
CO-CREATING (DUTCH) DIAMONDS, GOLD (STANDARDS) AND SILVER (BULLETS) IN THE FOOD SECURITY AND AGRICULTURAL BUSINESS MAZE

EVALUATION OF THE FOOD & BUSINESS KNOWLEDGE PLATFORM



FINAL REPORT JULY 13, 2018

JOEP VAN DEN BROEK AND TON DIETZ

Van den Broek, J.A. and T. Dietz¹, 2018, Co-creating (Dutch) diamonds, gold (standards) and silver (bullets) in the food security and agricultural business maze²: Evaluation of the Food & Business Knowledge Platform.

Requested by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands

1. Resilience BV. Joep van den Broek was mainly responsible for interviews in Africa and Asia; Ton Dietz for the analysis of websites and existing reports, and for interviews in the Netherlands. Contact details of the authors: joep@resiliencebv.com; tondietz@gmail.com

2. According to <http://www.dictionary.com> a 'maze' is (1) a confusing network of intercommunicating paths or passages; labyrinth; (2) any complex system or arrangement that causes bewilderment, confusion, or perplexity; and (3) a state of bewilderment or confusion. The ancient word 'clew' (or Dutch: 'kluwen') also comes close, but few will understand.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENTS

Table of contents	3
Executive Summary	5
Introduction	5
The evaluation.....	5
Major Findings.....	6
Conclusions	9
1 Introduction	15
A bit of history and the mission of the F&BKP	15
The Positioning and Organization of the F&BKP	16
The F&BKP (including the GCP, ARF and SEEDS programmes): financial information for 2013-2017	16
Terms of Reference and methods.....	17
2. Relevance of the F&BKP for the food security programme of the Netherlands Government.....	19
The Netherlands Government’s food security programme	19
The F&BKP and the three major Dutch policy themes for food security	20
Chronology of thematic focus fields	22
Global food insecurity, and the Dutch focus countries	25
The geographical distribution of F&BKP projects: the geographical relevance of the F&BKP	27
Agricultural products and sub-sectors: the product scope of the F&BKP	28
3. Strengthening the food and business network for development	30
The network of agencies in the Netherlands	30
The Food & Business Knowledge Platform: network and overlap with ‘Wageningen’ and AgriProFocus	31
The partner maze	34
The F&BKP network linkages in ‘the North’ (outside the Netherlands).....	36
The F&BKP network linkages in ‘the South’	36
4. Reaching out to the world: products and first impressions of impact	40
The ‘uptake’ strategy	40
The ‘products’ of the Food & Business Knowledge Platform.....	40
5 The opinions among diplomats working in relevant Netherlands Embassies and some other stakeholders in ‘the South’	45
Methodology.....	45
The website and other information channels	45
Putting things in perspective.....	46
Food and nutrition security research	47

Strategic partnerships & thematic networks	48
recommendations	49
6. The opinions among key people working in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature, and Food Quality/Ministry of Economic Affairs.....	51
Methodology.....	51
Involvement in the food security activities of the Dutch government	51
Relationship of the respondents with the F&BKP, and opinions about the relevance of the F&BKP for policy formulation and implementation.....	52
Relevance of the F&BKP for organising better synergy within the sector in the Netherlands	54
Suggestions for a next phase	54
7. Earlier assessments and opinions of other stakeholders.....	56
The Stakeholder Perceptions and Future Outlook report.....	56
The Gold Standard Report.....	56
The Mid-term evaluation of the GCP and ARF Programmes by Syspons GmbH (for NWO-WOTRO)	56
The knowledge portal survey	59
Topsector opinions.....	60
Wageningen responses	61
Results of a survey among project leaders of the first GCP and ARF projects.....	62
8 Conclusions	67
1 The relevance of the F&BKP in the Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) field.....	67
2. Assess the implementation of the program.....	68
3. Future outlook.....	69
Annex 1: F&BKP Projects: list	72
Annex 2: Reports, Conferences, Meetings and other Activities (co-) organized by the F&BKP (including NWO-WOTRO's input; and other than the ones mentioned under KMF; Annex 1)	76
Annex 3: F&BKP Project countries	81
Annex 4: Dutch involvement in F&BKP activities	83
Annex 5: Other Northern/Global involvement in F&BKP activities	96
Annex 6: Southern agencies involved in F&BKP activities; and linkages with NL Embassies (and MASP Food Security) and with AgriProFocus offices.....	99
Annex 7: Types of agricultural products as foci for F&BKP activities: project numbers and countries	118
Annex 8: Time frame F&BKP projects and activities	119
Annex 9: 'Products', as communicated on F&BKP and WOTRO websites	124
Annex 10: Terms of Reference.....	138

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The F&BKP was conceived after the WRR report 'Less Pretension, More Ambition' was published in 2010. Partly because of this report, agriculture and nutrition became central to the new development policy of the Netherlands, with Ben Knapen in charge of development co-operation and Europe. To aim for a better base for Dutch policy and practices, Knapen prepared four knowledge platforms and one of those had to be about food security. When Lilianne Ploumen took over in Rutte II, she combined the 'aid and trade agenda' in the approach for nutrition and agriculture, and the knowledge platform was called 'food and business'.

From the start the Food & Business Knowledge Platform was meant to support a combination of two policy goals: (a) improving food and nutrition security for the food insecure people in the world, with Dutch emphasis on fifteen focus countries for food security, ten in Africa and five in Asia, and (b) supporting the Dutch agricultural sector (and particularly its private sector) to get better access to the emerging economies of Africa and Asia. Later, a third policy goal was added: (c) support more sustainable global agriculture, and in particular: support the agricultural value chain to become 'climate smart'.

A consortium consisting of Wageningen CDI, AgriProFocus (first Arnhem, later Utrecht), and The Broker (first Amsterdam, later The Hague) won the tender, and set up a small office for the F&BKP secretariat in The Hague, since the Ministry asked for a neutral secretariat not directly linked to any of the three implementers.

In 2015 the three strategic goals of the F&BKP were reformulated, to serve as an open and independent initiative [...] to stimulate long-term changes to increase Food and Nutrition Security through: (a) improving relevance (focus and coherence) and efficient use of Dutch, local and international knowledge and research capacity; (b) strengthening the FNS related policies and programmes in the Netherlands and abroad; and (c) facilitating knowledge and research that suit Dutch and local entrepreneurs, traders and investors and increased investments and collaboration from the Dutch private sector in Low- and Middle-Income Countries. The approach of the F&BKP, in line with the three goals, consists of: (1) research (ARF & GCP) through open calls for proposals ('Uptake'); (2) stimulating thematic networks and partnerships in a multistakeholder setting, the 'Dutch Diamond' and (3) a knowledge portal with an emphasis on transparent web-based communication.

Between 2013 and 2017 (including 2017) 45.0m€ was spent on the various F&BKP instruments, of which 32.2m€ came from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (and as part of ODA), 4.0m€ was NWO's contribution to the Global Challenges Programme, 1.7m€ was CGIAR/CCAFS's contribution to the last Call for that programme, and 7.1m€ was agreed as co-financing from consortium members in GCP (Global Challenges Programme) and ARF (Applied Research Fund) programmes.

THE EVALUATION

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, after consultations with the Steering Committee of the F&BKP agreed to do a 'final review' for this phase of the Food & Business Knowledge Platform, that could be used as an input for a discussion about a new phase. The evaluators looked at: the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the platform and based on this formulated recommendations for the future outlook of the platform. The terms of reference are provide in annex 10.

For this review three major methods have been used:

- We did an analysis of the wealth of information on the website of the F&BKP (and on the NWO-WOTRO website about GCP and ARF), including earlier assessments, and in addition an analysis of internal documents (although most of the Platform, information is shared in a very transparent and

open way); also related reports have been used, including the recent IOB Evaluation about Food Security 2012-2016.

- We interviewed key persons active in or around the Platform, both in direct meetings, on the phone, and/or via email exchanges. This includes sending preliminary texts and overviews and using the (often detailed) responses for further refinement.
- We did a survey among Dutch diplomats (and a few other relevant people) in Africa and Asia (see chapter 5); a survey among civil servants working on food security issues at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and at the Ministry of Agriculture (see chapter 6); survey among project leaders of the first GCP and ARF projects (see chapter 7).

MAJOR FINDINGS

Objectives and geographical distribution of the F&BKP activities

The 'real' food security issues ('Eradicating existing hunger and malnutrition') were central to 53% of all F&BKP projects, of which 29% only focused on this theme, and the others in combination with other themes, particularly theme II. Theme II ('Promoting inclusive and sustainable growth in the agricultural sector') received a bit more attention (56%), with 32% as a 'stand-alone' objective. Theme III ('Creating ecologically sustainable food systems') was less important (with 19% in total; 6% of it together with one or two of the other themes). In the GCP projects themes I and III have been more important than in the ARF and KMF projects. If we add up the stand alone and joined projects Theme I dominated GCP, Theme II dominated ARF (although mostly together with theme I), and the KMF projects show a balanced combination of themes I and II. For theme III GCP has been the most important funding tool, mainly as a result of a deliberate attempt in 2017 to develop a Call about 'scaling up climate-smart agriculture'.

For both the KMF and ARF projects six countries received most attention: Benin, Uganda, Ghana, Ethiopia, Indonesia and Kenya. It can be concluded that the most serious cases of food insecurity received very little (or no) attention, partly due to high levels of conflict and lack of safety, but also due to lack of existing contacts. Countries with a lot of existing reliable contacts do get far more easy access to these research funds than countries with far less (knowledge and business) contacts, and where (Dutch) researchers either cannot do research due to the 'no go area policies' of their employers (following the list with 'red , orange, yellow and green countries' of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs), or shy away from those countries that are seen as difficult and dangerous.

Strengthening the food and business network for development

The network analysis of the Dutch food-oriented food agencies reveals that more than 300 Dutch agencies are active in that network, and mentioned on any of the websites of the (selected) partners of the F&BKP, as well as on the website of the Topsector Agri & Food, that is NOT a partner of the F&BKP. Most food-related agencies can be found on the website of NABC (120 different food-related agencies) and of the two Topsectors. If we look at these 'giants' in terms of food-related networks, the overlap between F&BKP and the Netherlands African Business Council is more prominent than the overlap with either of the two relevant Topsectors. It is telling that the Topsector Agri & Food is not a partner of F&BKP as such and the Topsector Agro&Food has not very actively participated in activities funded/organized by the Platform. The other Topsector, for Horticulture and Starting Materials IS a partner (and as such mentioned on the F&BKP website), but also they hardly ever participated in a GCP, ARF or KMF activity. And the network congruence between either of these two Topsectors and agencies active in or partner of F&BKP is very limited.

Of the more than 200 businesses or business support organizations detected by combining the various websites studied, only six are partner of the Platform, but some more (around 30) participated in activities funded/organized by the Platform, and maybe more representatives of the business sector participated in meetings organized around F&BKP activities. Although 30+ businesses active in the Platform is not a bad score (and there might be more), it is probably fair to say that the large majority of relevant food businesses has not yet been mobilized by the Platform. The most relevant ones (103 food-related businesses which are paying members of NABC, and hence interested in Africa) could have been approached more actively, with a better liaison with NABC, and that is an obvious task for the near future.

In total we can say that the GCP and ARF approaches indeed resulted in a broad representation of types of collaborating agencies. In addition initiatives of Dutch networks/organisations with support of the F&BKP Office (and often financed by KMF) also made use of the same or other agencies in the South, and in total the F&BKP resulted in the mobilisation of many academic and non-academic agencies in focus countries like Uganda, Kenya, Ethiopia, Benin and Ghana, and a bit less so in focus countries like Bangladesh and Indonesia. Among the non-focus countries a variety of agencies in Tanzania, South Africa and Vietnam have also been mobilised, and successfully linked to Dutch agencies active in food security and agricultural business and value chains. A final remark here: so far there were hardly any relationships between the Platform and relevant agencies at the level of Africa as a whole (e.g. the African Union, AGRA, the African Development Bank). This can be seen as an important challenge for the next period, but it requires dedicated time and effort, for which the current Office simply is too small.

Reaching out to the world: products and first impressions of impact

The F&BKP very actively engaged with the wider world. The website has been fed with a lot of relevant content, and making all activities, reports, and other relevant news available to a wider (global) public. In 2017 the number of page views had increased to close to 92,000 (cumulative for the entire period; with 17,251 page views in 2017). The Knowledge Portal (part of the F&BKP website) had more than 8,500 unique visitors at the end of 2016. In 2017 a service was added enabling users to get personalised email alerts (at the end of 2017 92 people had done so). Bimonthly newsletters since mid-2014 selected specific content to be sent to subscribers, of whom there were almost 2,000 at the end of 2017. For a knowledge platform that is only five years old and an Office that only had 5.3 fte at the end of 2017 this is a very commendable achievement. We should also say that the quality of the annual reports of the Office is outstanding.

However, it became clear to us that the decision to develop two different websites per GCP and ARF project (so 2 x 75 project websites – and sometimes projects also developed their own (additional) websites or had to be part of specific websites of their institutions) can be seen as a waste of energy (and money), and a cause for trouble. With hindsight it would have been more effective and more efficient to have one website (the Platform would be the most logical choice), and to make the WOTRO people co-responsible for project communication and become part of the website team feeding the Platform's website for the GCP and ARF projects.

Although it is too early to judge (many projects are not even half way) one can say that quite a large number of research projects either does not report adequately, or that information does not enter the websites of WOTRO and the Platform, or these projects are simply lagging behind in performance, or wait until the last moment with their products, and/or do not want to share those earlier. If one looks at the list of 'top performers' one can note that 'Wageningen' (initiator or partner in more than half of all GCP and ARF projects) is surprisingly less represented than one would expect.

The opinions of diplomats working in relevant Netherlands Embassies in 'the South'

When asked about the F&BKP many Embassies mentioned that they knew the newsletter and the website. At the same time the most heard comment was that "I think they are not that active in my country" and that they

“look more focused on the Netherlands”. Most agreed with the choice of topics on the knowledge portal and indicated that these are the most important topics that they are working on. The most relevant topics for the Embassy staff are: inclusive business, finance, nutrition and youth employment. Topics that were missing according to the Embassy staff were: food safety, scaling and migration. Most respondents appreciated the structure of the website and they found it quite easy to find certain studies and articles. At the same time, Embassy staff indicated that they would like to have more information on how to practically give hand and feet to the ‘Aid and Trade’ policy; *how* do you make this work? Another topic that a number of Embassies struggled with is ‘agricultural transformation’ (from low input and low productivity; to high input and high productivity); *how* can you support that transition in an integrated way?

With respect to the research projects the Embassies, overall, feel that the research projects run rather autonomously or independently, with very little coordination and communication with them. Some Embassies were not aware of quite a large number of projects taking place in their country. Only in those countries where specific events had been organized the visibility of (some) projects was better. In addition, many Embassies found that the participation of the Dutch private sector in the projects had been limited. Especially in those countries with a strong Trade and Aid policy or in so-called transition countries, this was seen as a missed chance. Lastly, Embassy staff that participated in the ‘learning journey’ and ‘terugkomdagen’ much appreciated these one-week missions. They mentioned that the journeys had provided them with new ideas and in some cases formed the basis for the development of a new project. In addition, the Embassies that were involved in the organization of the journeys mentioned that the collaboration with the F&BKP and Food Security Support Facility had generally been constructive, professional and positive.

Opinions among key people of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs & Agriculture, Nature, and Food Quality

In the conception of the knowledge platforms the idea was to put the formulation of a knowledge agenda outside the Ministry, and to no longer tolerate a very individualised system of funding with too much focus on ‘the usual suspects’. Knowledge Platforms were meant to open up to a larger and broader network, and to create more “level playing fields”.

Respondents who are close to the Platform see many positive impacts of the F&BKP, particularly on the formulation of new policies: organising a broad e-consultation for the Food Security Policy Note of 2014; the design of the Post-Harvest Network; the secretarial roles for the Landscape Forum; the new policy formulation by Minister Sigrid Kaag; and the reformulation of Dutch support for CGIAR, and activities together with IFPRI, and for the Agricultural Research for Global Challenges at EU level. The many network meetings and conferences (co-) organised by the Platform are seen as a welcome (although sometimes overwhelming) way of sharing insights. The ones that are mentioned explicitly are the Food First conferences) and a big meeting in December 2017 (‘Research & policy: two peas in a pod?’), where diplomats, practitioners, and researchers of GCP and ARF projects presented and discussed preliminary results. Also the e-learning initiatives have been highly appreciated.

However, also these respondents suggest that “the relationship between policymakers and the F&BKP can be more direct, and the effects of its many activities can be more recognisable”. Particularly the research component is seen as having too broad a scope. The general feeling among most respondents is that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs should have embedded the F&BKP better in the (many) existing structures of and programmes supported by the Dutch aid and trade agenda. In fact the large majority of GCP and ARF projects lack any relationship with one of the many Dutch-funded projects, and particularly with the ones funded by Netherlands Embassies. A repeated opinion is that the Ministry (or Ministries) should first put their own knowledge house in order, and make it a requirement that all projects, and all ‘dossierholders’ for these projects, are supposed to formulate knowledge questions, and consult with the Platform about alignment and knowledge development strategies. It also means that all diplomats and all other civil servants working for food security elements of the Dutch government policy should get dedicated time for knowledge development.

Earlier assessments and evaluations

Other evaluations that have been undertaken in the past are the stakeholder perceptions and future outlook report (Baidenmann and Percy-Smit, 2016), the Gold Standard report for all the five knowledge platforms (Lammers and de Winter, 2017), the mid-term evaluation of the GCP and ARF projects (Syspons, 2017) and the knowledge portal survey (2018). A selection of most important recommendations of these reports is provided below:

- About the Platform and knowledge portal: this was seen as “interesting and valuable”, by the Baidenmann and Percy-Smith, though “better focus and stronger attention to some elements” was advised and “the link with the private sector and with (Dutch) policies and the Netherlands Embassies should be strengthened”. (Stakeholder Perceptions & Future Outlook Report, November 2016)
- “The Platform [...] put major new themes on the policy agenda as ‘trending topics’, e.g.: social entrepreneurship and youth. At the same time, Lammers and de Winter observe there are tensions between ‘knowledge for policy’ versus ‘knowledge for the sector’”. (Gold Standard Report, February 2017)
- “The aspiration levels of the ARF and GCP instruments’ impact pathways are too high for the capacity of the funded projects”. E.g. this is mentioned in the context of the ARF Theory of Change to move from outcome to impact; “the missing step is the upscale effect from early adopters to a wider part of the population” and “neither instrument possesses adequate support mechanisms [...] to help them scale up [...] to a larger level”. (MTR, Syspons, December 2017)
- The knowledge portal survey is generally positive: “Half of the respondents [that make use of the Portal] state that the Portal ‘definitely’ has an added value compared to other sources, and most others said that it did so ‘to some extent’”. (Knowledge Portal Survey, January 2018)

CONCLUSIONS

1 The relevance of the F&BKP in the Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) field

1.1 How did the F&BKP enhance the achievement of the three strategic policy goals of the Netherlands in the field of Food and Nutrition Security?

The activities of the F&BKP, including the two research programmes, enhanced all three strategic goals of food and nutrition security, with most emphasis on the two first goals (Eradicating existing hunger and malnutrition, and Promoting inclusive and sustainable growth in the agricultural sector), and more modest, and mostly during the last year, attention for the third goal (Creating ecologically sustainable food systems), connected to a dedicated attempt to support research for climate-smart agriculture, together with CGIAR¹. The Platform actively supported the formulation of new policy papers, and the realignment of international collaborations (e.g., with the CGIAR institutes). The thematic choices made in the F&BKP activities, and the very flexible adjustments to a rather rapidly changing policy environment, can be seen as very adequate.

However, one should question the relevance of the geographical choices made, both the regional emphasis of the implemented food security policies of the Ministry itself (are the focus countries the most relevant ones for

¹ The Platform Office agrees with our statement about the ‘more modest’ attention for this third policy goal, but would like to note that ‘sustainability’ was also important in two KMF projects about soil fertility (which already started in 2014), in the policy consultation in 2014, where good use was made of AgriProFocus’s multi-stakeholder dialogue processes about agro-ecology; and about the landscape approach, that later also resulted in solid support for that ‘landscape approach’ by the Platform. Also the Portal included many sources about sustainable and climate-smart agriculture, since its start.

enhancing food security? Are the focus countries which received most funding/attention the most 'needy' ones?) and certainly the actual regional spread of the project portfolio, and the emphasis in knowledge-policy debates. One cannot escape the conclusion that a majority of research projects is located in the relatively 'easy' countries, with a lot of existing linkages, like Kenya, Benin, Uganda and Ghana, while very few activities can be found in very problematic areas like South Sudan, Yemen, and Burundi. And a relevant question is if 'learning from experiences elsewhere' should not put much more emphasis on the world's areas with most hungry people (India particularly, but also the numbers of hungry people in focus countries Bangladesh and Indonesia are still very high, even if the percentage of hungry people in the population is much lower than elsewhere).

1.2 What is the added value of the F&BKP in supporting knowledge management activities of various Dutch based networks and organizations in the Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) field?

The F&BKP (including the two research programmes) succeeded to mobilize almost all relevant knowledge, and NGO agencies active in the Netherlands in the field of food security, as well as a lot of partner institutes in Africa, and some in Asia, America, and Europe. The network is truly impressive. The intention to involve the business sector somewhat succeeded in most of the ARF and GCP projects, and in some of the KMF and other Office activities, as far as 'southern' businesses were concerned – as was the intention – but much less so in the Netherlands. Although the Platform succeeded to get Dutch agro-business firms around the table, and as participants in conferences and strategic meetings, their active involvement in research projects, and as initiators or co-sponsors of relevant knowledge activities was much more limited. Among the major players Rabobank (and its Foundation) was most involved, as well as for instance Friesland Campina. But major companies like Heineken, Unilever and Ahold, are conspicuously absent. Some smaller companies do play a role, though. It should be said though that the choice for focus countries restricted the interest of the Topsectors and companies, who would have preferred greater emphasis on emerging markets. It is also remarkable that pseudo-companies like SNV, or major players like IDH and FMO were less involved than we, as evaluators, had expected. Among the knowledge institutes the Platform succeeded to engage a large diversity of major groups from Wageningen University and Research Centre, but also all relevant other key players in this field in and around academia (including KIT).

The intention to open up and engage a wide variety of players has clearly succeeded, and it certainly enhanced the visibility of the 'Dutch diamond' concept, both in the Netherlands, among some global agencies (like the World Bank and CGIAR – but much less so among FAO, IFAD, WFP, and the regional banks), and in the South. There is a somewhat troublesome relationship, though, with 'government'. Some of the GCP, ARF, and KMF activities did succeed to engage relevant government agencies in the South (although often at a local level), but the relationship with Dutch Embassies, and with the many existing Dutch-funded food security and food and business projects in the South, has been much more limited than we expected (and currently it is the dominant expectation among key people in the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Economic Affairs, and Agriculture). It is fair to say, though, that when the programme was designed this was much less on the radar as a target and expectation. The chosen approach for the research programmes, and the selection process of projects by NWO-WOTRO, did not favour an approach to connect directly to existing Dutch-funded food security projects, and enhance their knowledge orientation. With hindsight it can be seen as a mistake to expect that such selection procedures can result in one-to-one project-research/knowledge connections, and for a programme like the Applied Research Programme this should not have been handled by NWO-WOTRO, but directly managed by the Platform itself and its multi-actor Steering Committee, like they successfully did with the Knowledge Management Facility, with a lot of other convening activities and with the Knowledge Portal. Of course, the Platform should then handle the Calls, and the granting process, with the same rigour as NWO-WOTRO is used to do, which adds an extra responsibility to the Steering Committee, and both the Platform Office and the Steering Committee need to have the expertise to do this properly.

2. Assessing the implementation of the program

2.1 To what extent is the F&BKP an effective knowledge platform?

The Platform has effectively managed a very complicated agenda, with many different stakeholders, and very many different subsectors, and (sub) objectives. Compared to the period before the Platform started, the chaotic and unconnected food security agencies and projects have become more aligned. Excellent reporting on the Platform's website (and excellent annual reports, and other activity reports) as well as a much appreciated knowledge brokerage function have helped to bring more 'order' in the maze. It can be observed that the Office (and the Steering Committee) needed the first two years to get started, but that from 2015 onwards many initiatives have been taken, in an often very pro-active and alert way, and that the Platform succeeded to become relevant in a strategic way as well (although not all civil servants active in the food security team would agree). The knowledge portal and the Knowledge Management Facility (and still less so the GCP and ARF projects) have become important and appreciated tools, although both could be more effective within the Ministries, if civil servants/diplomats would be supposed to develop a dedicated knowledge agenda for 'their' programmes and projects.

We would like to stress that the effectiveness of the Platform so far has been a result of a consortium of partners, where each partner brought (and brings) specific strengths: WCDI its knowledge, prestige and convening power in the food sector, AgriProFocus its local networks, and The Broker its expertise as a knowledge broker, and facilitator of online and offline multi-stakeholder dialogues. Office team members and consortium partners (together with the steering committee and its multi-stakeholder network) clearly strengthened each other: the result has been much stronger than it would have been if just one of the consortium members would have done the job.

The effectiveness can (and should) further be enhanced in five directions: (1) more alignment with the Dutch food security initiatives/projects (for which both a shift in attitude is needed within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and at the Embassies, as well as more direct contact and support from the Platform with them) (2) more involvement of the major business players in the food and agriculture sector in the Netherlands, (3) better and more effective connections with the two relevant top sectors [Agro&Food, and Horticulture and Starting Materials] and their sector associations, (4) better connections with major European and global players like the European Union, FAO, IFAD, WFP, the African Development Bank, and also SNV, IDH and FMO, and (5) alignment with the relevant think tanks in the South. During the last five years a lot has been done, but for the next phase 'upscaling' is important for global recognition. Depending on extra means to expand the Platform's network linkages, this expansion can all be attempted during the next five-year phase, or it can be done in two phases (see section 3).

2.2 To what extent is the F&BKP an efficient knowledge platform?

It is amazing how much has been done by a relatively small group of people in the Office of the F&BKP, and with relatively limited funding for KMF and Office activities. In that sense the 'efficiency' (value for money) is clearly high. Much more money has been spent on the GCP and ARF projects, and it is too early to assess the value for money of these projects, and of NWO-WOTRO's handling of those projects. For us it is obvious that at one point efficiency gains can be made: it is not very efficient to spend precious time on two research websites (one by the Platform and one by NWO-WOTRO, for both the GCP and the ARF projects). It also became clear that it has created reporting imperfections. We recommend that the Platform website is leading, and that NWO-WOTRO staff becomes part of the team that 'feeds' this website.

2.3 What lessons learned and recommendations from previous evaluations are taken into account by the F&BKP?

The Platform and its activities (and certainly including the research programmes) are heavily monitored and very often assessed. For the research programmes a very dedicated external evaluator (a German firm called Syspons) uses a very detailed approach and very detailed reporting (also NWO-WOTRO's own reporting about each and every project takes a lot of time and energy, also for the project leaders, who sometimes complain about the many (unpaid) services they have to provide in terms of reporting requirements).

As we have seen in chapter 7 next to Syspons, there have also been assessments of the knowledge platforms as a whole ('the gold standard report'), and of separate activities of the F&BKP, like a stakeholder perceptions and future outlook assignment, and a survey about the Knowledge Portal. The Office and the Steering Committee take these assessments very serious, and continuously seem to reflect about their implications. They also co-organise major discussions about relevant 'big' evaluations about the sector, like a discussion about the IOB report "Food for Thought" in 2018.

3. Future outlook

The ultimate aim of the F&BKP is to contribute to the strategic goals of DGIS for food and nutrition security: eradicating hunger, promoting agricultural growth and creating sustainable food systems. In the theory of change of the F&BKP the 'sphere of influence' that should provide the eventual outcomes towards these goals are: knowledge and innovation, co-creation and use. Given the scope and width of the DGIS strategic goals, we observe a gap on how, eventually, the achievements in the three F&BKP pillars contribute to the results at impact level (or the relationship between the 'eventual outcomes' and 'impact' in the theory of change of the F&BKP); and how scaling and leverage can be achieved. For the future phase, and in order to further enhance the impact of the platform, we further suggest to make clearer how the platform makes these contributions; and how, within the strategic goals, choices are made. As such, the Ministry could also prescribe more what and where to focus on (and what not); e.g. through a research, knowledge and innovation agenda, highlighting choices for specific thematic areas and agricultural subsectors.

It is obvious that a major challenge is to connect more directly and more effectively with the many Dutch-funded food security projects, particularly the ones managed by the Netherlands Embassies. And at least part of the funding available for the next phase should focus on knowledge management and research for and with these Dutch-funded food security projects. But it is also obvious that the relevant civil servants (in the three related Ministries, and at the Embassies) need to be stimulated to develop a much more knowledge-oriented attitude, and to develop adequate knowledge questions (together with the relevant stakeholders). Food security knowledge brokerage should be done both at a generic level (the three major goals of the Dutch food security policy, and their interconnections), and at a specific level (the many food security programmes and projects). It is recommended that all relevant food security project holders within Netherlands Embassies and in The Hague are expected to maintain a dedicated communication line with the F&BKP Office (and where there is a local AgriProFocus office also with that Office). It is also recommended that this feeds the knowledge agenda, and suggests new (KMF and other) knowledge initiatives within the F&BKP. We also suggest to better organize 'communities of practice' in the 'food security cluster' of the relevant Ministries, and to start a series of 'brown bag lunches' or other regular meetings to discuss F&BKP activities and outcomes, related to the three major policy goals of the food security policy.

The effectiveness of the Knowledge Platform as a tool for knowledge generation and dissemination for all relevant Dutch agencies and their connections abroad can be enhanced if the major players (Wageningen, AgriProFocus, the Embassies, the major Dutch-supported projects, the food security experts at the Ministry of Foreign affairs and at the Ministry of Agriculture, the two Topsectors and sector associations like Plantum and Groente & Fruit Huis, NWO-WOTRO (and NWO in general), KIT, SNV, Rabobank, Unilever, Heineken, Friesland Campina, to mention the most important ones) would regard the Platform as 'their thing', and if they would make 'their' knowledge information available via the F&BKP 'as a matter of principle'. However, that would necessitate a strong commitment by the top leaders in those organisations, and it is recommended to enable

this process by organizing a top-level meeting between the Ministers of BZ and LNV, the President of Wageningen UR, the AgriProFocus Director, NWO Board Member, and representatives from the private sector like CEOs from Unilever, Heineken, Rabobank, and NABC, to get a joint commitment for upscaling the Platform to gradually develop into a Netherlands Food Security Partnership for Development, connected to the broader Dutch agenda (and funds) for global food security². During the next phase, and certainly during Phase 3, it should be attempted to get part of the funding for F&BKP activities from other funders than the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (e.g., from Ministry of LNV, Topsectors, Businesses, EU, or the African Development Bank).

For a Netherlands Food Security Partnership to flourish Wageningen's commitment is crucial, and in order to connect with all business, knowledge and NGO partners, we do not see AgriProFocus as the logical host for this new Partnership. We strongly recommend to continue the existing consortium of Wageningen (through WCDI), AgriProFocus, and The Broker, and find a legal way to connect the various relevant policy instruments (and funds) with this Consortium. But within Wageningen a stronger commitment is needed to make sure that WCDI can indeed function as the obvious broker between the great variety of relevant research groups, and between these groups and the other relevant players in the Netherlands and abroad.

To us it is obvious that the existing lack of clarity about a follow up of GCP-like and ARF-like research programmes undermines the credibility of the Platform as an instrument worth investing in by scientists. A lasting commitment by Dutch and international scientists would be guaranteed with a new round of GCP-like and ARF-like projects, funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and hopefully financially supported by other major stakeholders. And it would help if new instruments (like the SEEDS Call, other Dutch support to CGIAR, the joint SDG Research Initiative) would be better aligned with the work of the Platform. The (potential) impact of the continuation of a food and nutrition security research programme is further supported by one of the conclusions of the recent IOB evaluation, 'Food for Thought' (2017), that states that "agricultural research supported by the Netherlands is likely to pay off substantially".

It would also help if forthcoming major research funding arrangements for food security would enable more linkages between Wageningen and other relevant parties in the Netherlands (other research institutes, but also NGOs, businesses etc.). A flourishing Netherlands Food Security Partnership for Development needs to go beyond 'Wageningen First'. It is recommended to soon start arrangements with the F&BKP consortium, the Steering Committee, and the Office about new rounds of ARF-like programmes (with a synchronized implementation period for both the Office and the envisaged research programme). It is also recommended that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs engages in a new round of discussions with NWO (-WOTRO) about the continuation of a GCP-like programme, and the Ministry should stimulate (or force) a self-evident link between existing and new research programmes related to food security issues within NWO, and the F&BKP. At the same time it is NWO-(WOTRO)'s duty to continue a strong food security research funding policy, and to acquire funding for that also beyond the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. For us the most crucial element of this research/knowledge strategy is to better understand the trade-offs between the three major food security policy goals, and the ways to stimulate (and upscale) triple-win solutions ('Food Systems Thinking'). This is a connected goal for both NWO and the F&BKP.

A dedicated discussion is needed during the next phase about the 'presence abroad'. AgriProFocus currently has a network of local focal points, but that network does not completely match with the most relevant areas for food security attention (also seeing the recent shifts in the regional orientation of the Dutch ODA agenda). Also the local focal points could be further developed as real examples of the 'Dutch diamond abroad', beyond the current dominance of NGO partners, and self-evident knowledge broker connections should develop between the AgriProFocus hubs and the relevant Netherlands Embassies, and their (involvement in) food

² One way to do this is to demand that for every new food security project five per cent of project funds will be added, for a dedicated knowledge agenda, connected to the F&BKP, and to stimulate that all project reports have to report on that knowledge agenda, and the collaboration with the Platform.

security programmes. It would be useful to discuss the existing connections in countries without an AgriProFocus focal point, as new 'hubs', and also (for Africa) to see how the business connection could be enhanced by a strategic alliance with the Netherlands African Business Council and/or the Netherlands Business Associations in Ghana and Ethiopia. Many businesses are looking for ways to be more specific about their social responsibility, and to better measure their impact on society, globally and locally. Platforms like the F&BKP did play a role in engaging business in strategic discussions about these issues, and to experiment with ways of effective involvement of businesses in multi-stakeholder dialogues, and research projects. However, much more can and should be done to expand that experience during the next phase.

In this report various suggestions can be found about the further expansion of the F&BKP, e.g. by engaging more with the European Union (including the EU-AU partnership called LEAP-Agri), and other major players in Europe (we suggest: particularly in Germany), by engaging big companies, by engaging global agencies like FAO, IFAD and WFP, and by engaging major players in Africa (e.g. the African Union, the African Development Bank, AGRA, other think tanks). If that expansion will indeed be formulated as a task for the next phase it is obvious that the capacity of the Office to do so should be expanded as well, and it is also obvious that this approach needs a strong commitment from the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, and from Wageningen, AgriProFocus, and The Broker. It has been successfully done before (CGIAR and World Bank), but it needs extra and dedicated effort to do it again!

Depending on the extra manpower at the Office, the expansion can all be done during the next five years, or a longer-term strategy can be designed, using a phased approach. For us, priorities we would recommend are the better inclusion of Dutch businesses, and the Topsectors, and much better connection with the Dutch-funded project portfolio for food security (see section 2.1). Gradually the European and International connections can be further developed.

Finally, although the Ministry has asked us to do this 'final review', it is not final at all. On top of the planned Syspans evaluations in 2020 and 2021, it is recommended to already plan a dedicated 'deep uptake' ex-post evaluation of the impact of the F&BKP activities during 2013-2018, including its research programmes, and to do so in 2023. That would also enable a strategic discussion in and beyond the various F&BKP activities about the preparations needed to measure those impacts, as an input in the third phase of the Knowledge Platform for Food & Business, from 2024 onwards. This would also be in line with some of the most salient conclusions of the recent IOB evaluation.

Food and Business activities are indeed **examples of a successful' Dutch diamond approach'**, and the Platform stimulated the sector to **strive for gold standards** of effectiveness and efficiency, but for solving food insecurity worldwide **there are no silver bullets**. It needs a continuation of long-term and high-quality involvement by many different stakeholders. And the F&BKP succeeded to show promising examples of what can be done and how it should be done! In the next phase this needs **upscaling, and stronger alignment** with other Dutch government initiatives and with those of the sector as a whole.

1 INTRODUCTION

A BIT OF HISTORY AND THE MISSION OF THE F&BKP

For a long time the Netherlands Government has had a 'global food security policy', as part of development co-operation, and managed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and in Collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture (in its various organizational forms³). For instance, already in the 1980s and 1990s, the Minister for Development Co-operation supported a 'Food and Nutrition Studies Programme', with Kenya, in collaboration with the African Studies Centre in Leiden, and the Nutrition Department of Wageningen University. Results could be used in the Dutch involvement in the Millennium Development Goals (2000-2015), where 'halving hunger' was the second of these MDGs. Although nutrition and food production were not very central to Dutch development assistance between 2000 and 2011, there have always been food security policies and activities supported by the Ministry, and in fact they were many, many different ones, and not very well integrated (some would say: indeed a maze of initiatives and funds). And the Ministry of Foreign Affairs also funded and supported many different activities related to agricultural research and implementation, e.g. long-time support to the International Agricultural Research Institutes (CGIAR, with a new commitment of the Netherlands for 2017-2022 of 79.7m€).

From 2008 onwards (when rising global food prices became a reason for concern) there was suddenly more attention for food (in-)security. The World Bank produced an influential report⁴. And in the Netherlands, after the WRR report 'Less Pretension, More Ambition' in 2010⁵ agriculture and nutrition became central to the new development policy under Rutte I, with State Secretary Ben Knapen in charge of development co-operation and Europe. To aim for a better base for Dutch policy and practices, Knapen also prepared four knowledge platforms and one of those had to be about food security. When Lilianne Ploumen took over in Rutte II, this time as Minister for Development Co-operation and International Trade, she combined the 'aid and trade agenda' in the approach for nutrition and agriculture, and the knowledge platform was called 'food and business' (and she added a fifth platform about inclusive development; INCLUDE). From the start the Food & Business Knowledge Platform was meant to support a combination of two policy goals: (a) improving food and nutrition security for the food insecure people in the world, with Dutch emphasis on fifteen focus countries for food security, ten in Africa, three in West Asia, one in South Asia and one in South East Asia, and (b) supporting the Dutch agricultural sector (and particularly its private sector) to get better access to the emerging economies of Africa and Asia. Later, a third policy goal was added: (c) support more sustainable global agriculture, and in particular: support the agricultural value chain to become 'climate smart'. This third goal brought 'environmental issues' back on stage, after Ben Knapen had called the environment 'a posteriority' during his brief period in office. When Lilianne Ploumen, together with the Ministry of Economic Affairs (State Secretary for Agriculture Sharon Dijksma), presented the new policy document on food security, in 2014, this document clearly stated these three different policy aspects, but all under the umbrella of 'food security'. In that policy document there is an optimistic attitude about a 'triple win', and the strong belief that the Netherlands (and the 'Dutch diamond dealing with food and business' – the combination of knowledge, business & banks, NGOs, and government) had a lot to offer. However: it is NOT AT ALL self-evident that improvements in any of the three policy goals will create improvements in the other two. According to us, it is one of the major 'global challenges' to find out how and where these triple wins can be supported, to learn

³ The current full name is 'Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality', or in Dutch LNV, It used to be part of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation (that currently is called Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate).

⁴ World Bank: World Development Report 2008 : Agriculture for Development

⁵ Went, Robert; Peter van Lieshout & Monique Kremer, 2010, Less Pretension, More Ambition: Development Policy in Times of Globalization. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press

lessons from where it seems to have worked (and then try ‘upscaling’) and also learn lessons from the many cases where a ‘win’ in one field, creates ‘losses’ in one or two of the other policy fields⁶.

THE POSITIONING AND ORGANIZATION OF THE F&BKP

The Food& Business Knowledge Platform was conceived in 2012, and started its activities in 2013. There would be many themes to be covered, and many activities to be supported. A consortium consisting of Wageningen CDI, AgriProFocus (first Wageningen, later Utrecht), and The Broker (first Amsterdam, later The Hague) won the tender, and set up a small office for the F&BKP secretariat in The Hague, since the Ministry asked for a neutral secretariat not directly linked to any of the three implementers. A Steering Group, consisting of representatives of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, and Economic Affairs (since 2017 Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality), NGOs, business, and the knowledge sector would steer the decision making process. Wageningen CDI, AgriProFocus and The Broker assigned (part-time) staff to the Office and other people working in the Office (the director and a secretary) would be employed by the three consortium partners (managed by AgriProFocus), while a Knowledge Management Fund (managed by the F&BKP Office, with the contract management and financial administration at Wageningen CDI), as well as a Knowledge Portal (with input from all, but a major responsibility of The Broker) would be the major tools, next to many conferences, meetings, and reports organized by the Office. Support of thematic networks, strategic partnerships, and learning events/trajectories would be a key activity of the Office and the Knowledge Management Fund was created to enable the Office and its partners (currently 37+3 on the website; see later) a chance to take (and fund) initiatives to provide the necessary financial means to realise its strategic objectives through a network approach (besides the research pillar) (and without having to go through a third party). The Office and the Steering Committee would also have an input in the Calls of two major research funds, to be managed by NWO-WOTRO, and in the co-creation of ‘research uptake’. One of these research funds was meant to be more fundamental, dealing with ‘global challenges in food security’ (the Global Challenges Programme), and the Calls for that GCP would not be restricted to the focus countries of the global food security policy of the Dutch Government. The other major research fund was meant to be more practical, more applied, and this Applied Research Fund was restricted to the Dutch focus countries for development co-operation, and particularly where those had a food security component in the Multi-Annual Strategic Plans of that focus country.

THE F&BKP (INCLUDING THE GCP, ARF AND SEEDS PROGRAMMES): FINANCIAL INFORMATION FOR 2013-2017

The Office of the F&BKP started in September 2013, and the Knowledge Management Fund, as well as projects in the GCP (Global Challenges Programme) and ARF (Applied Research Fund) Programmes managed by NWO-WOTRO started in 2014. In 2018 a seed system development call (SEEDS), part of the NL-CGIAR research programme, was added to the array of instruments (co-conceived by the F&BKP, and managed by NWO-WOTRO as well)⁷.

Between 2013 and 2017 (including 2017) 45m€ was spent on the various F&BKP instruments, of which 32.2m€ came from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (and as part of ODA), 4m€ was NWO’s contribution to the Global

⁶ In a response to the draft report NWO-WOTRO notes: “Policy goals come with many assumptions, which were not addressed [at the start of the CGP and ARF programmes]. It is very important when developing new programmes, to pay attention to the assumptions of different partners, and also the differences within organisations. It is very useful to discuss contradictory, conflicting or very diverse expectations at the start (as well as throughout)”..

