlands and Germany for example), so the regional perspective is very important.

Participants FNS Exchange days 2016

Representatives Dutch Embassies

EKN Bangladesh	Arman Khan	Policy Advisor Food Security
EKN Bangladesh	Laurent Umans	First Secretary Food Security
EKN Benin	Annelies van den Berg	Expert Food Security
EKN Benin	Marcellin Nonfon	Expert Food Security
EKN Burundi	Eddy Niyonzima	Local Theme Expert Food Security
EKN Burundi	Gerrit Noordam	First Secretary Food Security
EKN Ethiopia	Jan Willem Nibbering	First Secretary Food Security
EKN Ethiopia	Niek Bosmans	Future Agricultural Counsellor
EKN Ghana	Mariska Lammers	Policy Officer Food security
EKN Indonesia	Lucie Wassink	Agricultural Counsellor
EKN Kenya	Bert Rikken	Agricultural Counsellor
EKN Kenya	Melle Leenstra	First Secretary Food Security
EKN Mozambique	Célia Jordao	Local Theme Expert Food Security
EKN Mozambique	Ernesto Sechene	Programme Officer Private Sector
EKN Myanmar	Frederik Heijink	Future Agricultural Counsellor
EKN Myanmar	Geert Westenbrink	Agricultural Counsellor
EKN Rwanda	Carian Emeke	Future Agricultural Counsellor
EKN Rwanda	Caro Pleysier	First Secretary Economic Affairs
EKN Rwanda	Teddie Muffels	Agricultural Counsellor
EKN Saudi Arabia	Hans van der Beek	Agricultural Counsellor
EKN South Africa	Niek Schelling	Agricultural Counsellor
EKN South Sudan	Henk van Trig	Senior policy officer agriculture
EKN Uganda	Josephat Byaruhanga	Sr Policy Advisor Food security
New York	Nicolaas de Regt	Permanent Representative UN
Palestinian Territories	Jaap Satter	Future Agricultural Counsellor
Palestinian Territories	Wijnand Marchal	First Secretary Economic Affairs
Rome	Myrthe de Kock	Permanent Representative UN