



SEEDS GROW

HARVESTING GLOBAL
FOOD SECURITY AND
JUSTICE IN THE FACE
OF CLIMATE CHANGE

YEAR 3 ANNUAL
PROGRESS REPORT

1 April 2016 - 31 March 2017

SUBMITTED TO THE SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT AGENCY BY OXFAM NOVIB

30 September 2017



OXFAM

SIDA CONTRIBUTION ID: 61050063

SUBMITTED TO: Margareta Nilsson, Programme Manager, Natural Resources
Department for International Organisations and Policy Support / Unit for Global Economy and Environment
The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida

SUBMISSION DATE: 30 September 2017

FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT:

Cristina F. Garces, Contract Manager, SeedsGROW in Oxfam Novib
cristina.garces@oxfamnovib.nl

COVER PHOTO CREDIT: Bert Visser, Oxfam Novib and Community Technology Development Trust, Zimbabwe

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
SD=HS - Year 3 highlights	8
GROW - Year 3 highlights	16
Programme finance	19
1 INTRODUCTION: CHANGING CONTEXTS	20
Seed sector context for SD=HS	21
GROW context	23
Oxfam's internal context	24
2 PROGRESS REPORT ON SD=HS, APRIL 2016–MARCH 2017	26
Mid-term review	28
Pillar 1: Scaling-up models	29
Pillar 2: Farmer seed enterprises	32
Pillar 3: Women, seeds and nutrition	34
Pillar 4: Governance and knowledge systems	40
3 PROGRESS REPORT ON GROW, APRIL 2016–MARCH 2017	44
Specific Objective 1: Building a stakeholder movement	45
Specific Objective 2: Global-level policies and governance	50
Specific Objective 3: National policies and governance	55
4 SEEDSGROW PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT	60
Human resources	61
Programme reporting and governance	61
Programme development	62
5 SEEDSGROW FINANCES	64
SeedsGROW financial summary	65
SD=HS finance	67
GROW finance	70
Dutch Postcode Lottery	72
Cash-flow from donors	73
ANNEX 1 LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR SD=HS	76
ANNEX 2 LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR GROW	86

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AIIB	Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank
ANDES	<i>Asociacion para la Naturaleza y el Desarrollo Sostenible (Peru)</i>
ARIPO	African Regional Intellectual Property Organization
BtB	Behind the Brands (Oxfam International campaign)
CABEI	Central American Bank for Economic Integration
CAN	Climate Action Network
CAWR	Centre for Agroecology, Water and Resilience (Coventry University, UK)
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CGRFA	Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
CIMMYT	International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center
CIP	International Potato Centre
COP	Conference of Parties (used in the context of UNFCCC)
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CTDT	Community Technology Development Trust (Zimbabwe)
DESA	<i>Desarrollos Energéticos S.A.</i>
ETC group	Action Group on Erosion, Technology and Concentration
ETS	Emissions' Trading Scheme
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FFS	Farmer Field School
FMO	<i>Nederlandse Financierings-Maatschappij voor Ontwikkelingslanden</i>
FPIC	Free, Prior Informed Consent
FSE	Farmer Seed Enterprise
GB6	Sixth session of the Governing Body of the ITPGRFA
GPC	Global Programme Committee

ICRISAT	International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFC	International Finance Corporation
IPSHF	Indigenous Peoples and Smallholder Farmers
ITPGRFA	International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
LEAD	Leadership for Environment and Development
LAPA	Local Adaptation Plan of Action
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPL	National Postcode Lottery (the Netherlands)
NUS	Neglected and Underutilised Species
OPV	Open Pollinated Varieties
PGR	Plant Genetic Resources
PVP	Plant Variety Protection
SD=HS	Sowing Diversity=Harvesting Security
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal (United Nations)
SEARICE	Southeast Asia Regional Initiatives for Community Empowerment (Philippines)
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
ToT	Training of Trainers
TPPA	Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement
UMP	Uzumba-Maramba-Pfungwe district, Zimbabwe
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework on Climate Change Convention
UPOV	Union for the Protection of Plant Variety
WWF	World Wildlife Fund



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

“We are the first generation to be able to end poverty, and the last generation that can take steps to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. Future generations will judge us harshly if we fail to uphold our moral and historical responsibilities.”

(Ban Ki-Moon, former Secretary-General, United Nations)

The year 2015 saw the end of the United Nations’ Millennium Development project that outlined an intensive development global agenda to address extreme poverty. Recognizing that momentum to reach these global targets defined a critical moment to maintain progress towards ending poverty, improving health, promoting gender-justice, and protecting the environment, the United Nations and its Member States agreed upon and launched the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).¹ The SDGs define 17 priority areas with ambitious targets to end poverty, achieve food security, improved nutrition, and reverse land degradation and biodiversity loss.

The SDGs address the effects of severe climate change and its disastrous consequences. At the same time, the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment shows that human actions ‘lead to irreversible losses in terms of diversity... and these losses have been more rapid in the past fifty years than ever before in human history’.² Current food production, distribution, trade and consumption is not effective at stopping hunger, poverty and under nutrition. Hunger is not due to an inadequate amount of food; it is a matter of unequal access to food. This is a result of a complex reality of unequal power relations, gender inequality, insufficient governance structures, climate

change, land-use rights, low investment in smallholder farmers, declining biodiversity and food price volatility.

In 2013, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) began its support of Oxfam Novib’s programme **SeedsGROW: Harvesting Global Food Security and Justice in the Face of Climate Change**, which is also supported by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), and the Dutch National Postcode Lottery (NPL), among others. The SeedsGROW Programme contributes to the creation of equal and sustainable global seeds and food systems. SeedsGROW connects people and institutions on local, national and global levels. It demonstrates how to make changes and identifies how effective methods can be replicated and sustained. In selected countries in South America, Africa, and Asia, and globally, the programme pursues the overall objective of:

Harvesting greater food security and food justice by supporting the gender-just transformation of the global governance of food systems, and strengthening affected citizens’ access to knowledge, livelihood resources and public goods in the context of climate change and increased competition over resources.

The SeedsGROW Programme comprises two separate, yet complementary approaches: 1) the Sowing Diversity=Harvesting Security (SD=HS) programme; and 2) the GROW campaign. Both initiatives use a multi-stakeholder, gender-just approach focusing on enabling seed diversity, harvesting food and nutrition security, and building a more equitable and sustainable food system

1. See Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform. (n.d.). Sustainable Development Goals. United Nations. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/?menu=1300>

2. See A.K. Duraipappah, S. Naeem et al. (2005). Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Biodiversity Synthesis. World Resources Institute. <http://www.millenniumassessment.org/documents/document.354.aspx.pdf>

by strengthening the rights, opportunities and resilience to climate change and related injustices of people living in rural poverty, particularly women, to fairly access livelihood resources and global public goods and to raise their voices, influencing policies that affect their lives.