⁷ The SEEDS programme together with CGIAR, and as part of the new Netherlands-CGIAR collaboration that started in 2017, has a budget of 8.5m€, for the 2018-2022 period).

Challenges Programme, 1.7m€ was CGIAR/CCAFS's contribution to the last Call for that programme, and 7.1m€ was agreed as co-financing from consortium members in GCP and ARF programmes⁸.

The contribution of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was distributed as follows:

- office staff costs: 1.7m€ (actual expenditure; first three years)
- other office costs: 1.0m€ (actual expenditure; first three years)
- total office costs extra two years: 0.875m€
- Knowledge Management Facility: 2.637m€ (actual expenditure)
- Global Challenges Programme: 11m€ (budget)
- Applied Research Fund: 15m€ (budget)

So, in financial terms the two research programmes received the bulk of the funding. In total the Global Challenges Programme's total budget is 20.4m€ (a bit more than half coming from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs), and the Applied Research Fund total budget is 18.4m€ (of which most came from the Ministry). The total agreed expenditure of the Platform, without its involvement in these research programmes, was 6.2m€ during the September 2013-September 2018 period.

TERMS OF REFERENCE AND METHODS

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, after consultations with the Steering Committee of the F&BKP agreed to do a 'final review' for this phase of the Food & Business Knowledge Platform, that could be used as an input for a discussion about a new phase. The major review questions would be (see annex 10):

1. The relevance of the F&BKP in the Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) field
 - 1.1 How did the F&BKP enhance the achievement of the three strategic goals in the field of Food and Nutrition Security?
 - 1.2 What is the added value of the F&BKP in supporting knowledge management activities of various Dutch based networks and organizations in the Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) field?
2. Assess the implementation of the program
 - 2.1 To what extent is the F&BKP an effective knowledge platform?
 - 2.2 To what extent is the F&BKP an efficient knowledge platform?
 - 2.3 What lessons learned and recommendations from previous evaluations are taken into account by the F&BKP?
3. Future outlook

Soon after the start of the review activities, it became clear that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs strongly opted for an upscaling of the Platform, and four related funding mechanisms, as a new 'Netherlands Food Partnership'. This put an extra 'weight' on the outcomes of the review, the timing and the way the findings would be communicated to the Ministry and to the 'field'.

Also soon after the start of the Review, it became clear that different perceptions existed about the scope of the review: should it be restricted to the activities of the Office, Steering Committee, and the Knowledge Management Facility, or should it also look at the two major research programmes, linked to the Platform (GCP, and ARF), managed by NWO-WOTRO, but with a clear involvement by key players in the Platform. We

⁸ 3.7m€ as co-financing for GCP projects, and 3.4m€ as co-financing for ARF projects. The financial information about GCP and ARF (and SEEDS) was provided by the WOTRO office; and the information about the Platform, including the KMF, can be found in the F&BKP Annual Report for 2017 (with additional information from the Office).

decided that we cannot answer the first set of review questions without seriously looking at the GCP and ARF activities, and at the role of NWO-WOTRO⁹, and of an independent M&E consultant, Syspons GmbH. As only few GCP and ARF projects are ready, and most are ongoing, or have only recently started, this ‘final review’ can in no way be ‘final’. In fact Syspons has been hired to do a ‘final review’ of the ARF programme in 2020 and of the GCP programme in 2021.

For this review three major methods have been used:

- Doing an analysis of the wealth of information on the website of the F&BKP (and on the WOTRO website about GCP and ARF), including earlier assessments, and in addition an analysis of internal documents (although most of the Platform, information is shared in a very transparent and open way); also related reports have been used, including the recent IOB Evaluation about Food Security 2012-2016.
- Interviewing key persons active in or around the Platform, both in direct meetings, on the phone, and/or via email exchanges. This includes sending preliminary texts and overviews and using the (often detailed) responses for further refinement. Interviews were held with Melle Leenstra, Paul van der Logt, and Wijnand van IJssel (all: Ministry of Foreign Affairs), Frans Verberne (F&BKP director), Vanessa Nigten (F&BKP staff and The Broker), Nicole Metz (F&BKP staff and AgriProFocus), Paul Engel and Adrie Papma (former and current Chair of the Steering Committee), Saskia Hollander (director The Broker), Hedwig Bruggeman (former director of AgriProFocus, and current director of Wageningen CID), Sander Mager (current director of AgriProFocus), Huub Löffler, Herman Brouwer and Ruerd Ruben (representing ‘Wageningen’, together with Hedwig Bruggeman), Cora Govers and her staff (NWO-WOTRO), Marja Spierenburg (member WOTRO Programme Committee), and Ton van Arnhem and others at the Topsector Agro & Food (International section). Unfortunately people at the Topsector Horticulture and Starting Materials did not respond.
- Survey among Dutch diplomats (and a few other relevant people) in Africa and Asia (see chapter 5); survey among civil servants working on food security issues at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and at the Ministry of Agriculture (see chapter 6); survey among project leaders of the first GCP and ARF projects (see chapter 7).

In addition informal discussions have been held, a.o. at and around the Food First conference on June 1, 2018. Requested by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and by the Chair of the Steering Committee on 12 June a (very) provisional report has been sent to the core people involved in the F&BKP, including a (Dutch-language) set of impressions and provisional conclusions. Detailed and very useful responses to this provisional report have been received (and used for further refinement) from ‘Wageningen’ (a joint response by four key people: Huub Löffler, Herman Brouwer, Ruerd Ruben and Hedwig Bruggeman), the F&BKP Office (the three key people: Frans Verberne, Vanessa Nigten and Nicole Metz), and NWO-WOTRO (Cora Govers, Eric Beerkens, and Marja Spierenburg as member of the GCP/ARF programme committee). On Monday 9 July we presented our preliminary findings and our draft report to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, members of the Steering Committee and invited guests, and afterwards we received written comments¹⁰, which we incorporated in this final report.

⁹ In a response to the draft report NWO-WOTRO notes that it would have preferred to have known this in advance, and that they would have liked to have an input in the ToR. According to that response that would also have solved their legal restrictions to provide information to the evaluators about project selection.

¹⁰ Mainly from the F&BKP Office, NWO-WOTRO, Marja Spierenburg, Saskia Hollander, Paul Engel, and Wijnand van IJssel.

2. RELEVANCE OF THE F&BKP FOR THE FOOD SECURITY PROGRAMME OF THE NETHERLANDS GOVERNMENT

THE NETHERLANDS GOVERNMENT'S FOOD SECURITY PROGRAMME

According to the government's budget for 2017, in the section about 'sustainable development, food security and water' of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the annual budget for food security for 2017 would be 348m€ (for 2015-2017 974m€ and planned for 2018-2021: 1365m€). A considerable part of it would be spent on the country programmes for food security (in the ODA focus countries, see later): in 2017: 144m€, but also 'stimulation of inclusive and sustainable growth in the agricultural sector' would get considerable funds (in 2017: 74m€), as well as 'knowledge and capacity development for food security' (2017: 77m€, and this includes funds for the Knowledge Platform Food & Business, but also funds for NUFFIC's NICHE programme, funds for LANDAc, and funds for CGIAR). Smaller amounts were budgeted for 'eradication of hunger and malnutrition' (2017: 21m€), and 'realisation of ecologically sustainable food systems' (2017: 35m€).

In a recent IOB Evaluation "Food for Thought. Review of Dutch food security policy 2012-2016"¹¹ section 3.2.3 presents a detailed expenditure overview for 2012-2016, organized according to so-called 'impact pathways'. In those five years under review a total of 1,500m€ had been spent on three major objectives¹², and 11 different impact pathways. This information was copied in table 1.

Table 1: Expenditures on food security 2012-2016 by the Netherlands Government

Objectives and impact pathways	M€	%
Objective 1: More Sustainable Food Production	841	56
Impact pathway 1: Agricultural Research	187	12
Impact pathway 2: Public farmer training and information services	46	5
Impact pathway 3: Value Chain Development	417	28
Impact pathway 4: Natural Resource Management for agriculture	57	4
Multipurpose funds (e.g. IFAD)	132	9
Objective 2: Better Access to Nutritious Food	173	12
Impact pathway 5: Social Safety Nets/Transfer of food and cash	84	6
Impact pathway 6: Food Fortification	33	2
Impact pathway 7: Nutritional knowledge, awareness and behaviour	55	4
Objective 3: Enabling business environment	486	32
Impact pathway 8: Land rights	51	3
Impact pathway 9: Infrastructure (incl. finance)	136	9
Impact pathway 10: Capacity development/Farmer Organisations	116	8
Impact pathway 11: Private and public policy dialogue	50	3
Education and Training (not reviewed)	135	9

According to the IOB Evaluation report 68% of these funds have been disbursed through the bilateral channels (of which two-thirds was delegated to Netherlands Embassies: a total of €668m during these five years; see later in this chapter). The remainder was spent through the multilateral channel, e.g. FAO, IFAD, UNICEF. However, the Review also suggests that other budget articles also contribute substantially to the food security objectives, and they come to a suggested total of €4.1b spent on food security activities during that five-year period¹³. If we compare that with the total expenditure on the F&BKP by the Ministry (32m€, see earlier), this is

¹¹ IOB Evaluation no 419, October 2017.

¹² According to the IOB report this was 10% of total ODA expenditures of the Netherlands during this period

¹³ When State Secretary Ben Knapen drastically changed the focus of Dutch development assistance in 2011 and made food security one of his core objectives (after more than a decade of neglect), the Dutch

less than one per cent. If we compare the specific annual food security budget (300m€) with the annual expenditure of the F&BKP Office, including the KMF (1.24m€ on average) that is just 0.4 percent.

The review remarks (p. 23) " ..implementing 248 food security projects, many with small budgets, comes with high operational costs for staff at embassies and the Ministry. This does not contribute to the efficiency of the food security programme". It recommends "reduce the number of activities so as to lower the overhead costs and management burden at embassies and the Ministry... Having fewer but larger projects would allow for better supervision and technical support, and better-quality evaluations" (p. 26), and also: "the hierarchy of policy objectives needs to be clarified. Activities funded from the food security budget should have food security as their overall objective, and may at the same time contribute to other policy objectives, as long as there is no trade-off with the food security objective" (p. 26). Also they recommend "a more holistic approach, that considers the food system as a whole" (p. 25). And the final recommendation ('for strategic learning and policy development') is worth quoting as well (p. 27): "Plan and design evaluations more strategically, within a knowledge agenda, to inform policy for food security. Develop theory on the changes that occur along the different pathways to food security, as this will help identify the main assumptions and critical questions that we are uncertain about. Consider focusing on key questions and knowledge gaps in the whole portfolio rather than evaluating all activities superficially, as this is more useful for strategic learning. Measuring effectiveness and strategic learning may require an implementation period of 10-15 years...". We cannot agree more!

THE F&BKP AND THE THREE MAJOR DUTCH POLICY THEMES FOR FOOD SECURITY

The F&BKP (and NWO-WOTRO) used a variety of indications about the policy orientation of its research and other activities. We condensed it to the three policy goals, as they have been formulated in 2014 for the new Government policy on food security and development. But we add the earlier and other indications used.

Table 2: F&BKP projects and the three Dutch policy themes for food (security) and (agricultural) business

Eradicating existing hunger and malnutrition (H, 2017) = improved access to (better) nutrition (I, 2014-2016) = (more) efficient markets (M , 2014-16) = Inclusive business models for food security (B, 2015) = regional trade for food security (R, 2015) = sustainable food systems (S, 2016) = urbanization and challenges for food and nutrition security (U, 2016)	Promoting inclusive and sustainable growth in the agricultural sector (G, 2017) = Increased sustainable food production (F, 2014) = Increased sustainable agricultural production (A, 2014-2016) = better business climate (BB, 2014-16)	Creating ecologically sustainable food systems (E, 2017) = decrease environmental pollution (P, 2014) = climate smart agriculture and food security (CCAFS; 2017)
KMF: 1, (3), 6, 10, 11, 14, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 28; 29, 30, 33; 34; 35, 37, 41, 43, 45, 49, 54, 58, 59, 62, 66 GCP 1 (I+M); 2 (I) ; 3 (I+M); 4 (I); 5 (I+M); 6 (B); 7 (B); 8 (B+R); 9 (B+R); 10	KMF: 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34; 38, 40, 42, 46, 47, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 60, 61, 64, 65 GCP 1 (F); 2 (F); 3 (F); 4 (F); 5 (F); 13	KMF: 2, 7, 16, 34; 35, 36, 39, 44, 45, 48, 57, 63 GCP 4 (P); 23; 24; 25; 26; 27; 28;

food/nutrition and agricultural community came together under the umbrella of the Worldconnectors and co-designed a lobby document to plea for drastic increases in the budget for food and business (see: <https://www.scribd.com/document/137299296/Worldconnectors-Vision-Documents-Food-Security>). That co-creation process was chaired by one of the authors of this evaluation. In a consultation with Knapen a delegation representing this lobby group made a plea for an annual budget of 1b€ to be spent on food security. The figures given by the IOB review report come pretty close!

(B+R); 11 (B); 12 (B); 13 (M); 14 (M); 15 (S+U); 16 (U); 17 (S+U); 18 (S); 19 (U); 20 (S); 21 (S); 22 (S). ARF 1 (M); 4 (M+BB); 5 (M+BB); 8 (I); 9 (I); 11 (I); 12 (I); 14 (I+M); 15 (I); 16 (I+M); 17 (I+M); 18 (I); 21 (I); 23 (I+M); 25 (I); 27 (I+M); 28 (M); 30 (I); 31 (H); 32 (H); 33 (H); 34 (H); 35 (H); 36 (H); 37 (H); 43 (H).	(BB); 14 (BB). ARF 1 (F); 2 (F); 3 (A); 4 (A); 5 (A); 6 (F); 7 (F); 8 (A); 10 (A); 11 (A); 13 (A); 14 (A+BB); 15 (F); 16 (A+BB); 17 (A+BB); 18 (A); 19 (A); 20 (A); 21 (A); 22 (A); 23 (A); 24 (A); 25 (A); 26 (BB); 27 (A); 28 (A); 29 (A); 30(A); 31 (G); 32 (G); 33 (G); 34 (G); 35 (G); 37 (G); 39 (G); 40 (G); 41 (G); 42 (G); 43 (G); 45 (G).	29; 30 (23-30 all CCAFS). ARF [13 (P)]; 32 (E); 33 (E); 34 (E); 40 (E); 44 (E); + 38 ('farming as a business'; but about rainwater harvesting).
--	--	--

A list of project numbers can be found in annex 1

A = Increased sustainable agricultural production (used in 2014)

B = Inclusive business models for food security (used in 2015)

BB = better business climate (used in 2014-16)

CCAFS = climate smart agriculture and food security (used in 2017; collaboration with CGIAR)

E = Creating ecologically sustainable food systems (used in 2017, following the Dutch Government's Food Security Policy Note of 2014)

F = Increased sustainable food production (used in 2014)

G = Promoting inclusive and sustainable growth in the agricultural sector (used in 2017, following the Dutch Government's Food Security Policy Note of 2014)

H = Eradicating existing hunger and malnutrition (used in 2017, following the Dutch Government's Food Security Policy Note of 2014)

I = improved access to (better) nutrition (used in 2014-2016)

M = (more) efficient markets (used in 2014-16)

P = decrease environmental pollution (used in 2014)

R = regional trade for food security (used in 2015)

S = sustainable food systems (used in 2016)

U = urbanization and challenges for food and nutrition security (used in 2016)

Table 3: Thematic distribution of the KMF, GCP and ARF projects

Projects	I: Eradicating existing hunger and malnutrition	II: Promoting inclusive and sustainable growth in the agricultural sector	III: Creating ecologically sustainable food systems	I+II	I+III	II+III	I+II+III
KMF (n = 66)	23	30	9	1	2		1
In %	35%	45%	14%	2%	3%		2%

GCP (n = 30)	15		8	6			1
In %	50%	0%	27%	20%	0%		3%
ARF (n = 45)	3	15	2	20		2	3
In %	7%	33%	4%	44%	0%	4%	7%
Total (n = 141)	41	45	19	27	2	2	5
In %	29%	32%	13%	19%	1%	1%	4%

The ‘real’ food security issues (I in table 3: ‘Eradicating existing hunger and malnutrition’) were central to 53% of all F&BKP projects, of which 29% only focused on this theme, and the others in combination with other themes, particularly theme II. Theme II (‘Promoting inclusive and sustainable growth in the agricultural sector’) received a bit more attention (56%), with 32% as a ‘stand-alone’ objective. Theme III (‘Creating ecologically sustainable food systems’) was less important (with 19% in total; 6% of it together with one or two of the other themes). In the GCP projects themes I and III have been more important than in the ARF and KMF projects. If we add up the stand alone and joined projects Theme I dominated GCP, Theme II dominated ARF (although mostly together with theme I), and the KMF projects show a balanced combination of themes I and II. For theme III GCP has been the most important funding tool, mainly as a result of a deliberate attempt in 2017 to develop a Call about ‘scaling up climate-smart agriculture’, together with the CGIAR and its research programme on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS).

CHRONOLOGY OF THEMATIC FOCUS FIELDS

When the mission of F&BKP was formulated in 2013 it was stated that “the F&BKP is the gateway to knowledge for food and nutrition security: connecting business, science, civil society and policy” (AR2013:5). The idea was to support existing dynamic thematic networks and/or build ‘communities of practice’ around selected themes, developed by a consultation process with both Ministries concerned, and selected stakeholders, with a priority of ‘being a network of networks’. The F&BKP Steering Committee would make the selection of priority themes, that would guide the choice of Calls for the GCP and ARF programmes, and the choice of activities and partners to be funded for KMF projects, and other activities to be organized/stimulated by the Office. In 2013-2014 the intention was to select a limited number of themes for thematic and strategic collaboration. In October 2014 the Steering Committee decided that a broader set of themes should be covered. Table 4 gives the chronology of focus themes, and major partners for these themes. Indeed, one sees a rapid expansion of themes and major partnerships, and indeed the field of ‘food security and agricultural business’ is vast, and the Dutch involvement very broad, and very global (world-wide). Of course this provokes critical comments, for instance in the review of stakeholder perceptions (2016): “...pitfall of too many objectives and consequently too many activities and limited focus of the F&BKP Office”. However, it is either the one or the other! A ‘network of networks’, that the F&BKP wants to be, in a field with very many different topics, stakeholders, and knowledge demands, asks for a very broad coverage of topics, and a flexible adjustment of Office activities to the demands and activities of the main stakeholders. This is clearly visible in table 4. Also the 18 knowledge fields mentioned on the Knowledge Portal shows the same breadth. The alternative would be more focus and more depth by the Office itself. However: unlike a Platform like INCLUDE, that deliberately focused on three major strategic and emerging topics, the F&BKP covers an existing field with many existing stakeholders and activities. For the F&BKP the Office is a network catalyst, and a supporter of stakeholder activities, and ‘depth’ can and should be provided by the many partners.

Table 4: Chronology of major topics covered by the F&BKP

Theme	Major partner ¹⁴	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Food Wastage/Food Chain Efficiency	PhN; WUR-LEI; DFW; APF; FAO (and MinFA; MinEZ) + WOTRO-GCP; CrossWise Works & BoPInc.; Sunbarter; BeeCollective	vp	vg	vg	vg	g	
Nutrition Security/Eradicating hunger and malnutrition	AIM; NWGN; SUN + WOTRO ARF + KIT +MinFA	va	va	va	va	va	va
Sustainable Increase of Quality Food	WOTRO-GCP	p	g	g	g	g	g
Promoting inclusive and sustainable growth in agric. sector	WOTRO-ARF	p	a	a	a	a	a
Creating Ecologically sustainable food systems	WOTRO-ARF (and some GCP)	p	a	a	a	a	a
Partnerships	FDOV; SNV; PRC/PPP Lab	v	v	v		v	v
Inclusive Business	Seas of Change, SFL + WOTRO GCP + BopInc, PPPLab + GDPRD, BEAM Exch., also SNV		vg	vg	vg	vg	vg
Inclusive Finance in the agro sector	NpM + ICCO, Rabobank (strong role for AgriProFocus)		p	v	v	v	v
Land Governance	LandAc (and its partners, e.g. KIT) + CIFOR + SVF		v	v	v	v	v
Integrated Soil Management	FGI; KIT; MVO-NL; WER; ZOA; MinFA; MinANFQ		v	v	v	v	v
Inclusive Horticulture/Fruits and Vegetables	Topsector H&SM; BoPInc; SNV; MinANFQ; MinFA (strong role for AgriProFocus)		v	v	v		
From Value Chains to Sector Change	MinANFQ		p			v	
Social Entrepreneurship	Utrecht Univ (Soc. Entrepr. Initiative) & partners + SocietyWorks (strong role for The Broker)		v	v	v	v	v
Regional Trade	MinFA-DDE/ASCL;		vg	vg	vg	g	g

¹⁴ See the section about networks, later. These are partners of either F&BKP directly (and often with involvement of WCDI, and/or AgriProFocus and/or The Broker; if their involvement was really strong it has been indicated), or via NWO-WOTRO (and where WOTRO is mentioned in the 'themes' these are the official themes mentioned on the WOTRO Website).

	LEI; ECDPM + WOTRO GCP						
Sustainable agriculture	WOTRO-GCP			g	g	g	g
Urbanization and FNS/Feeding cities/Private sector coalitions to feed African cities	WOTRO-GCP + MVO-NL + RUAFA + FoodFirst Coalition; Topsectors, RVO, HHI, NL Int. Business, BoPInc, MinFA			g	vg	vg	g
Micronutrients	IFDC/RC, WUR/PPSAlterra /WUR/Nutrition-Wageningen			v	v		
Right to Food	The Hague Institute of Global Justice (strong role for the The Broker/Office)			v			
Integrated approaches	Strong role for The Broker			p	v		
Food (Security) and Stability	Clingendael, SKPSRL, MinFA, Strong role for the Office; The Broker			p	v	v	v
Capitalizing on knowledge (Seeding PPPs & Capitalizing on knowledge in agro & food)	MinEA/ Topsectors/LEI			v			
Internationalization of Green Education	Borderless Network; HAS Den Bosch; AERES; EP-NUFFIC			p	v	v	v
E-Learning FNS	Strong role for WCDI				v		
Fit to purpose	PhN, Pure Birds, companies (Topsector Agri&Food)			v	v		
Youth/Future of Farming	Food First/Socires + KIT, YPARD; (strong role for WCDI and AgriProFocus)			v	..	v	
Livestock development	SNV; Kenyan agencies (strong role for AgriProFocus)			v	v		
Poultry development	NABC, Wag. Livestock res.					v	
Potato development	Solynta + Radboud Univ.				v	v	
Agricultural innovation systems	KIT, ICRA, Wageningen				v	v	v
Landscape approach	MinFA, Wageningen, Beagle				v	v	v
Geodata for agriculture and water	G4AW; NSO; HCP; DBM				v		
Food Systems	MinFA, MinAgr, WEcR, PBL					v	v

Extension services	KIT, Agriterra, DADTCO and Moyee					v	v
Scaling climate-smart agriculture	CGIAR, WOTRO (strong role for Office and AgriProFocus)					vg	vg
Seed systems development	Office, WOTRO, CGIAR, MinFA, MinANFQ					vs	vs
Gender and FNS	KIT (strong role for Office, and AgriProFocus,					p	v
Embassy FNS Learning /support	MinFA, MinANFQ, (strong roles for WCDI, AgriProFocus and Office)	(..)	v	(..)	v	v	v

v = concrete activities of F&BKP office; p = in preparation; g = global challenges programme; a = applied research projects; s = seed call with CGIAR

In 2014 the Steering Committee of the F&BKP agreed on three basic ‘long-time changes’ to be achieved with all activities. These were: (a) coherent policy development and programmes supported by an efficient knowledge and research system; (b) increased investments and collaboration from the Dutch private sector in LMICs; and (c) thriving SMEs in inclusive agro-food value chains in LMICs. All F&BKP activities (including the GCP and ARF projects) had to contribute to these three goals, and for that they were encouraged to develop a ‘Theory of Change’. One should note, though, that the overall goal, as mentioned in MDG-2 (‘halving hunger’) and from 2015 onwards in SDG-2 (‘no hunger’) was not explicitly mentioned and hence not part of the ToC exercises yet.

In 2015 the ‘goals’ were reformulated: “an open and independent initiative...to stimulate long-term changes to increase Food and Nutrition Security through three strategic goals: (a) improve relevance (focus and coherence) and efficient use of Dutch, local and international knowledge and research capacity; (b) strengthen the FNS related policies and programmes in the Netherlands and abroad; and (c) facilitate knowledge and research that suit Dutch and local entrepreneurs, traders and investors and increased investments and collaboration from the Dutch private sector in Low- and Middle-Income Countries”. And as ‘overall goal’: “make knowledge work for policy and practice” (AR 2015: 5). In 2016 the SDGs were explicitly mentioned, emphasizing the focus on SDG2 (“End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture”) and SDG12 (“Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns”, or “Responsible consumption”) (AR2016: 5; AR2017: 5). In 2017 “generating some additional or integrated results towards SDG1 (“No poverty”), SDG5 (“Gender Equality”) , SDG8 (“Decent work and economic growth”).., SDG13 (“Climate Action”), and SDG17 (“Partnerships for the Goals”) were mentioned (AR2017: 5).

GLOBAL FOOD INSECURITY, AND THE DUTCH FOCUS COUNTRIES

Let us look at global food security, and the relative position of the Dutch focus countries for food security.

According to the FAO report about ‘The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the world’ in 2017 the world’s hungry people have increased again (after many years of gradual improvements) to a level of 815 million hungry people. The Dutch food security policy is focused on ten African countries, and on five Asian countries. Let us see how the Dutch focus countries relate to the geographical distribution of hunger, by looking at the ‘global hunger index’, made by IFPRI¹⁵.

¹⁵ The IFPRI global hunger index combines four aspects: undernourishment, child wasting (low weight for height of children under five, a measure of acute hunger), child stunting (low height for age of children under

Table 5: World hunger, and the Dutch food security focus countries¹⁶

Dutch focus countries for food security			Other countries with high hunger index		
Country	IFPRI hunger index (x100)	Estimated number of people affected by hunger (millions)	country	IFPRI hunger index (x100)	Estimated number of people affected by hunger (millions)
Burundi	>36	>4.0	CAR	51	2.4
South Sudan	>36	>4.7 (6.0?)	DRC	Very high (>40)	>35.0
Yemen	36	10.0	Somalia	Very high	>3.0
Afghanistan	33	11.9	Chad	44	6.6
Ethiopia	32	33.6	Zambia	38	6.5
Uganda	32	13.8	Madagascar	38	9.7
Mozambique	31	9.3	Sudan	36	14.6
Rwanda	31	3.7	Eritrea	>34	>1.7
Mali	29	5.5	Sierra Leone	35	2.7
Bangladesh	27	44.5	Liberia	35	1.6
Benin	24	2.6	Niger	35	7.5
Indonesia	22	58.0	Timor Leste	34	0.4
Kenya	21	10.5	Haiti	34	3.7
Ghana	16	4.6	Zimbabwe	34	5.6
Palestine	Angola	33	9.8
			Pakistan	33	65.0
Total		214.0	Comoros	32	0.3
			India	31	415.2
			Guinea Bissao	31	0.6
			Tanzania	29	16.6
			Burkina Faso	28	5.4
			Nigeria	26	49.6

The Dutch focus countries for food security deal with more than 214 million of the world's most hungry people (26% of the world total), and the Dutch focus countries with most hungry people are Indonesia, Bangladesh and Ethiopia, while the focus countries with currently the highest level of hunger are Burundi and South Sudan¹⁷. If we look at the current world distribution of hunger India still leads in numbers of people, followed by Pakistan, Nigeria, Bangladesh, and the DRC¹⁸.

With the recent shift in Dutch policy for aid and trade to focus more on North Africa, West Africa/Sahel and West Asia, countries with a high hunger index in these three regions could be added to the list of Dutch countries 'with special attention for the food security situation'. Table 5 already shows the importance of including Nigeria, Burkina Faso, Chad and Niger, but we should also point out that the food security situation of countries like Egypt (index 0.15; 15 million hungry people), and Iraq (index 0.23; 9 million hungry people), as well as Libya and Syria (no data, but high index; see <http://www.globalhungerindex.org/results-2017/#box-2-1>)

five, a measure of chronic hunger), and child mortality (under five). IFPRI updates the index every year. For 2017 see: <http://www.globalhungerindex.org/results-2017/>.

¹⁶ To arrive at the estimated number of people affected by hunger we used the IFPRI index figure for 2017 and multiplied that with the estimated number of people living in a country, using [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_by_population_\(United_Nations\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_by_population_(United_Nations)) for 2017.

¹⁷ The IOB Evaluation report "Food for Thought" (p. 31) highlights the most problematic countries in terms of food insecurity as Burundi, Yemen, Mozambique, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, and Mali.

¹⁸ We should add that China, with an IFPRI hunger index of 'only' 0.075, also still has high numbers of hungry people: 106 million, if we use this method of calculation. Indonesia, with a hunger index of 0.22 has 58 million hungry people.

is a reason for concern, together with the situation of the many Syrians in refugee camps in neighbouring countries.

The IOB Report “Food for Thought” (p. 51) shows that most of the country-specific food security expenditure by the Netherlands Government during the 2012-2016 period (via the Netherlands Embassies) went to Ethiopia (165m€), and Rwanda (126m€), followed at a distance by Uganda (57m€), Burundi (52m€), Mozambique (52m€), Benin (41m€), Bangladesh (33m€), South Sudan (24m€), Ghana (23m€), Kenya (20m€), the Palestinian Territories (19m€), Mali (16m€), the Great Lakes Region (15m€), Bolivia (15m€), and Indonesia (15m€).

THE GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF F&BKP PROJECTS: THE GEOGRAPHICAL RELEVANCE OF THE F&BKP

Many of the KMF projects, and many of the reports, conferences, meetings, and knowledge portal exchanges that the F&BKP (co-)organized do not have a clear geographical focus, and much more a thematic focus. However, all GCP and all ARF projects, as well as some KMF projects do have a country focus (and KMF projects often deal with more than one country).

KMF: fourteen of the 66 KMF projects have a regional focus, although often with ‘Africa’, ‘West Africa’, ‘East Africa’, or ‘Eastern and Southern Africa’ as the regional indication. In three projects (all under theme I, see earlier) a comparative approach was followed, in two related projects comparing Ghana, Ethiopia and Uganda (all three focus countries for Dutch food security), and in the other case Kenya, Ethiopia, South Sudan, and Ghana, as well as Bangladesh and Indonesia (*idem*). One project (under Theme II) focused on another Asian country with a lot of Dutch agricultural connections, but not a focus country for food security (Vietnam). And one project (under theme III) focused on Benin, which is a focus country.

All GCP projects have a country focus; and 14 out of the 30 funded projects work in more than one country. We have seen before that GCP has been the major ‘tool’ for ‘real food security issues’ (theme I: 15 as stand-alone projects; 6 together with theme II and one joining all themes), and for a focus on the environment (theme III: eight stand-alone projects about climate-smart agriculture and one project joining all three themes). Although GCP deliberately did not want to restrict research projects to the Dutch focus countries for food security, in practice twenty-one out of the thirty GCP projects DID include at least one of these focus countries in the research design. The continental focus was mainly on Africa (23 projects), and on Asia (7 projects, two of which also in Africa). Two projects were in Latin America (one in Brazil, and one in Chile and Uruguay).

ARF projects had to be located in one of the fifteen focus countries for Dutch food security policies, and the research initiative had to be taken by a private agency located in that country. As a result only few of these ARF projects took place in more than one country. Benin and Uganda are by far the most popular ARF countries, followed by Ghana, Bangladesh, Indonesia and Kenya. Table 5 shows the results. Kenya, Uganda, Ghana, Benin and Ethiopia dominate the list of countries with GCP and ARF projects, followed at a distance by Indonesia and Bangladesh. We deliberately put the list of focus countries and the list of other countries in order of food insecurity. It can be concluded that the most serious cases of food insecurity received very little (or no) attention, partly due to high levels of conflict and lack of safety, but also due to lack of existing contacts. Countries with a lot of existing reliable contacts do get far more easy access to these research funds than countries with far less (knowledge and business) contacts, and where (Dutch) researchers either cannot do research due to the ‘no go area policies’ of their employers (following the list with ‘red’, orange, yellow and green countries’ of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs), or shy away from those countries that are seen as

difficult and dangerous¹⁹. Among the non-focus countries Vietnam and Tanzania dominate the list and the same can be said about those two countries: they are favourites among Dutch agencies involved in ‘food and business’ research and practice, due to long-standing contacts.

Table 6: Geographical distribution of F&BKP projects with a geographical focus

Countries	KMF	CGP	ARF	Total
<i>Focus countries for Dutch food security policies</i>				
Burundi			2	2
South Sudan	1			1
Yemen				0
Afghanistan				0
Ethiopia	2	6	2	10
Uganda	1	3	10	14
Mozambique		2	2	4
Rwanda				0
Mali			1	1
Bangladesh	1		4	5
Benin	2	1	11	14
Indonesia	1	2	4	7
Kenya	3	10	4	17
Ghana	3	6	5	14
Palestine				0
<i>Other countries</i>				
Zambia		2		2
Sierra Leone		1		1
Zimbabwe		1		1
India		1		1
Tanzania		4		4
Burkina Faso		1		1
Malawi		1		1
Laos		1		1
Cote d’Ivoire		2		2
Vietnam	1	4		5
South Africa		1		1
Thailand		1		1
Brazil		1		1
Chile		1		1
Uruguay		1		1

A list of projects per country can be found in annex 3.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND SUB-SECTORS: THE PRODUCT SCOPE OF THE F&BKP

The Netherlands is known globally for its relative importance in horticulture, seed potatoes, and dairy. And also as a world player in the cocoa value chain, in beer production (Heineken), and in oil palm, tea and other ‘tropical products’ (Unilever and others). One would expect a dominance of these agricultural subsectors in the activities of the F&BKP, and particularly products with relevance for food security in the producing countries. Annex 7 provides an overview of all ‘products’ and sectors, as far as project websites have provided information. For many projects many products are included, as the focus has been on other issues, and not on

¹⁹ In a response to the draft report NWO-WOTRO notes: “This is not the only or maybe not even the main reason. [required] Co-financing of 20% by private partners is quite an investment, and such partners will not easily work or invest in difficult countries. Projects have thus been steered by the availability of co-financing”.

specific product or subsector issues. However, for those projects that are or have been focusing on specific products it is striking how diverse the range of products and subsectors is, and also (for us) it is surprising to see that 'products' or 'subsectors' have hardly been a way to organise think tank meetings or strategic partners active in a particular sector, neither for WOTRO, nor for the Platform Office. Horticulture has been a focus for 20 specific projects (but mostly vegetables), and in addition seed potatoes also received some focused attention. The attention for dairy was less outspoken, and more or less got the same attention as fish and marine species (for instance specific attention for shrimps). Cereals and other starch food like cassava and plantains did get some attention, but in that category rice dominated and (as usual) hardly any specific attention was given to the major food items in the most food insecure zones of the world: sorghum, millet, and other small grains. Crops traditionally provided to the world market, like cocoa, oil palm, various types of nuts, did get some attention, with cocoa clearly in the lead. However, even there, attempts to bring together groups of researchers and practitioners dealing with the same products does not seem to have been high on the Platform's agenda, although in some cases project leaders took the initiative to do so, and received some Platform funding for that.

3. STRENGTHENING THE FOOD AND BUSINESS NETWORK FOR DEVELOPMENT

THE NETWORK OF AGENCIES IN THE NETHERLANDS

According to the current website of F&BKP it has 37 partners and an additional three 'strategic partnerships' (CGIAR, World Bank and YEP). Among the 37 'partners' three are based abroad (a university in Benin, an NGO in Uganda, and PAEPARD in Brussels). Among the 34+1²⁰ Dutch partners we regard twelve as 'knowledge partners close to the scientific community', four as business partners, fourteen as NGO partners and five as 'close to government'. The large majority of these 'partners' (including the strategic partners, and the other partners abroad) did or do engage in F&BKP activities, either as participants in research projects (GCP and ARF), or as initiators or participants in KMF and special activities, and/or by playing roles in the governance of the Platform. However: the Platform succeeded to engage many more agencies in its activities. In total 99 Dutch agencies have played a clear role in the activities of the F&BKP during the last five years. In addition more agencies participated in strategic meetings, workshops, seminars, or conferences organized by the Platform, or in collaboration with the Platform.

Some of these strategic meetings have been explicitly planned to engage the (Dutch) business sector. An important example was the EMPS meeting in Baarn in 2014, the Exploratory Meeting Private Sector. Sixteen companies participated (next to NGOs and others). Five of those developed working relationships within Platform activities or projects (Nutreco, Rabobank, Royal Friesland Campina, Larive and the Netherlands African Business Council). In addition 25 Dutch companies in one way or the other participated in projects under the umbrella of the Platform. This is not a bad start, but some major companies (still) operate at a major distance of the Platform, e.g., Unilever, Ahold, Heineken, and FMO. There does not seem to be a self-evident match. The connections with the knowledge sector in the Netherlands, with the relevant NGO sector and with relevant policy departments are much more self-evident.

For us as evaluators there was one major handicap in finding out how many agencies would have liked to be involved in the projects under the umbrella of the Platform. For each GCP and ARF Call there have been (many) more applicants than grantees, but the legal department of NWO refused to give us (and the Ministry) an overview of all agencies applying for the grants. This does not make it possible to reconstruct the 'potential network' and it does not allow us to see how many 'failed' project applications came from which agency in the Netherlands and in the South (and from which countries). The self-evaluation documents made by NWO-WOTRO (shared with and much appreciated by the Steering Committee) do give some more information on 'gender' of applicants and team members (as if that is the most important network criterium²¹) or the countries where research would take place, but not about the (according to us) much more important information about the kind of potential partners (and their 'strategic' importance). What we do know, though, is that Netherlands Embassy people, who have been trying to engage local stakeholders, and sometimes put a lot of work in applications, became quite frustrated by the lack of success of 'their project teams' (and probably were not very well aware of the selection criteria and processes used by NWO-WOTRO). It also meant that deliberate

²⁰ We regard the World Bank –Netherlands partnership as a (partly) Dutch actor, in addition to the 34 Dutch agencies

²¹ The internal evaluation of the fourth GCP Call (together with CGIAR) shows a rather bizarre result that among 21 submitted proposals six have been submitted by female team leaders, and when eight projects were granted none of the female-managed ones got funding. In other Calls there was a more balanced outcome. NWO-WOTRO always claims that they select on the basis of scientific quality (in combination with criteria like societal relevance and importance for capacity development), but the selection process very much depends on the selected (and willing) referees and the composition of the advisory committees, and particularly the choice of referees can result in very biased outcomes, particularly in case of multi-disciplinary project proposals, with mixed or qualitative methods of analysis. And it is impossible to judge because referee reports are anonymous and the background of the referees are only known to NWO-WOTRO staff, who treat this as very confidential information. Scientific quality is a construct.

attempts to develop (ARF) research proposals close to ongoing food security projects supported by the Netherlands Embassy rarely resulted in project grants. In the words of one of the frustrated diplomats: “it was as if the more theoretical and the more remote from actual projects, the higher the chances were that a project would make it in the WOTRO tombola”.

THE FOOD & BUSINESS KNOWLEDGE PLATFORM: NETWORK AND OVERLAP WITH ‘WAGENINGEN’ AND AGRIPROFOCUS

As evaluators we used the information on relevant websites, and on the F&BKP website there is explicit attention for ‘partners’ (and ‘strategic partners’) . Of course other agencies have been engaged as well, and the differentiation of ‘partners’ and ‘non-partners’ is a bit of a construct, but for this analysis we want to stick to the ‘partners’ as they are mentioned on the website, even if the secretariat states that this is not such a relevant category (anymore?), and it is more important to see who actually participated in relevant activities (which we also do). Table 7 gives the results of our analysis.

Table 7: F&BKP partners, agencies involved in F&BKP activities, ‘Wageningen’ linkages in F&BKP activities, and overlap with AgriProFocus members

	F&BKP partners	Agencies involved in F&BKP activities	F&BKP Partners in Wageningen-connected F&BKP activities (and agencies active in F&BKP activities, with Wageningen partners)		Overlap between F&BKP partners and AgriProFocus members	Overlap between agencies involved in F&BKP activities and Members of AgriProFocus
Knowledge	10	31	6	(9)	2	6
Business	6	28	0	(9)	1	6
NGOs	14	35	5	(10)	2	18
Government	5	5	4	(4)	2	3
Total	35	99	15	(32)	7	33

(see annex 4 with detailed network information)

‘Wageningen’ is visible in many of the Platform’s activities. Wageningen CDI is a key actor in the Platform (together with AgriProFocus and The Broker) and manages the contracts and financial administration of KMF. Wageningen CDI (and earlier Wageningen International) can be regarded as a crucial intermediary between the Food & Business Knowledge Platform and the many different knowledge groups active in and around Wageningen University. Out of the 30 awarded GCP projects, departments/scientists from Wageningen are active in 22²², that is 73 percent. Out of the 45 awarded ARF projects Wageningen-based scholars became active in 23²³, that is 51 percent. And in at least 19 of the 61 KMF activities CDI and/or other Wageningen-based scholars/groups played a role²⁴ (31 percent, but here was a restriction in the KMF arrangement saying that the three organisers of the network could only get a maximum of 25 percent of the KMF funds). In foreign countries many partners directly connect ‘Wageningen’ with food and business activities from the Netherlands, and within the Netherlands ‘Wageningen’ dominates the field. So for ‘branding’ the Netherlands as a food & business knowledge hub a strong connection with ‘Wageningen’ was, is and remains crucial. What is also clear, though, is that the Platform DID succeed to connect to non-Wageningen knowledge groups in the Netherlands

²² Wageningen involvement in GCP projects, see annex-list: 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30.

²³ Wageningen involvement in ARF projects, see annex-list: 1, 3, 5, 7, 11, 12, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45.

²⁴ Wageningen involvement in KMF projects, see annex-list: 1, 6, 8, 9, 19, 25, 28, 29, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 49, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58.

active in this field: KIT, UvA, VU (including the World Food Research Programme), Utrecht (LANDAc network), Leiden (ASCL/INCLUDE Platform), Maastricht (ECDPM), Radboud University, EUR (PRC and ISS), and of course NWO-WOTRO as manager of the GCP and ARF Calls and projects. BUT: there are very few connections between Wageningen-based groups/CDI and these other Dutch knowledge centres in F&BKP projects. We may conclude that the ‘recruitment strategy’ of GCP and ARF did NOT encourage direct collaboration between ‘Wageningen’ and other knowledge institutes in the Netherlands, but it is fair to say that this has never been an explicit goal in any of the Calls, and the complexity of the (required) consortia was already such that further ‘burdens’ on project team leaders to go beyond one major Dutch knowledge partner (also give the limited research funds, and the matching requirements) was not very realistic. However, this puts an extra weight on the Office and on NWO-WOTRO to link Wageningen with other initiatives, and indeed this has happened a lot, also in various KMF projects.