In the final quarter of Year 2, Sida informed Oxfam Novib that the overall Programme budget will be reduced by 22 percent, which amounted to a 4,809,505 EUR reduction of the remaining Programme resources through Sida.

The budget reduction was due to the Government of Sweden's decision to reallocate more funding to address the urgent migrant crisis and was not due to the performance or progress of the SeedsGROW programme. As a result, both Programme elements had to adjust their respective activities, resource allocations, and outputs to accommodate the budget reduction and presented updated logical frameworks to Sida (see Annexes 1 and 2). In the midst of the Oxfam Novib reorganization and at the height of the SeedsGROW programme implementation, the budget cut had significant impact on programme reach, the level of engagement of the programme partners and trust in the Global Programme Committee (GPC) for SD=HS, and human resource management both at Oxfam Novib and partner levels. Country programmes and activities were drastically affected, with some partners opting to end their activities one year earlier than planned due to lack of funding. Additionally, some staff contracts had to be terminated and Oxfam Novib restructured its teams where required. Both the SD=HS and GROW teams strategically analysed the current state of the programs and opted to continue strategic, impactful, and innovative activities with regained spirit and commitment. The SeedsGROW Year 3 Annual Progress Report to Sida describes the implementation of a revised programme, according to the approved revised plans, budgets, and targets.

For SD=HS, the team deprioritised programme elements that had structural delays that limited their potential deliverables and impacts; had disproportionate cost structures on governance and management; or required extraordinary support from Oxfam's specialist team, beyond their current balanced portfolios. Details regarding activity-level changes are found in the updated SD=HS logical framework (approved by Sida in 2016) in Annex 1.

The Sida GROW programme focused on ensuring maximum synergy across the Oxfam International GROW campaign, looked at alternative funding sources to cover certain aspects of the campaign, and reduced support to components that were not progressing as planned. Details regarding activity level changes are found in the approved updated GROW logical framework in Annex 2. These adjustments were approved by Sida formally and Oxfam Novib now reports on the basis of the adjusted plans and budget for SD=HS and GROW respectively.

SOWING DIVERSITY=HARVESTING SECURITY (SD=HS)

SD=HS aims to uphold, strengthen and maintain the rights and technical capacity of indigenous peoples and smallholder farmers, and to influence local to global policies and institutions on the access to—and sustainable use of—plant genetic resources for food and nutrition security under conditions of climate change.

The SD=HS Programme recognizes that indigenous peoples and smallholder farmers have decisive roles in global food production and global seed systems. Fewer than 500,000 farming families own less than two hectares of land and they produce up to 80 percent of food consumed locally. In addition, about 80 percent of seeds are sourced locally either through farm saved



seeds, farmers to farmers' exchange and purchase of seeds at local markets. However, most governments' policies fail to support individual farmers and their seed systems. Although the small scale seed sector is resilient and dynamic, it is facing problems of seed purity, health, degeneration and unstable yields. It has limited access to breeding materials and good quality seeds to adapt to changing ecological and commercial conditions. Furthermore, smallholder farmers are under threat from regional and global seed policies and laws that favor the formal sector, and increased market concentration by a limited number of seeds multinationals which, if the recent mergers are approved, will dominate more than 60 percent of the global pesticide and seeds markets.

The SD=HS Programme continues to be built upon four pillars as in the original project proposal, which work in concert to achieve the Programme's mission:

- **Pillar 1 (Scaling up models):** Strengthen the adaptive capacities of indigenous peoples and smallholder farmers (IPSHF) in seed conservation, access and sustainable use by scaling up innovation and engendered models of biodiversity management.
- **Pillar 2 (Farmer Seed Enterprises (FSE):** Enhance the livelihoods and seed security of IPSHF by producing and marketing high-quality and diverse seeds through public-private partnerships.
- **Pillar 3 (Women, seeds and nutrition):** Empower women to reclaim their role in food security by strengthening their capacity in seed management, nutrition and global policy engagement enabling them to claim their right to food.
- **Pillar 4 (Governance and knowledge systems):** Strengthen the capacities and knowledge base of developing countries and their IPSHF to secure national and global legislation and policies for the full implementation of farmers' rights, and everyone's right to food.

SD=HS YEAR 3 HIGHLIGHTS PER PILLAR

Pillar 1 (Scaling-up models)

- A total of 394 farmer field schools (FFS) have now been established, increased from 172 in Year 2, with the majority of participants being women.
- Trained 885 farmer trainers (the majority are women) in Peru, Zimbabwe and Vietnam in FFS on managing plant biodiversity, neglected and underutilised species (for climate change adaptation, NUS) and micro-nutrient content.
- Farmer field school (FFS) farmers in Laos and Vietnam successfully registered the farmers' developed varieties.
- Myanmar completed training FFS facilitators on FFS principles in preparation to establish 20 FFS in Year 4.

Pillar 2 (Farmer Seed Enterprises)

- Pilot farmer seed enterprise in Zimbabwe, Champion Seeds, is actively implementing.

Pillar 3 (Women, seeds and nutrition)

- Global framework for Pillar 3 baseline finalised, consolidated baseline survey report completed for Zimbabwe and Vietnam and experiences used to improve the planning and tools for Pillar 3 interventions.
- With strong farmers' participation, drafted, tested, published and implemented FFS curriculum.

Pillar 4 (Governance and knowledge systems)

- SD=HS scaling-up pathways presented at the Sixth Session of the Governing Body of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA; GB6).
- SD=HS partners contributed to plant genetic resources (PVP) handbook for developing countries.
- SD=HS partners provided substantial text changes and successfully lobbied for the approval of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO) Voluntary Guide for National Seed Policy Formulation, which for the first time recognized and called to support farmers' seed systems.
- Members of the Union for the Protection of Plant Variety (UPOV) and the private seed sector considered SD=HS recommendations to establish a proper balance between farmers' rights and plant breeder's rights (PBRs). In its current form, the UPOV 1991 Convention nullifies the Farmers' Rights to freely save, use, exchange and sell seed of a protected variety. This can negatively impact IPShF who strongly depend on the informal exchange of seed for their seed and food security. [The SD=HS recommendations aim to strengthen the rights of IPShF when using seed of protected varieties.]
- Publication of a global seed law study, which findings have been validated through national and regional workshops. Seed laws are rarely studied and discussed. Yet, by determining who can produce and sell seeds under which conditions, seed laws have a major impact on the functioning of farmers' seed systems and the realization of Farmers' Rights.
- Local to global policy engagement has resulted in new local ordinances and global policy recommendations on Farmers' Rights.

In Year 3, the SD=HS programme was implemented through the partner consortium across three continents in five countries: Peru, Zimbabwe, Laos, Vietnam, and Myanmar. Considering the global scope of the programme — involving around sixty partners and allies with many stakeholders — it has been vital to agree on expectations, the definition of joint-programme interventions, the pooling of expertise and resources, and the sharing of commitments. As part of managing the drastic budget cut, Oxfam Novib seriously reconsidered engagement of partners who were unable to make progress and meet the milestones as set out in their contract. One such partner was the Centre of Agro-ecology, Water and Resilience (CAWR; Coventry University, UK). Oxfam Novib phased out this agreement and reinstated the functioning of the Global Partners Consortium (GPC). Key achievements of this approach are summarized below by pillar.

In 2016-2017, the mid-term review (MTR) carried out by external reviewers was conducted on the progress of the SD=HS Programme. The MTR was performed according to plan (though CAWR was not included with Sida approval, as Oxfam Novib and CAWR were in the process of finalising a legal settlement), with encouraging findings on key achievements³ and identification of some areas for improvement. The management response of Oxfam Novib and the GPC was accepted by Sida. The review was positive in confirming and documenting Programme achievements in scaling up especially the farmers' field schools and mainstreaming its innovations in enterprise development and the use of its tools and value of its influencing work, and, most importantly, in empowering indigenous peoples and smallholder farmers. Areas that could be further developed in the Programme include the need to review the opportunities for connecting with

youth, and integrating financial inclusion. Youth and financial inclusion components are currently being further discussed with relevant teams within Oxfam Novib. The SD=HS team is also developing a model to cost the FFS models as well as seeds systems linkages to show the spread of seeds from the FFS enabling large numbers of communities to benefit directly from the Programme which is scheduled to be piloted in Year 4. In order to ensure continued progress and success, SeedsGROW has prioritised fundraising. Results of this review is elaborated further in the report. Additionally, the SD=HS team is developing a new innovative approach to farmers' led biodiversity monitoring ('the biodiversity wheel'), ensuring key information on required and available seeds is in the hands of the farmers' collectives as part of working with the national seeds banks, and making them deliver what they need. This is being financed from Oxfam Novib's internal innovation fund (source: public fund-raising in the Netherlands).

Overall the SD=HS programme achieved its objectives over the past year. Through Pillar 1, which focuses on bolstering the adaptive capability of IPSHF to create PGR strategies, concepts, and tools, exponential expansion of farmer-mobilised FFS was facilitated by the new FFS ToT curriculum. This curriculum has helped empower farmers to become independent FFS facilitators and, moreover, agents of change within their communities on participatory plant breeding. Farmers have also developed higher capacity to select and create stronger varieties to withstand climate change across the countries. For example, in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam, FFS farmers and partners were able to generate successful crosses and able to select a number of robust rice lines. Another highlight from Year 3 is the launch of the Champion Seeds FSE in Zimbabwe, a sustainable

3. Oxfam Novib and CAWR reached an agreement in early Year 4 and CAWR returned unused funds to Oxfam Novib.

innovative pilot to concretely contribute to livelihoods and seeds security of IPSHF. An exploration for a second FSE in the Mekong region has started. The inclusion of women and their role in food security and nutrition was advanced over Year 3, which included women-focused FFS trainings, hosting and launching women-led seed networks, and empowering women community leaders to participate more actively in policy change. Further, completion of NUS research across countries and strategic alliance building have served as hallmarks of progress under this Pillar. Pillar 4 partners worked to influence the global inclusion and support of Farmers' Rights and their right to food by contributing positive changes (or, alternatively preventing negative changes) in public or private sector policies and their translation in law and implementation. Key publications on, for example, synthetic biology and regional trade agreements, together with multiple workshops, side events and interventions at (inter)national organizations and global level meetings, helped to raise the profile of Farmers' Rights in Year 3, further supporting the work being done at the country level. With the continued push for regional harmonization of seed laws and intellectual property rights, further concentration in the seed sector, and rapid advances in breeding technologies, a key challenge for Pillar 4 in Year 4 is to keep pace with these developments and to continue showing policymakers and other stakeholders the crucial role of IPSHF in the conservation and development of crop diversity for poverty alleviation and local to global food security.

PILLAR 1 (SCALING-UP MODELS)

A key achievement, a game changer, and an accelerator of Pillar 1 in Year 3 is the development, testing, and use

of the Farmer Field School (FFS) curriculum, which is fully gender sensitive, for lead farmers' Training of Trainers (ToT) that has allowed a massive expansion of farmer-mobilized FFS in Zimbabwe. In Year 3, the curriculum enabled formation of 318 new FFS by 274 lead farmers in Zimbabwe even beyond Sida funded sites. To date, 394 FFS were formed; of which 366 in Zimbabwe, which has exceeded the initial target⁴ of SD=HS by more than 200 percent. The wide expansion of FFS in Zimbabwe through the FFS curriculum of lead farmers' ToT demonstrates the options and conditions (pathways) for a successful scaling up. This approach builds on experiences gained over the last decade through previous efforts in the Mekong Delta region, where the 400 seed clubs – which were a direct FFS' spin-off – currently provide 30 percent of all rice seed demands of the region. The earlier successful worldwide adoption of integrated pest management (IPM) approaches through the spread of FFS in the 1980s and 1990s form a reference for this ambition.

Another notable achievement is the formal sector's acknowledgement of farmers' role in crop improvement and plant breeding. Through SD=HS, FFS farmers in Laos and Vietnam successfully registered the farmers' developed varieties; in Zimbabwe, farmers enhanced a local pearl millet variety that outperformed the original features⁵ (see case study section below), hence affirming that farmers performed well in breeding.

In the Mekong Delta of Vietnam, FFS farmers created successful crosses with three varieties prepared for local certification; in Laos, farmers evaluated, selected and identified varieties for production and seed mul-

4. The initial target was establishment of 117 FFS.

5. Farmers' enhanced local variety shows better drought tolerance, more tillering, little lodging, whilst retaining the good palatability of the variety

tiplication purposes. Peru hosted a national seed law workshop that influenced the national seed authority's agreement to conduct a participatory review of seed regulations.