What about AgriProFocus?

AgriProFocus (APF) is the other key player in the F&BKP, together with WCDI and The Broker. Compared to WCDI APF does seem to be less active in GCP, ARF and KMF projects, although there have been important contributions to the success of some of the meetings in Africa (Benin, Uganda, and Ethiopia). Like the F&BKP, APF is a network organization with partners (both in the Netherlands and in the 13 countries with APF offices ; 11 in Africa, and 2 in Asia²⁵). In the Netherlands currently there are 34 APF partners. However, between the Dutch partners mentioned on the websites of F&BKP and APF there is only limited overlap (seven overlapping agencies); quite a surprising finding. However, next to the F&BKP partners, there are many organisations in the Netherlands linked to F&BKP activities (GCP, ARF, KMF, and others) and some of those are also partner of APF. Table 8 gives the overview.

Table 8: Overlap between the F&BKP network and AgriProFocus partners

Type of overlap	Knowledge partners	Business partners	NGO partners	Government partners
Partner of F&BKP AND member of APF	Wageningen (KP: CDI + ESR + BBR)	MVO Nederland	BoPInc	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	KIT; until recently HAS/ETC		(Food First/Socires) (NpM; PostHarvest Network)	Ministry of Economic Affairs (and Climate) /Agric, Nature & Food Quality
Member of APF and collaborator in F&BKP projects, but not a F&BKP partner (= not on its partner part of the current website)	Van Hall Larenstein HBO	Friesland Campina	Agriterra	
	AERES MBO	Rabobank	Fair&Sustainable	
	ITC-Enschede	Rijk Zwaan	Both Ends	
	ICRA		ICCO	
			Heifer NL	
			MDF	
			Oxfam NOVIB	
			Solidaridad	
			Woord&Daad	
			ZOA	
			HIVOS	
		Oikocredit		
		SNV		

²⁵ Recently it was decided to close the office in Goma/DRC. The remaining twelve AgriProFocus offices are in Mali, Niger, Benin, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Burundi, Rwanda, and Zambia within Africa and in Myanmar and Indonesia in Asia. There were or are no AgriProFocus offices in important ‘food&business’ countries like Ghana, Nigeria, Mozambique, Bangladesh and Vietnam.

Partner of F&BKP, but not member of APF	ASCLeiden	NABC	AIM/GAIN	NL Embassies
	ECDPM	CrossWiseWorks	ETC (used to be a member)	TopSector Horticulture etc
	FGI	Solynta	FoodFirst/Socires	WorldBank NL Partnership
	LANDAc	LTO Nederland (indirectly via Agriterra)	Impact Reporters	
	INCLUDE	PUM (VNO-NCW)	NWGN	
	PRC		NLandscape	
	TheBroker		PPPLab Food & Water	
	NWO-WOTRO		RUAF	
			Seas of Change	
			Society Works	
Involved in F&BKP projects/activities, but not a member of APF and also not a partner of F&BKP (= not on its current website/partner page)			Sunbarter	
	ISS	Bridging People and Politics Cons.	Aidenvironment	
	DBM Research	Xomnia	Yoba4Life	
	ISRIC	HCP International	AquaSpark	
		aQysta	MCNV	
		Erna Zaden	ActionAid	
		EOSTA	Metameta	
		Topigs Nordvin	NWGIN	
		Theobroma	PureBirds	
		Nutreco	De Connectors	
		CSK Food Enrichment	IS Duurzaam	
		BodemBergsma		
		Larive Internat.		
		Koppert BV		
		Agrifirm		
		Away4Africa		
		Pelagic Freezer Association		
		Alema-Koudijs		
		TGS Business		
		Zetadec		
Member of APF, but not directly involved in F&BKP		Heineken	Shared Value Foundation	Netherlands Enterprise Agency
		Bejo	TheHungerProject	
		Partners For Innovation Cons.		
		Soil&More		

Note: AgriProFocus also collaborates with other networks, where major actors in those networks are partners of AgriProFocus; examples are Postharvest Network, Seas of Change, and Landac, while there are strategic partnerships with NABC, NPM en MVO-NL, and there has been collaboration with the FoodFirst Coalition. In practice the overlap between AgriProFocus and F&BKP partners is bigger than if we only look at the 'partners' mentioned on the websites.

In table 9 we will present a selection of F&BKP partners, and the overlap between them and F&BKP partners and agencies involved in F&BKP activities. The F&BKP partners selected are those with either a membership

structure, or with websites clearly indicating their network and or client base. See annex 4 with detailed information for each of those agencies.

THE PARTNER MAZE

Table 9: Selection of F&BKP partners, and the overlap between them and F&BKP partners and agencies involved in F&BKP activities.

	F&BKP/ Total food network	ASCL	AIM	BoPInc	CWW	ECDPM	Fertile Grounds Initiative	FoodFirst/ Socires	Impact reporters
Overlap with F&BKP partners									
Knowledge	10	9	1	1	0	4	1	3	2
Business	6	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
NGOs	14	2	2	3	1	0	0	1	1
Government	5	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	2
Total	35	14	4	7	2	5	3	5	5
Overlap with agencies active in the F&BKP network									
Knowledge	31	18	1	2	0	4	1	4	5
Business	28	1	0	4	0	0	0	1	2
NGOs	35	7	3	5	4	2	0	3	2
Government	5	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	2
Total	99	28	5	12	5	7	3	9	11
Overlap with agencies in the food network in the Netherlands (broadly defined)									
Knowledge	42	23	1	4	0	6	1	4	5
Business	202	3	3	9	2	0	0	1	2
NGOs	74	15	3	8	4	3	0	3	10
Government	13	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	3
Total	331	43	8	22	9	10	3	9	20

	INCLUDE Platform	KIT	LANDAC	NABC	NLand- scape	NpM	Posthar- vest Net- work	Seeds of Change	Topsector Horitc. &SM	Topsector AgriFood
Overlap with F&BKP partners										
Knowledge	6	0	4	3	2	0	1	1	1	3
Business	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1
NGOs	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	1	0	0
Government	1	1	2	3	2	1	1	0	2	2
Total	8	2	6	11	5	1	4	2	3	6
Overlap with agencies active in the F&BKP network										
Knowledge	8	1	7	4	3	0	1	1	1	5
Business	1	2	0	8	0	1	0	0	3	3
NGOs	1	0	6	4	7	2	2	2	0	0
Government	1	2	2	3	2	1	1	0	2	3
Total	11	5	15	19	12	4	4	3	6	11
Overlap with agencies in the food network in the Netherlands (broadly defined)										
Knowledge	8	2	9	6	4	0	1	1	1	6
Business	1	8	1	103	0	7	2	0	72	29
NGOs	2	0	10	7	17	7	2	3	0	7
Government	2	2	3	4	4	1	1	2	2	4

Total	13	12	23	120	25	15	6	6	75	46
-------	----	----	----	-----	----	----	---	---	----	----

The network analysis of the Dutch food-oriented food agencies reveals that more than 300 Dutch agencies are active in that network, and mentioned on any of the websites of the (selected) partners of the F&BKP, as well as on the website of the Topsector Agri & Food, that is NOT a partner of the F&BKP (see later). Most food-related agencies can be found on the websites of NABC (120 different food-related agencies) and of the two Topsectors: Topsector Horticulture and Starting Materials mentions 75 agencies, and Topsector Agri & Food (with 46 different agencies). If we look at these 'giants' in terms of food-related networks, the overlap between F&BKP and the Netherlands African Business Council is more prominent than the overlap with either of the two relevant Topsectors. Of course the difference is that NABC connects companies (and others) which are or want to be active in Africa, while the Topsectors are predominantly focused on the Netherlands (although with International 'branches'). It is telling that the Topsector Agri & Food is not a partner of F&BKP as such (although a representative of the two Topsectors is part of the Programme Committee of WOTRO's food security programmes, and ARF and GCP are part of the innovation contract of NWO with these Topsectors) and the Topsector Agro&Food has not very actively participated in activities funded/organized by the Platform. The other Topsector, for Horticulture and Starting Materials IS a partner (and as such mentioned on the F&BKP website), but also they hardly ever participated in a GCP, ARF or KMF activity. And the network congruence between either of these two Topsectors and agencies active in or partner of F&BKP is very limited.

Of the selected F&BKP partners (outside AgriProFocus and 'Wageningen', see earlier, and outside NABC, see above) the partners with the best overlap with the agencies with F&BKP activities are the African Studies Centre Leiden, BoPInc, Impact Reporters, and two related platforms: INCLUDE and LANDAc.

We can also look the other way around. Of the 42 knowledge centres that could be seen as (partly) active in the food sector the majority (31) was active in activities funded/organized by the Platform, and 10 were (active and recognized) F&BKP partners. So one can conclude here that the Platform succeeded to mobilize most of the relevant knowledge centres in the Netherlands; of course in and around Wageningen, but certainly also elsewhere.

Of the more than 200 businesses or business support organizations detected by combining the various websites studied, only six are partner of the Platform, but some more (around 30) participated in activities funded/organized by the Platform, and maybe more representatives of the business sector participated in meetings organized around F&BKP activities. Although 30+ businesses active in the Platform is not a bad score (and there might be more), it is probably fair to say that the large majority of relevant food businesses has not yet been mobilized by the Platform. The most relevant ones (103 food-related businesses which are paying members of NABC, and hence interested in Africa) could have been approached more actively, with a better liaison with NABC, and that is an obvious task for the near future. What is also quite clear from the analysis is that of the 'big players' only Rabobank can be said to actively engage with (activities of) the Platform, while Friesland Campina participated in some activities as well. Big companies like Unilever, Ahold, and Heineken, but also Philips, and AKZO Nobel, and all relevant banks besides Rabobank, have maintained quite a distance to the Platform and its activities.

We detected more than 75 NGOs (partly) active in the food sector. More than half of those participated in F&BKP activities (and there is a good overlap with AgriProFocus members), and 14 are mentioned on the F&BKP website as partners. That is a good coverage.

Finally the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in one way or the other has a strong relationship with many agencies active in the F&BKP partner group. The relationship of the (current) Ministry of Agriculture, Nature, and Food Quality is considerably less pronounced (although some individual people are actively involved). And the (current) Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate (and its RVO and Topsectors) keep a major distance to the Platform, with some exceptions.

THE F&BKP NETWORK LINKAGES IN ‘THE NORTH’ (OUTSIDE THE NETHERLANDS)

Although the Food & Business Knowledge Platform is supposed to connect ‘The Netherlands’ with ‘the Global South’ (and particularly with fifteen focus countries of the Dutch food security policy in Africa and Asia) a result of its open strategy to engage with partners elsewhere is that other agencies and experts from other ‘Northern’ countries have become involved as well (see annex 5). The intention to become one of the leading global think tanks and information hubs about food security and agricultural business (and value chains) necessitates an even stronger orientation on other major knowledge centres in the North (and in the South, see later) during the next period.

So far the ‘Northern’ network partners of F&BKP Office and KMF activities and GCP and ARF projects have been restricted to Belgium (and mainly Brussels as the Centre of the European Union – although in a limited way; also the Chair of the WOTRO Programme Committee for Food and Business Research comes from Belgium, The Museum for Central Africa in Tervuren), Germany, Switzerland, France (mainly because CGIAR has its strategic headquarters there), Italy (home of FAO, and because of the Expo in Milan), the UK, Denmark, Canada, the USA (WorldBank and others), and Australia. Annex 5 gives the details. Part of the ‘Northern linkages’ are a result of the choice of experts for the International Advisory Committee of the GCP projects (and NOT as members of the ARF International Experts Committee). In the IAC of the GCP we find people from the UK (3x), France-CGIAR (1x), Canada (1x), and the USA (1x)²⁶. Important roles have also been played by PAEPARD (based in Brussels and involved in a few training activities) and Syspons (based in Berlin, engaged by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to provide independent M&E instruments and information about the GCP and ARF projects). GCP participation comes from Germany, Switzerland, the UK, Canada and the USA. ARF participation from Germany, Switzerland, the UK, the USA and Australia. Finally KMF involvement came from Germany, Italy, the UK, the USA and Australia. The recent expanding relationship with CGIAR and the WorldBank adds to a global perspective, and global importance. Remarkably limited involvement exists so far from the UN agencies based in Rome: FAO, IFAD and particularly the World Food Programme. We suggest that this is one of the priorities for the next phase, but it demands a considerable extra effort, for which the Office has to be expanded.

THE F&BKP NETWORK LINKAGES IN ‘THE SOUTH’

One of the major intentions of the Knowledge Platforms (plural) was and is to better link Dutch agencies active in ‘the Dutch diamond’ with knowledge centres, businesses and business associations, NGOs and government agencies in ‘the South’. The Food & Business Platform works with many agencies who already have extensive networks in the South (although the Platform helped some to expand those). For the F&BKP it was more important to make sure that lessons learned by Dutch agencies and their network partners abroad would be shared in multi-stakeholder settings in the South (and hence to stimulate ‘the Dutch diamond approach’ to learning). Where they were available AgriProFocus focal points in Southern countries (see elsewhere) would play a role in linking, the F&BKP did not set up ‘own’ focal points, or links with ‘own linking partners in the South’. That was seen as unnecessary. When southern agencies asked for contacts (e.g. because they wanted to submit ARF proposals) the F&BKP Office linked them either to the AgriProFocus focal point, or to agencies in the Netherlands.

²⁶ Others are coming from Ethiopia, Kenya (2x), Thailand, Indonesia and the Philippines, next to eight people from the Netherlands (ISS, VU, Nijmegen, Maastricht, IHE-Delft, ECDPM, Rabobank and Friesland Campina. The ARF IEC consisted of people from Africa (Mozambique, Zimbabwe, and South Africa (2x)), from Asia (Bangladesh and Indonesia), from South America (Colombia) and from the Netherlands (UvA 2x, Utrecht, Nijmegen, KIT, and ETC. The absence of people from ‘Wageningen’ is remarkable, but probably a result of a strategy to avoid too much Wageningen influence – as the dominating giant in the Netherlands – and/or to avoid conflicts of interest, as many Wageningen-based scholars were expected to be involved in project applications.

For the Food & Business Knowledge Platform the focus would then be on the ‘focus countries’ of the Dutch food security policy, but to avoid a tunnel vision the Ministry of Foreign Affairs encouraged the Platform and the research projects (GCP in particular) to go beyond these focus countries and include agencies from other countries as well, both in the North and in the South. For the GCP projects most of the initiatives have been coming from Dutch initiators, who actively looked for partners elsewhere, both among scientists and among practitioners (which was a requirement). For the ARF projects the project leaders had to be from ‘the South’ (any of the focus countries) , but they were expected to find collaborators in the Netherlands, and most did, while a requirement was to find collaborators//consortium members’ from other types of agencies in their own country. Table10 shows the number of projects and the agencies involved in Southern countries . Annex 6 gives the details.

Table 10: number of projects and the agencies involved in Southern countries

Focus Countries of Dutch food security policies										
Country	GCP (n = 30, often active in more than one country)					ARF (n = 45, mostly active in only one country)				
	nr	Knowl	busin	NGO	govt	nr	knowl	busin	NGO	govt
Mali						1			1L	
Benin	1			1		11	11	2L+1	9L+1	4 + 1G
Ghana	6	4	1	2	2 + 1G	5	4	3L+3	1L+1	1L+5
Ethiopia	6	5		2	2	2	1		2L	2
Kenya	12	6	3	8	3 + 6G	5	4	2L+1	2L	2
Uganda	1	1				12	6	2L+7	5L+5	7
Burundi						2	2		2L	2
Mozambique						2	1		2L+2	1
AFRICA	26	16	4	13	7+7G	40	29	9L+12	24L+9	1L+23 + 1G
Bangladesh	1			2		4	1L+1		2L	
Indonesia	2	1		1	1G	4	4	1L+1	3L+1	1
ASIA	3	1		3	1G	8	1L+5	1L+1	5L+1	1
<i>Focuscountr.</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>7+8G</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>1L+34</i>	<i>10L+13</i>	<i>29L+10</i>	<i>1L+24+1G</i>
<i>Total</i>										
Non-Focus Countries of Dutch food security policies										
C.d'Ivoire	1				1					
Sierra Leone	1		1							
Tanzania	3	2		1	1 + 1G	1				1
DRC	1				1G					
Malawi	1	1								
Zambia	1	2	1							
Zimbabwe	1		1							
S. Africa	2	1	1	1	1					
AFRICA	11	6	4	2	3+2G	1				1
Thailand	1	1		1						
Malaysia	3			3						
Vietnam	4	5	3	2	2					
Laos	1				2					
Taiwan						1				1G
ASIA	9	6	3	6	4	1				1G
Mexico	1				1G	1				1G
Brazil	1	1	1							
Chile	1	1	1		1					
Uruguay	1	1			2					
L. AMERICA	4	3	2		3+1G	1				1G
<i>Non-focus c.</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>10+3G</i>	<i>3</i>				<i>2G+1</i>

<i>total</i>										
TOTAL	53	32	13	24	17+11G	51	1L+33	10L+13	29L+10	1L+25+3G

L = project leader; G = global agency (one of the CGIAR agencies)

Table 10 shows that almost all GCP projects had at least chosen one of the focus countries as fieldwork areas, but often added another fieldwork country beyond the focus countries, or collaboration with an agency outside the focus countries. All ARF projects worked in focus countries, and in a few cases went beyond these countries to find a collaborator from elsewhere in the South.

Knowledge agencies from the South (mostly universities) collaborated in all GCP projects, and in most ARF projects, but only once in a leading capacity. Most collaborating universities already have long-standing relationships with the Netherlands (e.g., as recipients of NUFFIC support, or as dedicated partners of Wageningen University, most clearly so the University of Abomey-Calavi, that even became a Project Partner of the F&BKP. Many collaborating scientists from these universities are alumni from Dutch institutions, or have had earlier research contacts. In that sense the GCP and ARF projects provided a very welcome opportunity to expand existing contacts, and provide alumni with a chance to sustain and renew the Dutch linkages.

Business agencies have become less involved in GCP research countries (and only a few in focus countries), but more so in ARF projects, where ten of the 45 project leaders had a business background, and thirteen others joined in as collaborators. Business contacts were very active in Uganda, Ghana, and Kenya, much less so in Benin, and Indonesia, and not at all in Mali, Ethiopia, Mozambique, and Bangladesh. One of the lessons learned was that businesses often do not want to be 'formally' part of research consortia (for various reasons, e.g. not willing to share commercially interesting results, not willing to be 'too close to government or to universities', not willing to be burdened by administrative requirements, or not willing to spend time in meetings and activities that are not seen as directly relevant to their business operations). Business participation in research or around research projects needs other instruments.

NGO agencies have been almost as active as knowledge agencies, but far more often as project leaders of ARF projects. Some of those NGOs are in fact Dutch agencies abroad (SNV, AgriProFocus, ZOA, Solidaridad), and sometimes with Dutch initiators stationed abroad, but many others are local NGOs.

Government agencies are almost always active in a collaborative capacity, and some of them are national or local government agencies, or pseudo-government agencies, and others are global agencies based in a Southern country. In some cases Dutch Embassies have been involved. Hardly any government agencies took the lead in initiating or leading a consortium of ARF projects.

In total we can say that the GCP and ARF approaches indeed resulted in a broad representation of types of collaborating agencies. In addition initiatives of Dutch networks/organisations with support of the F&BKP Office (and often financed by KMF) also made use of the same or other agencies in the South, and in total the F&BKP resulted in the mobilisation of many academic and non-academic agencies in focus countries like Uganda, Kenya, Ethiopia, Benin and Ghana, and a bit less so in focus countries like Bangladesh and Indonesia. Among the non-focus countries a variety of agencies in Tanzania, South Africa and Vietnam have also been mobilised, and successfully linked to Dutch agencies active in food security and agricultural business and value chains.

A final remark here: so far there were hardly any relationships between the Platform and relevant agencies at the level of Africa as a whole (e.g. the African Union, AGRA, the African Development Bank, LEAP-Agri²⁷). This

²⁷ LEAP-Agri is an African-European initiative of thirty partners, aimed at enhancing food and nutrition security and sustainable agriculture, which started in 2016. See: <https://www.era-learn.eu/network-information/networks/leap-agri>. NWO-WOTRO is involved as well: <https://www.nwo.nl/en/news-and-events/news/2017/wotro/2017.03.15-leap-agri-launched.html>

can be seen as an important challenge for the next period, but it requires dedicated time and effort, for which the current Office simply is too small.

4. REACHING OUT TO THE WORLD: PRODUCTS AND FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF IMPACT

THE 'UPTAKE' STRATEGY

The F&BKP very actively engaged with the wider world. The website has been fed with a lot of relevant content, and making all activities, reports, and other relevant news available to a wider (global) public. In 2017 the number of page views had increased to close to 92,000 (cumulative for the entire period; with 17,251 page views in 2017). The Knowledge Portal (part of the F&BKP website) had more than 8,500 unique visitors at the end of 2016. In 2017 a service was added enabling users to get personalised email alerts (at the end of 2017 92 people had done so). Bimonthly newsletters since mid-2014 selected specific content to be sent to subscribers, of whom there were almost 2,000 at the end of 2017. In 2017 a world map was added to the website with the location of all GCP and ARF projects. At the end of 2017 the Platform had more than 1,200 followers on Twitter, and more than 550 followers on Facebook, while the Platform is also visible on LinkedIn. An online poll at the F&BKP website to nominate candidates for the 'Agrofood Broker of the Year Award' attracted 2,000 online voters. For a knowledge platform that is only five years old these are very encouraging figures. For an Office staff that only had 5.3 fte at the end of 2017 (from 3.2 in 2013 and 4.8 in 2015) this is a very commendable achievement. We should also say that the quality of the annual reports of the Office is outstanding. It is good to also mention that the tasks (and expectations) have grown. The self-assessment of time spent was around 20% for the Knowledge Portal, around 40% for the strategic partnerships, around 10% for support to research, and around 30% for communication, secretarial work, monitoring and evaluation, and management (AR2016: 17).

Next to the time available at the Office for many different initiatives (see annex 2) the office also made good use of the Knowledge Management Facility. The Dutch FNS community could suggest activities to be funded by that Facility, to a maximum of 50,000€ per request. According to the latest annual report (AR2017: 15) there have been 62 of those requests, 13 times coming from either the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, or the Ministry of Economic Affairs/Agriculture (or both), only two times from the Netherlands Embassies in focus countries for food security (the requests came from the Embassies in Benin and Bangladesh; quite disappointing²⁸²⁹), and 43 times by any of the partners (or in combination). In four cases the Office initiated a KMF project.

According to the same annual report in total 15 explorative studies and events have been supported, 17 times studies that harvested lessons learned, 2 studies that supported Embassies, 7 projects that supported policy formulation, 32 learning events with experts, 7 capacity building and training activities, and 29 publications, shared online. These are products related to KMF subsidized projects, so excluding ARF/GCP product (analyses, factsheets) and other Office products (see the next section about products).

THE 'PRODUCTS' OF THE FOOD & BUSINESS KNOWLEDGE PLATFORM

Since it was conceived, in 2012, the Food & Business Knowledge Platform had an impressive output. This went far beyond the products of the Global Challenges Programme and the Applied Research Fund, which together had more than 500 different 'products'³⁰. The 66 activities funded by the Knowledge Management Facility

²⁸ At the same time, for 2017, APF reported more than 549,000 page views, 23,163 registered agribusiness professionals, 14,053 Twitter followers.

²⁹ Many more embassies in the food security focus countries could have initiated ideas for KMF projects, and could have actively formulated 'knowledge-for-policy' questions. In chapter 5 we will deal with some of the reasons why this did not happen as actively as we would have expected.

³⁰ For the GCP and ARF programmes we used the websites of the F&BKP, of NWO-WOTRO, and of individual projects. After mentioning the discrepancies of the information about 'products' (and after sharing doubts that the WOTRO website was up-to-date) WOTRO discovered that there was a problem in the communication

(with the Office in an initiating, collaborating or advisory role) added at least 220 additional products and the Office of the F&BKP (together with some adjacent agencies) added more than 200 other products, that were not part of the Knowledge Management Facility or the Knowledge Portal (with 1,019 'items' added until the end of 2017). See annex 9. So if we look at 'total output' the Platform's many different activities added almost 2000 different 'products' to the global knowledge base about food security and agricultural business, of which almost half were original contributions (assuming that most of the items added to the Knowledge Portal have been 'harvested' from other sources of 'existing knowledge').

The Platform's mission goes much beyond the production of new scientific knowledge, added to journals and books acknowledged as 'scientific' by the academic community. In fact, the production of 'scientific papers' so far has been rather limited (we counted a total of 25 published scientific papers so far, produced by 8 of the GCP and by 8 of the ARF projects), which means that the great majority of these WOTRO-managed projects do not show scientific results so far. This could partly be a result of bad or slow reporting (see earlier), but it is more likely the result of the fact that many projects of this type need time to produce scientific papers, or get them published by journals or publishers acknowledged as 'scientific' by the academic community, sometimes years after a project formally ended.

For the activities funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the Food & Business Knowledge Platform (either directly, or through WOTRO) a lot of emphasis was put, from the start, on producing knowledge that was meant to be useful for policymakers and practitioners (both businesses, and NGOs, but also training institutes). This was also the explicit intention of WOTRO that has been one of the pioneers within the NWO organization to stimulate transdisciplinary approaches of knowledge production and dissemination³¹. Beyond 'scientific papers' WOTRO uses separate categories for 'products for a broader public', and 'what they call "publical" products (see later).

The Knowledge Platform does not only see a great variety of 'publications' as products, but also the organization of strategic meetings, expert workshops and conferences, and the production of visual material. And not only the 'practice-oriented' activities of the Office (with its KMF and 'other activities') but also the GCP and ARF projects were expected to contribute to products written for a professional or even 'broader' group of readers, or users. To get funding the applicants had to 'plan' for trans-scientific ways of communication, and they were encouraged to develop 'theories of change' about how their potential findings could possibly 'change/improve' food security and agricultural value chains. Specific training sessions have been organized a few times (including 'write shops', workshops about co-creation, research uptake, power-analysis, outcome mapping, story-writing, etc.) to enable project collaborators to learn from existing examples and to develop an attitude of trans-disciplinary thinking and behaviour. In fact, all project consortia, both of GCP and ARF projects, had to consist of scientists and practitioners, and from 'North' and 'South' to encourage mutual learning. 'Learning by doing' was an important ingredient of 'work in progress'. And the Office, in collaboration with NWO-WOTRO (or the other way around), tried to encourage a communication strategy to share results as fast as possible. In its monthly 'tripartite' meetings the Office, WOTRO and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs not only developed new Calls, but also engaged in discussions about 'uptake' of the various activities, and the ways this 'uptake' could be encouraged and disseminated. These meetings were also meant to discuss priorities, planning, joint initiatives, etc.

between project leaders and NWO's system for product registration, and to make those visible on the WOTRO project websites. They will correct that in the coming month (and they sent us the 'raw' information), but we decided to work with the public information on the websites the way we found it.

³¹ Earlier WOTRO experimented with this approach in the CoCooN programme about conflict and cooperation on Natural Resources. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has been stimulating this approach since a long time, e.g. in the research projects funded in the programmes of Tropenbos International, that has never been managed by WOTRO/NWO.

We will soon look at the different types of products, but let us first look at the online communication strategies of both the F&BKP Office and WOTRO. Both have made extensive use of specific websites, and both the Office and WOTRO have developed separate websites for each and every GCP and ARF project. In addition the Office produced lots of additional website items, linked to KMF projects, and to the many additional initiatives taken by the Office (and endorsed by the Steering Committee). ‘Tagging’ all information to a number of selected catch words, representing the many different aspects covered by the Platform added a very useful search method for related knowledge products. In addition we should commend the Office for producing excellent annual reports, with a good balance between ‘details’ and ‘focus’, and highlighting the many activities and products initiated by the Office and by the Platform partners, and either funded by the Knowledge Management Facility, or by the Office itself, often in collaboration with one or more partners. So far so good.

However, it became clear to us that the decision to develop two different websites per GCP and ARF project (so 2 x 75 project websites – and sometimes projects also developed their own (additional) websites or had to be part of specific websites of their institutions) can be seen as a waste of energy (and money), and a cause for trouble. If we compare the project websites of the Platform it starts with a project title, followed by a picture (as a kind of ‘fingerprint’ of a project; a visual representation), and a project description; below that we can find ‘related articles’, also visually introduced, and in the right upper corner we find ‘related project items’ (in fact the different types of output), the project leader and his or her institution, the project consortium agencies (but without names of the project leaders per consortium agency), and the tags. In some cases the ‘project description’ also contains a summary of ‘progress’ after the first and sometimes also the second year, and in a few cases it adds a summary of the final results. The project websites produced by WOTRO are in two layers: the list of all GCP and ARF projects contains some general descriptions and refers to a specific website per project. That website starts with the title, then an introductory text followed by the same picture as the one used by the Platform (so the visual impression is the same). It then adds the link to the Platform project website, but continues with its own information about the consortium partners (giving institutions AND names, unlike the Platform – and it even adds a list of all collaborators in the upper right corner). It continues with ‘progress’ (but not always), a project summary (the words are identical compared to the Platform website, but the layout is often different) and (sometimes) ‘results’. If one compares both websites for each and every project it often results in confusion, and it is clear that the people responsible for the project websites at WOTRO and at the Office do not always communicate very well. And one often wonders how ‘up to date’ and ‘systematic’ the information is, and if the information entering WOTRO (they are responsible for the [annual] progress reports that all project leaders have to make) gets translated into the WOTRO website³², and then to the Platform website. And the other way around, where the Platform gets and adds information, it could also play a role on WOTRO’s project website, but it often does not (the Platform website has many more ‘products’ than the WOTRO website. With hindsight it would have been more effective and more efficient to have one website (the Platform would be the most logical choice), and to make the WOTRO people co-responsible for project communication and become part of the website team feeding the Platform’s website for the GCP and ARF projects.

If we look at the Platform’s project websites there is a problem with consistency. All GCP and ARF projects have a ‘project description’, but only for GCP6-12 and 14 (for numbers see Annex 1) there is a summary of ‘First Year progress’ (and no information about Second or Third Year progress where that is relevant). Only in 16 out of the 30 GCP projects there are ‘relevant articles’. For the 45 ARF projects only ARF1-3, 4-7 and 15 contain information about ‘progress’ during year 1 and year 2 (and in 6 also about a final report). And only in 21 ARF cases we find ‘relevant articles’. If we then look at the WOTRO project websites, only ten out of the 30 GCP projects, and only 20 out of 45 ARF projects show any information about project output, while we know from the Platform’s project websites that often there has been relevant output. The relatively few cases where

³² According to NWO-WOTRO project leaders themselves are responsible to upload information on the NWO website, using the ISAAC system, and WOTRO staff themselves are hardly involved.

WOTRO adds project output for the ARF projects these are often the ‘factsheets’ developed during the first year when projects were brought together to share insights on methods, concepts and ideas about ‘uptake’. For those projects with other types of output mentioned these are presented as ‘scientific publications’, ‘publications for a broader public’, and “publical” (sic) publications. The Platform’s much more detailed information about output shows a great variety of project output. And of course we should add that, although this evaluation was meant to be a ‘final evaluation’, many projects are not or not at all ready, and a lot more products can be expected to be produced later. So this is the situation in June 2018. We recommend that a real ‘final evaluation’ will be done in 2023, to look at the ‘end-of-project’ output and later results (and further ‘uptake’ and relevance of the results).

In table 11 we present the different types of output and how many times they feature in GCP, ARF, KMF and “Other” activities/projects. To avoid the obvious overlap (and hence ‘double counting’) we add the WOTRO categories ‘broader’ and ‘publical’ below the row with the totals of all output categories.

Table 11: knowledge products resulting from F&BKP activities/projects; until June 2018.

Type of output so far	KMF (n = 66)	Other (n = 174)	GCP (n = 30)	ARF (n = 45)	Total (n = 315)
Own website			7 (by 6)	4	11
Project summaries/ descriptions			30	45	75
Progress reports summary online			8	7	15
Expert meetings	28+ (by 23)	54 (by 49)			82+
Start of local platforms	4				4
Workshops/conferences	33+ (by 26)	38 (by 32)	8+3	1	83+
Poster			3	34 (by 27)	37
Powerpoint presentation online			3	21 (by 20)	24
Online consultations		10			10
Calls		8			8
Scientific papers (on wotro website, F&BKP website and elsewhere)			14 (by 8)	11 (by 8)	25
Thesis (Master, PhD)			25 (by 4)		25
Scoping study/literature review	10	6			16
Reflection paper	4	2			6
Reports/learning documents	59+ (by 34)	16	31 (by 8)	31 (by 9)	137+
M&E document		23			23
Policy brief/ flyer/brochure	8 (by 7)	5	6	39 (by 19)	58
Factsheet/Infosheet	13 (by 3)	2	10 (by 6)	12	37
Business cases /guidelines investors	30 (by 7)	1			31
Capacity development events	11 (by 10)	11			22
Training manuals	6 (by 5)				6
Pictures			1	4 (by 3)	5
Podcast, video, tv	5		6 (by 4)	11 (by 6)	22
Newsletter	5 (by 2)	29	16 (by 4)	5 (by 4)	55
Press release			2		2
Map		1			1
News items on F&BKP website	many		39 (by 16)	25 (by 20)	64+

Article in newspaper/ magazine			7 (by 6)	17 (by 8)	24
Social media (own accounts)		7	3	1	11
Award		1			1
Stand during exhibitions		2			2
Blogs/webinars/stories		3	10 (by 6)	7 (by 5)	20
Final events/End results	4			6	10
Total	220+	219	232	281	952+
Wotro website: publications for broader (non-academic) readers			10 (by 4)	6 (by 5)	16
Wotro website: "publical" products			43 (by 9)	36 (by 6)	79

Explanation: 28+ (by 23) means: at least 28 activities, by 23 projects

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs can be proud of its encouragement to trans-disciplinary knowledge development. The results are truly impressive, and the combination of four different funding lines (GCP and ARF through WOTRO, and the KMF and Office activities through the Platform itself) shows a good mix of dissemination methods, and has created flexibility and specificity.

What should be said, though, is a great diversity of project performance. Some projects can be regarded as exemplary, with many different types of products, and a very precise and detailed reporting of its performance. For the GCP projects we would like to mention three of those exemplary projects, and for the ARF projects three as well. These are (by far) the ones with most and most diverse project output so far. Project numbers can be found in annex 1.

- GCP1 Inclusive value chain collaboration in Ghana and South Africa. Project leader Dr Mirjam Ros-Tonen (University of Amsterdam)
- GCP6 Follow the Food - Dutch agribusiness and local food security in Africa. Project leader Dr Guus van Westen (Utrecht University)
- GCP7 Women Food Entrepreneurs in Kenya and Burkina Faso. Project leader Dr Nicky Pouw (University of Amsterdam)
- ARF26 Strengthening agribusiness Ethics, Quality Standards & ICT usage in Uganda's value chains? (AGRI-QUEST). Project leader Dr James Ssemwanga of The Ssemwanga Center for Agriculture and Food Ltd Uganda; supported in the Netherlands by Dr Christopher Wickert of the Free University in Amsterdam.
- ARF28 Introducing non-timber forest products in reforestation schemes & tree-crop farms in Ghana (TREEFARMS). Project leader Ms Valerie Fumey Nassah, of the Resource Management Support Centre, Forestry Commission Kumasi, supported in the Netherlands by Dr Mirjam Ros-Tonen of the University of Amsterdam.
- ARF9 Agro-ecological food resources for healthy infant nutrition in Benin (INFLO). Project leader Ms Sébastienne Adjadogbedji-Avouzoukan, GPO – Groupe Pépité d'Or (Consortium Infant Food), supported by Dr Anita Linnemann of the Food Quality and Design group of Wageningen University.

Although it is too early to judge (many projects are not even half way) one can say that quite a large number of projects either do not report adequately, or that information does not enter the websites of WOTRO and the Platform, or these projects are simply lagging behind in performance, or wait until the last moment with their products, and/or do not want to share those earlier. If one looks at the list of 'top performers' one can note that 'Wageningen' (initiator or partner in more than half of all GCP and ARF projects) is surprisingly less represented than one would expect.

5 THE OPINIONS AMONG DIPLOMATS WORKING IN RELEVANT NETHERLANDS EMBASSIES AND SOME OTHER STAKEHOLDERS IN ‘THE SOUTH’

METHODOLOGY

In the period of 13 April – 14 May, we interviewed the first secretaries of Food Security and Agricultural Counsellors of the following Netherlands Embassies: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Myanmar and Rwanda³³. In addition, two representatives of AgriProFocus (in Ethiopia and Myanmar) and the representative of the Ghana Netherlands Business and Cultural Council were interviewed. Interviews took place by phone and in person. Both Dutch and international staff were involved in the interviews. Questions were asked on the relevance and added value of the Platform’s activities for the day-to-day work of the Embassy staff, as well as on possibilities for future improvements.

The sample of countries included Embassies and network organizations as AgriProFocus and Netherlands Business Associations that were more intensively involved in some of the F&BKP activities (i.e. Ethiopia, Ghana and Kenya), as well as those that had a more distant relationship (i.e. Bangladesh, Myanmar and Rwanda).

The findings below are organized along the main functions of the F&BKP: (1) the website and other information channels; (2) the research activities, and (3) strategic partnerships and thematic networks. With respect to the network activities, many Embassies also mentioned the work of the Embassy Food Security Support Facility (in Dutch: the former Programma Ondersteuning Posten, POP). These reflections have been incorporated under (3) the thematic networks.

THE WEBSITE AND OTHER INFORMATION CHANNELS

For the respondents, the F&BKP activities related to the website, including the knowledge portal, newsletters (distributed by email), and social media (Facebook and Twitter), were often mentioned together. Therefore, they are presented here under the same heading.

The portal is organized in six main topics: Agribusiness Development & Trade; sustainable agriculture; innovations in agro-food sectors; food security policy and governance; consumption patterns and nutrition; and cross-cutting challenges to food security. Within each of these thematic areas more specific topics have been defined like: finance, soil management and land governance.

When asked about the F&BKP many Embassies mentioned that they knew the newsletter and the website. At the same time the most heard comment was that “I think they are not that active in my country” and that they

³³ Interviewed people

- Bangladesh (by phone and email): Durk Adema and Haruni Osman of the Netherlands Embassy in Dhaka
- Ethiopia (in person): Jan Willem Nibbering and Worku Tessema of the Netherlands Embassy in Addis Ababa, and Meskerem Ritmeester of AgriProFocus Ethiopia
- Ghana (in person): Thierry van Helden, Netherlands Embassy Accra and Afke van der Woude of the Ghana Netherlands Business and Cultural Council
- Kenya (by phone): Sanne Willems of the Netherlands Embassy in Nairobi
- Myanmar (in person): Frederik Heijink of the Netherlands Embassy in Yangon and Bente Meindertsma of AgriProFocus Myanmar
- Rwanda (by phone): Ton Negenman of the Netherlands Embassy in Kigali

“look more focused on the Netherlands”. Half of the interviewed Embassy staff knew the key people of the F&BKP by heart and had met them in person, while the other half had difficulties recollecting which people are behind the platform nor did they know their names.

When asked about the information provision of the platform all respondents indicated that they received the newsletter. Also many followed the F&BKP on twitter. At the same time, many expressed that they didn’t have time to read the newsletter and that they often saved it for a later occasion without eventually reading it. A much heard narrative was that “at the Embassy we have a huge workload with practical, operational activities; we don’t have time to read long reports or studies”.

Many indicated that they have a subscription on a large amount of newsletters, which they at best read “diagonally”. More targeted information, in the form of a personalized email, that contains directly relevant information for the country, would be preferred. For some, the twitter messages were seen as useful, and a number of new reports and articles were accessed through this medium.

When asked about the relevance of the selected thematic areas and topics, most agreed with the choice of topics and indicated that these are the most important topics that they are working on. The most relevant topics for the Embassy staff are: inclusive business, finance, nutrition and youth employment. Topics that were missing according to the Embassy staff were: food safety, scaling and migration. Most respondents appreciated the structure of the website and they found it quite easy to find certain studies and articles.

In terms of the quality of the reports and articles, those participants that had more intensively browsed the website, indicated that the level of information was often either too ‘academic’ or ‘technical’ and ‘location specific’. One Embassy staff explained that: “A success story of a specific innovation in Tanzania does not necessarily mean that it works in my country”. A number of Embassy staff indicated that for the day-to-day work at an Embassy the reports need to be either more ‘strategic’, ‘institutional’ or more ‘practical’.

This at a first glance sounds contradictory, but can be explained by the example provided by two Embassies of a well-appreciated report, that of the Sector Guidelines (Westenbrink et al 2017), that brings together more theoretical notions of agricultural sector development and practical guidelines on how to develop a subsector programme in a developing country or emerging economy. In the same line two Embassy staff indicated that they would like to have more information on how to practically give hand and feet to the ‘Aid and Trade’ policy; *how* do you make this work? Another topic that a number of Embassies struggled with is ‘agricultural transformation’ (from low input and low productivity; to high input and high productivity): *how* can you support that transition in an integrated way (e.g. extension, input supply, access to finance and market development)?

Embassy staff did indicate that the website and newsletters get more ‘on the radar’ after the specific activities of the learning journeys (in Ethiopia and Kenya), the Food Security ‘Terugkomdagen’ in the Netherlands, and specific events in the countries themselves. As such there seems to be some form of cross-pollination between the F&B research, thematic network activities and the knowledge portal. In order to improve the presence of the platform in third countries, Embassy staff mentions that (in those countries that they are present) AgriProFocus could play a bigger role. The relationship between the Embassy and APF is often good with close collaboration in the area of event organization and facilitation. Still, in some countries the Embassy lacked the real food security knowledge of APF or found that too little companies were involved (“mostly a network of NGOs”).

PUTTING THINGS IN PERSPECTIVE

It is important to note here that the core activities of Embassy staff are largely related to the development and oversight of the Embassy’s Food Security portfolio. At some Embassies this portfolio exceeds a budget of EUR 30 million per year, often being managed by one expatriate and one or two local staff. In addition, Embassies

are expected to (more distantly) advise on and monitor the performance of centrally funded activities of: Dutch NGOs (the strategic partnerships), RVO instruments (like FDOV) and NUFFIC (e.g. NICHE) that often amount to a similar budget as the dedicated Embassy budget. As such many Food Security teams are overstretched in terms of tasks and responsibilities, and have limited time for additional activities or strategic reflections.