PILLAR 2 (FARMERS' SEED ENTERPRISES)

A key accomplishment in Year 3 was the launching of the Champion Seeds Company in Zimbabwe where in the first season farmers produced 140 tonnes of seed that passed the certification test. Meeting both the quantity and quality standards are complicated even for the private sector, so this is a particularly notable achievement. In Year 3, the pilot farmer seed enterprise (FSE) has transitioned from the preparatory phase of consultations to the active implementation phase. Recruitment of key personnel, establishment of an advisory board as well as a joint Oxfam Novib (ON)-CTDT management committee have been milestones in formalizing the FSE in Year 3. In September 2016, Champion Seeds was registered as a cooperative company with smallholder farmers as its shareholders.

The Champion Seeds business plan has steered the course for Champion Seeds' first growing season, guiding confirmation of crop varieties and the process of breeder and foundation seed acquisition. A total of 96 seed producers received technical training in the first season together with Community Technology Development Trust (CTDT) seven CTDT field staff and four Agritex officers with support from Seed Services, the governmental seed regulatory body. Demonstration (demo) plots across CTDT's districts and 21 field days were held to promote of the Champion Seeds, exposing nearly 6,000 farmers to Champion's products. By the end of Year 3, despite heavy seasonal flooding, seed production sites could state with confidence there would be a decent harvest despite the rains. Small holder farmers continue to demonstrate their significance in climate



resilience and adaptation: Farmers in the selected sites have proven their ability to produce quality seeds that meet the Zimbabwean certification standards and their interest in the varieties of early maturing improved open pollinated varieties (OPVs) (which will be marketed by Champion Seeds) also serves as a strong indicator of sales for next season. Year 4 will continue to build upon and document these successes.

PILLAR 3 (WOMEN, SEEDS AND NUTRITION)

Achievements in bolstering the role of women in improving nutrition and their access to nutritious food were seen in Year 3, through development of a Pillar 3 specific FFS curriculum with the full and active participation of women farmers, local partners and key stakeholders. A robust methodology was taken to develop and ensure relevance of this unique curriculum. For example, the curriculum has been aligned with national initiatives and has formed new linkages with research institutes and government agencies related to nutrition were established for Pillar 3, especially for the nutritional content analysis of NUS prioritized by the communities. The curriculum will be published in Year 4.

The curriculum will be used to empower women farmers to enhance their knowledge, access and use of biodi-

versity for food and nutrition security. Through the FFS, approximately 140 farmers (majority women) in Peru, 385 farmers in Zimbabwe (86 percent women in Sida districts and 74 percent women in NPL districts), and 360 farmers in North-Vietnam (87.5 percent women) have been trained in FFS on plant biodiversity, NUS and good micro-nutrient content. Women farmers, as the custodians and conservers of Plant Genetic Resources (PGR), have started sharing their gained knowledge, seeds and ideas with other communities through video diaries, seeds and food fairs and NUS recipe books. Access to biodiverse sources of nutrition was also increased through seed banks, managed by community seed bank committees (67 percent women). Deeper understanding on the hunger period and the role of women was gained through participatory sessions during the Global Methodological Workshop that Oxfam Novib organised in The Hague in February 2017; this information is crucial in developing relevant curricula and materials and in using appropriate, non-stigmatising language to better reach and inform communities.

A notable success in Year 3 was the selection of two active women leaders from Peru – also FFS participants – by their communities to engage at the international policy level. Internal awareness on biodiversity based diets and the seasonal hunger was raised during the presentation of the Pillar 3 baseline findings at the 15th meeting of the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA).

The Oxfam Novib Global Methodological Workshop built consensus among partners on the approach for Pillar 3 and also defined areas that should be further researched in Year 4 (e.g. the concept of NUS and the hunger period).

PILLAR 4 (GOVERNANCE AND KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS)

In Year 3, the SD=HS partners have improved the knowledge and capacities of stakeholders through various meetings and reports, which focused on the impact and consequences for IPSHF of, amongst others, regional trade agreements, mega-mergers in the agribusiness sector, and synthetic biology. Some important accomplishments regarding influencing policy agendas (i.e. Programme outcome 4.2) have been achieved in Year 3. For example, the Pillar 4 awareness raising of rapid developments in digital information systems and new genomics technologies and their potential to undermine access and benefit-sharing arrangements included in international treaties, resulted in the topic to be firmly put on the international policy agenda the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Conference of Parties (COP)13 in Cancun. Another topic that was put on the international policy agenda is the (dis)balance between Farmers' Rights (as included in the ITPGRFA) and plant breeder's rights (as protected under the 1991 UPOV Convention).⁶ Following the inputs of P4 partners to an international symposium on the matter, some UPOV member countries and observers proposed follow-up actions in line with SD=HS recommendations to strengthen the rights of IPSHF when using seed of protected varieties. The various 'local to global' and evidenced-based policy advocacy pathways of the SD=HS program came together during the second Global Consultation on Farmers' Rights in Bali, where several presentations, a photo exhibit and movies were presented. This resulted in some of the SD=HS policy asks to be included in the Co-chairs' recommendations, which will be presented to the Governing Body of the ITPGRFA later in 2017.

⁶. *International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV)*.

The global seed law study, which findings from the SD=HS program countries were validated through national and regional workshops, was published in Year 3. This is an important contribution because seed laws are rarely studied, yet they have a major impact on the functioning of farmers' seed systems as they regulate who can produce and sell seeds from which varieties and under which conditions. The study findings were presented during the second Global Consultation on Farmers' Rights in Bali. Here, the various 'local to global' and evidenced-based policy advocacy pathways of the SD=HS program came together. Next to the presentation of key lessons and outcomes from the SD=HS program, a photo exhibit and movies of the FFS in Zimbabwe and the depositing of potato seed in the Svalbard Seed Vault, were presented. This resulted in the SD=HS policy recommendation to establish a voluntary guideline for national implementation of Farmers' Rights to be included in the Co-chairs' recommendations, which will be presented to the Governing Body of the ITPGRFA later in 2017.

GROW

GROW is Oxfam's main campaign dealing with the right to sustainable livelihoods.⁷ This report focuses on the Sida-funded activities and other activities to which

Sida was an important contributor mostly in line with contributions made by other donors such as the Dutch Ministry for Foreign Affairs (referred hereafter as Strategic Partnership funding) and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Reference is made to both 'Oxfam International' and 'Oxfam Novib'. This is to differentiate between Sida support for GROW campaign activities led by other Oxfam affiliates.

GROW aims to contribute to building a more gender-just, equitable and sustainable global food system by empowering people living in rural poverty, particularly women, to increase their resilience and claim their rights and opportunities to fairly access food, livelihood resources and public goods.

The Sida funding for GROW focuses on local, national and global policies on climate change, land rights and biofuels. This focus is reflected in the three objectives of the GROW logical framework of the SeedsGROW program:

- **Specific objective 1:** building global multi-stakeholder movements.
- **Specific objective 2:** improving global policies and governance.
- **Specific objective 3:** improving national policies and governance, and linking these with global campaigns.

7. For more information, see: Oxfam International. (n.d.). About GROW. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/campaigns/about-grow>

GROW – YEAR 3 HIGHLIGHTS PER OBJECTIVE

Specific objective 1: building global multi-stakeholder movements.

- Oxfam's #StandforLandRights online campaign (<https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/burning-land-burning-climate>) brought six land rights cases – in Australia, Honduras, India, Mozambique, Peru and Sri Lanka – to the attention of a wider international public, to put pressure on the national governments concerned to address the issues. The campaign spike reached 7.7 million people, engaged half a million and resulted in 41,503 actions, mostly online. As a result, the land rights cases progressed to the benefit of the impacted communities, even though a final solution is yet to be found. This will be followed through by the Oxfam and partners in-country.

Specific objective 2: improving global policies and governance.

- Oxfam contributed to keeping climate financing on the agenda during the COP 22 in Marrakesh, publishing a Climate finance shadow report 2016 report '<https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/climate-finance-shadow-report-2016>' that was referenced widely, including by the president of Zambia. Although governments made no new commitments, a hopeful sign is that they did not accept developed countries' accounting methods, which Oxfam criticised.
- Oxfam influenced the roll-out of various policy frameworks in ways that protect the land rights of women and indigenous communities: ensuring the inclusion of CSOs in World Bank policy implementation; improved due diligence in the IFC framework; and influencing the Dutch FMO's sustainability policy.

Specific objective 3: improving national policies and governance, and linking these with global campaigns.

- The Pakistan province of Punjab issued the first draft of a bill on climate change, to which Oxfam and partners made a substantial input.
- The GROW campaign in Niger ('Cultivons') influenced new laws on agriculture and social protection, including a legal framework for protection of vulnerable groups such as small scale producers.

In Year 3, the Sida GROW programme implemented planned activities successfully to move policy agendas forward and to influence key actors and stakeholders. Developments within GROW provide insight into the complex and unpredictable ways in which advocacy can change policy. Although not all anticipated outcomes were accomplished, unforeseen events and opportunities were met with determined action – and led to significant achievements. If 2015 was the year of major treaties – the ambitious 2030 Sustainable Development (SDG) Agenda, and the Paris Agreement on climate change – 2016 and 2017 are marked as the era of their implementation. This also applies to the World Bank/

IFC and AIB, which adopted their environmental and social frameworks (ESF) to include the protection of the land rights of women and indigenous communities. In Year 3, Oxfam and partners monitored the implementation of and advocated for realistic change of the above frameworks.

In the fall of 2017, Oxfam conducted a multi-country public action on land rights coined as #StandforLandRights. The action brought six land cases in Australia, Honduras, India, Mozambique, Peru and Sri Lanka into the global spotlight to pressure the respective national governments to address the land issues (as highlighted

in the spike). The spike itself had a reach of 7.7 million people, engaged half a million people, and resulted in 41,503 actions, mostly online. The spike also contributed to moving forward the specific land cases in Honduras, Peru, Sri Lanka to reach a solution for the communities involved.

Meanwhile, Oxfam has started its preparations for its new private sector campaign to be launched in 2017-18. This campaign complements the ongoing private sector campaign (i.e., Behind the Brands-BtB) and is geared towards holding companies and the retail sector accountable for inequality in their value chains and for responsible sourcing practices. Early discussions regarding a potential delay in the private sector campaign spike were held in Year 3 with the previous Sida Programme Manager (Frida Rodhe), as it was already becoming evident that key activities leading up to the spike may not be fully completed yet prior to the scheduled launch in October 2017. As discussed with Sida in June 2017 (Quarter 1, Year 4), the spike for the private sector campaign would be therefore best launched in 2018. Successful campaigns require significant level of preparation, much of which is evidence-based (including updated data, research, communication with private sector). As a result, Sida allowed for the spike to be moved to 2018 and recommended Oxfam Novib to submit a request for a no-cost extension.

Drawing upon the lessons from the GROW evaluation and BtB, the design is based on a co-created campaign with Northern and Southern Oxfams. Whereas the BtB campaign had concentrated on getting commitments from the food and beverage (F&B) companies, the focus in this reporting year was on implementing policies in

BtB priority countries: India, Indonesia, Thailand, Ghana, Malawi, and Brazil. In support to the campaign, two major reports were released (“the journey to sustainable food”, “Land Rights and Soda Giants: Reviewing Coca-Cola and PepsiCo’s land assessments in Brazil”).⁸

After the Paris agreement was signed in 2016, COP22 in Marrakech was the next opportunity for Oxfam to raise the neglect of adaptation finance as a major issue for this session. Oxfam published its ‘climate finance shadow report 2016’ (<https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/climate-finance-shadow-report-2016>) showing that levels of climate finance to adaptation and to Least Developed Countries (LDCs) are critically low and new commitments to increase both are urgently needed. Oxfam’s message resonated well with media and government negotiators and was referenced widely, including at the highest levels (e.g., the President of Zambia referenced the report). Oxfam’s message resonated well with media and government negotiators and was referenced widely, including at the highest levels (e.g., the President of Zambia referenced the report). While governments made no new commitments during the COP, present accounting methods by developed countries – as criticized by Oxfam – were not accepted. It means that developed countries after COP22 will feel more pressure to increase their adaptation finance.

Oxfam’s engagement on the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS) review did not result in the accomplishments as hoped. Oxfam actively promoted amendments proposing to create a fund for international climate action, but the position adopted by the European Parliament did not include binding provisions setting aside a share of ETS revenues for this purpose. For the

8. See <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/journey-sustainable-food> and <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/land-rights-and-soda-giants>

EU Renewable Energy Directive revision (RED-II), Oxfam released a new report entitled ‘Burning Land, Burning the Climate’ (<https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/burning-land-burning-climate>) seeking to influence its proposal with the aim of ending the use of unsustainable bioenergy, which threatens the access to land and the food security of people in developing countries. Together with allies, a series of high level meetings with the European Commission were held in the period between the launch and the adoption of the legislative proposal which resulted in several provisions (as propagated for by Oxfam) were partially included in the proposal to the European Parliament.