As an example, the Netherlands Embassy in Ethiopia calculated that the full Food Security portfolio, of both central and decentralized activities, amounts to more than EUR 100 million per year. It is against this background that the day-to-day work of Embassy staff is shaped, with a primary focus on monitoring the food security portfolio and its administrative burden, while being busy brokering linkages between a multitude of programmes, projects and instruments (i.e. actively 'connecting the dots'). Any activity that aims at reducing the workload of these tasks or an activity that contributes to the greater integration of food security activities is often warmly welcomed, while additional tasks or activities outside this scope can result in a response of stress or indifference.

In terms of policy influencing the Embassies engage more at a national or regional level than at local level. The specific opportunities for influencing policy change in developing countries are often very specific with very small policy windows, often involving either a multilateral setting (i.e. sector working groups) or concrete doing business obstacles (e.g. import tariffs or food safety scandals). In terms of the Embassy's strategies (especially the MASP or MACP) the timelines are often very short, and decision-making is mostly influenced by nationally available analyses and plans (e.g. from the WB, IFPRI, UN, and the country's government). For a Netherlands based platform the objective of supporting "the co-creation of better *policies* and practices on Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) in the [...] South" was seen as overly ambitious. Emphasis on practices was seen as more realistic and feasible.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY RESEARCH

Under the Food and Nutrition Security Research component two research funds have been established; the Applied Research Fund and the Global Challenges Programme. Out of a total of 45 ARF and 30 GCP projects, 31 projects (at least partly) took place in one of the six selected countries. By far the most projects were approved for three countries: Ethiopia, Ghana and Kenya (27). For Myanmar and Rwanda no projects have yet been approved while for Bangladesh four projects are being implemented at the moment.

During the phase of the Calls for Proposals, a few Embassies organized a meeting, often in collaboration with APF, to inform research institutes and NGOs, and to a lesser extent companies and policymakers, in their country about the opportunity of the Calls. In one case an organization was further supported in the development of a proposal as in this specific country no proposals had yet been granted. Mostly, however, the development of proposals happened outside of the view of the Embassies. In essence, they were developed between already related Dutch and third countries' institutions (based on historical relationships). Still, the Embassies that did organize an information meeting felt this was a useful activity that increased the number of applications from their country.

After the proposals were submitted, the Embassies were asked to review the proposals that targeted their country. According to two Embassies (that received many applications) the assessment process was not very clear. In particular, Embassies complained that they were not informed in advance on how their evaluations were going to be used nor what the weight of their advice was in the overall assessment. Similarly, the information provided afterwards was seen as rather minimal with little explanation if a proposal, that had been viewed positively by the Embassy, was rejected. Two Embassies indicated that "this is not very encouraging for doing future evaluations seriously".

After the approval of the proposals, the lead organizations of the ARF and GCP projects often did not inform or update the Embassies about their project activities or missions (from the Netherlands) when in the country. In a few cases special events were organized by WOTRO and the F&BKP Office that brought together a number of

research projects around a theme, e.g. nutrition security or value-chain development. These meetings, also discussed more extensively in the next chapter, were generally seen as informative and useful. In one case an Embassy pro-actively contacted the projects and organized a meeting.

Overall, the Embassies feel that the research projects run rather autonomously or independently, with very little coordination and communication with the Embassies. Some Embassies were not aware of quite a large number of projects taking place in their country. Only in those countries where specific events had been organized the visibility of (some) projects was better.

For those Embassies that knew about the research projects in their country, the relevance of the topics was a bit of a mixed bag. Some projects were seen as very relevant, especially those that focused on priority subsectors of the Embassy, e.g. dairy, horticulture or cacao. At the same time a number of projects were seen as quite irrelevant tackling topics that were in no way related to the Embassy's priorities, whether thematic or at subsector level.

In addition, many Embassies found that the participation of the Dutch private sector in the projects had been limited. Especially in those countries with a strong Trade and Aid policy or in so-called transition countries, this was seen as a missed chance. In those cases that there was a strong link with an agri-food company immediately the results were more visible and tangible. In this context the new SBIR on Food Security in sub-Saharan Africa and the VIA-Water projects were mentioned by three Embassies as good examples how to stimulate agribusiness innovations.

For a number of projects, Embassy staff felt that the implementation, or internal coherence between the activities of an individual research project, was rather loose with quite diverse research activities. Overall, the respondents feel that the projects are not much linked to the portfolio of projects and programmes of the Embassy and that there has been limited effort to better link the ARF and GCP projects to the Embassy's portfolio.

STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS & THEMATIC NETWORKS

Under this component both the strategic partnerships with the CGIAR and World Bank are captured, as well as more localized, demand driven, initiatives initiated by the Embassies, the F&BKP itself and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In the context of this report, the following activities were mentioned: the Food Security learning journeys (jointly organized with the Embassy support facility also known as POP), a number of thematic research events in the countries themselves and the "short-term analytical research requests".

Strategic partnerships

With respect to the more higher level strategic partnerships none of the interviewed Embassies mentioned experience with an activity or project in the context of the CGIAR and WB partnerships.

Learning journeys and 'terugkomdagen'

With respect to the learning journey (to Ethiopia and Kenya specifically) the Embassy staff that participated in them, much appreciated these one-week missions. They mentioned that the journeys had provided them with new ideas and in some cases formed the basis for the development of a new project. In addition, the Embassies that were involved in the organization of the journeys mentioned that the collaboration with the F&BKP and Food Security Support Facility had generally been constructive, professional and positive.

Thematic events

For the specific thematic events that took place in the countries themselves, bringing together a number of ARF and GCP projects the experience was also positive. A number of Embassies participated at least partly in these events (often the closing or policy day) and they mentioned that the discussions were relevant and informative.

They did mention, however, that after the events (in Ethiopian, Ghana and Kenya), there had been little follow up and it seemed more like a one-off type of event.

Short-term analytical research questions

From the interviewed people none had submitted a short-term analytical research question, nor were they aware of the existence of such a facility. They did, however, not see this as a shortcoming as many other instruments are available to them in case they want support for a short-term consultancy assignment (e.g. through the Embassy support facility or one of the RVO instruments).

RECOMMENDATIONS

From the interviews with six Embassies and three platform organizations we have come to five major recommendations:

The use of the website and other information channels is limited. Important to expand on face-to-face interactions and events within the countries in order for the platform to come alive.

The interviewed Embassy staff used the F&BKP website, newsletters and social media to a very limited extent. They found the platform slightly static or passive with limited organized interactions. Half of the interviewed Embassy staff didn't know the people behind the F&BKP. Only when they had interacted with the platform's staff and in the platform's activities they gained better insight and appreciation for the platform. This could be addressed through the organization of more events and closer collaboration with local organizations present in the countries (see below).

If the platform has local presence, activities are better known and appreciated

This relates to the lack of local presence in the countries. Often Embassies directly work with the AgriProFocus network for organizing Food Security related activities, or through the Business Councils (e.g. GNBCC and ENLBA). In order for the platform to have a greater presence and visibility in the third countries, greater collaboration and/or integration needs to be sought with these organizations.

The topics of the website are relevant but the reports can be more strategic and institutional

The thematic areas and topics of the knowledge portal present the most important topics that Embassies work on. Especially the topics of inclusive business, finance, nutrition and youth employment were seen as very relevant. Topics that were missing according to Embassy staff were: food safety, scaling and migration. The main critique concerned the 'level' of information, this was often seen as rather technical and context specific. Whereas for Embassies to make it more relevant, the reports and articles need to be more strategic and practical. To this end the Platform could more closely liaise with interested Embassy staff to develop a number of broader (cross-cutting) research questions around topics like 'sector transformation', 'scaling' and the 'trade and aid agenda'. Think more in terms of guidelines (*how* can research findings be implemented) than research questions as such (*what* is the solution for a specific problem)

In many partner countries a large portfolio of Trade and Aid programmes and projects exists and more emphasis could be paid to involving the Dutch private sector and their networks in these countries

Especially in Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya and Myanmar the integration of food security and private sector development objectives has much advanced in the last four years. For these countries this portfolio will, most likely, be continued and expanded in the next four years. Therefore, for the next phase of the platform, greater effort could be made to involve Dutch companies in the activities of the F&BKP, as well as more attention for the business climate in which these companies operate. In the mentioned countries strong networks of Dutch companies exist that can be used for increasing participation and input.

The research funds operate rather autonomously and have little relationship to the Embassy's priorities and programmes

One of the main criticisms of the research projects is that they are implemented quite autonomously or independently, with limited direct linkage to the Embassy's project portfolio. In order to improve this, the Calls for Proposals could stipulate that research questions preferably be tied to existing programmes or specific subsectors of the Embassies' Multi Annual Strategic or Country Plans (MASPs/MACPs).

6. THE OPINIONS AMONG KEY PEOPLE WORKING IN THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, NATURE, AND FOOD QUALITY/MINISTRY OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

METHODOLOGY

A list of 'key people' was provided by the food security coordinator in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (section IGG – Inclusive Green Growth -, nowadays responsible for the F&BKP – it used to be DDE; most but not all relevant people working for DDE have been transferred to IGG in 2014). Fifteen key people worked in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and twelve in the (former) Ministry of Economic Affairs. All 27 people received an email with an explanation and questions. We received twenty responses, fourteen of those from people working for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs³⁴. The differences in 'eagerness' to respond tells a lot about the interest in the F&BKP of people working for Foreign Affairs, and the much more distant relationship between the F&BKP and people working for Economic Affairs/Agriculture. All written responses were in Dutch. We translate some quotes, but without showing the identity of the respondents³⁵.

INVOLVEMENT IN THE FOOD SECURITY ACTIVITIES OF THE DUTCH GOVERNMENT

Respondents had various backgrounds; in summary:

MFA/IGG: head food security; past and current coordinator food security & knowledge, including the F&BKP; leader of the nutrition team and involved in result measurement; some members of the IGG staff were initiators of the Platform; some respondents were recently recruited (junior) policy officers, e.g. for Water and Food; together the respondents are and have been responsible for many different projects, so there were many different 'dossierholders': for AgriProFocus; Support Facility Food Security; Emergency Food Aid; Amsterdam Centre for World Food Studies; Drylands Development Programma (Water and Food); ('focal point') land governance, and LANDAc, LANDdialogue, LAND partnerschap with Kadaster, ILC, GLTN; SUN and GAIN; NL-CGIAR partnership; Geodata4Agriculture and Water [G4AW]; Agricultural Risk Management Team WorldBank; and the Natural Capital Accounting programme of the World Bank (WAVES); Global Land Outlook of the UNCCD (via Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving) ; Access to Seeds Index; Food Security elements of the water trust fund of the Asian Development Bank; Young Expert Programme; MoU 'convenant' with LNV³⁶; SDGProgramme – the follow up to the FDOV programme³⁷. One of the respondents had a strong involvement in the F&BKP activities when at the Embassy in Kenya.

MFA/DDE: Private sector development section; 2SCALE programma (PPP's for inclusive agribusiness); regional trade West Africa (support small trader and women); support Embassies, particularly Benin and Ghana; dossier holder Dutch support to CAADP (NEPAD/AU) and ReSAKSS (IFPRI).

MFA/DAF: member programme committee NWO-WOTRO GCP and ARF

LNV/Team Food Security: Global agenda for sustainable livestock (FAO-connection); dossier holder post-harvest network; concept note food systems (together with MFA/IGG); Food Security Exchange (together with MFA).

³⁴ The former coordinator of the food security agenda in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Wijnand van IJssel, was interviewed by telephone.

³⁵ From the Ministry of Foreign Affairs we received responses from Anouk Aarts, Cindy van den Boom, Monique Calon (DDE), Ati van der Honing, Jan Hijkoop, Melle Leenstra, Paul van de Logt, Marc Mazairac, Aaltje de Roos (DDE), Jeroen Rijniens, Rober-Jan Scheer (DAF), Tjeerd de Vries, Frits van der Wal, and Wijnand van IJssel. From the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality/(ex-)Economic affairs we received responses from Mireille Boshuizen, Hans Brand, Marcel van Nijnatten, Niek Schelling, Jeanet Smids-Goosen, and Patricia Wagenmakers.

³⁶ LNV = Netherlands Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality

³⁷ Total budget: 70m€, of which 30m€ meant to support food security goals.

Most of the food security work in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is currently part of 'Inclusive Green Growth', or IGG, where it was transferred in 2014 after having been initiated by the department for economic development, DDE. Some of the key people who initiated the Platform remained behind in DDE (or "refused to move to IGG, and that was tolerated", according to one respondent). There they are still involved in the private sector development elements of 'food and business', although some regret the move to IGG, and see a gradual shift in priorities, away from the 'business part' of 'food and business', and a greater interest in the 'real food security' issues. Between IGG, DDE, and LNV a 'cluster' was formed recently to have regular meetings to support policy coherence. This, according to some key informants, has improved relations, particularly between IGG and LNV. Tensions remain between DDE (and some people close to 'DDE-thinking', but now part of IGG) and the others. There are some relevant co-productions now (e.g. the annual Food Security Exchange meetings with Embassy staff, but also joint policy notes).

In the conception of the knowledge platforms the idea was to put the formulation of a knowledge agenda OUTSIDE the Ministry, and to no longer tolerate a very individualised system of funding ('every civil servant their own pet projects'), too much focused on 'the usual suspects' (in the food security context that meant: 'too much Wageningen, and too long a relationship with VU-SOW'). Knowledge Platforms were meant to open up to a larger and broader network, and to create more 'level playing fields'.

For the F&BKP a co-ordinating group of stakeholders (a 'Regiegroep') would define the strategy, and both the Ministry and 'Wageningen' would not play key roles. Research allocations would deliberately go to an independent agency, NWO-WOTRO. The Chair and members of the Steering Committee, and in the Programme Committee of WOTRO's Food Security team (and that included the Ministry people involved in both committees, in those early years had a strong opinion that demand articulation should come 'from the South', and without a strong link with the existing food security projects, funded by the Netherlands).

RELATIONSHIP OF THE RESPONDENTS WITH THE F&BKP, AND OPINIONS ABOUT THE RELEVANCE OF THE F&BKP FOR POLICY FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

Respondents who are close to the Platform see many positive impacts of the F&BKP (and its core people), particularly on the formulation of new policies: organising a broad e-consultation for the Food Security Policy Note of 2014 – voedselzekerheids beleidsbrief; the design of the Post-Harvest Network; the secretarial roles for the Landscape Forum; in 2017/2018 the new policy formulation by Minister Sigrid Kaag and her team; also in 2017 the reformulation of Dutch support for CGIAR, and activities together with IFPRI, and for the Agricultural Research for Global Challenges at EU level; input in some review activities (e.g. G4AW; hunger and conflict) and on becoming more familiar with the many food security issues at stake. The co-organisation of the 'terugkomdagen' (food and business experts working in Dutch Embassies coming back to the Netherlands once a year to discuss strategies and policies) is also well appreciated, including the 'learning journeys'. The many network meetings and conferences (co-) organised by the Platform are seen as a welcome (although sometimes overwhelming) way of sharing insights. The ones that are mentioned explicitly are the Food First conferences (the most recent one was on June 1, 2018), and a big meeting in December 2017 ('Research & policy: two peas in a pod?', a co-production of the F&BKP and NWO-WOTRO, that was very much appreciated), where diplomats, practitioners, and researchers of GCP and ARF projects presented and discussed preliminary results. Also the e-learning initiatives have been highly appreciated.

However, also these respondents suggest that "the relationship between policymakers and the F&BKP can be more direct, and the effects of its many activities can be more recognisable". Particularly the research component is seen as having too broad a scope, "flying over the heads of policymakers", and "research designs should have been more demand oriented" (meaning 'demand' by the Dutch policymakers). Key food security people in the Ministry are often overwhelmed by the many activities that the Platform has (co-) organised, but also ask themselves: "what is the link with our food security policy?". The online knowledge portal, and its direct connections with the knowledge management fund and its many activities, is generally well appreciated

(and “very well written/presented”; “very professional”), but often respondents add: “in practice I do not make a lot of use of it” (sometimes adding “yet”), blaming full agendas, and lack of time for knowledge-related activities. More fundamental is the remark that the knowledge portal does not enough connect to the learning outcomes and activities of the many Dutch-funded food security projects and initiatives. “The knowledge provided is too general”.

The general feeling among most respondents is that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs should have embedded the F&BKP better in the (many) existing structures of and programmes supported by the Dutch aid and trade agenda. In fact the large majority of GCP and ARF projects lack any relationship with one of the many Dutch-funded projects, and particularly with the ones funded by Netherlands Embassies. Some respondents strongly voice their opinion that there could have been (much) more added value, particularly with the ‘business support agenda’ of the Ministry (and particularly with DDE after they ‘lost’ the Platform to IGG). One DDE respondent wrote: “the F&BKP has played a suboptimal role for the Ministry, although the last two years there has been some improvement” (in particular referring to the youth employment agenda), and concludes with the very negative sentence: “For DDE the knowledge platform did not have any value... a missed chance...it looks like the agenda of the F&BKP could not be influenced by people “external to the Platform”. Another respondent (at IGG) added: “it is difficult to relate the many activities of the Platform with the food security agenda of the Ministry. That is not the problem of the Platform, but the problem of DGIS³⁸: there is little knowledge about knowledge; there is no organised demand articulation, and there is no structured knowledge agenda”, and then ends with a cynical note: “there is a lot of money to put in knowledge creation; count your blessings”, meaning: every key person in the Ministry can still develop his or her pet project, and can do so without any connection with existing initiatives elsewhere [note: is that still true??]. So : “DGIS should do its home work first!”

Looking back, some respondents feel that some basic organisational mistakes have been made in the beginning (in 2012). People who had been responsible for AgriProFocus (APF) in the Ministry regret that the APF and the F&BKP were not immediately aligned, to arrive at a better complementarity from the start. But also the delegation of selection of research projects to NWO-WOTRO is now being regarded as a wrong strategy by some: “the Ministry has lost the tools to connect specific knowledge questions, related to specific food security projects or approaches, to groups of dedicated researchers, and the Ministry does not have any say in the outcomes of the selection process” (talking about GCP and ARF; for KMF the links are much more direct, but there the funding is much more limited , max. 50k€, compared to the 250k€-600k€ spent on ARF and GCP projects). And there is irritation about the fact that “the Ministry does not even get information about the consortium partners, of projects that did not make it in the selection process” (and indeed the representative of the Ministry in the Programme Committee cannot share that information with his colleagues or others, as there is a strong legal and practical resistance at NWO to breach privacy rules).

There is a feeling that the Ministry (and the Netherlands Embassies in food security focus countries) should first have formulated its own policy-related research questions, and then specifically ask for research on these questions. Respondents doubt if Calls like the ones co-developed with NWO-WOTRO are not the most adequate way to do this, and certainly not for the ‘applied research’ facility. Many of the GCP and ARF projects are not seen as relevant for (Dutch) policy makers, although both NWO-WOTRO and the F&BKP are trying hard to organise ‘research uptake’. However, we should again note that the steering group, and that includes the key people representing the Ministry in 2012-2015, perceived ‘demand articulation’ as the demand from ‘the South’, and regarded the research uptake ‘in the South’, by relevant stakeholders there, as much more important than the demand articulation by Dutch policymakers. And this connects well with the design of the two instruments as laid down in the programme document of ARF and GCP, developed by NWO-WOTRO in close collaboration with DDE in 2011-12. Looking back, and seeing the current emphasis in Dutch policies across the board on “what is in it for us” (Parliament and public opinion, the Ministry, the business sector, the

³⁸ DGIS = Directorate General International Co-operation of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Dutch knowledge sector, etc.) one can conclude that this 'empathy with the South' has been difficult to connect to two major formulated goals of the Knowledge Platform as these are perceived now: support food security policies (in the Netherlands) and create synergy among Dutch stakeholders in food (security) and (agricultural) business.

Some respondents explicitly state that they appreciate the Newsletters, the meetings to bring together stakeholders, and the information sharing (e.g., the Knowledge Portal), and current key people have experienced a lot of support and relevant input, but others (including some key initiators) feel a major distance between the jobs they have to do, and the connection to 'major knowledge questions'; "I hardly connect with the Platform", or: "I really wonder what to do with all that information", or (with some honesty): "I wonder who is to blame, the Platform, or myself?". Some very negative respondents blame "the distance created between the F&BKP and the Food Security experts at the Ministry of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs". The Platform also seems to be at a distance to most of the people (but not all) at the Ministry of Agriculture, and some are explicitly stating that "there has never been any contact" (surprisingly also among people who perform key roles in the food security agenda in that Ministry). On the other hand, those who have been participating are generally very positive: "the Platform people are respected partners, and they deliver high quality based on good expertise", or "I appreciated the role the Platform played in the design of relevant GCP and ARF Calls", and "to be honest, I only recently discovered that the Platform does many relevant things; and their website is a gold mine". And an interesting observation was added by one of the 'knowledge brokers' at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs: "in the South the innovative , co-creative ways of knowledge production can be seen as a boost for the 'Dutch diamond approach'". And someone at the Ministry of Agriculture adds "the involvement of business in knowledge for development has been mainstreamed now". However, also at the Ministry of Agriculture some respondents are negative about the fragmentation of knowledge production (in Dutch 'snipperwerk') and not enough emphasis on strategic knowledge development for food security objectives.

RELEVANCE OF THE F&BKP FOR ORGANISING BETTER SYNERGY WITHIN THE SECTOR IN THE NETHERLANDS

There are conflicting opinions here. Some respondents say that the Platform "hardly" organised better synergy. Some respondents who strongly criticize the Platform for 'lack of multi-actor initiatives', and 'lack of initiatives coming from the business sector' do not seem to know what actually happened in particularly many ARF projects, and again one can ask : who is to blame? Surprisingly many respondents say they 'lack information', which means they never read the Newsletters and they never look at the F&BKP website.

Others are much more positive about the organising role of the Platform in the Netherlands, and the international synergy-organising role in relevant countries by AgriProFocus, that was seen to be boosted by the many F&BKP activities in these countries. However, also in the Netherlands more co-ordination is generally perceived to be needed, and a greater 'buy in' by main actors in the field. As such the number of agencies mobilised (in the Netherlands and abroad) is "impressive", but these agencies are often not working together, where that could have resulted in better and faster results. One respondent notes that the field is enormous, with very many players, and that "the limited number of people working in the Office, plus the contested mandate of the Platform (even among its key 'owners', let alone the many 'partners') restricts the scope and effectiveness of the F&BKP". The important roles played by the Platform (and the Office in particular) with regard to the restructuring of the Dutch support for CGIAR, and the relationship with the World Bank is noted, though, and has indeed worked as a 'capacity enhancer' for IGG.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A NEXT PHASE

Many respondents share the feeling that a next phase could be (much) more useful if there is more coordination with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (and its various sections dealing with food (security) and

(agricultural) business), and maybe also with the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate, and its two relevant Topsectors. Instead of an independent position (as it is mainly perceived to have been the situation during the last five years) better embedding in the Ministry is seen (by many respondents, but not by all) as a prerequisite for success: better alignment with the policymakers and their agendas, and better alignment with practitioners. One respondent added: "More coordination with other knowledge platforms (INCLUDE was mentioned explicitly) and with other knowledge centres (mentioned: Wageningen, Nijenrode, ASC, UvA, VU, ISS, etc. is needed". Another respondent: "better alignment is needed with other initiatives" (funded by the Netherlands), and "better demand management" (referring to the Climate Development Knowledge Network in the UK as a good example of how that should be done). Some respondents are very clear about the necessity to "integrate the various funding lines of the Ministry" and particularly integrate AgriProFocus, the F&BKP (including the Knowledge Management Facility), the food and business support facility [POP], the Talent Pool, and the multilateral partnerships relevant for food security and agricultural business development. Others are sceptical about the timing: it may be a good idea to develop this integration, but one should not be too fast, and time is needed to align the integration with the maintenance of a key role for 'Wageningen', and better connections with other existing knowledge centres in the Netherlands and their partners abroad. We also note that our impression is that 'Wageningen' and other key players in the knowledge industry in the Netherlands are quite well connected to the activities of the Platform, but mainly thanks to the research subsidies they have received from GCP and ARF through NWO-WOTRO. If there would not be a new round of major research subsidies, their interest will certainly dwindle, and the connections between 'serious science' and the F&BKP or its successor will become minimal. "One should take the lessons learned in the existing Netherlands Water Partnership serious" (the perceived disconnect between the NWP and the ViaWater Knowledge Platform for Water) .

A repeated opinion is that the Ministry (or Ministries) should first put their own knowledge house in order, and make it a requirement that all projects, and all 'dossierholders' for these projects, are supposed to formulate knowledge questions, and consult with the Platform about alignment and knowledge development strategies. It also means that all diplomats and all other civil servants working for food security elements of the Dutch government policy should get dedicated time for knowledge development, and that it becomes crucial in their performance reviews to show that they have done so. It is also a suggestion to expand the existing food security cluster (now consisting of IGG, DDE and LNV) and include for instance DSH and DSO. Some respondents are very clear about the necessity to bring all knowledge development activities together under one umbrella (which not only means the ones mentioned in the current discussion about a possible Netherlands Food Partnership (NFP), but also for instance LANDAc, the SEEDS programme, and other CGIAR activities, the stability, food security and climate agenda, the NL-World Bank collaboration, and others). And some respondents are very doubtful about giving the key role in the new NFP to AgriProFocus, and they suggest a continuation of the existing consortium, with clear continued commitment by 'Wageningen'.

About the 'outreach and communication strategy': "good basis; can be made more accessible; and the website should be better used in the broader communication strategies of partners" (e.g., referring to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs itself). Respondents also add that more should be done in the next phase to connect to knowledge products generated by the many other Dutch-funded food security activities, including the many 'bilateral' products; that is: activities funded by the Embassies, and by IGG and DDE directly. Some add that 'Wageningen' and the Embassies could do more ('be more pro-active") to add relevant information to the Knowledge Portal. The professionalism of the people doing the knowledge portal is beyond any doubt, but it would be better to change the priority from 'hunting for general information' to 'giving access to specific information, linked to the major Dutch elements funded as part of the food security and agricultural business agenda'.

Finally there is a suggestion by one of the key players to go to a next level of international visibility of the F&BKP, by connecting much stronger to southern and global thinktanks ("like INCLUDE did").

7. EARLIER ASSESSMENTS AND OPINIONS OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

THE STAKEHOLDER PERCEPTIONS AND FUTURE OUTLOOK REPORT

In November 2016 Jolein Baidenmann and Alex Percy-Smith presented their results of a stakeholder survey about the Food & Business Knowledge Platform, based on 58 responses. The main conclusion was “interesting and valuable”, but “better focus and stronger attention to some elements” was recommended. Knowledge brokering, and knowledge sharing were seen as the strong points as well as the support for thematic networks, network brokering in the Netherlands, the network events, the support for the Calls, and the KMF funding opportunities, while the survey suggested that the knowledge portal as it was functioning in mid-2016 was not yet seen as covering a unique niche, and research uptake, agenda setting and strategic partnerships should be increased. Also more international activities should be organized, and the link with the private sector and with (Dutch) policies and the Netherlands Embassies should really be strengthened. After an appreciative management response (by the Chair of the Steering Committee) many suggestions have been implemented by the Platform, although some problems are clearly difficult to tackle.

THE GOLD STANDARD REPORT

In February 2017 a (beautiful) report was published about all five knowledge platforms, based on extensive interviews: ‘The Gold Standard. Exploring the added value of the Dutch knowledge platforms’ (Ellen Lammers and Daniëlle de Winter). It shows the shifts from research to knowledge creation as “the combined process of setting the agenda, identifying knowledge questions and jointly carrying out research and other activities to generate new knowledge” (p. 24). For the F&BKP it shows the combination of online and face-to-face consultations, with identifying emerging issues for a forward-looking knowledge agenda, while there would be a mix of targeted partners and audiences, and a diversified approach of research calls and granting schemes (including small grants, the KMF, p. 44), with engagement of multi-actor and diversified research consortia (p. 25). The Platform combined stakeholder mapping with scoping studies (p. 26), and put major new themes on the policy agenda as ‘trending topics’ (examples: youth and social entrepreneurship in the agricultural sector; p. 28). The report mentions the tensions between ‘knowledge for policy’ versus ‘knowledge for the sector’ (p. 31). It shows that the Platform wants to function as a ‘network of networks’ (p. 50), and the ‘presence in the South’ is mainly through the local offices of one of the consortium members [AgriProFocus] (p. 57), and through the engagement of many southern research partners in projects and seminars (p. 78), and of a dedicated relationship with two of the main global players (CGIAR and the World Bank; p. 62). And a lot of emphasis was placed on knowledge brokering (p. 89ff).

THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE GCP AND ARF PROGRAMMES BY SYSPONS GMBH (FOR NWO-WOTRO)

In December 2017 Syspons GmbH presented its mid-term review. They have been engaged by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs from the start of the GCP and ARF process for independent monitoring and evaluation, and so far they had produced inception reports in November 2014, and in November 2015. The 2017 report is very detailed, and strongly formulated ‘strengths’, but also major ‘weaknesses’ of the GCP and ARF programmes and projects. Here we copy their major conclusions on strengths and weaknesses, as these are worth repeating.

“The **strength** of both instruments and their corresponding projects is that they are in line with the Dutch Food Security Policy and address relevant research needs in the target countries and the global food system. The relevance is thereby ensured in both instruments by effective needs assessment mechanisms that are embedded in the instruments’ processes. Therefore the intended demand-driven approach to identify relevant research needs has been successful. Moreover, ARF projects of the first and second call are addressing food security challenges in all four Dutch food security pillars. In addition, the majority of the GCP funded projects

from the first and second call address Dutch food security policy objectives. Regarding implementation, both instruments possess efficient implementation processes and structures, in which the foreseen role distribution in accordance with the principle of co-creation have been adopted successfully. Particularly, the results for both instruments show that the established mechanism of co-creation is a prerequisite for the generation of new knowledge and innovation. Furthermore, the results indicate that consortia members take advantage of the complementing competences to distribute roles and responsibilities within the projects.

Moreover, the provided support for the implementation of the funded projects under both instruments by NWO-WOTRO enables an efficient programme implementation. In line with this, GCP and ARF projects express a high satisfaction concerning NWO-WOTRO's role. A further positive result with regard to the implementation of the instruments is that the calls for proposals have been built upon a learning process in consultation with the Steering Committee. To ensure a learning process, NWO-WOTRO took into consideration lessons learned for each new call. This resulted in - for example - changes regarding the role assignment to the Dutch Embassies in the selection process. Although this mid-term evaluation focused on ongoing ARF and GCP projects and thus cannot draw final conclusions on the effectiveness of both instruments, the results of the mid-term evaluation showed that ARF and GCP projects are well on track in achieving their intended outputs and outcomes in their project areas. With respect to ARF, first results are seen in the development of new insights, knowledge and methods which have already been tested and shared among consortia members and the respective target groups. This positive results have been found in projects in all three case study countries (Benin, Ghana and Uganda). In addition, the evaluation of ARF demonstrated that the instrument has been successful in selecting projects to cover all intended research outcomes at programme level, although some are predominant, such as the increase of farm-level production and productivity by early adopters, the uptake of new agricultural production techniques and the orientation towards local knowledge needs in the field of food security. The GCP projects have also already accomplished noteworthy results by generating new knowledge and technologies. Positive examples have been found in all GCP projects selected as case studies in Ghana, Zambia and Ethiopia. Results identified concern for example new insights on inclusive business cases in the field of food security, access to credit and inputs in agricultural production and new knowledge on production methods to increase nutritional values of specific products. Hence, it can be assumed that the funded projects will contribute to their programmes' objectives. In addition, the evaluation showed that all intended programme outcomes of the first and second call are addressed by the funded GCP projects, although some programme outcome are addressed more intensively. For example, most GCP projects address issues concerning an increased food production, a sustainable increase of quality food and the development of inclusive business models for food security.

In this light it is also noteworthy that the funded ARF and GCP projects have already established or plan to establish mechanisms which ensure the sustainability of their results. Particularly, mechanisms to ensure the institutional, ecological, social or technological sustainability - where it is needed in the projects - have been established successfully. This makes it more likely that the potential reached impacts of both instruments will be durable after the projects have ended.

However, both instruments also exhibit some **weaknesses**. So far both instruments do not achieve or have mechanisms in place to ensure policy coherence, as the consortia members have not established the needed relations with relevant stakeholders to transfer relevant research results into other programmes. This also includes the Dutch Embassies, which have not made active use of both instruments and in most cases do not have contact with the projects. As a result, cooperation with other Dutch or international donor interventions has not materialised yet. Regarding policy coherence, a tension between the demand-driven approach of the instruments and the Dutch Policy has to be pointed out. A strong demand-driven approach (e.g. towards certain target groups) can result in projects working outside the areas that were defined as relevant by Dutch policy.

At the same time the aspiration level of both instruments' impact pathway are too high for the capacity of the funded projects. With regard to GCP, the impact pathway sets a bar that is too high for the funded GCP projects to move from outputs to outcomes, as latter are intended to be reached on a national or global level. For ARF the step from outcome to impact is too far, as the transfer of a technology adopted by early adopters to the application on national level in a country is a too high bar. Moreover, the impact pathways in both cases leave out necessary and important steps. In the case of ARF the missing step is the upscale effect from early adopters to a wider part of the population. In GCP the adoption of technologies by early adopters has been skipped as well as possible pathways for the application of the innovation by national or global systems of food production and consumption. As a consequence, neither instrument possesses adequate support mechanisms for its projects to help them scale up their achieved preliminary results in the project area to a larger level. This result has to be interpreted in light of the complexity inherent to scaling up research results and to influence policy development for comparatively small projects. In this regard the financial sustainability of both instruments is also currently a weakness, as most consortia members do not have plans or mechanisms in place to ensure that financial resources are available after the ARF and GCP projects have ended.

Next to these weaknesses, there are also chances that could be missed. As a result of the missing support mechanisms for scaling-up, most consortia do not perceive their research results as innovations that could challenge dominant regimes of food production and consumption in their respective target countries. This might lead to repercussions regarding the effectiveness and sustainability of both instruments. Moreover, most projects have not collected relevant baseline data, which might impede the measurement of long-term results on the programme level for both instruments.

Nevertheless, it can be concluded that both instruments have the opportunity and potential to develop innovative solutions to challenges in the global food system which can be implemented on national or global level³⁹. For this purpose the F&BKP has to develop into an active player for the transfer of knowledge and innovation produced by the funded projects. In this regard, it has to be acknowledged that the F&BKP did not have a role in research uptake in the first year of implementation, but has increased its activities and efforts since the second year. However effects of these activities will have to be taken into consideration for the ex-post evaluation process”.

The Syspons report continues with seven **recommendations**: “Based on the findings of the mid-term evaluation the following seven recommendations for the future implementation of ARF and GCP or similar instruments are put forward. They are grouped into recommendations on the strategic and operational level.

Strategic-Level Recommendations

1. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (including its Embassies) and NWO-WOTRO should reinforce their coordination efforts to increase synergies and cooperation opportunities between ARF, GCP and other food security programmes.
2. NWO-WOTRO should intensify its cooperation with the Food and Business Knowledge Platform to increase awareness and understanding of ARF and GCP projects about the platform's role and mechanisms.
3. NWO-WOTRO and the Programme Committee should engage in a discussion with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs about the aspiration levels outlined for both instruments and the support and scaling-up mechanisms available to the projects.

³⁹ These are quotes from Syspons. Reading their report we cannot escape from the feeling that they are a victim of 'mission creep' (which we also see in some 'Theory of Change' excesses): the expectation that a relatively small GCP or ARF project – even if it is excellent in 'uptake' activities – can change national or even global-level approaches.

Operational-Level Recommendations

4. NWO-WOTRO should carry on supporting co-creation structures at ARF and GCP project level.
5. NWO-WOTRO and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs should increase their attention regarding financial sustainability at ARF and GCP project level to ensure funding is available to make further use of research results.
6. NWO-WOTRO should increase its quality assurance mechanisms regarding project baselines to ensure sound data collection and values are delivered on time.
7. NWO-WOTRO should carry on supporting the implementation of ARF and GCP stakeholder workshops to ensure the projects' relevance and effectiveness.

As these recommendations lacked any reference to the Platform (and to WOTRO's relationship with the Platform), and this was seen to suggest that the Platform is irrelevant for the GCP and ARF approach, it could be expected that the Steering Committee and the Office would not be very pleased. In their **written response** the irritation that could clearly be noticed in discussions with key stakeholders, is voiced in a very diplomatic way:

"A few important issues...should be strongly emphasized by Syspons in the Executive Summary, since many people only read this section:

- Make it over-explicit that it concerns a mid-term review which was conducted at a rather early stage; no projects are finished and most tangible results are yet to be achieved.
- Be clear about what is meant by research uptake and upscaling (outcomes and impact). The report expects too much of the projects on e.g. upscaling.
- Make explicit that the F&BKP did not have a role in research uptake in the first FBR year, only in the development of the scope of the calls. At the start project teams mainly communicate[d] with WOTRO. (Syspons: We are aware of the fact that the F&BKP is much more involved now.) Transparency on the roles of WOTRO and F&BKP is indeed needed".

And they followed up with a **Follow-up section** [after a joint session of the Programme Committee, the Steering Committee, and Syspons], with three main points:

WOTRO: Enabling and scaling is indeed not the primary role of the projects. The Research Impact Pathway for projects is not always realistic and can be revised by themselves along the way. Now it is time for us to also revise our call/programme Impact Pathways. Projects can join us in that process. The revisions of the Impact Pathway on programme level will be conducted by WOTRO, discussed with the PC and preferably in another joint meeting with the Steering Committee. And we will continue our dialogues with MoFA, RVO (FDOV) and other policy programmes to align for scaling up opportunities.

F&BKP: Our future role in and resources for research uptake will become clear in course of 2018. Regarding the new phase... the question is what should an active role of the Platform look like? The ambitions (impact/upscaling) of the FBR programme are put [by Syspons] on the agenda of the F&BKP, while it is a responsibility of all related actors (e.g. to align instruments).

The FBR Programme Committee and F&BKP Steering Committee need to decide proactively on vision and level of impact and upscaling and the linkage to policy of the new minister/government. A proactive plan (with scenarios) should be presented to MoFA. The MoFA has priority since they are the main funder. However we should also look e.g. for leverage with Brussels and the agenda of the Topsectors (agriculture, water and food is one of the priorities).

THE KNOWLEDGE PORTAL SURVEY

In January 2018 the Office evaluated the knowledge portal, based on a survey among users in November-December 2017 (80 people responded). It concludes by saying that the number of visits to the Portal has grown

over the years (with more than 37,000 page views between the start (March 2015) and December 2017, and a growing number of organizations submitting items to the Portal. Also the functionalities have improved a lot (filtering, email alerts, easy ways to contribute items). The information that is found most useful are case studies and papers about best practices, followed by reports, and policy papers. Topics about inclusive business and youth and employment in food value chains are valued most, and the average value of the satisfaction with the Portal is between 4 and 5 on a scale of 5 (and more or less the same for 'quality of knowledge items', 'quantity of knowledge items', 'length of summaries', and 'usefulness of summaries'. Also 'ease of use/navigation' and 'attractiveness' gets high marks. Respondents using the Portal do so mainly to stay up-to-date on new development of a specific topic, or to deepen their understanding about a specific topic. Half of the respondents stated that the Portal 'definitely' has an added value compared to other sources, and most others said that it did 'to some extent'. Other sources often used were the INCLUDE platform, the AgriProFocus portal and the FAO portal. Most respondents are (very) happy with the current content and form, and the report adds a number of suggestions for further improvements.

TOPSECTOR OPINIONS

When the F&BKP was conceived, also the 'Topsectors' were created, and two of those seem to be directly relevant for food security: the Topsector Agro&Food and the Topsector Horticulture and Starting Materials. Both were clearly perceived to support the Dutch business and knowledge agencies and to give a boost to the idea of a typical Dutch approach, the 'Dutch diamond', both in the Netherlands, and abroad. In fact, these two Topsectors (at least on their websites) already function as Netherlands Food Partnership agencies, but NOT with a focus on developing countries, and NOT with global food security as their main concern. When we noticed relatively few joint activities (on the website of the F&BKP the Topsector Agro&Food is not even mentioned as a partner) we asked some of the leading people in those topsectors about their opinions about the Platform. Unfortunately we could not get any response from the secretariat of the Topsector Horticulture and Starting Materials. But we did get interesting responses from Agro&Food. The first response by one of the leading people in the international section was "I have never heard about them, but I will enquire". He did that and some of his colleagues DID know the Platform ("trustworthy, dedicated, they connect people, and they are involved in the Food First Coalition") and then responded by saying that it would be worthwhile to liaise and discuss potential collaboration. Later an 'official' response came, saying that there have been and still are useful contacts (e.g. about the Netherlands-WorldBank partnership), and that the conference "Research & Policy: two peas in a pod? A dialogue for food security impact" (December 2017; co-organised with NWO-WOTRO) was experienced as useful, and that further collaboration is seen as useful as well. This is clearly a matter of further intensification during the next phase.

The F&BKP Office would like to emphasize that the F&BKP Office and Steering Committee really tried to develop those linkages, but that intensive collaboration is not easy, as the focus is different (business development versus knowledge development; global versus developing countries) and on both sides there is lack of capacity. But according to the Office there is more collaboration than we seem to suggest and they presented the following overview:

- In the early stages a member of Topsector Agro&Food was a member of the F&BKP-Office to enable better connections, although that did not work out well because of differences in focus and approach.
- Very few so-called seed money projects funded by Topsector Agro&Food had a link with low and middle income countries, but there have been discussions between the Topsector and F&BKP how to improve that, and how to learn lessons and communicate about those. However, time and again the Topsector lacked the capacity to follow up, and there were three contact people in five years; no continuity. Recently some connections have been fruitful, e.g. the WorldBank-NL debates.
- There have been more intensive connections with Topsector Horticulture and Starting Materials, and they have been a collaborator in the joint Fruits & Vegetables project of the Office, and also

participated in the World Bank Group – NL partnerschap, in the Innovation Network Feeding Cities and in discussions how to develop better ‘learning loops’.

- However, according to the F&BKP Office also Topsector Horticulture and Starting Materials lacks capacity, and certainly for development-relevant activities.
- NWO-WOTRO adds that the Topsectors are represented in the Programme Committee, “and therefore informed well about ARF and GCP projects, and the activities jointly organised between NWO-WOTRO and the F&BKP Office”.