Following the completion of policy frameworks such as the Safeguards on land and resettlement from the World Bank/IFC and the AIIB, Oxfam focuses on the implementation and monitoring of these safeguards. The World Bank considers the years 2016 and 2017 as a preparation period for transitioning to the new framework. The World Bank heeded Oxfam’s call for involving CSOs and invited Oxfam to be part of working groups developing implementation and monitoring methods to support the ESF implementation.

Oxfam continued engaging financial intermediaries on their lending practices in the reporting year. One year on from the launch of Oxfam and partners’ paper “The Suffering of Others” – which aimed to make IFC more transparent on its lending practices, such as disclosing information on their clients – was a sound achievement this year as IFC has now also committed itself to take steps towards better due diligence. As for the AIIB, Oxfam coordinated its advocacy with other CSOs regarding the implementation of its ESF.

Oxfam placed strong pressure on the Dutch FMO to review its existing policies on environmental and social sustainability. FMO is currently considering including requirements on Human Rights Impact Assessments, inclusion of FPIC, reference to human rights treaties and contextual risk. This reflects Oxfam’s comments submitted as part of FMO’s Sustainability policy review in 2016.

Oxfam is also involved in the review of land indicators under the SDG-framework as planned for in 2017. The main focus of Oxfam is to embed land rights of women, indigenous people and communities in the monitoring and reporting methodologies developed for these indicators.

On the country level, the GROW campaign in Niger (Cultivons) focused in its last year of receiving Sida support on one focal area, agricultural investment and resilience. Through engagement of parliament and government, the campaign followed through on its ‘ALKWALI Niger Manifesto’⁹ as signed by several political parties prior to the national elections in March 2016. Among others, the manifesto was signed by the political party of President Issaoufou¹⁰. The focus in its follow up was on Agricultural Law (Loi d’Orientation Agricole-LOA) and the Law on Social Protection (Loi sur la protection).

For LOA, Cultivons supported one of its members, the network organisation *Réseau des Chambres d’Agriculture du Niger* (RECA), in engaging the new members of parliament for adaptation of this legal framework, relevant for agricultural investment policy for the years to come, and by meeting with its *commission développement rural* (rural development commission). With the help of the

9. Please be referred to the SEEDSGROW annual report 2015-2016 as submitted to Sida.

10. *Parti Nigérien pour la Démocratie et le Socialisme (PNDS)*

commission, the draft became a bill in 2017. The Law on Social Protection is soon to be presented to the national assembly for approval. The law, once adopted, will provide a legal framework for protection of vulnerable groups such as small producers.

In Pakistan, the provincial government of Punjab moved forward to establish a provincial climate change policy and presented a draft for discussion internally within all the provincial Government departments to which Oxfam and its local partner, Lead, facilitated inputs from civil society. The 16-government departments approved the policy and will move forward for the approval from the Chief Minister. Moreover, GROW conducted a detailed review of climate public expenditure in both targeted provinces and conducted research on 'Tracking of Public Agricultural Investments and Climate Change Adaptation Finance Flows in Pakistan' (for 2015-2016). This was complemented by a national briefing paper publication "FOOD, CLIMATE CHANGE, & WOMEN." The briefing paper findings showed that women small scale farmers play a significant role in food production, yet policies and investments fail to recognise their contribution, meet their needs, or support their enormous potential to eradicate hunger.

Oxfam's GROW campaign is inspired from inputs from the local level reflecting the true issues from small scale producers. In Pakistan, the development of Local Adaptation Plans of Action (LAPA) – as an advocacy tool – plays a key role. LAPAs have been finalized in 11 districts. The linchpin in local to provincial advocacy, as described above, is the GROW provincial steering committee. The two provincial committees (Punjab and

Sindh) finalised the charter of demands, which served as input to the provincial governments. In support of its advocacy, GROW Pakistan launched various public actions throughout the year. In October 2016, a national spike was launched to target the urban middle class to support and to build pressure on the government and political leaders to prioritize the climate change agenda.

PROGRAMME FINANCE

In February 2016, Sida informed Oxfam Novib that there will be a budget reduction of SEK 42,000,000 (approximately EUR 4,666,000), which results in a 22 percent budget reduction of the five-year programme. In July 2016, the SeedsGROW programme submitted to Sida updated logframes for both the SD=HS and GROW components and an updated multiple year budget, including adjusted human resources. In the adjusted budget, the amount that was underspent for the first two years of implementation was considered as well as reduction in human resources and activities. Taking the above into account, the total expenditure for SeedsGROW in Year 3 was EUR 4,145,170, of which 3,565,569 was funded by Sida and EUR 579,641 by the Dutch Postcode Lottery (NPL) with an absorption rate for both projects of 87 percent.

At Oxfam Novib's level we have managed to continue the implementation of the SeedsGROW Programme despite some considerable human resource challenges, like the long-term illness of the overall SeedsGROW Programme Lead which was solved by appointing an interim Programme Lead; the change in the Programme Steering Committee due departure of the Campaigns Director, staff transitions, and layoffs in the SD=HS team.



CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: CHANGING CONTEXTS

The contexts in which SeedsGROW operates are changing, both in terms of policy environment and commercial seed sectors, in ways that require the SD=HS Programme's policy agenda to be revisited.

SIDA FUNDING REDUCTION

In March 2015, Sida informed Oxfam Novib (reference 13/000818) that the SeedsGROW Programme will experience an overall budget reduction for the multi-year programme in the amount of 22 percent. As the budget reduction was to be enacted at the midpoint of the programme and was to be absorbed in the remaining three years, Oxfam Novib had to reduce the budget by 44 percent for implementation for years 2016-18. Both programme elements, SD=HS and GROW, discussed strategies on how best to achieve the same or similar results with reduced funding. Both SD=HS and GROW used the following principles to guide the strategic visions of the remaining years:

1. maintain the structure of both programmes, which are both formed upon strong evidence base and shaped and managed by expert teams;
2. keep intact elements that are central to the successes to date;
3. prioritise areas of the programme where work is already well underway; and,
4. deprioritise areas of the programme that have experienced severe delays, limiting potential deliverables and impact.

SD=HS reduced countries from eight to five, laid off three staff, and reduced the number of FSE pilots to only one. During this time, the SeedsGROW programme leader became ill and we had to restructure the manage-

ment of the programme to ensure continued efficiency and success. More details on where programmes were adjusted are included in Annexes 1 and 2.