WAGENINGEN RESPONSES

Responding to a provisional earlier version of the report a response was given by four Wageningen-based stakeholders⁴⁰, and this was followed up by a telephone conversation with one of them⁴¹. Besides suggestions for corrections and additions (taken into account, elsewhere in the report) there were some more general strategic remarks that we would like to share:

- “Given the large number of SMEs in up/downstream agriculture, both Topsector International and BuZa⁴² FDOV funds face many constraints in finding suitable co-investment projects. Knowledge is only one aspect in risk reduction.
- It is welcomed that the evaluation traces the attention for knowledge on food security back to the 80’s. If a historical perspective is used, it should also be mentioned that the current institutional maze and fragmentation of the FNS field in the Netherlands are to a large extent also caused by DGIS⁴³. Over the years, too many different activities and actors have received support to essentially take on similar roles in this field. DGIS should know that this happened under their watch, and with their explicit support.
- Is the F&BKP a multi-stakeholder initiative financed by the Ministry, or is it primarily a service provider to the Ministry? At the onset the emphasis was on the former, but currently there seems to be a trend at BuZa towards the latter. The evaluation should analyse this shifting BuZa perspective on the role of F&BKP [it does⁴⁴]. It should also evaluate F&BKP against the original ToR, which positioned F&BKP more as a knowledge-based multi-stakeholder platform than a knowledge services provider to the Ministry [noted].
- The evaluation is right to point out that the capacity to articulate knowledge questions at the Ministry is limited, and/or uncoordinated. This influences the quality of services requested from F&BKP. Improving the relationship between policy and knowledge is indeed a Catch 22 ...But improving this linkage is not the only thing that should be done. There are also good reasons to continue with funding of research: it (ideally) helps policy makers to ask questions they had not asked before. There should be scope for that type of knowledge creation. Research funding is best linked to F&BKP (or its successor) – otherwise [there would be] little incentive for academics to engage with the Platform.

⁴⁰ Herman Brouwer, Hedwig Bruggeman, Ruerd Ruben and Huub Löffler.

⁴¹ Huub Löffler

⁴² BuZa = Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs; also used: ‘MFA’, or ‘BZ’.

⁴³ DGIS = Directorate General International Co-operation of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

⁴⁴ This point was also highlighted in a written response by the former Chair of the Platform’s Steering Committee, Paul Engel, who added that it would be very unfair to judge the Platform’s performance against the current approach, while the ToR agreed in 2012 gave the Platform a very different mandate. According to us this is a matter of strategic behaviour: already in 2012 it was obvious to many insiders that the wind was blowing from a different direction, and it was also clear from the start of actual GCP and ARF granting that there was a very disappointing link between (granted) research proposals and the existing project portfolio. In fact corrections were only made in 2017 (with clear linkages to the CGIAR programme and specific requirements to link with ongoing CGIAR projects on climate-smart agriculture). One cannot escape the impression that the Steering Committee (and the representatives of the Ministry) continued to give priority to ‘southern demand’, and was not very interested in a knowledge agenda linked to the many projects in the ongoing food security portfolio of the Ministry.

- The future of the Platform as a partnership also depends on the regional scope: only ODA countries or broader. This would also determine the types of relationships with the Topsectors.
- DGIS has a somewhat dualistic approach in combining policy demands with economic interest. It creates some tension, that is also reflected in the platform (who do we serve: Dutch and/or local policy makers, embassies, smallholders, Dutch and/or local business, ...)."

RESULTS OF A SURVEY AMONG PROJECT LEADERS OF THE FIRST GCP AND ARF PROJECTS

Method

We asked the five project leaders of the first five GCP projects about their opinions about the Platform and about WOTRO. All five responded⁴⁵. And we also attempted to get responses from project leaders of the first 18 ARF projects, seven of them responded⁴⁶. These 23 projects are either 'ready' or almost ready, and the opinions of the twelve project leaders provide a valuable assessment of those with the longest relationship with the Platform. The projects that are covered did research in focus countries Ghana, Kenya, Burundi, Uganda, Bangladesh and Indonesia (but unfortunately not Ethiopia), and also in Brazil, Vietnam, South Africa, Sierra Leone and Zambia; a nice spread. The GCP projects mainly cover scientists working at Wageningen University, and one at the University of Amsterdam, and ARF project leaders either have an NGO background or a business background, and those with a Dutch knowledge connection have one with Wageningen, and with the University of Amsterdam. So, although the responses are from a relatively small group of project leaders, and only reflect the opinions of (some) 'early participants', we find the responses very enlightening.

Opinions about the relationship with NWO-WOTRO

GCP Respondents applauded the clear communication with NWO-WOTRO and the involvement that was shown when they were trying to solve some problems encountered within their project. "The objectives of the project were always leading and solutions were sought out to reach those, rather than trying to keep to the original plan", "Both the NWO team and the Food & Business Knowledge platform team have been very cooperative, friendly and engaged", and: "very productive and inspiring. The WOTRO bureau has been thinking along throughout the project". One of the project leaders said: "I participated in organizing the [Two Peas in a Pod] conference in December [2017; co-organised by NWO-WOTRO and the F&BKP] and enjoyed the struggle to find the right framing, format, engagement, before, during and after the conference. A big thumbs up to the NWO team for how they keep investing, enthusiasm and clear communication and keep pushing".

It was appreciated that there were serious efforts to bring the different GCP and ARF projects together to share experiences or delve deeper in several themes (e.g. theory of change, inclusive business, knowledge co-creation), and also the conference "two peas in a pod" was very much appreciated. In general it was very much appreciated that there was so much emphasis on the 'social impacts' and the various activities were "rewarding". One project leader wrote: "As a project team we are quite technically oriented and meetings, discussions ..., as well as the organized trainings, helped us a lot to bring our research closer to the stakeholders".

Some critical remarks had to do with the demanding and time-consuming progress reports, mid-term self-evaluations, and annual reports. "These are not necessarily useless, but could be less demanding and more to-the-point". And sometimes project leaders found the involvement "a little too engaged at times" and asking for "participation in a wide range of events (and the project did not contain staff time)". And: "especially engaging with policy makers was a struggle at times. But in my view that is to be expected". One project leader added: "we, as project consortium, are bombarded with invitations, requests to submit reports, to attend

⁴⁵ Mirjam Ros-Tonen, and Edith van Ewijk (GCP1), John Bastiaansen (GCP2), Maarten Voors (GCP3), Johan Verreth (GCP4), and Sijmen Schoustra (GCP5).

⁴⁶ Margaret Komen (ARF4), Nahayo Pierre Claver (ARF5), Alastair Taylor (ARF7), Francis Alacho (ARF8), Richard Yeboah (ARF13), Rokeya Begum Shafali (ARF15), and Aditya Surono (ARF17).

meetings, and so on, which are or were not all included in the original labour overhead. I can understand the motivation for all this, but it would be preferable if the labour implications/the expectation to attend meetings and what types and frequency of reporting, is announced in the call for proposals, or at least during the contract negotiations”, followed by: “.if we compare this with regular NWO or STW or Nuffic/NFP or even H2020 ... projects, the.. 2 WOTRO PhDs [in this GCP project] were “expensive” in terms of labour costs besides the pure scientific supervision. I think it would become worthwhile if the projects would be larger; in Wageningen we have an INREF program and typical INREF projects have 6-8PhDs plus a postdoc involved. Then it pays off to spend more time in common agreements, in a common methodology such as ToC approaches and so on”.

ARF respondents were also very happy with the relationship: “always they have a helping attitude”. One project leader with a business background wrote: this “was a unique project by design” and she added that traditionally the private sector is only considered at the end of a project, where the research findings find their way in the private sector only through dissemination”. “In the NWO-WOTRO arrangement, the private sector was at the centre of the project and actually the designer. This turned the use of Project results from being supply driven to one which is demand driven. In this case, the outcomes are almost instantly consumed. To our view, the involvement of the private sector should be the most recommended model for grants”. Another project leader commented: “. I liked the way the approach brought together various actors seeking to support rural innovations – in our case an NGO, a Dutch research institute and a Ugandan university. The interactions within the project were not only beneficial to ourselves as implementers, but also – and perhaps more importantly – a great experience for the contact farmers”.

What was also liked was that the planning meetings at the start of the Project brought together different Projects, and “was a great opportunity to share our Project with others and obtain new perspectives”. “The constant communication from the office ensured that we remained focused to the Project throughout the three years, a case that may not be easy for a private sector actor. The staff at the grants office was very useful and available to address any issue that arose”. “The opportunity to learn and share in the co-creation workshops was very informative of what other organizations were doing and how we could partner and share knowledge and experiences”.

The more formal parts of the relationship were also appreciated a lot (although at times a bit bureaucratic and slow if there were changes in project leadership). One project leader used the word “impeccable”: financial arrangements were fast, and reporting requirements clear and useful”. Another project leader added: “I liked the detailed guidelines in applying for the grant, selection process, implementation of the project, how to run the consortium, reporting and approval processes. It all showed a high level of transparency, professionalism and fairness to the applicants and implementers”, and: “The level of transparency in the selection process whereby we were given a chance to react to the evaluators’ comments was very fair and helped point out the likely pitfalls and challenges that were not obvious at the stage of proposal write up. A consultant, Syspons, was hired to review and update the project impact pathway. I had several skype calls and a field visit from Syspons which were very helpful in an effort to meet the expectations of NWO-WOTRO. I felt we walked together and had a common purpose as partners with the funding agency”. And also the reporting to ‘ISAAC’ (NWO’s electronic reporting system) was “smooth”.

Some project leaders regretted that meetings had not been organized in their country (some add: “maybe because of the security situation”). One project leader said: “I think we didn’t make good use of the potential support. ..this was the first time we participated in a[n] NWO-WOTRO research fund, more support on how to go about research project would have been an added value”.

Opinions about the relationship with the Platform

Particularly the brokering function, and the helpful attitude was much appreciated by GCP project leaders. “The F&BKP helped us crystallize our ideas on how the impact of our project should be established. They helped us

to think about the routes through which our desired outcomes might be realized (which stakeholders, how to involve them)". "It has been great to have the FB platform reach out for project updates and actively participate in getting reports online, editing summaries etc. Having the FB website makes creating an independent (and perhaps hard to find) own project website obsolete". A project leader said: "I experienced their power in bringing together policy makers and stakeholders. That is obviously... very positive for any Research 4 Development program, such as GCP". Another project leader saw a process of growing engagement: "We had a workshop/exchange of ideas in the first year or so during which we presented and discussed ideas on how the platform could help us. We did not hear back much. Later on, the Platform became more active and engaged. Last December, they organized the large meeting with practitioners and policy makers in Den Haag. This was a very useful and inspiring meeting. Also during the mid-term evaluation of our round of projects .., they had a valuable input on how we could connect our work to practitioners". What was disliked was the lack of time "to provide the extra information that they need". But that also has to do with an attitude: "At an NGO we tend to be doing things rather than researching things and hence opportunities to take time to read and network are not as frequent as they should be".

ARF project leaders were equally appreciative: The "Food and Business Knowledge Platform is a very good platform and we recommend that it be expanded. As a Project, we attended two meetings of the Food and Business Knowledge Platform, and in both cases, the discussions contributed to good results of the Project. In most cases, Projects may have almost similar objectives but the methodology differs a great deal. Discussions usually helped us ..to address problems at hand. The meetings influenced out methodologies and variables of study". The Newsletters "helped the project to open up and emphasize knowledge sharing at all levels". It stimulated project leaders to actively think about communication and about sharing results on the WOTRO and Platform websites, and uploading papers on sites like www.afrii.org . "The incentive and motivation came from the Food and Business Knowledge Platform that encouraged this kind of initiative. This is a practice, principle and value that Afril is [now] adopting as an institution". One project leader enjoyed the way the Platform played a role in communicating about their work and outcomes, but added that it would even be better if the Platform could also play a brokering role in getting them (better) access to Journals and Publishers. And a project leader said: "The platform is useful, however we didn't make maximum use of it. I believe that we are now making more use of it, after the implementation of our project, and are studying how we can work more closer".

Opinions about the relationship with the Netherlands Embassies and AgriProFocus

Here GCP project leaders are more critical. Some reported that "there was no relationship with the Embassy", or that the project took place in countries where the Embassy was not interested in food security issues, as these countries were not part of the focus countries for food security. Others wrote that the "Embassies have been invited to our learning ...but we have not received a response", or that they maintain regular contacts on various projects, "but not in this case". In one project (with research in Sierra Leone that started when ebola became a real threat) there was a very strong and fruitful relationship: "We have actively engaged with the NL mission in Ghana (the Embassy for West Africa). The relationship has been rather unusually strong. When Ebola broke out in 2014, the research team (GCP researchers and others) wrote a paper on what we knew about our research area -- where the outbreak marched through. This was read by an Embassy employee at the time, who then contacted us. A year later we started a project with KIT and several other partners on community responses to Ebola and post Ebola resilience. This was funded by the NL embassy in Ghana and had a large impact both in policy terms and academically. However he adds: "we have not been actively engaged since and have not been actively engaged related to agricultural issues or the GCP project specifically". And only one respondent mentioned AgriProFocus, but only to say "I did never manage to meet up with the AgriProFocus office".

Some ARF project leaders were quite positive about the relationship with the Netherlands Embassies, mentioning Embassy involvement in their opening workshop, and joint activities as a follow-up. Particularly

project leaders with a chain of projects maintain a self-evident relationship: “We are involved in several projects, so whenever we meet the Embassy we informed them about all our project results. We shared lessons learnt and use these in improving proposals we work on now”. Others, however, wrote: “No direct communication regarding this project with them but we are in good relationship”, or “We did not have a meeting with the Embassy for the purpose of the Project. We think, if we were to get another Project, we should start with a courtesy call at the Embassy at Project inception”. One even suggested: “There was no formal relationship [with the NL Embassy]. I think in future the guidelines could stipulate this as a requirement so that funded projects can work closely with the Netherlands Embassy”. However, that used to be a requirement (in the early Calls) and did not seem to have had an impact, as one project leader suggested: The “Netherlands Embassy .. was not related with this project. When we applied the 1st time a recommendation was needed from the Embassy and they recommended our project for funding [but then the application failed]. After that we [have been] awarded [a] project in [the] 3rd call but [then] no recommendation was needed from the Embassy”.

Some ARF project leaders (but not all) actively engaged with the AgriProFocus office in their country. One project leader wrote: (through them) “we interacted with many agribusinesses, ...through the network, we are in the process of developing another project”. A second project leader wrote: “AgriProFocus [was] involved in innovative activities similar to what my institution.. was doing. They had successfully incubated small and medium scale businesses in banana, coffee and horticulture value chains particularly with the youth.... This gave us impetus in the consortium to work beyond the research project proposal and support activities geared at developing SME businesses in the sesame value chain. .. To support this we encouraged the Smallholder Farmers to form a Sesame Cooperative Society ... As a lesson learnt from the relationship [we] developed a project aimed at creating business opportunities for over 4,000 youth in the cassava industry”. Another project leader engaged with them in a marketing activity, although he wrote that improvements are necessary at the AgriProFocus office to more effectively reap the benefits of project results. That was said in other words by another project leader: “yes we are [AgriProFocus] members and get their mailings and email reminders to check the platform, but the actual checks are limited”.

Opinions about the role of the F&BKP in building (better) relationships with Dutch institutions

GCP project leaders are very positive. “Through the joint activities for GCP and ARF projects organized by WOTRO and the F&B KP, we came in touch with projects working on similar issues. The exchange was highly useful”. It led to a highly dynamic session at a recent conference, with lots of F&BKP-related people, “ to discuss knowledge co-creation for food security through platforms and partnerships. We are now discussing whether we can organize a follow-up discussion at the SDG conference in Wageningen end of August [2018]”. The relationship with non-academic (business and NGO) partners was seen as beneficial, and this probably would not have happened without the F&BKP approach. Again the very positive experiences of the Conference in The Hague in December 2017 was highlighted.

ARF project leaders highlighted the chances created as a result of F&BKP activities to engage with Dutch organizations like SNV, and businesses active in the sector, and the way they learned from the experiences: e.g. “we learnt a lot in data management”. The relationship in some cases also resulted in various useful suggestions from colleagues in Wageningen, in follow-up projects, and in (funded) PhD trajectories with Wageningen. Some project leaders suggest that the Netherlands Embassy (and AgriProFocus?) should do more to organize fruitful (follow-up) connections. Project leaders express their willingness (or even eagerness) to participate in new ARF-like projects, if new funding would become available.

Opinions about the role of F&BKP in creating new partnerships in the South

It seems that most consortia already existed before the GCP and ARF projects got funding, so it did not create many ‘new’ partnerships, although it expanded the existing linkages. However, local organizations intensively use the F&B KP website and in that way get access to many more relevant partners, and “ they appreciated and

are following up on the “Accra workshop” where different project teams working in Ghana were brought together (NB this refers mainly to the ARF project). Methods regarding stakeholder analysis / identification of boundary partners and Theory of Change in Benin were immediately applied in the ARF project”. In some of the GCP projects the consortium connections became a start of many follow-up activities and new initiatives, also engaging new partners. Dutch and other scholars (also in Southern universities) are actively ‘used’ to provide feedback, co-develop new proposals, and provide training/teaching. In ARF projects a lot of new relationships have been established at local levels (with farmers, local traders), and due to the linkages provided by the Platform this can be (and is being) ‘upscaled’ to more fruitful relationships at the national level. Examples given are established linkages with a National Bureau of Standards and a National Seed Certification Service, and with relevant (marketing) businesses in the region. NGOs and businesses active in ARF projects also started to provide training and co-research activities for staff and students of local universities. What some ARF project leaders highlighted was the very positive experience of not just being seen as beneficiaries (“like in NICHE projects”), but as partners, and acknowledged as being in the driver’s seat.

Opinions about a possible next phase

Project leaders express their strong support for a continuation of the Platform and its activities. Some just say: “keep at it!”, or “the research support is very good and should continue”; others are more specific: “I would certainly be in favour to continue the platform as it performs an important brokering function between policy and research. It is good to keep researchers alert to the contribution they can make to policy. More can be done to make clear what these policies are – most projects (notably the ARF projects) are more oriented towards the policies in the countries where they work. Hence, policy relevance does not always mean that projects are relevant for Dutch policy (or that all MinBuza staff are open to advice from researchers). Increasing that relevance requires deliberate brokering! Also the workshops and events that bring GCP and ARF projects together are a plus (networking; exchanging experiences; joint learning)”. In a similar tone: “Organising and facilitating a dialogue between researchers on the one hand and practitioners and policy makers on the other hand is a strong side of the Platform. The meeting in Den Haag [in December 2017] was a huge success. This is what they should continue. Support to individual projects has been [more] difficult to carry out; this part could be scaled down”.

ARF Project leaders strongly voice their desires that follow-up activities make sure that the (positive) results and findings can be further disseminated and would like to see much more ‘valorization’ activities in other donor-funded (or for that matter: other Dutch-funded) projects. Much more is needed “to test proof of concept in order to support ... commercialization”, or “to support upscaling”. “There are many opportunities to support agricultural innovations but funding is often not available.” “If possible funding calls could require support or partnerships to the development of value chains but with a prominent research element”. Another project leader encourages the organization of annual follow-up workshops, and offers to organize one in her country, where no ARF workshops have been organized yet. Another project leader was very much encouraged by the new ways of communication and valorization, and he suggests that the next phase of the Platform should further encourage forms of communication other than reports (e.g., videos, and interactive methods via websites). One project leader adds an important suggestion that is in line with some of the salient recent findings: “We believe that the greatest challenge to food production and consumption is synchronizing the production and consumption times and regions. There is need to emphasize more on marketing and create demand-driven production systems. Thus, the emphasis could shift to marketing and postharvest handling which will provide an incentive system to farmers to produce more, and [as a result] we become food secure”. And finally one project leader suggested: “It would be nice to have a more direct link with companies who are looking for partnerships or proof of concept in the countries we work in. Based on that the platform could write challenges [for] which partners could then submit [a] proposal and work closer with the companies. So the knowledge platform should be more than only [doing] knowledge brokerage”.

8 CONCLUSIONS

We follow the Terms of Reference.

1 THE RELEVANCE OF THE F&BKP IN THE FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY (FNS) FIELD

1.3 How did the F&BKP enhance the achievement of the three strategic policy goals of the Netherlands in the field of Food and Nutrition Security?

The activities of the F&BKP, including the two research programmes, enhanced all three strategic goals of food and nutrition security, with most emphasis on the two first goals (Eradicating existing hunger and malnutrition, and Promoting inclusive and sustainable growth in the agricultural sector), and less, and almost only during the last year, attention for the third goal (Creating ecologically sustainable food systems), as a result of a dedicated attempt to support research for climate-smart agriculture, together with CGIAR. The Platform actively supported the formulation of new policy papers, and the realignment of international collaborations (e.g., with the CGIAR institutes). The thematic choices made in the F&BKP activities, and the very flexible adjustments to a rather rapidly changing policy environment, can be seen as very adequate.

However, one should question the relevance of the geographical choices made, both the regional emphasis of the implemented food security policies of the Ministry itself (are the focus countries the most relevant ones for enhancing food security? Are the focus countries which received most funding/attention the most 'needy' ones?) and certainly the actual regional spread of the project portfolio, and the emphasis in knowledge-policy debates. One cannot escape the conclusion that a majority of research projects is located in the relatively 'easy' countries, with a lot of existing linkages, like Uganda, Kenya, Benin, and Ghana, while very few activities can be found in very problematic areas like South Sudan, Yemen, and Burundi. And a relevant question is if 'learning from experiences elsewhere' should not put much more emphasis on the world's areas with most hungry people (India particularly, but also the numbers of hungry people in focus countries Bangladesh and Indonesia are still very high, even if the percentage of hungry people in the population is much lower than elsewhere).

1.4 What is the added value of the F&BKP in supporting knowledge management activities of various Dutch based networks and organizations in the Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) field?

The F&BKP (including the two research programmes) succeeded to mobilize almost all relevant knowledge, and NGO agencies active in the Netherlands in the field of food security, as well as a lot of partner institutes in Africa, and some in Asia, America, and Europe. The network is truly impressive. The intention to involve the business sector somewhat succeeded in most of the ARF and GCP projects, and in some of the KMF and other Office activities, as far as 'southern' businesses were concerned – as was the intention – but much less so in the Netherlands. Although the Platform succeeded to get Dutch agro-business firms around the table, and as participants in conferences and strategic meetings, their active involvement in research projects, and as initiators or co-sponsors of relevant knowledge activities was much more limited. Among the major players Rabobank (and its Foundation) was most involved, as well as for instance Friesland Campina. But major companies like Heineken, Unilever and Ahold, are conspicuously absent. Some smaller companies do play a role, though. It is also remarkable that pseudo-companies like SNV, or major players like IDH and FMO were less involved than we, as evaluators, had expected. Among the knowledge institutes the Platform succeeded to engage a large diversity of major groups from Wageningen University and Research Centre, but also all relevant other key players in this field in and around academia (including KIT).

The intention to open up and engage a wide variety of players has clearly succeeded, and it certainly enhanced the visibility of the 'Dutch diamond' concept, both in the Netherlands, among some global agencies (like the World Bank and CGIAR – but much less so among FAO, IFAD, WFP, and the regional banks), and in the South.

There is a somewhat troublesome relationship, though, with 'government'. Some of the GCP, ARF, and KMF activities did succeed to engage relevant government agencies in the South (although often at a local level), but the relationship with Dutch Embassies, and with the many existing Dutch-funded food security and food and business projects in the South, has been much more limited than we expected (and currently it is the dominant expectation among key people in the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Economic Affairs, and Agriculture). It is fair to say, though, that when the programme was designed this was much less on the radar as a target and expectation. The chosen approach for the research programmes, and the selection process of projects by NWO-WOTRO, did not favour an approach to connect directly to existing Dutch-funded food security projects, and enhance their knowledge orientation. With hindsight it can be seen as a mistake to expect that such selection procedures can result in one-to-one project-research/knowledge connections, and for a programme like the Applied Research Programme this should not have been handled by NWO-WOTRO, but directly managed by the Platform itself and its multi-actor Steering Committee, like they successfully did with the Knowledge Management Facility, with a lot of other convening activities and with the Knowledge Portal. Of course, the Platform should then handle the Calls, and the granting process, with the same rigour as NWO-WOTRO is used to do, which adds an extra responsibility to the Steering Committee, and both the Platform Office and the Steering Committee need to have the expertise to do this properly.

2. ASSESS THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

2.1 To what extent is the F&BKP an effective knowledge platform?

The Platform has effectively managed a very complicated agenda, with many different stakeholders, and very many different subsectors, and (sub) objectives. Compared to the period before the Platform started, the chaotic and unconnected food security agencies and projects have become more aligned. Excellent reporting on the Platform's website (and excellent annual reports, and other activity reports) as well as a much appreciated knowledge brokerage function have helped to bring more 'order' in the maze. It can be observed that the Office (and the Steering Committee) needed the first two years to get started, but that from 2016 onwards many initiatives have been taken, in an often very pro-active and alert way, and that the Platform succeeded to become relevant in a strategic way as well (although not all civil servants active in the food security team would agree). The knowledge portal and the Knowledge Management Facility (and still less so the GCP and ARF projects) have become important and appreciated tools, although both could be more effective within the Ministries, if civil servants/diplomats would be supposed to develop a dedicated knowledge agenda for 'their' programmes and projects.

We would like to stress that the effectiveness of the Platform so far has been a result of a consortium of partners, where each partner brought (and brings) specific strengths: WCDI its knowledge, prestige and convening power in the food sector, AgriProFocus its local networks, and The Broker its expertise as a knowledge broker, and facilitator of online and offline multi-stakeholder dialogues. Office team members and consortium partners (together with the steering committee and its multi-stakeholder network) clearly strengthened each other: the result has been much stronger than it would have been if just one of the consortium members would have done the job.

The effectiveness can (and should) further be enhanced in five directions: (1) more alignment with the Dutch food security initiatives/projects (for which both a shift in attitude is needed within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and at the Embassies, as well as more direct contact and support from the Platform with them) (2) more involvement of the major business players in the food and agriculture sector in the Netherlands, (3) better and more effective connections with the two relevant top sectors [Agro&Food, and Horticulture and Starting Materials] and their sector associations, (4) better connections with major European and global players like the European Union, FAO, IFAD, WFP, the African Development Bank, and also SNV, IDH and FMO, and (5)

alignment with the relevant think tanks in the South. During the last five years a lot has been done, but for the next phase 'upscaling' is important for global recognition. Depending on extra means to expand the Platform's network linkages, this expansion can all be attempted during the next five-year phase, or it can be done in two phases (see section 3).

2.2 To what extent is the F&BKP an efficient knowledge platform?

It is amazing how much has been done by a relatively small group of people in the Office of the F&BKP, and with relatively limited funding for KMF and Office activities. In that sense the 'efficiency' (value for money) is clearly high. Much more money has been spent on the GCP and ARF projects, and it is too early to assess the value for money of these projects, and of NWO-WOTRO's handling of those projects. For us it is obvious that at one point efficiency gains can be made: it is not very efficient to spend precious time on two research websites (one by the Platform and one by NWO-WOTRO, for both the GCP and the ARF projects). It also became clear that it has created reporting imperfections. We recommend that the Platform website is leading, and that WOTRO staff becomes part of the team that 'feeds' this website .

2.3 What lessons learned and recommendations from previous evaluations are taken into account by the F&BKP?

The Platform and its activities (and certainly including the research programmes) are heavily monitored and very often assessed. For the research programmes a very dedicated external evaluator (a German firm called Syspons) uses a very detailed approach and very detailed reporting (also WOTRO's own reporting about each and every project takes a lot of time and energy, also for the project leaders, who sometimes complain about the many (unpaid) services they have to provide in terms of reporting requirements).

As we have seen in chapter 7 next to Syspons, there have also been assessments of the knowledge platforms as a whole ('the gold standard report') , and of separate activities of the F&BKP, like a stakeholder perceptions and future outlook assignment, and a survey about the Knowledge Portal. The Office and the Steering Committee take these assessments very serious, and continuously seem to reflect about their implications. They also co-organise major discussions about relevant 'big' evaluations about the sector, like a discussion about the IOB report "Food for Thought" in 2018.

3. FUTURE OUTLOOK

The ultimate aim of the F&BKP is to contribute to the strategic goals of DGIS for food and nutrition security: eradicating hunger, promoting agricultural growth and creating sustainable food systems. In the theory of change of the F&BKP the 'sphere of influence' that should provide the eventual outcomes towards these goals are: knowledge and innovation, co-creation and use. Given the scope and width of the DGIS strategic goals, we observe a gap on how, eventually, the achievements in the three F&BKP pillars contribute to the results at impact level; and how scaling and leverage can be achieved. For the future phase, and in order to further enhance the impact of the platform, we further suggest to make clearer how the platform makes these contributions; and how, within the strategic goals, choices are made on priorities and (sub-)thematic areas. As such, the Ministry could also prescribe more what and where to focus on (and what not); e.g. through a research, knowledge and innovation agenda.

It is obvious that a major challenge is to connect more directly and more effectively with the many Dutch-funded food security projects, particularly the ones managed by the Netherlands Embassies. And at least part of the funding available for the next phase should focus on knowledge management and research for and with these Dutch-funded food security projects. But it is also obvious that the relevant civil servants (in the three related Ministries, and at the Embassies) need to be stimulated to develop a much more knowledge-oriented attitude, and to develop adequate knowledge questions (together with the relevant stakeholders). Food

security knowledge brokerage should be done both at a generic level (the three major goals of the Dutch food security policy, and their interconnections), and at a specific level (the many food security programmes and projects). It is recommended that all relevant food security project holders within Netherlands Embassies and in The Hague are expected to maintain a dedicated communication line with the F&BKP Office (and where there is a local AgriProFocus office also with that Office). It is also recommended that this feeds the knowledge agenda, and suggests new (KMF and other) knowledge initiatives within the F&BKP. We also suggest to better organize 'communities of practice' in the 'food security cluster' of the relevant Ministries, and to start a series of 'brown bag lunches' or other regular meetings to discuss F&BKP activities and outcomes, related to the three major policy goals of the food security policy..

The effectiveness of the Knowledge Platform as a tool for knowledge generation and dissemination for all relevant Dutch agencies and their connections abroad can be enhanced if the major players (Wageningen, AgriProFocus, the Embassies, the major Dutch-supported projects, the food security experts at the Ministry of Foreign affairs and at the Ministry of Agriculture, the two Topsectors and sector associations like Plantum and Groente & Fruit Huis, NWO-WOTRO (and NWO in general), KIT, SNV, Rabobank, Unilever, Heineken, Friesland Campina, to mention the most important ones) would regard the Platform as 'their thing', and if they would make 'their' knowledge information available via the F&BKP 'as a matter of principle'. However, that would necessitate a strong commitment by the top leaders in those organisations, and it is recommended to enable this process by organizing a top-level meeting between the Ministers of BuZa and LNV⁴⁷, the President of Wageningen UR, the AgriProFocus Director, NWO Board Member, and representatives from the private sector like CEOs from Unilever, Heineken, Rabobank, and NABC, to get a joint commitment for upscaling the Platform to gradually develop into a Netherlands Food Security Partnership for Development, connected to the broader Dutch agenda (and funds) for global food security⁴⁸. During the next phase, and certainly during Phase 3, it should be attempted to get part of the funding for F&BKP activities from other funders than the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (e.g., from Ministry of LNV, Topsectors, Businesses, EU, or the African Development Bank) .

For a Netherlands Food Security Partnership to flourish Wageningen's commitment is crucial, and in order to connect with all business, knowledge and NGO partners, we do not see AgriProFocus as the logical host for this new Partnership. We strongly recommend to continue the existing consortium of Wageningen (through WCDI), AgriProFocus, and The Broker, and find a legal way to connect the various relevant policy instruments (and funds) with this Consortium. But within Wageningen a stronger commitment is needed to make sure that WCDI can indeed function as the obvious broker between the great variety of relevant research groups, and between these groups and the other relevant players in the Netherlands and abroad.

To us it is obvious that the existing lack of clarity about a follow up of GCP-like and ARF-like research programmes undermines the credibility of the Platform as an instrument worth investing in by scientists. A lasting commitment by Dutch and international scientists would be guaranteed with a new round of GCP-like and ARF-like projects, funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and hopefully financially supported by other major stakeholders. And it would help if new instruments (like the SEEDS Call, other Dutch support to CGIAR, the Joint SDG Research Initiative) would be better aligned with the work of the Platform. It would also help if forthcoming major research funding arrangements for food security would enable more linkages between Wageningen and other relevant parties in the Netherlands (other research institutes, but also NGOs, businesses etc.). A flourishing Netherlands Food Security Partnership for Development needs to go beyond 'Wageningen First'. It is recommended to soon start arrangements with the F&BKP consortium, the Steering Committee, and the Office about new rounds of ARF-like programmes. It is also recommended that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs engages in a new round of discussions with NWO (-WOTRO) about the continuation

⁴⁷ BuZa and LNV = the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Agriculture, Nature & Food Quality

⁴⁸ One way to do this is to demand that for every new food security project five per cent of project funds will be added, for a dedicated knowledge agenda, connected to the F&BKP, and to stimulate that all project reports have to report on that knowledge agenda, and the collaboration with the Platform.

of a GCP-like programme, and the Ministry should stimulate (or force) a self-evident link between existing and new research programmes related to food security issues within NWO, and the F&BKP. At the same time it is NWO-(WOTRO)'s duty to continue a strong food security research funding policy, and to acquire funding for that also beyond the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. For us the most crucial element of this research/knowledge strategy is to better understand the trade-offs between the three major food security policy goals, and the ways to stimulate (and upscale) triple-win solutions ('Food Systems Thinking'). This is a connected goal for both NWO and the F&BKP. A dedicated discussion is needed during the next phase about the 'presence abroad'. AgriProFocus currently has a network of local focal points, but that network does not completely match with the most relevant areas for food security attention (also seeing the recent shifts in the regional orientation of the Dutch ODA agenda). Also the local focal points could be further developed as real examples of the 'Dutch diamond abroad', beyond the current dominance of NGO partners, and self-evident knowledge broker connections should develop between the AgriProFocus hubs and the relevant Netherlands Embassies, and their (involvement in) food security programmes. It would be useful to discuss the existing connections in countries without an AgriProFocus focal point, as new 'hubs', and also (for Africa) to see how the business connection could be enhanced by a strategic alliance with the Netherlands African Business Council and/or the Netherlands Business Associations in Ghana and Ethiopia. Many businesses are looking for ways to be more specific about their social responsibility, and to better measure their impact on society, globally and locally. Platforms like the F&BKP did play a role in engaging business in strategic discussions about these issues, and to experiment with ways of effective involvement of businesses in multi-stakeholder dialogues, and research projects. However, much more can and should be done to expand that experience during the next phase.

In this report various suggestions can be found about the further expansion of the F&BKP, e.g. by engaging more with the European Union, and other major players in Europe (we suggest: particularly in Germany), by engaging big companies, by engaging global agencies like FAO, IFAD and WFP, and by engaging major players in Africa (e.g. the African Union, the African Development Bank, AGRA, other think tanks). If that expansion will indeed be formulated as a task for the next phase it is obvious that the capacity of the Office to do so should be expanded as well, and it is also obvious that this approach needs a strong commitment from the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, and from Wageningen, AgriProF, and The Broker. It has been successfully done before (CGIAR and World Bank), but it needs extra and dedicated effort to do it again! Depending on the extra manpower at the Office, the expansion can all be done during the next five years, or a longer-term strategy can be designed, using a phased approach. For us, priorities we would recommend are the better inclusion of Dutch businesses, and the Topsectors, and much better connection with the Dutch-funded project portfolio for food security (see section 2.1). Gradually the European and International connections can be further developed.

Finally, although the Ministry has asked us to do this 'final review', it is not final at all. On top of the planned Syspans evaluations in 2020 and 2021, it is recommended to already plan a dedicated 'deep uptake' ex-post evaluation of the impact of the F&BKP activities during 2013-2018, including its research programmes, and to do so in 2023. That would also enable a strategic discussion in and beyond the various F&BKP activities about the preparations needed to measure those impacts, as an input in the third phase of the Knowledge Platform for Food & Business, from 2024 onwards. This would also be in line with some of the most salient conclusions of the recent IOB evaluation.

Food and Business activities are indeed **examples of a successful' Dutch diamond approach'**, and the Platform stimulated the sector to **strive for gold standards** of effectiveness and efficiency, but for solving food insecurity worldwide **there are no silver bullets**. It needs a continuation of long-term and high-quality involvement by many different stakeholders. And the F&BKP succeeded to show promising examples of what can be done and how it should be done! In the next phase this needs **upscaling, and stronger alignment** with other Dutch government initiatives and with those of the sector as a whole.

ANNEX 1: F&BKP PROJECTS: LIST⁴⁹

KMF projects follow the list in the F&BKP Annual Reports ; GCP and ARF project numbers follow the F&BKP order on their website (NOT the WOTRO project nrs); the list with special activities/products gives all activities reported in annual reports of the F&BKP not covered by KMF, GCP, or ARF projects.

KMF1	Reducing food wastage, improving food security (C) 2014
2	Benin, critical assessment of various bylaws (for land governance) (B) 2014
3	Food security exchange embassies (funding cancelled; activity organised) (B) 2014
4	Workshop East Africa Inclusive Business (A) 2014
5	Agricultural finance for smallholders and producers organizations (A) 2014
6	Consultation Dutch food security policy (B) 2014
7	Soil fertility exploration study (A)
8	Private sector meeting (C)
9	Fruits and vegetables study (A)
10	LANDac land governance floriculture, scoping study East Africa and Ghana (A)
11	LANDac land governance floriculture, capacity development trajectory Ethiopia, Ghana, Uganda (A)
12	Strengthen NL-CGIAR partnership (B)
13	Publication guidelines Inclusive business (A)
14	Nutrition event scaling up Dutch effort for global nutrition (A)
15	Video interviews Inclusive business (A)
16	Articles related to soil fertility and international policies on soil management (A)
17	Do higher quality standards hinder inclusive growth/fevour exclusive growth? (B)
18	Fit-to-purpose development programme (C)
19	Capitalizing on knowledge (C)
20	SEAsia Round Table Vietnam on Inclusive Business (A)
21	FoodFirst conference 'the future of farming and food security in Africa'(A)
22	Integrated approaches on food security (A)
23	Livestock Expo Conference Nairobi (A)
24	Mapping study right to food dilemmas (A)
25	WBG (WorldBank Group) Learning Tour food safety (B)
26	Wicked problem session postharvest losses and food security (A)
27	Work conference internationalization 2.0 (A)
28	Postharvest network , 'drivers of change to reduce postharvest food losses' workshop with Dutch embassies food security experts, and brochure (A)
29	Scoping study – improving the perspective for regional trade and investment in West Africa (B)
30	The role of the private sector in city-region food systems (A)
31	Massive open online course Inclusive business (A)
32	Mission East Africa Potatoes (A)
33	Food wastage: the food connection: fit for purpose solutions for food losses; Ghana (A)
34	Essay: micronutrient management for improving harvests, farmers' incomes, human nutrition, and the environment (A)
35	Regional workshop on knowledge sharing about soil management: fertile grounds initiative (A)
36	E-learning course food and nutrition security (C)
37	Support strategic partnership CGIAR-NL 2016 (B)
38	Landscape seminar (A)
39	Agricultural innovations systems seminar (A)
40	Framework for measuring effects on household nutrition (A)
41	Expert meetings finance for smallholders/inclusive finance (A)
42	Innovation platform – feeding cities (A)

⁴⁹ Information based on the F&BKP website <http://knowledge4food.net>, and <https://www.nwo.nl/en/research-and-results/programmes/food+%26+business+research/gcp+research+projects> as well as <https://www.nwo.nl/en/research-and-results/programmes/food+%26+business+research/ARF+research+projects>

43	Mapping the ecosystem of social entrepreneurs in the food security sector: linking pins in seven Dutch partner countries: food security mapping (408 social enterprises mapped) (A)
44	Geodata for agriculture and water facility (G4AW): mid-term review light (B)
45	Learning platforms on land governance and food security (A: LANDAc)
46	Mapping capabilities of Dutch companies to increase engagement in inclusive agribusiness (A)
47	How will geodata and technological applications influence access to financial services to smallholder farmers (A)
48	Research 'green education' in partnerships (A)
49	Validating indicators results framework food security (A)
50	Agro-based clustering for sustainable upscaling (B)
51	Poultry development in Eastern and Southern Africa (A)
52	WorldBank Group – NI partnership – support activities (B)
53	Workshop Global IAB research and learning agenda on inclusive business (A)
54	Learning lessons from supporting embassy food and nutrition security programmes (B)
55	Agricultural cooperatives and inclusion of rural youth (A)
56	Support strategic partnership CGIAR-NL 2017 (B)
57	Building a landscape knowledge network – Nlandscapes.nl (A)
58	Food security learning journey Nairobi (B)
59	Can food security policy improve 'doing good' in instable countries? (A)
60	Effective and inclusive agricultural extension in an agri-business context (A)
61	Critical capital for SME's in African agri-food (A)
62	FoodFirst conference 2018 (A)
63	Business drivers for climate-smart agriculture (A)
64	Support strategic partnership CGIAR-NL 2018 (A)
65	WorldBankGroup Datathon on food wastage (B)
66	Validating FNS indicators result reporting (?)
GCP1	Inclusive value chain collaboration in Ghana and South Africa
GCP2	Adapting pork production to local conditions in Brazil
GCP3	Helping poor farmers grow money in Sierra Leone
GCP4	Nutritious-system pond farming in Vietnam
GCP5	Zambian traditional fermented foods
GCP6	Follow the Food - Dutch agribusiness and local food security in Africa
GCP7	Women Food Entrepreneurs in Kenya and Burkina Faso - WFE
GCP8	Access to finance: Information transparency system cocoa farmers in Ghana
GCP9	increase livestock production in Africa: Insect products as feed in Kenya
GCP10	Governing aquaculture in coastal landscapes Southeast Asia (SUPERSEAS)
GCP11	Local and International business collaboration for productivity and Quality Improvement in Dairy chains in SE Asia and East Africa (LIQUID)
GCP12	Sustainable integrated fish-vegetable production in Ethiopia (AQUAPONICS)
GCP13	Serious games for sustainable shrimp farming in Viet Nam (ALEGAMS)
GCP14	Intermediaries in inclusive business networks for scaling food security in East & West Africa/Bringing food security to scale in Kenya, Ghana, Nigeria and Mozambique: understanding and supporting the role of intermediaries in inclusive business networks
GCP15	Sustainable aquaculture to support mangrove forest restoration in Indonesia (PASMI)
GCP16	Allotment gardens and food security in urban Africa (Benin)
GCP17	Assessing and supporting Dairy Input & Advisory service Systems (ADIAS) in Ethiopia and Kenya
GCP18	Horticultural food systems in Chile and Uruguay (HortEco)
GCP19	Fish for food security in city regions of India and Ghana (Fish4Food)
GCP20	Scaling-up nutrition-sensitive agricultural initiatives in Vietnam and Lao PDR
GCP21	Cocoa crop improvement, farms and markets in Ghana and Ivory Coast
GCP22	Sustaining food supplies and improving health in Kenya
GCP23	Business models Ethiopian and Kenyan dairy chains
GCP24	Understanding and scaling Organizations for SMALLholder RESilience
GCP25	Upscaling climate smart agriculture via micro finance in Tanzania