SEED SECTOR CONTEXT FOR SD=HS

The main developments in the seed sector described in the Year 2 Progress Report¹¹ have continued over the last year. The consolidation in the global seed sector continues apace. After several unsuccessful bids by Monsanto to take over Swiss seeds and pesticides firm Syngenta, the China National Chemical Corp (ChemChina) has offered a US\$43bn share buyout for Syngenta, which was approved by the company's board in February 2016. A few months earlier, Dow and DuPont announced that they were merging to form DowDuPont, with a combined value of US\$130bn. The latest and biggest takeover is Bayer buying Monsanto for \$56 billion, which will create the world's largest integrated pesticides and seeds company. If these mergers are all approved by the anti-trust regulators around the globe, the first links of the global industrial food chain will largely be in the hands of just three companies, which together will control over 60 percent of global pesticide sales and commercial seed sales¹². The consolidation at the global level is also happening at the national level. In Zimbabwe, for example, 7 national seed companies have been bought by the global seed giants over the last years¹³. This development is leading to greatly reduced competition in the market and reduced variety choices for farmers, and is likely to increase the cost of seeds and chemicals.

Another continuing theme is that regional harmonisation processes are favouring the establishment and imple-

11. SeedsGROW. (2015). *SeedsGROW. Harvesting global food security and justice in the face of climate change. Progress Report. 1st October 2013-31st March 2015.*

12. ETC Group. (2016). *Merge-Santo: New Threat to Food Sovereignty. Briefing note.* <http://www.etcgroup.org/content/merge-santo-new-threat-food-sovereignty>

13. <https://www.theindependent.co.zw/2015/08/14/seed-sector-collapses-from-foreign-acquisitions/>

mentation of laws on seed marketing and plant variety protection that support the private seed sector. In addition, many developing countries are involved in international trade agreements¹⁴ which often include obligations that may negatively affect farmer seed systems. One example is the requirement to allow patents on plant material. Patents are even more stringent than plant breeders' rights, as they effectively reduce the genetic material available for further breeding, giving breeders and farmers fewer options to integrate preferred new traits into their own varieties or to adapt such varieties to local circumstances.

The need for SD=HS work has become increasingly evident in light of the severe effects of El Niño, which caused the worst drought in 20 years in Zimbabwe. The need for SD=HS work has become increasingly evident in light of the severe effects of El Niño, which caused the worst drought in 20 years in Zimbabwe. This has had direct implications for majority of the farmers in the FFS who not only lost their crops and but also lost their seeds as their means of livelihoods. In these situations, seed banks are critical in enabling farmers to plant for next year's season. For example, SD=HS farmers who had access to community seed banks could replant up to two to three times. This illustrates that strengthened farmer seed systems can provide a safety net to smallholder farmers, which would be increasingly needed as extreme weather event such as drought becomes the new normal.

The drought also affected the Pillar 1 work on participatory varietal selection trials organised through FFS: it was reported that around 80 percent of the

trials were affected by the drought. However, from those trials that produced a decent crop, a number of adaptation strategies were developed and shared among farmers. These include, for example, breeding for local conditions, crop diversification, conservation agriculture, staggered planting and water-harvesting techniques.

On the national level, it should be noted that in Zimbabwe (which implements across all Pillars), the drought and rainfall drastically affected the crop yields; simultaneously, the country experienced an economic crisis requiring quick programme innovations. Following a drought in Year 3, Zimbabwe experienced a tremendous amount of rainfall in the 2016-2017 agricultural season, breaking 100-year records in the project sites. This resulted in nitrogen leaching, especially in sandy soils, affecting crop yields in some areas. Tsholotsho district, for example, received heavy rains of above 1000mm compared to the expected average of 450mm per annum; compounded by Cyclone Dineo and poor soils, this resulted in nutrient leaching, leading to stunted crops. Rivers and dams over flooded, leading to river siltation and heavy soil degradation. The cyclone left a trail of disaster on road networks, bridges and dams, making access to project sites impossible during the worst period. The change in climate also led to an outbreak of a new pest, the fall armyworm, which damaged between 20 percent and 50 percent of the crops (especially maize and sorghum) in project sites. Farmers struggled to control the pest, as there were no known pesticides nor traditional methods of control. Weeds, too, became more prevalent, causing increased manual labour in the fields.

14. For example, the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement. More information about similar trade deals can be found at: <http://www.bilaterals.org/>, <http://ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/countries-and-regions/development/economic-partnerships/> and <https://ustr.gov/trade-agreements/free-trade-agreements>

Further impacting the programme in Zimbabwe, in July 2016, a cash crisis began in the midst of an already deteriorating socio-economic situation. The Government of Zimbabwe introduced bond notes in November 2016 to ease the liquidity challenges and shortage of US dollars, but there continues to be a serious liquidity crisis. CTDI has been managing the cash crisis by encouraging the use of plastic money: operational resources are transferred online into staff's bank accounts by CTDI's finance officer to pay for field-level supplies. Such cash transfers into staff accounts are considered as cash advances and follow the same strict procedures for cash reimbursements. A lesson learned from the challenges that Zimbabwe is facing – and understanding that these challenges are not unique to Zimbabwe but many other countries as well – is that there is a strong need to include a chapter in the FFS curriculum that specifically addresses disaster risk reduction and management.

GROW CONTEXT

The election of President Trump in 2016 heralded tremendous uncertainty and anticipated global political change. During his election campaign, President Trump was overtly critical on climate change, and the US duly pulled out of the COP Paris Agreement. No other countries followed suit, as became apparent in the G-20 summit of July 2017.¹⁵

Both the election of President Trump and the earlier result of the UK's Brexit referendum fit Oxfam's analysis of a wider, worldwide trend of "new nationalism." This is characterised by governments both in the North and South pushing domestic interests out of populist considerations, but without being isolationist. One

negative effect is the trend of shrinking CSO space in many countries, as reported in previous reports to Sida. The rising nationalism also undermines multilateral institutions and international law, which potentially threatens prosperity and security as many challenges (e.g. climate change, migration) are not only national in nature, but also have strong regional and/or global components. Even though the GROW campaign critiques the policies and governance of many multilateral institutions, such as World Bank/IFC and UN, it does not seek to challenge their *raison d'être* or to restrict their mandate to the benefit of nation states. For Oxfam, this confirms the relevancy of pursuing a local-to-global approach in all its campaigns where both levels are connected.