GCP26	Inclusive Low-Emission Development (i-LED): East African dairy
GCP27	Scaling climate-smart nutrient management tools in Africa
GCP28	Citizen's Science for climate smart nutritious varieties
GCP29	Promoting climate resilient maize varieties in Uganda
GCP30	Climate-Smart Financial Diaries for Scaling in Kenya
ARF1	Cashew nuts for farmers' income Uganda
ARF2	Building on Fertile Ground in Burundi
ARF3	Improve Indonesia's rice production by biological crop protection
ARF4	Indigenous African vegetable systems for better livelihoods in Kenya
ARF5	More potatoes - Secure food in Burundi
ARF6	Mozambique: land, inclusive business & food security
ARF7	Farmer-led soil innovations to sustain food production in Uganda
ARF 8	Stabilizing sesame productivity in northern Uganda
ARF9	Agro-ecological food resources for healthy infant nutrition in Benin (INFLOR)
ARF10	Water and weather monitoring services for cocoa farmers in Ghana
ARF11	Improved varieties of spider plant for Africa (Benin and Kenya)
ARF12	Affordable protein fortified cereal products developed in Uganda (Afri-Taste)
ARF13	Improving agricultural productivity using organic waste in Ghana (UOWIAP)
ARF14	Solar drying technology for smallholder farmers in Ghana
ARF15	Rodent management for post-harvest loss reduction in Bangladesh
ARF16	Ensuring food security by enhancing rice value-chain Benin
ARF17	Technology innovations towards sustainability in tuna supply chains Indonesia
ARF18	Improving resilience of inland fisher communities in Benin
ARF19	Towards an efficient soybean food chain in Benin (ProSeSS)
ARF20	Salvaging tomato production in Kenya from pests and diseases
ARF21	Greening farms in Indonesia (PROFARM)
ARF22	Agronomic and processing practices for pineapple in Benin (DAPIS)
ARF23	Innovations for Sustainable and Profitable Intensification of smallholder Dairy in Kenya (ISPID)
ARF24	Farmer-led Agroforestry Innovation in Ethiopia: Improving livelihoods and food security by utilising Acacia saligna
ARF25	Enhancing Rice Markets in Uganda through Smart Micronutrient Fertilization (ENRICH)
ARF26	Strengthening agribusiness Ethics, Quality Standards & ICT usage in Uganda's value chains? (AGRI-QUEST)
ARF27	Cassava Applied Research for Food Security in Northern Uganda
ARF28	Introducing non-timber forest products in reforestation schemes & tree-crop farms in Ghana (TREEFARMS)
ARF29	Unravelling the potential of Farmer led Irrigation Development in Mozambique (FIAD)
ARF30	Ground cover app to drive an irrigation scheduling service in the delta region of Bangladesh
ARF31	Enhancing Rice-Greengram productivity in Northern Uganda (ERIGNU)
ARF32	Scaling-Up "Biochar-Urine Nutrient Cycling for Health" in Bangladesh (BUNCH2Scale)
ARF33	Improved Resilience Through Sustainable Production Of Grafted Tomatoes In Uganda (IRESO)
ARF34	Enabling Access to Sustainable Irrigation with EASI-Pay for Barsha pumps in Indonesia
ARF35	Efficient fish feeds to enable emergence of catfish breeding in Benin (ProfishBenin)
ARF36	Valorisation of Moringa leaves to alleviate malnutrition in vulnerable groups in Benin (FortiMoringa)
ARF37	Commercial Seed System for African Indigenous Vegetables in Uganda
ARF38	Rainwater harvesting from roads for indigenous pasture production & improved rural livelihoods in Kenya (ROFIP)
ARF39	Safe and accessible greenhouse production of (fruit) vegetables in Ghana (Fresh Green Ghana)
ARF40	Enhancing safety and quality of milk in Ethiopia
ARF41	Enhancing Kersting's groundnut production-marketability in Benin
ARF42	Economically viable foundation seed model for Mali
ARF43	Promoting dye sorghum cultivation in Benin
ARF44	Bangladesh Mangrove Polders for Shrimp Aquatic Productivity

ARF45	Diffusion of promising plantain varieties in Benin
-------	--

For KMF: A = initiated by one of the Platform partners; B = initiated by either the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Economic Affairs/Agriculture, or NL Embassies; C = initiated by the Platform Coordinating group ('regiegroep') and office

ANNEX 2: REPORTS, CONFERENCES, MEETINGS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES (CO-) ORGANIZED BY THE F&BKP (INCLUDING NWO-WOTRO'S INPUT; AND OTHER THAN THE ONES MENTIONED UNDER KMF; ANNEX 1)

2012	
12-1	Programme Document Applied Research Fund & Global Food Challenges Programme as part of the DGIS Food and Business Knowledge Agenda (NWO-WOTRO, in consultation with DGIS-DDE and the Steering Committee of the Food and Business Knowledge Forum (Nov. 2012)
12-2	Steering Committee F&BKP installed; started online debate on food security on website of The Broker
2013	
13-1	Beoordelingsmemorandum Office Food and Business Knowledge Forum (MinBuZa)
13-2	Contract F&B Knowledge Agenda signed by Minister Ploumen; launch in April 2013 The Hague (MinBuza)
13-3	Consortium of AgriProFocus, Wageningen CDI and The Broker won the tender for the F&BKP 2013-2018
13-4	GCP 1 st Call and ARF 1 st Call – two rounds in 2013 (Steering Committee F&BKP and WOTRO)
13-5	Start of Office, and brainstorm day with new Office team (September 2013)
13-6	2-pager (flyer) about mission, vision, added value of the F&BKP (Office; October 2013)
13-7	Inception Report and proposal for initial knowledge agenda (Office; November 2013)
13-8	Annual Workplan for 2014 (Office)
[13-9]	Network of Excellence Post-Harvest Food Losses: report on reducing post-harvest waste and losses
13-10	Meeting at Ministry of Economic Affairs about reducing food losses (Office and MinEZ)
13-11	Meetings with representatives of Topsectors Agri&Food and Horticulture&Starting Materials (Office and Topsectors)
13-12	Presenting F&BKP at Participants Council of AgriProFocus (Office and APF)
13-13	Lunchmeeting at MinFA (Office and MinFA)
13-14	Meeting with Cluster Food Security of Ministries of FA and EZ (Office and MinFA and MinEZ)
13-15	Vijverberg Session on Family Farming (Food First and KF&BKP; co-funding)
13-16	Meeting with FAO Committee on Food Security and its Chair Gerda Verburg about FAO Save Food Partnership (Office); participation in Save Food Conference (December 2013)
13-17	Meeting website developers Zimmerman & Zimmerman (December 2013; Office)
13-18	Evaluation 1st Call GCP (WOTRO)
2014	
14-1	GCP 2d Call, 3d round ARF 1 st Call, and ARF 2d Call (F&BKP & WOTRO)
14-2	Introductory meeting with Dutch organizations (February 2014; Office; 40 participants, with Report)
14-3	Launch of F&BKP website (Office; March 2014; also link with general website of all five knowledge platforms) and start of twitter account @foodplatform; setting up database
14-4	Food Security Exchange with professionals of Dutch Embassies and experts from Dutch organizations (Food Security Exchange Week; May 2014, including thematic expert sessions at Wageningen UR and company visits; also meetings with IDH, BopInc and MVO)
14-5	Online consultation future Dutch food security policy (Request by two Ministries: May 2014; start: June 2014; Office and The Broker; input by 82 professionals; presentation of results October 2014)
14-6	Annual Report F&BKP 2013 (Office F&BKP)
14-7	Annual Report F&BKP (first half-year report for 2014) (Office F&BKP)
14-8	Learning journey for Dutch Embassies through Ethiopia; Exploring Dutch Food & Nutrition Security programs for better results and more impact (CDI and NL Embassies)
14-9	Start of Knowledge Management Facility (Office and CDI)
14-10	Facilitation and moderation of a write-shop in Entebbe Uganda (Office & WOTRO-PAEPARD/Brussels-RUFORUM/Uganda-AgriProFocus Uganda)
14-11	Sysons Inception Report of the Evaluation of the Food and Business GCP (Nov. 2014) (for MinFA/WOTRO)
[14-12]	Global Food Security, Letter to Parliament by Minister for Dev. Coop & Internat. Trade & State Secretary for Agriculture (November 2014)

14-13	Presence at lunch meetings MinFA; Lectures Wageningen University; Vijverberg sessions (Office)
14-14	Presence at RVO meeting (Office)
14-15	Stand at AgriFoodTop 2014 (Office)
14-16	Monthly tripartite meetings Office + MinFA + WOTRO
14-17	F&BKP Steering Committee Meetings in May, October, and December (with advisory documents produced by Office); smaller meetings in February and May ('petit comité).
14-18	Lunch meeting MinFA about land governance in Benin (Office & LandAc, MinFA, EKN Cotonou, The Hague Institute for Global Justice, GBKN (Grootschalige Basiskaart Nederland).
14-19	Participation in Book Launch 'The Global Land Grab – Beyond the Hype' at MinFA (Office and LandAc)
14-20	Participation in NCDO Round Table event on Sustainable Investment in Food Security (May 2014; Office and NCDO)
14-21	Reflection meeting SC, MinFA, and consortium members about progress so far (July 2014)
14-22	Flyer for private sector meeting (Office)
14-23	Development of knowledge portal (late 2014; to be launched in early 2015; Office)
14-24	Preparing online newsletters; 1 st Newsletter August 2014 (Office)
14-25	Multi-stakeholder debate on sustainable agriculture (September 2014; AgriProFocus)
14-26	Participation at international session on research uptake, UKCDS London (December; Office; co-organized with NWO)
14-27	Participation at 'WOTRO 50 th anniversary' conference (October 2014). Battle of Ideas: team 'Food Security – Reducing Food Waste' won the Prize; follow up with F&BKP
14-28	Participation at 2d Africa Works Conference, Leiden (NABC and African Studies Centre Leiden); input in four workshop sessions.
14-29	Exploratory meeting with the private sector in Baarn (November 2014; 40 companies and other organizations participated)
14-30	Kick-off meeting for all GCP Call-1 projects (December 2014; Office & WOTRO)
14-31	Evaluation 2d Call GCP (WOTRO)
14-32	Annual Plan 2015
14-33	2d Newsletter (Office; October 2014)
14-34	3d Newsletter (Office; December 2014)
2015	
15-1	GCP 3d Call (F&BKP and WOTRO)
15-2	Annual Reports GCP Call 1, year 1 (2014-2015) (WOTRO)
15-3	Annual Reports ARF Call 1, year 1 (2014-2015) (WOTRO)
15-4	Syspops Inception Report Sept 2015 (for MinForAff/WOTRO)
15-5	Annual Report F&BKP 2014 second half year (Office F&BKP)
15-6	Introduction of knowledge portal with 18 topics (March 2015) (Office); discussion with ECDPM about their experiences with a knowledge portal
15-7	Strategic meetings about and with CGIAR, preparing a new partnership (Office; MinFA; MinEZ; CGIAR)
15-8	Strategic meetings about and with the WorldBank, preparing and signing a new partnership (Office; MinFA; MinEZ; WorldBank)
15-9	Preparing the Young Expert Programme's connection with the F&BKP (Office, MinFA)
15-10	Internal reflection meeting about relevance of GCP and ARF for policy and practice (mid 2015; F&BKP and WOTRO)
15-11	Introduction of all GCP and ARF projects on F&BKP website (Office)
15-12	Start of Facebook and LinkedIn accounts (Office)
15-13	Bi-monthly Newsletters (Office): 4 th newsletter (February 2015)
15-14	Exploratory meeting of social entrepreneurs and impact investors (Office & Utrecht University)
(15-15)	Livestock Expo and Conference Nairobi (AgriProFocus; November 2015)
15-16	Youth in Agriculture meeting (Wageningen; December 2015; AgriProFocus + CDI + KIT + Young Professionals for Agricultural Development (YPARD), F&BKP).
(15-17)	Innovations in Trade in Horticulture in East Africa, Meeting in Kigali (November 2015; AgriProFocus + Rwanda National Agricultural Export Board (NAEB) + the Private Sector Federation (PSF)
15-18	Dynamic learning events held in Africa (Uganda, Ghana, Ethiopia), on land governance and food security (October-December, 2015; LANDAc + F&BKP)

15-19	Workshop in Uganda (Entebbe) on knowledge co-creation and research uptake for food security with ARF Call partners (NWO-WOTRO and the F&BKP Office, together with PAEPARD, RUFORUM and AgriProFocus Uganda)
15-20	Launch of a new book, "The MSP Guide: How to Design and Facilitate Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships" (May 2015; CDI)
15-21	Evaluation 3d Call GCP (WOTRO)
15-22	Stakeholder analysis of food security PPPs (Office and PPPLab/FDOV)
15-23	Learning Tour WorldBank experts on Food Safety (Office, BopInc, WorldBank)
15-24	Involvement in Young Expert Programme (Office)
15-25	Food and Stability literature study (Office)
15-26	Input in Food First Conference at Rabobank Utrecht (Office; Socires; Rabobank; 395 participants)
15-27	Annual Plan 2016 (Office)
15-28	5 th Newsletter (Office, April 2015)
15-29	6 th Newsletter (Office, May 2015)
15-30	IOB mid-term review of the five knowledge platforms (IOB, mid 2015, in collaboration with Office)
15-31	One-day kick-off workshop 2d GCP Call (Wotro and F&BKP)
15-32	7 th Newsletter (Office, July 2015)
15-33	8 th Newsletter (Office, September 2015)
15-34	9 th Newsletter (Office, October 2015)
15-35	10 th Newsletter (Office, December 2015)
2016	
16-1	The Broker; social entrepreneurship; explorative meeting with social entrepreneurs and impact investors; literature review
16-2	Stakeholder Perceptions and Future Outlook of the Food & Business Knowledge Platform
16-3	Management Response to the Review Stakeholder perceptions etc (by the F&BKP SC)
16-4	Annual reports ARF Call 1 and 2, year 2 (2015-2016) (WOTRO)
16-5	ARF 3d Call (F&BKP and WOTRO)
16-6	Enhancing research impact for food security: strengthening knowledge co-creation and research uptake; ARF and CRF projects workshop October 2015 Entebbe/Kampala Uganda (WOTRO-PAEPARD; report March 2016; in collaboration with F&BKP Office; NWO-WOTRO, Agriprofocus and RUForum)
16-7	Annual Report F&BKP 2015 (Office F&BKP), plus Executive Summary
16-8	Scoping and final conferences Regional Trade and Food Security in West Africa (Leiden, African Studies Centre + ECDPM + LEI Wageningen + MinBuZa + F&BKP)
16-9	Youth in Agriculture meeting May 2016 (AgriProFocus + CDI + F&BKP)
16-10	Moving Forward on Youth Inclusion in Agricultural Transformation (F&BKP + INCLUDE + AgriProFocus + CDI; Vijverberg session, part of the foodFIRST series, on December 7, 2016 and lunch meeting at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on December 8, 2016)
16-11	Quick Scan Youth inclusiveness in agricultural transformation for Mali, Kenya and Ghana (F&BKP + INCLUDE + AgriProFocus).
16-12	Six expert meetings (Uganda, Tanzania, Kenya, Rwanda, Burundi, Ethiopia) on Finance for Smallholders (AgriProFocus + NpM + F&BKP; January-July 2016)
16-13	ARF-2 projects International workshop and public seminar in Benin (October 2016, F&BKP, NWO-WOTRO, in collaboration with the University of Abomey-Calavi Cotonou and AgriProFocus Benin)
16-14	Netherlands Landscape Learning Journey, (June 2016, CDI and F&BKP); and International seminar Landscape Governance, Spatial Planning and Finance (Jun 2016; CDI +LPFN+F&BKP)
16-15	Workshop Youth in agriculture organized by the thematic directorate "Inclusive Green Growth" from the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs and moderated by Cees van Rij from Agriterra. The workshop was part of a five-day food security exchange visit for Dutch Embassies' policy staff.
16-16	First CDI seminar addressing urban food and nutrition security (December 2016, CDI)
16-17	Agricultural Innovation Systems: reality check, workshop (Sept. 2016; CDI)
16-18	Food and Nutrition Security open market space 2016 (March 2016, CDI+F&BKP+MinForAff+MinEcAff)
16-19	Partnering for Success – How M&E can strengthen partnerships for sustainable development (March 2016; CDI)
16-20	Seminar "The future of our food" (January 2016; CDI)

16-21	Food and Nutrition Security Exchange days 2016 for NL Embassy staff (CDI)
16-22	Company capability assessment track for agribusiness in developing markets (CDI/PPP Lab, BoPInc, F&BKP)
16-23	11 th Newsletter (Office; February 2016)
16-24	12 th Newsletter (Office; April 2016)
16-25	13 th Newsletter (Office; May 2016)
16-26	14 th Newsletter (Office; July 2016)
16-27	15 th Newsletter (Office; September 2016)
16-28	16 th Newsletter (Office; November 2016)
16-29	Participation in sounding board WorldBank-NL Partnership (Office)
16-30	Participation in YEP selection of 14 Dutch and 14 local young experts for 19 organizations in 13 countries (Office)
16-31	Participation in ARCH European Research Agenda setting (Office)
16-32	Food Stability overview paper and follow up meetings (Office)
16-33	Quarterly meetings with the Steering Committee, and some more with the 'petit comité'; monthly 'tripartite' meetings with the MinFA, SC and WOTRO
16-34	Engaging youth in food systems (Office)
16-35	Youth Inclusiveness in agricultural transformation, quick scan study (Office/INCLUDE/AgriProFocus)
2017	
17-1	Annual Report F&BKP 2016 (Office F&BKP)
17-2	GCP 4 th Call (F&BKP, WOTRO and CGIAR)
[17-3]	Food for Thought. Review of the Dutch Food Security Policy 2012-2016 (IOB Evaluation; Ferko Bodnár & Rob Kuijpers, assisted by Antonie de Kemp & Joep Schenk and with fieldwork by Jan Joost Kessler (Aidenvironment) and Philip de Jong (APE) for Bangladesh, Pernille Nagel Sørensen (PSAdvice) and Erwin Bulte (WUR, economics) for Ethiopia, Chris Elbers (AIID) and Bas Warmenhoven (PWC) in Rwanda and Menno Pradhan (AIID) and Bas Warmenhoven (PWC) in Uganda.
17-4	Idem , Evaluatie van het Nederlandse voedselzekerheidsbeleid 2012-2016 (IOB Evaluatie Nieuwsbrief)
[17-5]	The Gold Standard. Exploring the added value of the Dutch knowledge platforms (for MinBuZa, WOTRO and the five knowledge platforms)
17-6	Annual reports GCP, Call 2, year 2 (2016-2017) (WOTRO)
17-7	Annual reports GCP, Call 3, year 1 (2016-2017) (WOTRO)
17-8	Syspons Mid-Term Evaluation Report (Dec 2017) (for MinForAff/WOTRO)
17-9	Response F&BKP Steering Committee to Syspons Report (F&BKP Office)
17-10	Community of Practice on Youth in Agribusiness (September 5, 2017; AgriProFocus + F&BKP)
17-11	Knowledge Portal Survey (F&BKP office)
17-12	December 2017: Blog Conference 'Research 'IN' development: serving several masters' (The Broker and F&BKP)
17-13	Agrofood Broker of the Year Award (F&BKP office)
17-14	International course "Making Agriculture Work for Food and Nutrition Security" (November 2017, CDI)
17-15	NUFFIC Alumni Event in Indonesia (May 2017, CDI)
17-16	NUFFIC Alumni Event Uganda & Rwanda (June 2017, CDI)
17-17	Seminar "Coping with Change" (April 2017, CDI)
17-18	Workshop "Towards a global research and learning agenda for inclusive agribusiness" Brighton, (March 2017; CDI, Seas of Change, Global Donor Platform for Rural Development, Beam Exchange)
17-19	Second CDI seminar addressing urban food and nutrition security (January 2017, CDI)
17-20	Evaluation 4th Call GCP (WOTRO)
17-21	Newsletter 2017-1 (Office; February 2017)
17-22	Newsletter 2017-2 (Office; March 2017)
17-23	Newsletter 2017-3 (Office; May 2017)
17-24	Newsletter 2017-4 (Office; July 2017)
17-25	Newsletter 2017-5 (Office; September 2017)
17-26	Newsletter 2017-6 (Office; November 2017)
17-27	Special Newsletter about GCP-1 (Office and WOTRO; March 2017)

17-28	Special Newsletter Food & Nutrition Security Learning Journey in Kenya (Office and Dutch Embassy staff; July 2017)
17-29	Special Newsletter Conference 'Research & Policy: Two Peas in a Pot (Office and WOTRO; December 2017)
17-30	Food systems CoP organized (Office, with Wageningen Economic Research and PBL)
17-31	Participation in YEP selection of 16 Dutch and 13 local young experts for 24 organizations in 14 countries (Office)
17-32	Quarterly meetings with the Steering Committee, and some more with the 'petit comité'; monthly 'tripartite' meetings with the MinFA, SC and WOTRO
17-33	Input in development of a Call on Seed System Development (Office and CGIAR – WOTRO – MinFA)
17-34	World Map all GCP and ARF projects (Office with WOTRO)
17-35	Involvement in WOTRO Call SURE : Research Uptake (Office and WOTRO)
17-36	Personalised email alerts (Office)
2018	
18-1	AR 2017 (Office F&BKP)
[18-2]	Accenten in het voedselbeleid voor de komende Jaren (Ministerie van Landbouw, Natuur en Voedselkwaliteit; brief aan Voorzitter Tweede Kamer)
18-3	Knowledge Portal Survey Report (January 2018, for F&BKP)
18-4	Inclusive agri-business (IAB) strategies. Knowledge Sharing Meeting in Nairobi, Kenya (February 2018; F&BKP and NWO-WOTRO).
18-5	Third international workshop of the Food & Business Applied Research Fund (ARF) February 13 to 16, 2018, in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. co-creation and research uptake (NWO-WOTRO and the F&BKP, in collaboration with AgriProFocus and IFPRI Ethiopia).
18-6	Increasing investments of the Dutch Agri-food sector in emerging economies. 2nd meeting Innovation Network Feeding Cities (January 2018, F&BKP + MVO NL)
18-7	Seminar "Youth in Markets: Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Agribusiness", April 2018 (CDI)
18-8	International course on landscape governance, April 2018 (CDI)
18-9	Newsletter 2018-1 (Office; February 2018)
18-10	Newsletter 2018-2 (Office; April 2018)
18-11	Newsletter 2018-3 (Office; June 2018)
18-12	Special newsletter ARF-1 (Office and WOTRO; February 2018)
18-13	Co-organization FoodFirst Conference Utrecht (June 2018: "Team Up With African Agripreneurs").
[18-14]	Call seed system development (MinFA-WOTRO-CGIAR)
18-15	Capitalizing on untapped potential: finding jobs for youth in Africa's agricultural transformation (Office/The Broker)
18-16	Co-organization of debate about the outcomes of the IOB evaluation of the Food Security Policy 2012-2016; Wageningen; 31/5/2018 (Office and WCDI)

ANNEX 3: F&BKP PROJECT COUNTRIES

	Africa	Asia	America
KMF2	BE		
KMF4	EAST AFRICA		
KMF5	RW, BU, ET		
KMF10 + 11	GH, ET, UG, OTH E. AFR		
KMF16	ET, UG, BU		
KMF17		BD	
KMF20		VN	
KMF21	AFRICA		
KMF23	KE		
KMF26	KE		
KMF29	WEST AFRICA		
KMF32	EAST AFRICA		
KMF33	GH		
KMF43	KE, ET, SSUD, GH, BE	BD, INDO	
KMF51	EASTERN AND SOUTHERN AFRICA		
KMF55	RW, TA, UG		
KMF58	KE		
KMF61	KE, TA, ZA, MALI		
GCP1	GH, SA		
GCP2			BR
GCP3	SL		
GCP4		VN	
GCP5	ZA		
GCP6	ET, GH, KE		
GCP7	BF, KE		
GCP8	GH		
GCP9	KE		
GCP10		SEA (VN)	
GCP11	KE, TZ	INDO, TH	
GCP12	ET		
GCP13		VN	
GCP14	(Cdl), KE, NG, GH, MOZ		
GCP15		INDO	
GCP16	BE		
GCP17	ET, KE		
GCP18			CH, UR
GCP19	GH	INDI	
GCP20		VN, LA	
GCP21	Cdl, GH		
GCP22	KE		
GCP23	ET, KE		
GCP24	MALAWI, MOZ, TZ, ZA, ZI,		
GCP25	TA		
GCP26	KE		
GCP27	ET, TZ		
GCP28	ET, UG		
GCP29	UG		
GCP30	KE		
ARF1	UG		

ARF2	BU		
ARF3		INDO	
ARF4	KE		
ARF5	BU		
ARF6	MOZ		
ARF7	UG		
ARF 8	UG		
ARF9	BE		
ARF10	GH		
ARF11	BE		
ARF12	UG		
ARF13	GH		
ARF14	GH		
ARF15		BD	
ARF16	BE		
ARF17		INDO	
ARF18	BE		
ARF19	BE		
ARF20	KE		
ARF21		INDO	
ARF22	BE		
ARF23	KE		
ARF24	ET		
ARF25	UG		
ARF26	UG		
ARF27	UG		
ARF28	GH		
ARF29	MOZ		
ARF30		BD	
ARF31	UG		
ARF32		BD	
ARF33	UG		
ARF34		INDO	
ARF35	BE		
ARF36	BE		
ARF37	UG		
ARF38	KE		
ARF39	GH		
ARF40	ET		
ARF41	BE		
ARF42	MALI		
ARF43	BE		
ARF44		BD	
ARF45	BE		

No specific countries: KMF1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28; 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66

ANNEX 4: DUTCH INVOLVEMENT IN F&BKP ACTIVITIES

Agency		FBKP project/activity	Who in charge	where		
F&BKP	Office, The Hague	Director	Frans Verberne (also observer at F&BKP SC meetings), and colleagues	-		
		Office Manager	Ine Martens (also observer at F&BKP SC meetings, and taking minutes).	-		
Universities	Faculty/department/group					
Wageningen UR	CDI Wageningen	'Co-owner' and PP (current director: Hedwig Bruggeman) , Other:13-3; 14-8; 15-16, 15-20, 16-9&10, 16-14, 16-16, 16-17, 16-18, 16-19, 16-20, 16-21, 16-22; 17-14, 17-15, 17-16, 17-16, 17-17, 17-18, 17-19; 18-7, 18-8		..		
		EMPS 2014	Co Verdaas, (then) Director, and Peter Ravensbergen, Business Developer / Knowledge Broker	-		
		KMF4	..	UG, KE		
		KMF13				
		KMF15		
		KMF25 +52		
		KMF31		
		KMF36		
		KMF38+57	Dr Cora van Oosten	..		
		KMF39		
		KMF46		
		KMF49		
		KMF53	Joost Guyt, Anne Rappoldt, Monika Sopov, Jim Woodhill	..		
		KMF54	Herman Brouwer, Dr Ir Jan Brouwers, Bram Peters MSc	..		
		KMF55	J. Jacobs	RW, TA, UG		
		KMF57		
		KMF58	..	KE		
		ARF23	Jan van der Lee	KE		
		Oth 16-6	Pieter Windmeijer	-		
			F&BKP SC and observer in the WOTRO PC	Dr Huub Löffler (since 2017)	-	
		SOCIAL SCIENCES				
		Subdepartment Business, Consumer and Competence Studies				
		Education and Competence Studies	F&BKP SC	Prof. dr Arjen Wals (early years)	-	
		Management Studies Group/Bedrijfseconomie/Bedrijfskunde	GCP10	Dr Ir Miranda Meuwissen	SEASIA	
			GCP11	Dr Jos Bijman	INDO, TH, KE, TZ	
			GCP18	Prof. dr Jacques Trienekens	CH, UR	
			GCP24	Prof. dr Jacques Trienekens, dr Valentina Materia and Dr Domenico Dentoni	Malawi, MOZ,ZI, ZA, TA	
Marketing and Consumer Behavior Group	ARF19	Dr Paul Ingenbleek	BE			
	ARF41	Dr Paul Ingenbleek	BE			
Subdepartment Management Decision Support: no involvement						

Subdepartment Economics			
Agricultural economics and rural policy: no involvement			
Development Economics Group	F&BKP SC and observer at WOTRO PC	Pof. Dr Erwin Bulte (2013-2015)	-
	GCP3	dr. ir. Maarten Voors, and Prof. Erwin Bulte	SL
	GCP8	Prof. B.W. Lensink	GH
	GCP22	Prof. Dr. Erwin Bulte and Dr Janneke Pieters	KE
	GCP29	Dr. Robert Albert Sparrow	UG
	[Oth 17-3]	Prof. dr Erwin Bulte (for IOB Evaluation)	ET
Environmental Economics and Natural Resources Group	ARF44	Dr ir Rolf Groeneveld	BD
Rural and environmental history: no involvement			
Urban Economics: no involvement			
Economic Research (LEI)	Meeting in 2013; PP	..	-
	EMPS 2014	Prof. dr Ruerd Ruben, Programme Manager Food Security	-
	F&BKP SC and observer at WOTRO PC	Prof. dr Ruerd Ruben (2015, until 2017)	-
	GCP25	Prof. dr Ruerd Ruben	TZ
	GCP30	Cor Wattel (Project leader CCAFS)	KE
	ARF44	Prof. dr Ruerd Ruben	BD
	KMF9
	KMF19	Ir Yuca Waarts	-
	KMF 28	..	-
	KMF29	Prof. Ruerd Ruben; dr Marie-Louise Rau	West Africa
	Oth 17-30	..	-
Subdepartment Sociology			
Health and society: no involvement			
Rural Sociology	GCP18	Dr Jessica Duncan	CH, UR
	KMF6	Aniek Hebinck	..
Sociology of development and change: no involvement !			
Sociology of consumption and households: no involvement			
Subdepartment Sustainable Governance			
Environmental Policy	ARF17	Dr Megan Bailey	INDO
Land and Governance: no involvement			
Public Administration and Policy (Bestuurskunde)	KMF1	Dr J. Candel, dr T.Tielens	-
Subdepartment Communication, philosophy and technology			
Knowledge, Technology and Innovation Group	GCP14	Dr. ir. Laurens W.A. Klerkx	KE, (Cdl), NIGERIA, GH, MOZ
	GCP17	Dr. Ir. Laurens Klerkx	ET, KE
	GCP18	Dr. Ir. Laurens Klerkx	CH, UR

	GCP21	Dr. Ir. Sietze Vellema	GH, Cdl
	GCP26	Dr. Ir. Sietze Renze Vellema	KE
	GCP27	Prof. dr. ir. Cees Leeuwis	ET, TZ
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES			
Environmental Sciences	ARF24	Prof. dr Frans Bongers	ET
Environmental Policy Group	GCP10	Dr Simon Bush	S.E.ASIA
Water Resources Management Group	ARF29	Prof. dr Charlotte de Fraiture; dr ir Gert-Jan Veldwisch; dr ir Jaime Hoogesteger van Dijk	MOZ
Marine Ecology	ARF44	Dr Dolfi Debrot	BD
Geo-information Science	GCP13	Prof. dr. ir. Arnold K. Bregt	VN
Environmental research (Alterra)	ARF2	Dr Christy van Beek	BU
	ARF7	Kees Slingerland	UG
	KMF16	..	ET, UG, BU
	KMF34
	KMF35
PLANT SCIENCES			
Plant Sciences Group	GCP21	Prof Dr Ken Giller	GH, Cdl
	ARF5	Anton Haverkort	BU
Laboratory of Entomology	GCP5	Dr Hans (Eilt Johannes) Smit	ZAMBIA
	GCP9	Prof. dr Marcel Dicke	KE
Laboratory of Genetics	GCP5	Dr. ir. Sijmen E. Schoustra	
Biosystemics Group	ARF11	Prof. dr Eric Schranz	BE, KE
Farming Systems Ecology Group	GCP18	Dr. Ir. Walter Rossing and Dr Ir. Felix Bianchi	CH, UR
Plant Production Systems	GCP12	Dr Ir Maja Slingerland	ET
	GCP21	Dr Ir Maja Slingerland	
	GCP27	Prof. dr. ir. Martin van Ittersum (CCAFS partner)	ET, TZ
	WOTRO PC	Dr José Vogelesang, (as representative for the Top Sectors Agro&Food and Horticulture & Starting Materials)	
Plant Sciences, Centre for Crop Systems Analysis	GCP21	Prof. dr Niels Anten	
	ARF22	Prof. dr. Ir. Paul Struik	BE
	ARF25	Dr Xinyou Yin	UG
	ARF45	Prof. dr ir. Paul Christiaan Struik	BE
Plant Research International	ARF3	..	INDO
Plant Research International, Business Unit Bioscience	ARF21	Ingrid van der Meer	INDO
ANIMAL SCIENCES			
Animal Breeding and Genomics Centre	GCP2	dr. ir. John Bastiaansen, taken over by Prof. Johan van Arendonk	BRAZIL
	GCP15	Prof. dr Johan Verreth	INDO
Department of Animal Sciences	GCP4	Prof. dr. Johan A.J. Verreth	VN
	GCP13	Dr Ir Roel Bosma	VN
	ARF44	Dr ir Roel Bosma	BD

	Livestock Research	EMPS 2014	Ir Jan van der Lee, Senior Advisor Sustainable Livestock Systems	-	
		GCP17	Ir Jan van der Lee	ET, KE	
		ARF23	Ir Jan van der Lee (also WCDI)	KE	
	Animal Production Systems Group	GCP11	Dr Simon Oosting	IN DO, TH KE, TZ	
	AGROTECHNOLOGY AND FOOD SCIENCES				
	Division of Human Nutrition	ARF36	Dr Inge Brouwer	BE	
	Food Quality and Design	GCP5	Dr Anita Rachel Linnemann	ZAMBIA	
		GCP11	Dr Pieternel Luning and Simon Oosting	INDO, TH, KE, TZ	
		ARF9	Dr Anita Rachel Linnemann	BE	
		ARF12	Dr Anita Rachel Linnemann	UG, BU, RW,SSUD	
ARF35		Dr Anita Linnemann	BE		
ARF43		Dr Anita Linnemann	BE		
Food and biobased research	PP		
	KMF8	Ir J. Ravensbergen			
	KMF19	Ir Marion de Reuver	..		
	KMF28		
Agrotechnology & Food Sciences Group (AFSG)	KMF34		
RIKILT (Food safety)	ARF40	Dr M.J. Groot	ET		
GENERAL AND UNCLEAR					
Stichting Dienst Landbouwkundig Onderzoek (DLO) – Wageningen UR	ARF3	Dr Ir. Anne Elings (and Dr Andre van der Wurff, Dr Marta Streminska)	INDO		
	ARF15	Dr ir. Bastiaan Gezelle Meerburg	BD		
Wageningen International	Involved in stimulating participation in GCP and ARF Calls, and in strategic position Wageningen in F&BKP (Dr Huub Löffler until 2017). Recently became part of Wageningen Corporate Strategy and Accounts.				
	General (Post Harvest Network)	KMF28	
	Stichting Wageningen Research	ARF39	Dr ir Anne Elings	GH	
	Vague	ARF5	..	BU	
Van Hall Larenstein University of Applied Sciences (VHL)	GCP23	Dr. Robert Baars, Dr Rik Ekweg , Dr Annemarie Westendorp, Marco Verschuur	ET, KE		
Delft University of Technology	Water Resources management	ARF34	Dr Ir Maurits Ertsen	INDO	
		ARF10	Prof. dr ir. Nick van de Giesen	GH	
IHE Delft		ARF29	Prof. dr Charlotte de Fraiture (also Wageningen)	MOZ	
Erasmus University Rotterdam	ISS	GCP-IAC	Prof. dr Bert Helmsing (GCP Call 2 and 3)	-	
	Partnerships Resource Centre PRC/PPP Lab	Meeting in 2013; PP (2x)	Prof. dr Rob van Tulder	..	
		KMF46	
		EMPS 2014	Fieke Maas Geesteranus, Project Officer	-	
Twente Univ	Ujuizi Laboratories	ARF14	Valentijn Venus MSc	GH	

	(spin off)			
	Faculty ITC	ARF30	Dr Raul Zurita-Milla	BD
Vu Amsterdam	Centre for World Food Studies	GCP16	Dr. ir. B.G.J.S. Sonneveld	VN
		GCP30	Prof Dr Remco Oostendorp	KE
		ARF2	Dr Roelf Voortman	BU
		ARF18	Dr ir B. Sonneveld	BE
		GCP-IAC	Dr Lia van Wesenbeeck (GCP Call 2 and 3, Chair)	-
	Athena Institute	GCP20	Prof. dr. Jacqueline Broerse	VN, LAOS
		ARF18	Dr ir Ben Sonneveld (also CWFS)	BE
	Faculty of Economics and Business Administration	ARF26	Dr Christopher Wickert	UG
	Centre for International Cooperation	ARF32	Anna Bon	BD
Unclear	KMF2	M. Lankhorst, M. Lansink	BE	
U. Amsterdam	AISSR/GID	GCP1	Dr Mirjam A.F. Ros-Tonen	GH, SAFR
		ARF IEC	Dr Mirjam Ros-Tonen (ARF Call 2 round 2)	-
		ARF28	Dr Mirjam Ros-Tonen	GH
		GCP7	Dr N.R.M. Pouw	KE, BF
		ARF IEC	Dr Nicky Pouw (ARF Call 2 round 3; and Call 3 round 1 and 2)	-
		GCP19	Prof. Dr. Maarten Bavinck	GH, INDIA
	Faculty of Science	GCP7	Dr Boris Jansen	KE, BF
UvA & VU	AIID	Oth 17-3	Prof. dr Chris Elbers	RW
			Prof. dr Menno Pradhan	UG
U. Utrecht	IDS (The International Development Studies group of the Faculty of Geosciences)	GCP6	Dr Guus van Westen	ET, KE, GH
		ARF6	Prof. dr Annelies Zoomers,	MOZ
		KMF 10 AND 11	(LANDac)..	GH, UG, ET, AND OTHER E.AFR
		ARF IEC	Dr Guus van Westen (Call 3 round 1 and 2)	-
Leiden University	African Studies Centre Leiden	PP		
		KMF29	Prof. T. Dietz, Drs P. Lange, ASCL Library: U. Oberst & E. de Roos	West Africa
Radboud University Nijmegen	School of Management	KMF50
	Idem, Environmental Sciences (Milieukunde)	GCP-IAC	Ms Irene Dankelman (GCP Call 4)	-
	Cultural anthropology and Development Studies	ARF IEC	Dr Joost Beuving (ARF Call 2 round 3)	-
		WOTRO PC	Prof. Dr Marja Spierenburg	-
	CIDIN Advanced Master International Development	Interns at Office F&BKP since 2015	Junior knowledge brokers	-
Maastricht University	NUTRIM School of Nutrition and	GCP-IAC	Prof. dr Wim Saris (GCP Call 2)	-

	Translational Research in Metabolism vakgroep Humane Biologie Faculty of Health, Medicine & Life Sciences			
Hanze University of Applied Sciences Groningen Centre for Development Cooperation	ARF37	Linda de Maat	UG	
Aeres Hogeschool	KMF27	
HAS University of Applied Sciences	KMF48	
	EMPS 2014	Toon Keijsers, Lecturer International Food & Agribusiness - Coordinator International Projects	-	
HAS Den Bosch	F&BKP SC	Ir Frederike Praasterink (until 2017)	-	
	F&BKP SC	Toon Keijsers MSc, MBA (ongoing)	-	
	KMF27	Ir Frederike Praasterink	-	
Nijenrode	KMF31	
Other knowledge centres				
KIT (Sustainable Economic Development)	PP			
	GCP1	Dr Bart De Steenhuijsen Piters	GH, SA	
	GCP7	Dr Fred Zaal	KE, BF	
	GCP28	Dr. Peter Gildemacher, Dr Silvia Sarapura, Froukje Kruijssen	ET, UG	
	ARF42	Dr. Peter Gildemacher	MALI	
	KMF7	(Fertile Ground Initiative)	..	
	KMF12+37+56+64	Dr Coosje Hoogendoorn et al.	..(CGIAR-broad)	
	KMF39	
	KMF40	Nutrition dept	..	
	KMF49	
	KMF55	Rural Youth team, I Flink, C. Vaast	RW, TA, UG	
	KMF60	
	ARF IEC	Ir Albertien van der Veen (ARF Call 2 round 1 + Call 2 round 3 chair + Call 3 round 1, and 2)	-	
(UNESCO-) IHE Delft	GCP-IAC	Prof. dr Charlotte de Fraiture (GCP Call 4, chair, also WUR)	-	
Netherlands Agro, Food and Technology Centre - NAFTC	GCP7	Jan Hak	KE, BF	
Centre for development oriented Research in Agriculture (ICRA), The Netherlands	GCP14	Richard Hawkins	KE, (Cdl), NIGERIA, GH, MOZ	
	KMF39	
Stichting Dienst Landbouwkundig Onderzoek, IMARES The Netherlands	GCP19	Dr Marloes Kraan	GH, INDIA	
ISRIC - World Soil Information	ARF25	dr ir Bas Kempen	UG	
ECDPM Maastricht	PP			
	F&BKP SC	Dr Paul Engel (early years; as Chair)	-	
	KMF29	Ms Jeske van Seters	WEST AFRICA	

	GCP-IAC	Ms Jeske van Seters (GCP Call 3 and Call 4)	-
Knowledge, Perspectives and Innovation	F&BKP SC	Dr Paul Engel (after leaving ECDPM; Chair until 2017)	-
INCLUDE, Knowledge Platform for Inclusive Development	PP	..	
	Oth 16-32	Prof. Marleen Dekker, Dr Karin Nijenhuis	AFRICA
	Oth 16-35	Joint team with F&BKP: Karlijn Muiderman, Yannicke Goris, Babs Ates	MALI, GH, KE
LANDac	PP	Prof. Annelies Zoomers	
	KMF 10 AND 11		GH, ET, UG + OTHER EAST AFRICA
	KMF45		
Knowledge Platform Security and the Rule of Law	Oth 16-32	..	AFRICA
Netherlands Water Partnership	Collaboration in YEP	..	-
DBM Research	Oth 17-5;	Dr Ellen Lammers & Daniëlle de Winter	-
	KMF44b	idem	-
The Hague Institute for Global Justice	KMF 1	Marco Lankhorst	BE
	KMF24	..	-
EP NUFFIC	KMF27	..	-
	Oth 17-15, 17-16	..	-
Netherlands Space Office	KMF 44 and 47
PBL (Plan Bureau voor de Leefomgeving)	Oth 17-30
TNO	EMPS 2014	Maurits Burgering, Business Development Manager Food and Nutrition	-
Business			
Rabobank / Rabobank Foundation (Utrecht)	GCP-IAC	Mr P. Niekus (GCP Call 2)	-
	KMF21	Pierre van Hedel et al	-
	KMF47
	KMF61	Pim Mol	KE, TA, ZA, MALI
	KMF62 and Oth 18-13
	EMPS 2014	Pierre van Hedel	-
Rijk Zwaan (De Lier)	F&BKP SC	Ms Heleen Bos (until 2017)	-
Albert Heijn	EMPS 2014	Mr Leon Mol; Agronomist - Excellent Supplier Manageme	-
EOSTA (Waddinxveen)	F&BKP SC	Michaël Wilde [Sustainability & Communications Manager] since 2017	-
Topigs Norsvin, The Netherlands	GCP2	Hans Olijslagers	BRAZIL
Theobroma International BV	GCP3	Wim Groen	SL
Nutreco Nederland BV	GCP4	Leo den Hartog	VN
	EMPS 2014	Marjan Beerthuis, Patents & Grants Manager	-
CSK Food Enrichment	GCP5	Wilco Meijer	ZAMBIA
CrosswiseWorks	PP		
	KMF33	..	GH

BodemBergsma	GCP7	Huig Bergsma	KE, BF
Zetadec	GCP9	No longer?	KE
Royal FrieslandCampina	GCP11	Atze Schaap	INDO, TH, KE, TZ
	GCP-IAC	Dr Ger Willems (GCP Call 1)	-
	EMPS 2014	Frank Systemans, Corporate Account Manager	-
TGS Business & development initiatives	GCP12	Rutger Toorman	ET
Alema-Koudijs Feeds	GCP17	..	ET, KE
Pelagic Freezer Association, The Netherlands	GCP19	Gerard Van Balsfoort	GH, INDIA
Away4Africa B.V.	ARF1	Willem Jacob Simonse	UG
Koppert BV, The Netherlands	F&BKP SC	Peter Jens [Director Strategic Alliances at Koppert Biological Systems] (since 2017)	-
	ARF3	Nico Stutterheim	INDO
	ARF20	Rick van der Pas	KE
Larive International, The Netherlands	ARF3	Matthias Brienen	INDO
	EMPS 2014	Menno Morenc, Project Manager	-
Erna Zaden Beheer BV	ARF33	Ruud Berkvens	UG
aQysta BV	ARF34	Pratap Thapa	INDO
	ARF35	Pratap Thapa	BE
Dutch Farm Experience/NLF	ARF40	Drs K. van 't Hooft	ET
Solynta – Agventure Exploitatie BV	PP		
	KMF32	..	EAST AFRICA
HCP International, Amsterdam office (?)	KMF44(a)
NABC Netherlands African Business Council	PP	..	
	KMF51	..	E+S AFRICA
	EMPS 2014	Bob van der Bijl, Managing Director Lars Kramer, Programme Manager	Africa
SANEC	EMPS 2014	Mark Agterdenbosch, General Manager	Southern Africa
Xomnia Amsterdam	KMF65
Bridging People and Politics	F&BKP SC	Ms Hilke Jansen (since 2017)	-
APE Public Economics, Amsterdam	Oth 17-3	Prof. dr Philip de Jong (for IOB Evaluation)	BD
PWC (Price Waterhouse Coopers)	Oth 17-3	Bas Warmenhoven MPhil	RW and UG
IS Duurzaam	Oth 16-2	Jolein Baidenmann	-
Droomzaken (Odijk)	Oth 15-14	Gerrit van Veldhuisen, Christiaan Glerum, Martijn Blom	-
De Investeerdensclub (Rotterdam)	Oth 15-14	Charlotte van Slobbe, Keith Wallace et al.	
Unilever (as co-initiator of NWGN)	KMF14	..	-
DADTCO Philafrica (Dordrecht)	KMF18	..	a.o. MOZ
	KMF60	..	
Moyee Coffee (Amsterdam)	KMF60	..	
Geerlofs Koeltechniek (Rijswijk)	KMF18	..	-
Growpact (Gravendeel)	KMF18	..	-
SunBarter	PP
Fedecom	EMPS 2014	Theo Vulink, Branche Manager	-

FMO	EMPS 2014	Anton Timpers, Agribusiness, Food & Water Senior Investment Officer	-
Fresh Food Technology	EMPS 2014	Sander van Schaik, International Project Manager	-
ISO Group	EMPS 2014	Andreas Hofland, Product & Sales Manager - Consortium in Controlled Growing	-
Kuehne & Nagel	EMPS 2014	Natasha Solano, Global Business Development Manager Perishables Logistics	-
Nederlandse Aardappel Organisatie (NAO)	EMPS 2014	Karst Weening, Policy Advisor	-
Q-Point BV	EMPS 2014	Olivia Ansenk, Consultant	-
Viscon Group	EMPS 2014	Robbert-Jan In 't Veld, and Bart den Hertog, Business Development	-
NVKL - Branchevereniging Koudetechniek & Luchtbehandeling	EMPS 2014	Max Neus, Board Member	-
NGO's			
AgriProFocus, The Netherlands	'co-owner' and PP, Oth: 13-3, 13-12, 14-10, 14-25, 15-15, 15-16, 16-17, 15-19, 16-6; 16-9, 16-10, 16-11, 16-12, 16-13.		..
	EMPS 2014	Hedwig Bruggeman, Managing Director	-
	GCP23	Wim Goris	..
	(ARF5)	..	BU
	KMF5	..	RW, BU, ET
	KMF9	..	-
	KMF23	..	KE
	KMF25	(Partnership WorldBank-NL)	-
	KMF27	..	-
	KMF41
	KMF61	Sander Mager (dir)	KE, TA, ZA, MALI
	KMF63
	Oth 16-6	..	-
LTO Nederland	F&BKP SC	Klaas Johan Osinga [International Affairs Team] (since 2017)	-
Oxfam Novib	F&BKP SC	Adrie Papma (ongoing, chair since 2017)	
ETC Foundation	ARF IEC	Bert Lof MSc (ARF Call 2 round 1 and 2; Call 3 round 1, and 2, all: Chair)	
Aidenvironment	Oth 17-3	Jan Joost Kessler (for IOB Evaluation)	BD
Yoba-for-Life Foundation	GCP5	Wilbert Sybesma, Remco Kort	ZAMBIA
Solidaridad, the Netherlands	GCP6	Katie Minderhoud	ET, KE, GH
Fair & Sustainable Advisory Services, The Netherlands	GCP6	Wilfried Schasfoort	ET, KE, GH
	KMF61	Bert van Maanen	KE, TA, ZA, MALI
Aqua-Spark, The Netherlands	GCP10	Amy Novogratz	S.E.ASIA
Agriterra	GCP11	Kees Blokland	INDO, TH, KE, TZ
	KMF60	..	-
	KMF62	Cees van Rij	Africa
AgroFair	EMPS 2014	Hans-Willem van der Waal, Managing	-

		Director	
Fair Food	EMPS 2014	Suzanne van Rooijen, Sustainable Consultancy	-
BoP Innovation Center (BopInc)	Meeting in 2014; PP	..	-
	EMPS 2014	Niek van Dijk, Inclusive Agribusiness Expert	
	F&BKP SC	Myrtille Danse (early years)	-
	GCP14	Myrtille Danse	KE, (Cdl), NIGERIA, GH, MOZ
	KMF9 follow up	..	-
	KMF17	..	BD
	KMF31
	KMF33	..	GH
	KMF46
Both ENDS, The Netherlands	GCP19	Ilge Burghard	GH, INDIA
Medisch Comité Nederland-Vietnam (MCNV)	GCP20	Pamela Wright	VN, LAOS
ZOA , Apeldoorn, The Netherlands	ARF1	Dr. Geoff Andrews	BU
	KMF16	..	ET, UG, BU
Action Aid NL	ARF6	Ruud van de Hurk	MOZ
MDF Training & Consultancy BV,	ARF13	..	GH
	KMF31
	KMF66
Woord en Daad	ARF16	Rina Molenaar	BE
MetaMeta Research	ARF38	Dr Frank van Steenbergen	KE
Seas of Change	Meeting in 2013; PP	..	-
	KMF4	Ir Joost Guijt	..
	KMF13+15
	KMF20	..	VN
	KMF53
NpM, Platform for Inclusive Finance	Meeting in 2014; PP	..	-
	KMF5	..	RW, BU, ET
	KMF41
	KMF47
Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN), Utrecht office/Netherlands Working Group on Nutrition (NWGN)	KMF14
	KMF40
	EMPS 2014	Herbert Smorenburg, Senior Manager	-
Impact Reporters, Utrecht	PP	Joris Tielens & Jeroen Candel	..
	KMF1	idem	..
	KMF15	Idem?	..
	KMF16	..	ET, UG, BU
PureBirds, Noordwijk	KMF18
Socires Food First Network (and their Vijverberg sessions and Food First conferences)	Meeting in 2013; PP	Dr. Wim Kuiper, directeur-bestuurder; Drs. Cor van Beuningen, adviseur; Mr. Jos van Gennip, adviseur; Dr. Hans Groen, project coordinator	..
	KMF21+62	Collaboration with Rabobank	AFRICA

		Foundation (Pierre van Hedel et al.)	
De Connectors/Wicked World – Bee Collective	KMF26
RUAF Foundation	PP		
	KMF30
MVO-Nederland (maatschappelijk verantwoord Ondernemen; CSR NL = responsible business)	Meeting in 2014; PP		
	KMF42
SocietyWorks	PP		
	KMF43	..	Seven countries
SharedValueFoundation	KMF45
ICCO	KMF41
	KMF61	Marinus Verwey (dir.)	KE, TA, ZA, MALI
MasterCard Foundation	KMF10 and 41
Fertile Grounds Initiative	Meeting in 2014; PP	..	
	KMF16	..	ET, UG, BU
	KMF35	..	
Amsterdam Initiative Against Malnutrition (AIM)	Meeting in 2013; PP	..	
	KMF14	..	-
Sustainable Food Lab	KMF4+ 15		
Netherlands Working Group on International Nutrition	Meeting in 2013; PP		
NLandscape	PP		
	KMF38 and 57
Postharvest Network (PhN)	Meeting in 2013; PP (+KMF1)		
	EMPS 2014	Dirk 't Hooft, Project Leader	-
Society for International Development	KMF10
SNV World	Meeting in 2013; KMF9 follow up; KMF12; KMF23	..	.
	EMPS 2014	Eelco Baan, Senior Strategy Officer Agriculture	.
Damn Food Waste (= campaign 2013-2015 by One World/FoodGuerrilla; Voedingsplatform; Wageningen UR; Young Food Movement, DuurZaamDoor & EU Fusions)	Meeting in 2013	..	-
NCDO	Meeting in 2014		
IDH (Initiatief Duurzame Handel)	Participation in Food Exchange Week 2014; meetings 2015 KMF9 follow-up; KMF12		
Borderless Network/Groen Onderwijs	KMF27	Ir Frederike Praasterink et al.	

Beagle	KMF57
YPARD/Young Professionals fo Agricultural Development (NL representative)	KMF55	M. Turolla	RW, TA, UG
	15-16
Ministries/Embassies			
MinBuZa (IGG/ Inclusive Green Growth)	Funder and PP		
	F&BKP SC	Wijnand van IJssel (secretary until 2016)	
	KMF25, Oth 13-1; 14-3; 15-4; 17-8	Wijnand van IJssel (from 2016: WorldBank)	-
	F&BKP SC	Marcel Beukeboom (early years)	
		Jeroen Steeghs (head of Food and Nutrition Security), 2016-2017	-
		Paul van de Logt (2017 onwards)	-
Oth 18-3	Ati van der Honing	-	
MinBuZa (DDE)	Oth 12-1	..	-
	KMF10 AND 11	(Frits v.d. Wal et al.)	GH, ET, UG, OTHER E. AFR
MinBuZa (Africa Department)	WOTRO PC	Mr Robert-Jan Scheer	
MinBuZa (Postharvest Network; PhN)	KMF28	..	
FDOV; Ministry of Foreign Affairs Learning Trajectory/Facility for Sustainable Entrepreneurship and Food Security	Meeting in 2013		
Young Expert Programme	Strategic Partner since 2014		
MinEcZa (Postharvest Network; PhN)	KMF28	..	-
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality/earlier: Ministry of Economic Affairs/RVO	PP		-
	EMPS 2014	Ella Lammers, Senior Advisor Public Global Goods	-
	F&BKP SC	Annette Wijering (early years)	-
		Patricia Wagenmakers / Sjaak Mesu (2016)	-
		Caroline Wooning (ongoing)	-
KMF25	(Partnership WorldBank-NL)		
Topsector Horticulture and Starting Materials	PP	..	-
	EMPS 2014	Rubert Konijn, Coordinator International	-
	KMF9	..	-
	KMF19	..	-
	KMF25	(Partnership WorldBank-NL)	-
Topsector Agri & Food	Some contacts	Ton van Arnhem et al.	-
	EMPS 2014	Willie van den Broek, Programme Manager Research	-
	KMF 18 & 19	..	-
	KMF25	(Partnership WorldBank-NL)	-
Both topsectors	WOTRO PC	Dr José Vogelesang, (representative for the Top Sectors Agri&Food and	

		Horticulture & Starting Materials)	
Netherlands Embassies (particularly in Benin, Kenya, Uganda, Ethiopia and BanglaDesh)	PP; KMF3	..	-
NL Embassies in Ghana, Ethiopia and Uganda	KMF10 and 11	..	GH, ET, UG, OTHER E. AFR
WorldBankGroup-NL Partnership ('Food for All')	KMF25+52 (+65)
IOB	[Oth 17-3]	Ferko Bodnár, Rob Kuijpers, Antonie de Kemp, Joep Schenk (IOB Evaluation 'food for thought' 2017).	General + BD, ET, RW, UG
PUM Netherlands senior experts	EMPS 2014	Thijs van Praag, CEO	-
The Broker	'co-owner' and PP	Frans Bieckmann (until 2017), Saskia Hollander, Vanessa Nigten	
	KMF22	Le Chen, Rojan Bolling, Saskia Hollander	..
	KMF24
	KMF59
	Oth 12-2, 13-3, 14-5, 16-1 17-12 + many others
	Oth 18-3	Babs Ates	
Zimmerman & Zimmerman	Website developer 2013ff		
NWO-WOTRO	PP; Partner for GCP and ARF	Dr Cora Govers (also: observer at F&BKP SC) and colleagues	..
	Sp 12-1	And many follow up documents (Dr Cora Govers and colleagues)	..
Unclear : PPS	KMF34

No Dutch partner: ARF8, ARF27 (Oxfam-Novib -local), ARF31 (SNV-local)

PP = Partner of the Platform (as on <http://knowledge4food.net/our-partners/partners-of-the-platform/>; May 2018)

EMPS 2014 = Exploratory Meeting Private Sector, Baarn, November 27, 2014.

ANNEX 5: OTHER NORTHERN/GLOBAL INVOLVEMENT IN F&BKP ACTIVITIES

Agencies	FBKP project	who	where
Belgium (EU)			
European Commission; Framework Programme	F&BKP was asked to become Member in 2013	FUSIONS project (Food Use for Social Innovation by Optimising Waste Prevention Strategies)	-
EU Research Agenda ARCH	Oth 16-31
Platform for African European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development (PAEPARD)	PP (ARF5) (ARF19) Oth 14-2 Oth 16-6	Gerard den Ouden	BU BE UG UG
Royal Museum for Central Africa, Belgium	WOTRO PC Chair	Dr Guido Gryseels	-
Germany			
Syspons	Oth 14-3, 15-4 and 17-8	Lennart Raetzell (Manager)	-
Dresden University of Technology Faculty of Environmental Sciences Institute of Soil Science and Site Ecology	GCP7	Prof. Dr Karsten Kalbitz	KE, BF
GIZ	Meeting in 2013
	GCP10	Mark Prein	S.E.ASIA
Global Donor Platform for Rural Development (Bonn, at GIZ offices)	KMF20	Dr Reinhild Ernst	VN (ASEAN)
	KMF53	Clare Bishop, Romy Sato	..
Global Development Institute Bonn	KMF53	Dan Zook, Matt Shakhovskoy	..
UNIQUE forestry and land use GmbH, Germany (CCAFS partner)	GCP23	M.Sc. Suzanne Marjolein van Dijk, dr. Charles Odhong, Dr. Andrew Wilkes	KE, ET
Institute of Public Health, Heidelberg University, Germany	ARF32	Dr Sabine Gabrysch	BD
Switzerland			
Stark Consulting, Switzerland	GCP10	Michele Stark	S.E.ASIA
Ithaka Institute for Carbon Strategies, Switzerland	ARF32	Hans-Peter Schmidt	BD
Lindt Cocoa Foundation	GCP1	..	GH
SUN Movement, Scaling Up Nutrition, Geneva	Meeting in 2014	Gerda Verburg (former State Secretary for Agriculture)	..
France			
CGIAR System Office	Strategic Partner since 2014	2017-2022 NL Support for CGIAR Research Programmes on Nutrition (A4NH); Climate-smart Agriculture (CCAFS/ Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security and WLE/Water, Land and Ecosystems), markets (PIM/Policies, Institutions and Markets), and Starting Materials/Seeds. The CCAFS collaboration resulted in a joint GCP Call in 2017 (together with WOTRO). WOTRO received funding for a separate research programme on Seeds (with involvement of F&BKP in 2017, and a Call [not part of the	

		F&BKP] in 2018).	
	GCP-IAC	Dr Alain Vidal (GCP Call 4)	-
Italy			
FAO Committee on Food Security and Save Food Partnership	Meetings in 2013	Gerda Verburg	-
Expo Milan	KMF5	Presentation at Expo	RW, BU, ET
	KMF24	Idem	-
UK			
Mondelez International, United Kingdom	GCP21	Dr Nicholas Cryer	GH, Cdl
Natural Resources Institute – University of Greenwich, United Kingdom	ARF15	Dr Steven Belmain	BD
Oxfam UK	GCP-IAC	Mr Erinch Sahan (GCP Call 2)	-
University of Sussex IDS	GCP-IAC	Ms Jodie Thorpe (GCP Call 2)	-
		Dr Lars Otto Naess (GCP Call 4)	
CDS (Centre for Development Studies) Cambridge	Meeting research uptake 2014	..	
Oxford University, Environmental Change Institute	GCP-IAC	Dr John Ingram (GCP Call 3)	-
BEAM (Building Effective & Accessible Markets; Brighton), supported by UKAID and SDC Switzerland; part of Donor Community for Enterprise Development	KMF53	Mike Albu	..
Denmark			
PS Advize	[Oth17-3]	Dr Pernille Nagel Sørensen (for IOB Evaluation)	ET
APS Consulting Services	Oth 16-2	Alex Percy-Smith	-
Canada			
York Centre for Asian Research (YCAR), York University, Canada	GCP10	Dr Peter Vandergeest	S.E.ASI A
University of Waterloo	GCP-IAC	Prof. dr Bruce Frayne (GCP Call 3)	-
USA			
World Bank	Strategic Partner since 2014	(Wijnand van IJssel)	-
Cornell University	GCP-IAC	Dr Edward Mabaya (GCP Call 2)	-
Sustainable Fisheries Partnership, Hawaii, USA	GCP10	Anton Immink	S.E.ASI A
East Carolina University, USA	GCP19	Dr Holly Hapke	GH, INDIA
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), USA	GCP22	Vivian Hoffmann	KE
Michigan State University (MSU), United States of America	GCP23	Dr Christopher Peterson	KE, ET
African Orphan Crops Consortium, USA and African Plant Breeding Academy, USA	ARF11	Dr Allen van Deynze	BE, KE
Virtual Fertilizer Research Center of the International Fertilizer Development Center	ARF25	Dr Prem Bindraban	UG
	KMF34	idem	-
Australia			
Food Security and Climate Change Team World Vision, Australia	ARF24	Tony Rinaudo	ET

Food Systems Initiative	KMF20	..	VN (ASEAN)
Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	KMF20	..	VN (ASEAN)

**ANNEX 6: SOUTHERN AGENCIES INVOLVED IN F&BKP ACTIVITIES; AND
LINKAGES WITH NL EMBASSIES (AND MASP FOOD SECURITY) AND WITH
AGRIPROFOCUS OFFICES**

Country	Project	University /Research	Business	NGO	Government/CGIAR
NORTH AFRICA					
	NL Embassies in Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya and Egypt, but so far without a status as partner or focus countries for the Dutch Aid and Trade Agenda. This will change now. So far: no AgriProFocus presence and also so far no projects or activities related to the F&BKP. From 2018 onwards part of the focus regions of the new NL aid and trade policy.				
WEST AFRICA					
Burkina Faso	No NL Embassy, No MASP Food Security, No Agriprofocus office; NL Consulate in Ouagadougou				
	GCP7	University of Ouaga II: Boubié Toussaint Bassole			Institut de Recherche en Sciences de la Santé Burkina Faso: Hermann Lanou
Mali	Partner country for Dutch development cooperation between 2012 and 2018. NL Embassy with MASP Food Security; also Agriprofocus office & network. From 2018 onwards part of the focus regions of the new NL aid and trade policy.				
	ARF42	Polytechnique Rural Institute of Training and Applied Research (IPR/IFRA): <i>Dr Ousmane Niangaly</i>		<i>Dr Sokona Dagnoko</i> Sasakawa Global (2000) Mali Bamako	
Nigeria	NL Embassy without an MASP Food Security; No Agriprofocus office & network; Between 2012 and 2018 NOT a partner or focus country for the Dutch aid and trade agenda; from 2018 onwards part of the focus region West Africa/Sahel of the new Aid and Trade Agenda.				
	No F&BKP partners/activities so far				
Niger	No NL Embassy (but there is a consulate); AgriProFocus office & network; Between 2012 and 2018 NOT a partner or focus country for the Dutch aid and trade agenda; from 2018 onwards part of the focus region West Africa/Sahel of the new Aid and Trade Agenda.				
	No F&BKP partners/activities so far				
Benin	Partner country for Dutch development assistance, with a 'transitional status' between 2012 and 2018; NL Embassy with MASP Food Security; also AgriProFocus office & network; from 2018 onwards in the margin of the focus region West Africa/Sahel of the new Aid and Trade Agenda.				
	PP	Faculty of Agricultural Sciences of the University of Abomey-Calavi			
	GCP16	Faculty of Agricultural Sciences of the University of Abomey-Calavi Benin: <i>dr ir K.N. Augustin Aoudji</i>		Centre d'Actions pour l'Environnement et le Développement Durable - ACED Benin: <i>Sourou Fréjus Thoto</i>	
	ARF9	Faculté des Sciences		<i>Ms Sébastienne Adjadogbedji-</i>	ABSSA – Agence Béninoise de Sécurité

		Agronomiques, Université d'Abomey-Calavi Benin: Dr Joseph Hounhouigan		<u>Avouzoukan</u> , GPO – Groupe Pépité d'Or (Consortium Infant Food)	Sanitaire des Aliments Benin: Mamam Toleba Seidou
	ARF11	Faculty of Agronomic Sciences, University of Abomey-Calavi: Dr Enoch Achigan-dako and X. Matro		<u>Edgar M. Dequenon</u> Hortitechs Développement Cotonou	
	ARF16	LARDES - Laboratory of Research and Development in Social Economy / Faculty of Agronomy, University of Parakou: <i>Jacob Yabi</i>		<u>Mr. Jean Kpetere</u> DEDRAS - Développement durable, le Renforcement et l'Auto-promotion des Structures communautaires Parakou	INRAB – Institut National des Recherches Agricoles du Benin Benin: <i>Cyriaque Akakpo</i>
	ARF18	Laboratory of Hydrobiology and Aquaculture of the University of Abomey-Calavi: <i>Adédjobi Laleye</i>		<u>MSc. Frejus Thoto and Donald Houessou</u> , Actions pour l'Environnement et le Développement Durable (ACED) Abomey-Calavi	
	ARF19	UAC/LSA - University of Abomey-Calavi / Laboratory of Food Sciences: <i>Djidjoho Joseph Hounhouigan</i>		<u>Mr Patrice Lagnon Sewade</u> Association for the Development of Soybean Cotonou + REDAD - Sustainable Agriculture Development Network: <i>Frédéric Ahouedehou</i>	IITA - International Institute of Tropical Agriculture Benin: <i>Manuele Tamo</i>
	ARF22	University of Abomey-Calavi, Faculty of Agronomic Sciences: <i>Djidjoho Joseph Hounhouigan</i>	<u>Ms Mahoutondji Félicité Djivoh</u> Group Magnificat, "Allotcheou" Fruit beverage company Cotonou	Table Filière Ananas (TFA), Pineapple Stakeholders Platform, Benin: <i>Athanase Akpoe Adanguédé</i>	
	ARF35	University of Abomey-Calavi, Faculty of Agronomic Sciences / School		<u>Ibrahim Imorou Toko</u> AquaDeD-NGO, Cotonou + Benin Federation	

		of Nutrition and Food Sciences and Technology (FSA/ ENSTA): <i>Prof. dr Polycarpe Kayode</i>		of Fish Farmers (FENAPIB; Federation Nationale des Pisciculteurs du Benin): <i>Kouderin Martial</i>	
	ARF36	University of Abomey-Calavi, Faculty of Agronomic Sciences / School of Nutrition and Food Sciences and Technology (FSA/ ENSTA): <i>Prof. dr Polycarpe Kayode</i>		<i>Ir Pascal Djohossou</i> , The Hunger Project-Benin Cotonou	
	ARF41	University of Abomey-Calavi/Faculty of Agronomical Sciences, Laboratory of Applied Ecology (UAC/FSALEA): <i>Assogbadjo Achille</i>	Benin Agribusiness Incubation Hub (BAIH-Sarl), Benin: <i>Bassou Diane Gisele</i>	<i>Sègbégnon Martin Aqboton</i> SOJAGNON-NGO, Cotonou	Benin-Bioversity International (CGIAR): <i>Vodouhe Raymond</i>
	ARF43	Faculty of Agronomic Sciences / School of Nutrition and Food Sciences and Technology (FSA/ ENSTA): <i>prof. dr ir Polycarpe Kayode</i>	<i>Ms. Florentine Djequi</i> Leman Sarl Abomey-Calavi		CARDER/Atacora-Donga Benin: <i>Mr Alphonse N'dah</i>
	ARF45	Faculty of Agronomic Sciences/ University of Abomey-Calavi, Benin: <i>Ms Bonaventura Cohovi Ahohuendo</i>		<i>Ms Berthe Eleonore Nanoukon</i> Cité des Bananes , Cotonou + GERME (Groupe d'appui, d'Encadrement et de Recherche en Milieu rural): <i>Jean-Baptiste Adimou</i>	
	KMF43		Food entrepreneurs mapped		
Ghana	Partner country for Dutch development assistance, with a 'transitional status' between 2012 and 2018; NL Embassy with MASP Food Security; but no AgriProFocus office & network; from 2018 onwards in the margin of the focus region West Africa/Sahel of the new Aid and Trade Agenda.				
	GCP1	University of Energy and	Ghana Agricultural		

		Natural Resources (UENR): Dr Daniel Obeng-Ofori	Associations Business & Information Centre (GAABIC): William Akonnor Kotey		
	GCP3				Netherlands Embassy
	GCP6			Solidaridad West Africa: Aliyu Abdulahi	
	GCP8	University of Ghana - Agricultural Extension: Dr George Kwadzo		People4Earth Foundation Ghana (and AgriPlace): Nico Broersen	Cocoa Research Institute of Ghana (CRIG): Mercy Asamoah
	GCP19	University of Ghana: Dr Edward Ebo Onumah + Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology Kumasi: Dr Benjamin Betey Campion			
	GCP21				International Institute for Tropical Agriculture (IITA), Ghana: Richard Asare
	ARF10	KNUST - Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology: Frank Annor	<u>Alloysius Attah</u> Farmerline Kumasi		
	ARF13	Institute for Environment and Sanitation Studies University of Ghana: Dr Dzidzo Yirenya-Tawiah		<u>Richard Yeboah</u> , MDF Training and Consultancy, East Legon, Accra	Ga West Municipal Assembly Ghana: Sam Atukwei Quaye + Ministry of Food and Agriculture Ghana: Michael Dadebo
	ARF14	Department of Horticulture of Kwame Nkrumah University of Science & Technology (KNUST), Department of Horticulture: Dr Patrick Kumah	<u>Kwasi Etu-Bonde</u> Sustenance Agro Ventures Kintampo Brong Ahafo Region + Eucharia Farms Ltd: Daniel Asare-Kyei		

	ARF28	UENR - Department of Forest Science, University of Energy and Natural Resources, Ghana: <i>Dr Mercy Derkyi</i>		RUDEYA - Rural Development Youth Association, Ghana: <i>Harris Andoh</i>	<i>Ms Valerie Fumey Nassah</i> Resource Management Support Centre, Forestry Commission Kumasi
	ARF39		<i>Ms Sonia Folikumah</i> Safi Sana Ghana Limited, Accra + Agri-Impact Limited Ghana: <i>Dan Acquaye</i> + Premium Vegetables Co. Ltd Ghana <i>Kofi Anku</i> + Urban Jungle Agro Ind. Ltd. Ghana: <i>Isaac Henaku Bishop</i>		
	KMF10 AND 11				
	KMF33		4 Companies		
	KMF43		Food entrepreneurs mapped		
C'd'Ivoire	No partner or focus status in the Dutch Aid and Trade agenda between 2012 and 2018; NL Embassy; No MASP Food Security; No AgriProFocus office & network; from 2018 onwards in the margin of the focus region West Africa/Sahel of the new Aid and Trade Agenda. But important because of the site of the African Development Bank.				
	GCP21				Centre National de Recherche Agronomique (CNRA): Dr Alexis Assiri
Sierra Leone	No partner or focus status in the Dutch Aid and Trade agenda between 2012 and 2018; No NL Embassy; No AgriProfocus Office; from 2018 onwards in the margin of the focus region West Africa/Sahel of the new Aid and Trade Agenda.				
	GCP3	Njala University Sierra Leone (Prof. Paul Richards)	Agroproduce Management Services Ltd. (AMS) SL (Pim van den Langenberg)		
NORTHEAST AND EAST AFRICA					
Ethiopia	Partner country for Dutch development assistance, with a 'transitional status' between 2012 and 2018; NL Embassy with MASP Food Security; also AgriProFocus office & network; From 2018 onwards part of the focus region Horn of Africa of the new Aid and Trade agenda.				
	GCP6	St Mary's University College - Soil			

		Science: Dr Tilaye Kassahun			
GCP12	Addis Ababa University Ethiopia: Dr Abebe Getahun			Great Commission Ministry (GCM), Ethiopia (NGO): Tadesse Kibru	
GCP17	Addis Ababa University College of Veterinary Medicine & Agriculture Department of Animal Production: Dr Ashenafi Mengistu				
GCP27					Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research- EIAR Ethiopia: Gebreyes Gurm Debele
GCP23	Jimma University (JU): Dr Taye Tolemariam, Dr Jemal Yousuf , Eyerus Muleta			AgriProFocus Ethiopia: Ayalew Abebe	
GCP28	Mekelle University Ethiopia : Dr Dejene Kassahun Mengistu				Bioversity International Ethiopia (CCAFS partner): Dr. Carlo Fadda and Dr Gloria Otieno
ARF24	Mekelle University (MU) College of Dryland Agriculture and Natural Resources – Dept of Land resources Management and Environmental Protection: <i>Hizikias Emiru Birhane</i>			<i>Mr. Asfaw Mariame Beshah</i> ; succeeded by <i>Mr Kebede Reqassa Beyene</i> , succeeded by <i>Mr Kibret Mamo Bahiru</i> World Vision Ethiopia (CC&EP manager), Addis Ababa	TARI - Tigray Agricultural Research Institute, Ethiopia: <i>Abadi Girmay Reda</i>
ARF40				<i>Dr Getachew Gebru</i> and <i>Dr Daniel Temesgen</i> , ESAP – Ethiopian Society of Animal Production, Addis Ababa	Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries (MoLF), Ethiopia: <i>Gifawessen Tessema</i> (director special support regions)
KMF5				AgriProFocus Ethiopia	
KMF 10 AND 11					

	KMF16				
	KMF43		Food entrepreneurs mapped		
	GCP-IAC			AGRA-Ethiopia: Dr Steven Were Omamo (GCP Call 1)	
Sudan	Between 2012 and 2018 not a partner or focus country of the Dutch aid and trade agenda. NL Embassy, but without an MASP Food Security; No AgriProFocus office & network; from 2018 onwards part of the focus region Horn of Africa of the new Aid and Trade agenda.				
	No F&BKP activities so far				
South Sudan	Partner country of Dutch development cooperation between 2012 and 2018, but not an active relationship because of the civil war; NL Embassy, with MASP Food Security; No AgriProFocus office & network; ; from 2018 onwards part of the focus region Horn of Africa of the new Aid and Trade agenda.				
	No F&BKP activities so far except KMF 43: Food entrepreneurs mapped				
Kenya	Partner country of Dutch development cooperation between 2012 and 2018 with a transitional status; NL Embassy with MASP Food Security; also AgriProFocus office & network; from 2018 onwards part of the focus region Horn of Africa of the new Aid and Trade agenda.				
	GCP6			Solidaridad East and Central Africa Expertise Center: David Ojwang Juma + Centre for Africa Bio-Entrepreneurship (CABE): Dr Hannington Odame	
	GCP7			Victoria Institute for Research on Environment and Development – VIRED: Dr Jash Barack Okeyo-Owuor	
	GCP9	ICIPE Kenya: Saliou Niassy	SANERGY-Kenya: Nicholas Kibet Korir	Solidaridad East & Central Africa Expertise Centre/SECAEC: David Ojwang Juma	KALRO/ Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization: Robert Irungu
	GCP11	Egerton University: Prof. dr Patience Mshenga			
	GCP14	Association of African Business Schools (AABS) Kenya: Dinah Hanson			International Fertilizer Development Centre East and West Africa (IFDC), Kenya and Ghana: Dr Arno Maatman
	GCP17	Egerton University, Department of Animal Sciences: Prof. dr Bockline	newKCC	African Centre for Technology Studies – ACTS, Kenya: Ann Kingiri	

	Bebe			
GCP22		Eastern Africa Grain Council (EAGC) Kenya: Gerald Masila		International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) Kenya: Dr Charity Mutegi and Dr Ranajit Bandyopadhyay
GCP23	United States International University – Africa (USIU): Prof. dr Francis Wambalaba, Karen Musikoyo		AgriProFocus Kenya : Maureen Munjua	
GCP25				CIAT Kenya (CAAFS partner) Dr Evan Girvetz
GCP26			African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS) : Joanes Atela	Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR): George Schoneveld + Ministry of Agriculture Kenya, Livestock and Fisheries (State Department of Livestock: Robin Mbae + International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI): Kenya (CAAFS partner) Dr Polly Ericksen and Todd Crane
GCP27				International Maize & Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT) Kenya: Dr Jens Andersson, Dr Peter Q. Craufurd
GCP30	School of Economics, University of Nairobi: <i>Dr John Gathiaka</i>		Vi Agroforestry Eastern Africa Kenya: <i>Arne Andersson</i>	International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) Kenya (CAAFS partner) <i>Dr. Maren Radeny</i>
ARF4	University of Eldoret Kenya: <i>Dr Anderson Kipkoech</i>	<u>Margaret J. Komen</u> Mace Foods Eldoret		
ARF11		African Orphan Crops Consortium, Kenya		KENRIK, Centre for Biodiversity, National Museums of Kenya: <i>Patrick Maundu</i>
ARF20	Kenyatta University: <i>George Muhia</i>	<u>Geoffrey Onqoya Wafula</u> Koppert		

		<i>Kariuki</i>	Biological Systems (K) Ltd. Nairobi		
	ARF23	Egerton University: <i>Prof. dr Bockline Omedo Bebe</i>		<i>Mr Godfrey O. Nyang'ori</i> Mt. Clara Mtakatifu Mwangaza Nakuru	
	ARF38	South Eastern Kenya University (SEKU): <i>Prof. Nashon Musimba</i>		<i>Dr Kevin Zowe Mqanqa</i> Rise Against Poverty Worldwide-Kenya, Mombasa	
	KMF4		Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund, Nairobi		
	KMF23		Kenya Commercial Bank; Kenya Markets Trust; Land O'Lakes;	AgriProFocus Kenya; SNV Kenya	Kenya Livestock Marketing Council; Extensive Livestock Expo
	KMF26		NaiLab; innovation lab for social businesses + Art of Hosting		
	KMF43		Food entrepreneurs mapped		
	GCP-IAC				International Plant Nutrition Institute Nairobi-office, Dr Shamie Zingore (GCP Call 3 and 4)
	GCP-IAC				International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) Nairobi, Dr Isabelle Baltenweck (GCP Call 4)
Uganda	Partner country of Dutch development cooperation between 2012 and 2018 with a transitional status; NL Embassy with MASP Food Security; also AgriProFocus office & network; also involvement in MASP Food Security for the Great Lakes Region. from 2018 onwards part of the focus region Great Lakes of the new Aid and Trade agenda.				
	PP	RUForum			
	GCP28	Egerton University Kenya		Participatory Ecological Land Use Management (PELUM) Uganda : Josephine Akia	National Agricultural Research organization, Plant Genetic Resources Centre Uganda : John Wasswa Mulumba
	GCP29	Makerere University Uganda : Dr Fredrick Bagamba	Wageningen UR Uganda Ltd: Astrid Mastenbroek		

ARF1			<u>Hellen Ketty Acham Elungat</u> North East Chilli Producers Association, Lira, Uganda + Agency for Sustainable Rural Transformation (AFSRT) Uganda: <i>Patrick Ogwang</i>	NABUIN Zonal Agricultural Research Development Institute Uganda/National Forestry Resource Research Institute (Uganda): <i>Denis Byabashaija Mujuni</i>
ARF4 (+ ARF5)	RUFORUM - The Regional Universities Forum for Capacity Building in Agriculture (Uganda): <i>Dr Paul Nampala</i>			
ARF7	College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences of Makerere University: <i>Dr Giregon Olupot</i>		<u>Drs. Gerard Hooiveld > Tsjeard Bouta and Alastair Taylor</u> ZOA Uganda Kampala	
ARF8		UOSPA - Uganda Oilseeds Producers and Processors Association: <i>Ray Bruno Agong</i> + FICA - Farm Inputs Care Center Ltd/FICA Seeds Ltd: Narcis Tumushabe	<u>Francis Ouruma Alacho</u> Africa Innovations Institute Kampala (Commodity Value Chains Programme)	NaSARRI - National Semi-Arid Resources Research Institute Uganda: <i>Walter Okello Anyanga</i>
ARF12		Food and Nutrition Solutions Ltd (FONUS), Makerere University, Uganda: <i>Dr Abel Atukwase</i>	<u>Gaston A. Tumuhimbise</u> Value Addition Institute Kampala	
ARF25		FICA Seeds Ltd, Uganda: <i>Tumushabe Narcis</i> + WindWood Millers Uganda: <i>Ivan Okori</i>	<u>Prof. George William Otim-Nape</u> Africa Innovations Institute Uganda	ISRIC - World Soil Information Uganda

	ARF26	Makerere University Business School Kampala: <i>David Katamba</i>	<u><i>Dr James Ssemwanga</i></u> The Ssemwanga Center for Agriculture and Food Ltd Uganda Kibeedi & Co. Advocates Uganda: <i>Janet Namuddu</i>		
	ARF27		Family Diet Limited Uganda: <i>Issa Wamala</i>	<u><i>Mr Peter Kamalingin</i></u> Oxfam Uganda Kampala + A2N - Africa 2000 Network Uganda: <i>Christopher Kyeswa</i>	NaCRRRI - National Crops Resources Research Institute, Uganda: <i>James Ogwang</i>
	ARF31	Makerere University Uganda: College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and College of Computing and Information Sciences: <i>Dr Bernard Obaa</i>		<u><i>Dr Dorothy Okello,</i></u> Women of Uganda Network (WOUGNET) Kampala + SNV Netherlands Development Organisation, Uganda: <i>Bernard B. Conilh de Beyssac</i>	National Semi-Arid Resources Research Institute (NaSARRI) Uganda/National Agricultural Research Organisation (NARO): <i>Robert Amayo</i>
	ARF33	Makerere University Uganda: <i>Dr Moses, Makooma Tenywa</i>		<u><i>Julius Ssemyalo/David Ojwang</i></u> Solidaridad Eastern and Central Africa Expertise Centre, Kampala, Uganda	National Crops Resources Research Institute (NaCRRRI), Uganda: <i>Dr Kangire Africano</i>
	ARF37	Uganda Christian University (UCU): <i>Dr Elizabeth B. Kizito</i>	<u><i>Dr Apolo Kasharu</i></u> CHAIN Uganda LTD Kampala		Uganda, Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry & Fisheries: <i>Moses Erongu</i>
	KMF4		African Agribusiness Academy, Kampala		
	KMF 10 AND 11				
	KMF16				
	Oth 14-2	RUForum Kampala			
	Oth 16-6	RUForum Dr Paul Nampala and Makerere			

		University Agricultural Research Institute			
Tanzania	NL Embassy but no MASP Food Security; AgriProFocus office & network; in 2012-2018 no longer part of the partner or focus countries for the Dutch aid and trade agenda. Also from 2018 onwards not part of a focus region.				
	GCP11	Sokoine University of Agriculture: Prof. Bendantunguka Tiisekwa			International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) Tanzania: Dr Edgar Twine
	GCP25	Sokoine University of Agriculture : Dr Joseph Hella		CARE International Tanzania: Thabit Masoud	
	GCP27				Agricultural Research Institute (ARI) – Ilonga Tanzania : Arnold Angelo Mushongi
	ARF25				Africa Rice Centre (Tanzania): <i>Senthilkumar Kalimuthu</i>
DR Congo	No partner or focus country of Dutch development cooperation between 2012 and 2018; NL Embassy; no specific MASP food security, but involvement in MASP Food security for the Great Lakes Region; AgriProFocus Office and Network, based in East DRC, to be closed soon. From 2018 onwards the DRC is part of the focus region Great Lakes of the new Aid and Trade agenda.				
	GCP24				World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) Democratic Republic of the Congo (CAFS partner) Todd Rosenstock
Burundi	Partner country of Dutch development cooperation between 2012 and 2018; NL Embassy with MASP Food Security; also AgriProFocus office & network; also NL Embassy involvement in MASP Food Security for the Great Lakes Region. From 2018 onwards part of the focus region Great Lakes of the new Aid and Trade agenda.				
	ARF2	<i>Salvator Kaboneka - University of Burundi (FABI)</i>		<i>ZOA Burundi, <u>Dr Geoff Andrews</u></i>	Burundian soil science structures Burundi
	ARF5	<i>Institut de Sciences Agronomiques du Burundi (ISABU): <i>Astère Bararyenya</i></i>		<i><u>Pierre Claver Nahayo</u> Confédération des Producteurs Agricoles pour le Développement (Capad)</i>	Innovative Technology Development for Rural Entrepreneurship Center (ITEC): Vital Ndayishimiye
	KMF5			AgriProFocus Burundi	
	KMF16				
Rwanda	Partner country of Dutch development cooperation between 2012 and 2018; NL Embassy, but without an MASP Food Security, except some involvement in MASP Food Security for the Great Lakes Region; AgriProFocus office & network. From 2018 onwards part of the focus region				

	Great Lakes of the new Aid and Trade agenda.				
	KMF5			AgriProFocus Rwanda	
	Oth 15-17				Rwanda National Agricultural Export Board (NAEB)
East Africa general	KMF4: meeting with SMEs in East Africa, members of the Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund (with Seas of Change; 2014)				
SOUTHERN AFRICA					
Mozambique	Partner country of Dutch development cooperation between 2012 and 2018, with a transitional status; NL Embassy with MASP Food Security; No AgriProFocus office & network; From 2018 onwards no longer part of a focus region for the Dutch Aid and Trade Agenda.				
	ARF6			<u>Amade Suca (M.Sc.)</u> ActionAid Mozambique Maputo + LDC - Liga dos Direitos da Criança - Maganja da Costa Mozambique + ORAM - Associação Rural de Ajuda Mutua - Gaza Mozambique	PLADISMA - Plataforma Distrital de Massingir Mozambique
	ARF29	ISPM - Instituto Superior Politécnico de Manica Mozambique: <i>Angela Manjichi</i>		<u>Mr Wouter Beekman</u> Resiliência Moçambique Condominio PAF Chimoio, Mozambique	
	ARF IEC				National Land Directorate: Ir Joao Zamith Carrilho (ARF Call 3 round 2)
Malawi	Not a partner or focus country of Dutch development cooperation between 2012 and 2018, No NL Embassy (but there is a Consulate); No AgriProFocus office & network; from 2018 onwards not part of a focus region for the Dutch Aid and Trade Agenda.				
	GCP24	Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources (LUANAR) Malawi: Dr Sera Gondwe			
Zambia	No longer a partner or focus country of Dutch development cooperation between 2012 and 2018, No NL Embassy (but there is a Consulate); AgriProFocus office & network; from 2018 onwards not part of a focus region for the Dutch Aid and Trade Agenda.				
	GCP5	University of Zambia (John Shindano + Himoonga Bernard Moonga), + Tropical	Heifer International Zambia (James Kasongo + Nachimuka Cheepa)		

		Diseases Research Centre Zambia (Ray Handema)			
Zimbabwe	Not a partner or focus country of Dutch development cooperation between 2012 and 2018; NL Embassy without an MASP Food Security; No AgriProFocus office & network; from 2018 onwards not part of a focus region for the Dutch Aid and Trade Agenda.				
	GCP24		Zimbabwe Super Seeds: Nelson Munyaka		
	ARF IEC	University of Zimbabwe: Prof. Brighton Mvumi (ARF Call 3 round 2)			
South Africa	Focus country for the Dutch Trade agenda between 2012 and 2018; NL Embassy without an MASP Food Security; No AgriProFocus office & network; from 2018 onwards not part of a focus region for the Dutch Aid and Trade Agenda.				
	GCP1	University of Limpopo, School of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (UL): Petronella Chaminuka	South Africa Subtropical Growers' Association		The Agricultural Research Council (ARC) South Africa: Dr Aart-Jan Verschoor
	GCP24			VUNA-Africa (DfID- funded & Adam Smith International- implemented): Golden Mahove, and Sam Kareithi	
	ARF IEC	PLAAS, Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies: Dr Darlene Miller (ARF Call 2 round 1) and Dr Barbara Tapela (ARF Call 2 round 2 and 3)			
WEST ASIA					
	Between 2012 and 2018 Afghanistan, Palestine and Yemen were partner countries for Dutch development cooperation, and (unclear) focus countries for Dutch food security policies. There are NL Embassies in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Syria, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Palestine, Jordan, Lebanon, Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, UAE and Yemen. No AgriProFocus presence; No F&BKP activities yet. From 2018 onwards part of the Focus area West Asia.				
SOUTH, SOUTHEAST AND EAST ASIA					
Bangla Desh	Partner country of Dutch development assistance with a transitional status between 2012 and 2018. NL Embassy with attention for Food Security, and focus country of Dutch food security policies; No AgriProFocus office & network. From 2018 onwards continued attention as a special focus country for the Dutch aid and trade agenda.				
	GCP10			BRAC Bangladesh: Belayet Hossan + World Fish	

				Bangladesh	
ARF15		Modern Rice Milling Unit Bangladesh: Farid Ahmed		<u>Ms Rokeya Begum Shafali</u> Association for Integrated Development- Comilla Village: Raghupur	
ARF30	<u>Mr Shahid Uddin Akbar</u> Bangladesh Institute of ICT in Development Mohakhali, Dhaka				
ARF32				<u>Ms Jillian Waid,</u> Helen Keller International (HKI) Bangladesh Dhaka	
ARF44	Khulna University Bangladesh, Life Science School: <i>Dr Muslima Khatun, Dr Nazmul Ahsan, dr Nazrul Islam</i>			<u>Selim Reza Hasan,</u> Solidaridad Network Asia, Dhaka	
ARF IEC					ISSD Integrated Seed Sector Development Programme Bangla Desh: Dr Amsalu Ayana Aga (ARF IEC Call 2 round 1 and 2).
KMF17					NL Embassy Dhaka
KMF43		Food entrepreneurs mapped			
India	NL Embassy without an MASP Food Security; No AgriProFocus office & network; no special status in the Dutch aid and trade agenda, neither between 2012 and 2018 nor from 2018 onwards				
GCP19	Amrita University: Dr Amalendu Jyotishi				Fisheries Management Resource Centre (Fish MARC) India: Vriddagiri Vivekandandan
Myanmar	NL Embassy but without MASP Food Security; AgriProFocus office & network; NL Embassy without an MASP Food Security; No AgriProFocus office & network; no special status in the Dutch aid and trade agenda, neither between 2012 and 2018 nor from 2018 onwards No F&BKP partners and activities				
Thailand	NL Embassy without an MASP Food Security; No AgriProFocus office & network; NL Embassy without an MASP Food Security; No AgriProFocus office & network; no special status in the Dutch aid and trade agenda, neither between 2012 and 2018 nor from 2018 onwards				
GCP10	Prince of Songkla University			Suratthani Shrimp Farmers Club	

		Thailand: Dr Pornpimon Chuaduangpui		Thailand: Somchai Rerkpooke	
	GCP-IAC				Institute of Nutrition: Dr Pattanee Winichagoon (GCP Call 1)
Malaysia	NL Embassy without an MASP Food Security; No AgriProFocus office & network; NL Embassy without an MASP Food Security; No AgriProFocus office & network; no special status in the Dutch aid and trade agenda, neither between 2012 and 2018 nor from 2018 onwards				
	GCP4			WorldFish: Jens Peter Tang Dalsgaard)	
	GCP10			WorldFish Malaysia: Mohan Chadag	
	GCP19			WorldFish: Froukje Kruijssen	
Singapore	KMF20			World Economic Forum – Grow Asia	
Vietnam	Focus country of the Dutch Trade agenda between 2012 and 2018; NL Embassy with attention for Food Security, but not officially part of the 'Dutch focus countries for food security'; No AgriProFocus office & network; no special status in the Dutch aid and trade agenda from 2018 onwards				
	GCP4	Can Tho University Vietnam (Phuong Nguyen Thanh)	Skretting-Vietnam (Marc Le Poul) + Vemedim Corporation Vietnam (Hien Nguyen Duc)		Mekong Delta Development and Research Institute (MDI) Viet Nam
	GCP10	Can Tho University - Viet Nam: Mekong Delta Development and Research Institute (MDI): Thanh Vo Thi	Bao Minh Insurance Company Viet Nam: Dang Ho Hai	Pangasius Association Viet Nam: Thang Nguyen Vliet	
	GCP13	Can Tho University Viet Nam: Dr Thi Phung Ha Tran		IUCN Viet Nam: Jake Brunner	
	GCP20	Hue University of Agriculture and Forestry (HUAF): Dr Van An Le + Hue University of Medicine & Pharmacy - Inst Community Health Research (ICHR): Dr Van Thang Vo			Vietnam National Institute of Agricultural Planning and Projection (NIAPP): Quang Dzung Nguyen
Laos	No NL Embassy; No AgriProFocus office & network; no special status in the Dutch aid and trade agenda, neither between 2012 and 2018 nor from 2018 onwards				
	GCP20				National Institute of

					Public Health (NIOPH): Sengchanh Kounnavong National Nutrition Center (NNC): Bounthom Phengdy + National Agriculture and Forestry Research Institute (NAFRI): Khamphone Mounlamai
Indonesia	Partner country for Dutch development cooperation between 2012 and 2018, with a transitional status; NL Embassy with attention for Food Security; AgriProFocus office & network; After 2018 the special relationship continues, but not part of a focus region for the new aid and trade agenda.				
GCP15	Diponegoro University - UNDIP, Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Science (Semarang): Dr Sri Rejeki			Wetlands International Indonesia: Nyoman Suryadiputra	
GCP26					CIFOR (Bogor)
ARF3	Gadjah Mada University	<i>Devendra Gangwar</i> UPL Limited Jakarta (formerly known as United Phosphorus Limited); succeeded by <i>Dr Pradeep Bahuguna</i>			
ARF17	The Fishing & Living Indonesia; Institut Pertanian Bogor (Bogor Agricultural University): <i>Budy Wiryawan</i>	PT. Harta Samudra Indonesia: <i>Robert Tjoanda</i>	<i>Mr. Aditya Utama Surono</i> and <i>Momo Kochen</i> Masyarakat dan Perikanan Indonesia (MDPI); Ruko Istana Regency; Denpasar		BHLN Technical Services: <i>Blane Olson</i> (LLC in support of Anova)
ARF21	VEDCA - Vocational Education Development Center for Agriculture: <i>Rahima Sary Intan</i>		<i>Mr Robert de Groot</i> Hivos, Jakarta + Yayasan Rumah Energi Indonesia: <i>Yudha Hartanto Yayasan</i>		
ARF34	University of Merdeka Malang, Indonesia: <i>Indrayanti, Wiwik Kadenti</i>		<i>Adrianus Petrus Lagur</i> Yayasan Komunitas Radio Max Waingapu (KRMW)		

				Foundation) Sumba	
	GCP-IAC				Ministry of Agriculture, Dr Tahlim Sudaryanto (GCP Call 1)
	ARF IEC				CIFOR, Bogor, Dr Pablo Pacheco (ARF Call 3 round 1 and 2)
	KMF43		Food entrepreneurs mapped		
	KMF45				CIFOR, Bogor
Philippines (but Global)	NL Embassy, but no MASP Food Security; No AgriProFocus office & network; no special status in the Dutch aid and trade agenda, neither between 2012 and 2018 nor from 2018 onwards				
	GCP-IAC				IRRI, Los Baños; Global Rice Science Partnership: Dr Bas Bouman – director (GCP Call 1, chair)
Taiwan (but Global)	No NL Embassy, but there is a 'Trade and Investment Office'; No AgriProFocus office & network; no special status in the Dutch aid and trade agenda, neither between 2012 and 2018 nor from 2018 onwards				
	ARF11				AVRDC , The World Vegetable Center, Taiwan (but with global activities): S. Solberg
AMERICA					
Mexico (but Global)	NI Embassy; No MASP; No AgriProFocus office & network; no special status in the Dutch aid and trade agenda, neither between 2012 and 2018 nor from 2018 onwards				
	GCP29				International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT) Mexico (CCAFS partner) Dr. Jonathan Hellin (Research in UG)
	ARF30				CIMMYT - International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center Mexico (Research in BD): Dr Urs Schulthess
Brazil	NI Embassy; No MASP; No AgriProFocus office & network; no special status in the Dutch aid and trade agenda, neither between 2012 and 2018 nor from 2018 onwards				
	GCP2	Universidade Federal de Viçosa (UFV): Simone Guimaraes	Topigs Norsvin do Brasil: André da Costa		
Chile	NI Embassy; No MASP; No AgriProFocus office & network; no special status in the Dutch aid and trade agenda, neither between 2012 and 2018 nor from 2018 onwards				
	GCP18	Pontifical Catholic University of	Hortach Chile: Mario Alejandro		Chile National Commission for Rural Development (CNFR):

		Valparaíso – Agronomy School Chile: Dr Carlos Alberto Huenchuleo Pedreros	Marín Valdebenito		Gustavo Adolfo Cabrera Pereyra
Uruguay	NI Embassy; No MASP; No AgriProFocus office & network; no special status in the Dutch aid and trade agenda, neither between 2012 and 2018 nor from 2018 onwards				
	GCP18	University of the Republic, Montevideo (UdelaR) – Faculty of Agronomy Uruguay: Dr Santiago Dogliotti			Administrative Commission of the 'Modelo Market' (CAMM) Uruguay: Marcelo Amado Chalela + National Horticultural Commission (ODEPA) Uruguay: Andrea Flaño Ipinza
Colombia (but Global)	Focus country for the Dutch Trade agenda between 2012 and 2018; NI Embassy; No MASP; No AgriProFocus office & network; no special status in the Dutch aid and trade agenda, neither between 2012 and 2018 nor from 2018 onwards				
	ARF IEC				CIAT International Center for Tropical Agriculture (= CGIAR), Ir An Notenbaert (ARF Call 3 round 2)

F&BKP SC = Steering Committee; GCP IAS = International Advisory Committee; ARF IEC = International Experts Committee

**ANNEX 7: TYPES OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AS FOCI FOR F&BKP ACTIVITIES:
PROJECT NUMBERS AND COUNTRIES**

Products	GCP	ARF	KMF + Other
Animal husbandry/livestock			22 (general)
Dairy/Milk	11 INDO, TH, KE, TZ; 17 ET, KE; 23 ET, KE; 26 KE	23 KE; 40 et	
pigs	2 BR		
poultry			51 (E+S Africa)
Feed (insects)	9 KE	35 BE	
Fodder		21 INDO; 38 KE	
Fisheries general		18 BE	
Fish	19 INDIA, GH;		
tuna		17: INDO	
aquaculture	4 VN, 10 S.E.AS.; 12 ET; 15 INDO		
Shrimp	13 VN	44 VN	
Crops			
Fortified cereals		12, BU, RW, SS, UG	
Cereals: maize	22 KE; 29 UG		
Cereals: rice		3 INDO; 16 BE; 25 UG; 31 UG	
Cereals: sorghum		43 BE	
Cassava		27 UG	
Plantains		45 BE	
(Seed) Potatoes		5 BU	26 (KE); 32 (East Africa), 50 (general)
Soybean		19 BE	
Groundnuts		41 BE	
Fermented foods	5 ZA,		
Horticulture	18 CH, UR	39 GH	
Vegetables	12 ET; 16 BE	4 KE; 11 BE, KE; 37 UG	9 (general)
Tomato		20 KE; 33 UG	
Greengrams		31 UG	
Moringa leaves		36 BE	
Fruits		14 GH	9 (general)
avocado	1 SAFR		
Pineapple		22 BE	
Floriculture			10; 11 EAST AFRICA (A.O. ET AND UG) AND GH
cocoa	1 GH, 3 SL, 8 GH; 21 GH, Cdl;	10 GH	
Oil palm	1 GH		
Sesame		8 UG	
Cashew nuts		1 UG	
Macadamia nuts	1 SAFR		
Treecrops		24 ET; 28 GH	
Seeds		42 MALI	
Unspecified	6 ET, KE, GH; 7 KE, BF; 14 NG, Cdl, KE; 20 VN, LA; 24 Sn AFR.; 24 TZ; 27 ET, TZ; 28 UG, ET; 30 KE	2 BU; 6 MOZ; 7 UG; 9 BE; 13 GH; 15 BD; 26 UG; 29 MOZ; 30 BD; 32 BD; 34 INDO	Most

ANNEX 8: TIME FRAME F&BKP PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES

KMF	2014			2015				2016				2017			
	I, II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
1	V	V	V												
2 (3-)	V														
4				V	V	V	V	V							
5		V	V	V	V	V	V	V							
6		V	V												
7		V	V												
8				V	V	V	V								
9				V	V	V	V								
10				V	V	V	V	V							
11				V	V	V	V	V							
12															
13				V	V	V	V	V							
14					V	V	V								
15				V	V	V	V								
16					V	V	V	V							
17					V	V	V								
18					V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V			
19					V	V	V								
20				V	V	V	V	V							
21					V	V	V	V							
22					V	V	V	V							
23						V	V	V	V						
24						V	V	V	V						
25							V	V	V	V					
26							V	V	V	V					
27							V	V	V	V					
28								V	V	V					
29								V	V	V	V				
30								V	V	V	V				
31									V	V	V				
32									V	V	V	V			
33									V	V	V				
34									V	V	V	V			
35									V	V	V	V			
36									V	V	V	V			
37										V	V	V	V		
38										V	V				
39										V	V	V	V		
(40)										V					
41										V	V	V	V		
42										V	V	V	V		
43										V	V	V			
44										V	V				
45											V	V	V	V	
46											V	V	V	V	
47											V	V	V	V	
48											V	V	V	V	V
49											V	V	V	V	V
50											V	V	V		
51											V	V	V	V	V

52													V	V	V	V
53													V	V	V	V
54													V	V	V	V
55													V	V	V	V
56														V	V	V
57														V	V	V
58															V	V
59														V	V	V
60															V	V
61																V
62																
63																
64																
65																
66																

KMF	2018				2019	2020	READY
	I	II	III	IV			
1							V
2 (3-)							V
4							-
5							V
6							V
7							V
8							V
9							V
10							V
11							V
12							V
13							V
14							V
15							V
16							V
17							V
18							V
19							V
20							V
21							V
22							V
23							V
24							V
25							V
26							V
27							V
28							V
29							V
30							V
31							V
32							V
33							V
34							V
35							V
36							V
37							V

38							V
39							V
(40)							X?
41							V
42							V
43							V
44							V
45							X
46							X
47							V
48							X
49							X
50							V
51							X
52							X
53							V
54							V
55	V	V	V				
56	V	V	V				
57	V	V	V				
58	V	V	V				
59	V	V	V				
60	V	V	V				
61	V	V	V				
62	V	V	V				
63		V	V				
64		V	V				
65		V	V				
66		V	V				

GCP	2014			2015				2016				2017			
	I, II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
1,3			V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
2,4		V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
5				V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
6,7							V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
8						V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
9								V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
10															
11						V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
12				V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V		
13					V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
14				V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	
15-17								V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
18											V	V	V	V	V
19-20											V	V	V	V	V
21													V	V	V
22											V	V	V	V	V
23														V	V
24, 30														V	V
25														V	V
26, 28														V	V
27, 29															

ARF	2014			2015				2016				2017			
	I, II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
1	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V			
2	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V		
3, 4,		V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	
5		V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	
6	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V				
7		V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	
8				V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
9			V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
10			V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V				
11				V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
12				V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
13			V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
14				V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
15			V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
16					V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
17					V	V	V	V	V	V	V				
18					V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
19-21						V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
22							V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
23, 25-28, 30								V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
24, 29								V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
31, 34												V	V	V	V
32, 33												V	V	V	V
35												V	V	V	V
36												V	V	V	V
37, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45															V
38															V
39													V	V	V
43													V	V	V

GCP	2018				2019	2020	READY
	I	II	III	IV			
1,3	V	V	V	V	Oct		
2,4	V	V	V	V	Spt		
5	V	V	V	V	Spt		
6,7	V	V	V	V	Oct		
8	V	V	V	V	V	Aug	
9	V	V	V	V	Oct		
10					?		
11	V	V	V	V	V	Oct	
12							
13	V	V	V	V			
14							
15-17	V	V	V	V			
18	V	V	V	V	V	Aug	
19-20	V	V	V	V	V	Aug	
21	V	V	V	V	V	Spt	
22	V	V	V	V	V	May	

23	V	V	V	V	V	Apr	
24, 30	V	V	V	V	V	Oct	
25	V	V	V	V	V	Mar	
26, 28	V	V	V	V	V	Sep	
27, 29	V	V	V	V	V	Dec	
	2018				2019	2020	READY
ARF	I	II	III	IV			
1							V
2							V
3, 4,							
5							V
6							V
7							V
8	V						X
9							X
10							V
11	V						X
12	V						V
13							X
14							X
15							V
16	V	V					
17							V
18	V	V					
19-21	V	V	V				
22	V	V	V	V	Spt		
23, 25- 28, 30	V	V	V	V	Jan		
24, 29	V	V	V	V	Feb		
31, 34	V	V	V	V	Jun		
32, 33	V	V	V	V	Dec		
35	V	V	V	V	Dec		
36	V	V	V	V	V	Jan	
37, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45	V	V	V	V	V	Jul	
38	V	V	V	V	V	Jun	
39	V	V	V	V	V	May	
43	V	V	V	V	V	Jun	

ANNEX 9: 'PRODUCTS', AS COMMUNICATED ON F&BKP AND WOTRO

WEBSITES

KMF projects, based on information in all annual reports of the F&BKP (and on its website).

Numbers refer to the list of projects in annex 1

KMF Part 1

Projects KMF	Workshop/conference	(Explorative) meeting	Local knowl. platform	Final event	Scoping study/Lit review	Reflection paper	Brochure/policy brief	Newsletter
1					+			
2								
3		+						
4		+						
5		+						
6								
7								
8		+						
9	++	++		+				
10	6	+			+			
11			+			+		
12		++						
13								
14		+						
15								
16								
17	+							
18	+	+				+		
19		+					+	
20	+							
21	+							
22					+	+		
23	+							
24		+			+			
25		MoU						
26	+							
27	+	+				+		
28	+	+		+	+		+	
29	+			+	+		2(E/F)	
30	+	+						
31								
32								
33	+			+				
34	+				+		+	
35	+							
36								
37		+						
38	+							
39	+							

40		+						
41								
42	+				+			
43	+	+	+		+			
44							+	
45			+					
46								
47	+				+			
48								
49		+						
50								3
51								
52	+							
53	+							
54								
55							+	
56		+						
57		++	+				+	
58								+
59	+	++						
60	+							
61	+							
62	+	++						
63								
64								
65								
66								
Total	26 (>33)	23 (>28)	4	4	10	4	7 (8)	2 (5)

KMF Part 2

Proj KMF	Factsheets	Business cases	Guidelines for investors	Capacity development events	Report/Learning document/online consult.	Video's/TV presence	Training manual
1							
2					+		
3							
4							
5				+		+	
6					+		
7					+		
8							
9					+		
10						+	
11	13		1	3			
12							
13							+
14							
15						+	
16					7		

17						+	
18	++	3					
19		10			+		
20		10			++		
21				+	+		
22					+		
23							
24					+		
25				+			
26							
27							
28					+		
29					++		
30	+				4		
31				+			
32					+		
33		4			+		
34					+		
35		+					
36				+			
37							
38					4		
39							
40					+		
41							
42							
43					+		
44					+		
45					+		
46		+		+			+
47					+		
48				+	++		
49					+		
50					1		
51					+		
52					4		+
53					6		++
54					+		
55					+		+
56							
57				+	++		
58				+	+	+	
59					++		
60							
61					+		
62							
63							
64							
65							
66							
Total	3 (13)	6 (29)	1	10 (11)	34 (>59)	5	5 (6)
Grand Total				144 (>220)			

Other F&BKP activities, based on information in all annual reports of the F&BKP (and on its website).

Numbers refer to the list of projects in annex 1

Other activities of the F&BKP Office, part 1

Proj	Call	Workshop /confer.	meeting	Report	Learning document /M&E	Social media	Lit./Scoping study	Online consultation	Reflection paper
12-1				+					
12-2								+	
13-1					+				
13-2					+				
13-3					+				
13-4	++								
13-5			+						
13-6									
13-7				+					
13-8				+					
13-9				+					
13-10			+						
13-11			+						
13-12			+						
13-13			+						
13-14			+						
13-15		+							
13-16		+	+						
13-17			+						
14-1	+++								
14-2			+						
14-3						+			
14-4			+	+					
14-5				+				+	
14-6			+						
14-7			+						
14-8									
14-9						+			
14-10				+					
14-11				+					
14-12						+			
14-13			+						
14-14			+						
14-15			+						
14-16			+						
14-17			+						
14-18			+	+					
14-19			+						
14-20			+						
14-21			+						
14-22									
14-23						+			
14-24			+				+		
14-25			+						
14-26			+						
14-27			+						

14-28			+						
14-29			+	+					
14-30			+						
14-31					+				
14-32									
14-33									
15-1	+								
15-2					+				
15-3					+				
15-4				+					
15-5				+					
15-6			+			+			
15-7			+						
15-8			+						
15-9			+						
15-10			+						
15-11						+			
15-12						+			
15-13									
15-14			+						
15-15		+							
15-16			+						
15-17			+						
15-18									
15-19		+							
15-20			+						
15-21					+				
15-22			+		+		+		
15-23									
15-24							+		
15-25							+		
15-26		+							
15-27			+						
15-28									
15-29									
15-30					+				
15-31		+							
15-32									
15-33									
15-34									
15-35									
16-1			+					+	
16-2					+			+	
16-3					+				
16-4					+				
16-5	+								
16-6		+							
16-7					+				
16-8		+							
16-9			+						
16-10		+	+						
16-11							+		
16-12			6						
16-13		+	+						
16-14		+							

16-15		+							
16-16		+							
16-17		+							
16-18								+	
16-19					+				
16-20		+							
16-21									
16-22									
16-23									
16-24									
16-25									
16-26									
16-27									
16-28									
16-29		+		+					
16-30		+							
16-31		++		++					
16-32		+						+	
16-33		+++							
16-34									
16-35								+	
17-1					+				
17-2	+								
17-3					+				
17-4					+				
17-5					+				
17-6					+				
17-7					+				
17-8					+				
17-9									+
17-10				+					
17-11								+	
17-12								+	
17-13									
17-14									
17-15				+					
17-16				+					
17-17		+							
17-18		+							
17-19		+							
17-20					+				
17-21									
17-22									
17-23									
17-24									
17-25									
17-26									
17-27									
17-28									
17-29									
17-30		+							
17-31		+							
17-32		+++							
17-33		+							
17-34									

17-35		++							
17-36								+	
18-1					+				
18-2									+
18-3				+				+	
18-4			+						
18-5		+							
18-6			+						
18-7		+							
18-8									
18-9									
18-10									
18-11									
18-12									
18-13		+							
18-14	+								
18-15									
18-16		+							
Total	7 (9)	32 (38)	49 (54)	16	23	7	6	10	2

Other activities of the F&BKP Office, part 2

Proj	Reflection paper	Brochure/flyer	Newsletter	Factsheets /map	Business cases	Award	Capacity development events	stand	Blogs/websites
12-1									
12-2									
13-1									
13-2									
13-3									
13-4									
13-5									
13-6				+					
13-7									
13-8									
13-9									
13-10									
13-11									
13-12									
13-13									
13-14									
13-15									
13-16									
13-17									
14-1									
14-2									
14-3									
14-4									
14-5									
14-6									
14-7									

14-8							+		
14-9									
14-10							+		
14-11									
14-12									
14-13									
14-14									
14-15								+	
14-16									
14-17									
14-18									
14-19									
14-20									
14-21									
14-22		+							
14-23									
14-24			+						
14-25									
14-26									
14-27									
14-28									
14-29									
14-30									
14-31									
14-32			+						
14-33			+						
15-1									
15-2									
15-3									
15-4									
15-5									
15-6									
15-7									
15-8									
15-9									
15-10									
15-11									
15-12									
15-13			+						
15-14									
15-15								+	
15-16									
15-17									
15-18							+		
15-19									
15-20									
15-21									
15-22									+
15-23							+		
15-24							+		
15-25									
15-26									
15-27									
15-28			+						
15-29			+						

15-30									
15-31									
15-32			+						
15-33			+						
15-34			+						
15-35			+						
16-1									
16-2									
16-3									
16-4									
16-5									
16-6									
16-7									
16-8									
16-9									
16-10									
16-11									
16-12									
16-13									
16-14							+		
16-15							+		
16-16									
16-17									
16-18									
16-19									
16-20									
16-21							+		
16-22					+				
16-23			+						
16-24			+						
16-25			+						
16-26			+						
16-27			+						
16-28			+						
16-29							+		+
16-30									
16-31									
16-32									
16-33									
16-34		+							
16-35									
17-1									
17-2									
17-3									
17-4									
17-5									
17-6									
17-7									
17-8									
17-9	+								
17-10									
17-11									
17-12									+
17-13						+			
17-14							+		

17-15									
17-16									
17-17									
17-18									
17-19									
17-20									
17-21			+						
17-22			+						
17-23			+						
17-24			+						
17-25			+						
17-26			+						
17-27			+						
17-28			+						
17-29			+						
17-30									
17-31									
17-32									
17-33									
17-34				+					
17-35									
17-36									
18-1									
18-2	+								
18-3									
18-4									
18-5									
18-6									
18-7									
18-8							+		
18-9			+						
18-10			+						
18-11			+						
18-12			+						
18-13									
18-14									
18-15		+							
18-16									
Total	2	3	29	2	1	1	11	2	3
Grand Total 219									

GCP projects: output so far (on FBKP and wotro website, and - if available – own websites; early May/ mid-June 2018). Numbers refer to the list of projects in annex 1

GCP Part 1

Proj	Own website	Twitter /fb/linkedin	Own newsletter	News fbkp	Scientific paper	conference abstr.	PHD/Msc thesis	Proj summary	WOTRO: broader	Fact sheet	(wsh./fv) reports
GCP1	+		2	1	1=w		9	Wp	6	+	11
2	+	+		2	3=w	1		Wp	1	+	

3				2				Wp		+	
4	+	+	8	1	1			Wp		+	
5				2				Wp		+	
6				5	1	1	2	wp	x		5
7				11	1			wp	2		7
8					x			wp	x		
9					x			wp	x		
10	+		5	3	4w (3+1)			wp	x		
11	++	+		1	2=w	1	7	wp	x		1
12	+			4	x		7	wp	x		4
13				1	x			wp	x		1
14				1	x			wp	x		
15			2					wp			
16				2	x			wp	x		
17					x			wp	x		
18				1	x			wp	x		1
19					1			wp	1		
20				1	x			wp	x		1
21				1	x			wp	x		
22					x			wp	x		
23-30					x			wp	x		
Total	6 (7)	3	4 (17)	16 (39)	8 (14)	3	4 (25)	wp30	4 (10)	5	8 (31)

W= on wotro website, p = on platform website

GCP Part 2

Proj	infosheet	policy brief	poster	WOTRO: pub	Press rel.	/Newsp/maga zine	presentation	flyer	Blog/col. story	pictures	Video/podcast	Policy/ Stn. wsh
GCP1	5		1	7		1	1	1				1
2				5					1			
3		1		x			1					1
4			1	x								1
5				x	1				2	1	2	1
6		1	1	10							1	1
7				1			1					1
8				x								
9				x		1			1			
10				x	1	1			3		1	1
11		1		2		1						
12				2		1		1			2	1
13				x								
14				x								
15				7								
16				x				1	2			
17				7								
18				x								
19				2		2						
20				x								
21				x					1			

22				x								
23-30				x								
Total	1 (5)	3	3	9 (43)	2	6 (7)	3	3	6 (10)	1	4 (6)	8
Grand Total: 140 (278), but overlap												

ARF projects: output so far (on FBKP and wotro websites, and - if available – own websites; early May/mid-June 2018). Numbers refer to the list of projects in annex 1.

ARF Part 1

Proj	Own website	Twitter	Own newsletter	News fbkp web	Scientific paper	Proj summary	Fs End results fsh	(wsh./fv) reports	factsheet	Wotro broader	Wotro 'publical'
1				1		w	+	1=w	wp	x	x
2	(+)		1	1		w	+		wp	x	x
3						w		w	x	x	x
4						w			x	x	x
5				1	1	w	+		wp	x	5
6				1	1	w			x	x	x
7				1		w	+		wp	1	x
8				1	1	w			wp	W2	x
9				2	1	w		1=w	w	x	x
10				1		wp		2	wp	x	x
11				1	1	wp			w	x	x
12						w			x	x	x
13			2			wp			x	x	x
14						wp			x	x	x
15				2		w	+	1	wp	x	x
16						w			x	x	x
17				1		w	+		wp	x	x
18			1	1		w			x	w	x
19						w			x	x	+
20					1=w	w			x	x	(+)
21						w			x	x	?
22				2		w			x	x	x
23						w			x	x	x
24						w			x	x	x
25						w			x	x	x
26	+	+		1	2(w3)	w		1 w9	+	1	(16)
27				2		w		5	x	x	x
28	+					wp		1 (w10)	1=w	(+)	(12)
29						w			x	x	x
30						w			x	x	x
31						w			x	x	(+)
32						w			x	x	x
33	+			1		w			x	x	x
34						w			x	x	x
35				1		w			x	x	x
36						w			x	x	x
37						w			x	x	x
38				1		w			x	x	x
39						w			x	x	x

40			1	1	2	w			x	x	x
41						w			x	x	x
42						w			x	x	x
43				2		w		1	x	x	x
44						w			x	x	x
45						w			x	x	x
tot	4	1	4 (5)	20 (25)	8 (11)	W45 p5	6	9 (31)	12	5 (6)	6 (36)

x: nothing on wotro project website; Project summaries: on wotro website: for all projects (=w); on Platform website (=p).

ARF Part 2

Proj	Wotro 'publicat'	policy brief	poster	Magazine/ newspap	presemnta tion	flyer	Blog/col. story	pictures	Video/ podcast	Policy/ Sth. wsh
1R	x		1		1	1				
2R	x		1							
3N	x		1			1				
4N	x		1				w	w		
5R	5		1	1=w						
6R	x	4=w1	1			1				
7R	x		1		1					
8N	x		1=w		1	1				
9N	x		6	1	1	2				
10R	x		1	1	1					
11N	x		2 w1		1	3				
12R	x		1	1		1		1		
13N	x				1	1			2	
14N	x				1					
15R	x	w	2	2 (w4)						
16	x		1		1					
17R	x		1							
18	x				1	1	2		2	
19	+		1=w		1	1	1			
20	(+)		1	1		2		2 =w		1
21	?		1							
22	x		1		1		2		2	
23	x		1			1				
24	x		1							
25	x		1		1					
26	(16)	9 (w4)	1		1	6				
27	x		1		1	1			1	
28	(12)		1=w	W1	2					
29	x	1	1							
30	x		1			1				
31	(+)				1				W1	
32	x									
33	x				1		1			
34	x			7					3	
35	x									

36	x				1					
37	x									
38	x									
39	x									
40	x									
41	x				1					
42	x									
43	x									
44	x									
45	x									
tot	6 (36)	4 (15)	27 (34)	8 (17)	20 (21)	15 (24)	5 (7)	3 (4)	6 (11)	1?
Grand Total: 209 (316), but overlap										

R = Ready; N = should be ready but not yet. x: nothing on wotro project website;w: Project summaries: on wotro website: for all projects; p: on Platform website.

Terms of Reference

Final review

Food & Business Knowledge Platform

1. Organizational background

The Food & Business Knowledge Platform (F&BKP) is one of the five Knowledge Platforms for global development initiated by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs through the policy letter written by Ben Knapen in 2011. The five platforms are instruments to enhance the quality of the Dutch Development Cooperation policy and distinguish *knowledge for policy*, *knowledge in developing countries* and *policy for knowledge*. The platforms will strengthen the research and knowledge exchange agenda by:

- Identify, select and define research questions
- Develop a coherent and joint research agenda.
- Map how existing knowledge is used and implemented.
- Bring knowledge from research back to policy and practice.

The platforms will bring together strengths of researchers from the Netherlands, emerging and developing countries with strengths of private companies, NGO's and the government. The Embassies of the Kingdom of the Netherlands have a central role in bringing parties from North and South together.

The F&BKP is a platform that aims to stimulate long-term changes to increase food and nutrition security in emerging economies and developing countries, one of the priority themes set by the Dutch Ministers for Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation and Agriculture in 2014. The strategic goals for Food and Nutrition Security include:

- Improve relevance and efficient use of Dutch, local and international knowledge and research capacity.
- Strengthen food and nutrition security policies and programs in the Netherlands and abroad.
- Facilitate knowledge and research that are suitable for Dutch and local entrepreneurs and increase investments and collaboration from the Dutch private sector in low- and middle-income countries.

These goals in the knowledge domain should support the three strategic goals of the Dutch Ministers for Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation and Agriculture as formulated in the policy letter of November 2014 and the national budget of 2017:

- Eradicating existing hunger and malnutrition ('people').
- Promoting inclusive and sustainable growth in the agricultural sector ('profit').
- Creating ecologically sustainable food systems ('planet').

During 2016, mid-term review was carried out, which gauged the perceptions of stakeholders on the functioning of the Food & Business Knowledge Platform. These perspectives on the platform will be a useful input to the current evaluation.

2. Objective and scope of the review

The Minister of Foreign Trade and International Cooperation contracted the consortium of AgriProFocus, The Broker and CDI Wageningen UR for the implementation of the F&BKP secretariat (Office). The program started in September 2013 and runs until 30 August 2018. As agreed in the

Assessment Memorandum, the report of the final review needs to be completed 6 weeks before the end of the program.

The aim of the final review is in twofold.

The ultimate aim of this review is to assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the F&BKP as a way to support the implementation of the Food and Nutrition Security policy, executed in the period 2013-2018. Therefore the performance of the platform needs to be assessed in relation to its objectives.

The second aim of the final review is to provide input to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for decision making on a possible second phase of the F&BKP program. Therefore the strategy implemented in the first phase and the possible next strategy that is proposed by the Steering Group and consortium partners should be assessed in relation to the renewed policy of the minister.

3. Main topics of the review

The following three topics should be emphasized and elaborated in the final review. Sub-questions are written down under each topic.

1. The relevance of the F&BKP in the Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) field

1.1 How did the F&BKP enhance the achievement of the three strategic goals in the field of Food and Nutrition Security?

- To what extent did the F&BKP realize multi-stakeholder identification, selection and definition of research questions or themes beneficial for policy-theoretical and applied research?
- What gaps did F&BKP identify with southern parties and international networks involved in FNS and how did the F&BKP cover these gaps?
- What links did F&BKP create between knowledge agendas and policy questions?
- Which stakeholders engaged in the network of F&BKP (knowledge institutions, NGO's, public organizations and international partners and companies) and are such organizations sufficiently represented?
- To what extent did the F&BKP act as a central vehicle for the allocation of research funds by the Ministry of Agriculture, with a clear collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture and top sectors? What are ways to improve this?
- To what extent did the F&BKP contribute to the realization of a coherent knowledge agenda, in which affiliated networks for the Dutch policy agenda participated, including a diversity of stakeholder groups consisting of companies, knowledge institutions, policy and NGO's in North and South? What is still missing and how could these gaps be filled?
- To what extent did embassies with FNS programmes engage in and benefit from knowledge and research trajectories facilitated by the F&BKP?

1.2 What is the added value of the F&BKP in supporting knowledge management activities of various Dutch based networks and organizations in the Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) field?

- What is the distinctive position and added value of the F&BKP in comparison to other Food and Nutrition Security relevant initiatives such as AgriProFocus, Partnership Resource Centre and the learning activities of individual (embassy) programmes?
- To what extent did duplication of initiatives, knowledge products or portals occur and could this duplication have been avoided?

2. Assess the implementation of the program

2.1 To what extent is the F&BKP an effective knowledge platform?

- What type of activities were organized to bring organizations and actors in the field together to realize knowledge exchange and collaboration? And what type of activities were started that supported the network function of F&BKP?

- Have knowledge and research under F&BKP credibly contributed to policy and practice?
- To what extent did the F&BKP map relevant and existing knowledge through synthesis documents, learning trajectories, online debates and other instruments?
- To what extent did the F&BKP facilitate research and short studies and analyses that have contributed to policy debates and research, or are conducted for scientific substantiation and underlying assumptions of policy theories in the area of FNS and private sector development?

2.2 To what extent is the F&BKP an efficient knowledge platform?

- Was the available budget for the F&BKP sufficient to meet its core goals?
- Did F&BKP achieve value for money?
- What balance was reached between direct implementation of activities by the Office team, and facilitating and empowering others to act?

2.3 What lessons learned and recommendations from previous evaluations are taken into account by the F&BKP?

- How did the F&BKP realize “feedback loops” to translate ongoing research trajectories in concrete policy and practical activities (through interaction with one or more networks and policy officials)?

3. Future outlook

Focus on lessons learned and recommendations, new strategy, relationship with new policy.

- What are recommendations for the institutional set up taking into account the implementation of the programme in the past
- What existing and new strategies and activities could be relevant, and aligned with the new policy, in a possible next phase?
- What are the main challenges and opportunities for the F&BKP, aligned with the new policy, in a possible next phase?

4. Methodology; Interview and reflection meetings

The consultants will conduct desk study of the foundation documents on which the knowledge platform is based, annual plans and reports as well as the products of the platform’s activities. This will provide input for the consultants for an assessment framework against which the effectiveness of the platform can be assessed by means of additional qualitative research. Important are interviews with parties involved with FNS policy implementation in-country, particularly embassies with Food and Nutrition Security programs. A good sample of embassies with differing contexts and programmes must be represented, for example:

- Ethiopia
- Ghana
- Kenya
- Rwanda
- Myanmar
- Bangladesh

Travel is not included in this evaluation. Interviews can be conducted in person or by phone. Input and perspectives from the following stakeholders is most important:

- Current and previous members of the Steering Group;
- Representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality.
- Representatives of relevant Embassies of the Kingdom of the Netherlands;
- Directors or representatives of the consortium partners (AgriProFocus, CDI-WUR, The Broker)

- Representatives of NWO-WOTRO.

Perspectives and inputs from the following parties are also desired:

- Participants in the network and other relevant stakeholders (networks which organized knowledge activities under the umbrella of F&BKP and were financed by the Knowledge Management Fund (KMF); knowledge institutes, top sectors, etcetera.
- Representatives of other and/or similar knowledge platforms to consider the value of alternative approaches.

5. Organization and responsibilities

The contracting partner is the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and will therefore be responsible for chairing the reference group. The steering committee will be actively involved in the evaluation. The Terms of Reference (ToR) will be made in close collaboration with them. The evaluation will be carried out by a relevant team of consultants.

6. Planning of the review

The review will take place in May and/or June 2018. The final report will be available latest mid- July (table shows indicative steps - to be confirmed together with the consultant).

February 2018	Discussion on outline of objectives and approach of review Appointment of Reference Group; representatives of Steering Committee
February 2018	Final draft ToR to Reference Group, IGG and consortium members for comments
February 2018	Approval of ToR
February 2018	Recruitment consultant(s)
March 2018 onwards	Interaction Consultant-Reference Group on (1) Objective and approach of review; ToR (2) Progress of review.
March >April 2018 onwards	Implementation: analysis of documentation, interviews, draft-report
May 2018 > June	Discussion on draft report
Early June > July	Final Report
Mid-June > July	Discussion on final report and the strategic implications for the F&BKP