Commercial land deals continue to put pressure on the land rights of indigenous communities and women. Since 2009, Oxfam and others have been sounding the alarm about millions of hectares being acquired by investors to meet rising demand for food and bio-fuels, or for speculation. Up to 59 percent of these commercial land deals cover communal lands claimed by indigenous peoples and small communities. Yet only a small fraction of these deals, 14 percent, have involved a consent process with local communities. In the absence of international norms on mediation – i.e. FPIC – land issues can turn violent. Global Witness 2016 reported an increasing number of deadly attacks against environmental activists, including land rights activists, in recent years.¹⁶ Human rights issues have become more prominent in the GROW land agenda – for example, Oxfam's campaign against FMO in the aftermath of the murder of activist Berta Cáceres, who was protesting a massive hydroelectric project in Honduras,

15. See also <http://www.politico.com/story/2017/07/08/trump-climate-change-g20-240320>

16. <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/about-us/annual-reviews/>

in March 2016.¹⁷ FMO and other development banks later suspended funding for this project.

OXFAM'S INTERNAL CONTEXT

In 2015-16, Oxfam Novib underwent a significant internal change process in order to face the changing donor landscape and become a more agile project organization that is better equipped to respond to external challenges; an organization that can facilitate the further integration of Oxfam Novib within Oxfam International. By mid 2016, the organisation was in a period of recovery, with finalisation of the new structure and way of working as a project-based organisation, which a clear focus on developing and managing larger-scale multi-country programmes, ensuring quality delivery of these projects with Oxfam country offices and civil society partners, and ensuring knowledge creation, innovation and impact measurement.

OXFAM NOVIB

In February and April 2017, two members of the Board of Directors, who also happen to be the members of the SeedsGROW Steering Committee, left the organisation. A new member of the Board has been recruited and will start in September 2017. It is expected that the three members of the Board of Directors will redistribute their tasks. The Executive Director will become responsible for the Public Engagement unit, in addition to the Corporate Communications and Innovation units. The main task of

the Director of Programmes and Campaigns will be the central management of multiple project departments (Thematic Units, Programme Support and Impact). The Director of Operations will remain responsible for the departments of Quality, Finance and Control (QFC), HR, ICT, and Institutional Funding and Donor Relations. The new Director of Programmes and Campaigns will be a member of the Oxfam Novib SeedsGROW Steering Committee along with the Manager of the Thematic Unit for Food, Land and Water in which this project is based and managed.

The Oxfam2020 change process which was started in 2013 reached its peak in 2016 with the actual transition towards one single programme management system and country strategy in all countries where Oxfam has a presence. By mid-2017 the confederation hopes to have reached the final stage of the transition, meaning that the new Oxfam offices will then operate in the new model. As with all change processes, it takes time to adjust and the process of change is therefore closely being monitored. With Oxfam2020, the Oxfam Confederation creates greater organisational simplicity, efficiency, and effectiveness and works towards becoming more rooted in the countries where it works, have a stronger representation and influence from the global 'South' to be able to run better quality programmes, reach more people and have greater impact on poverty.

17. Berta Cáceres was a Honduran land, human rights, and environmental activist who led the struggle against one of Central America's largest projects, the Agua Zarca hydroelectric project. She was also co-founder of the Council of Indigenous Peoples of Honduras. As a result of the murder, the Dutch FMO, the Finnish Fund for Industrial Cooperation, and the Central American Bank for Economic Integration (CABEI) decided to suspend their funding for the Agua Zarca project.





Zunzanyika Farmer Field School

Building Community Resilience To Climate Change Through
Crop Diversification

Supported By:



CHAPTER 2

PROGRESS REPORT ON SD=HS

APRIL 2016–MARCH 2017

The Sowing Diversity=Harvesting Security (SD=HS) Programme aims to provide greater access to seeds and nutritious foods, to raise policy awareness and increase the technical and influencing skills of 17,500 households over five years (reduced from 150,000 as a result of budget cut), with women comprising at least 50 percent of beneficiaries. The aim is to enable them to uphold, strengthen and mainstream their rights and technical capacities, to access and sustainably use plant genetic resources (PGR) for food and nutrition security. The SD=HS programme is implemented by a consortium of nine organizations across three continents:

- the Southeast Asia Regional Initiatives for Community Empowerment (SEARICE);
- the Third World Network;
- GRAIN;
- the Action Group on Erosion, Technology and Concentration (ETC Group);
- the South Centre;
- the Community Technology Development Trust (CTDT);
- *Asociacion para la Naturaleza y el Desarrollo Sostenible* (ANDES);
- the Centre for Agroecology, Water and Resilience (CAWR; Coventry University, UK)¹⁸; and
- Oxfam Novib.

SEARICE works directly with the following national partners:

- The Metta Foundation in Myanmar;
- The Mekong Delta Development Research Institute of Can Tho University, and the Plant Resources Centre, in Vietnam; and
- The Plant Quarantine Division of the Department of Agriculture in Laos.

Due to the budget cut, Oxfam reprioritised the SD=HS Programme by taking into account current progress and ensuring that the programme maintained its evidence-based approach as supported by a specialist team. This resulted in a revised logical framework for 2016-17, as submitted to Sida in July 2016 with an explanation about which areas were deprioritised.

Oxfam Novib and the SD=HS consortium partners built on the interventions and lessons learned from the pilot programme 'Putting Lessons into Practice', initially funded by IFAD and Oxfam Novib. The current Sida grant enables significant scaling up of proven concepts and methodologies. Extensive documentation and record-keeping allows for international comparisons and analysis, and improved knowledge management for South-South capacity building. This includes consistency in concepts (e.g. scaling-up frameworks), methods (e.g. participatory plant breeding, baseline surveys) and indicators (e.g. number of households and women reached, seed security, food and nutrition security, and policy engagement). This consistency has been developed in an iterative and participative manner with inputs from partners and communities, and scientific and technical experts, in consultations led by Oxfam Novib.

The Programme's global frameworks, methodologies and tools are tailored to local circumstances. Pilots have been conducted in the field involving communities, partners and experts, allowing for further refinement. Meaningful local information is obtained in a form that can be aggregated and analysed at regional and global levels to inform global policy debates with evidence-based advocacy. Oxfam's resulting publications and reports are distributed to global governance bodies, such as the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food

¹⁸ Details of CAWR and its partners in India, Senegal, and Mali are not included in this report as activities were not conducted in Year 3.

and Agriculture (ITPGRFA), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Committee for World Food Security. A special contribution has been submitted for the State of the World Report on Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture 2017, to be published by the FAO.

The SD=HS programme and its advocacy are centred on the abilities and knowledge of indigenous peoples and smallholder farmers, bolstered by and assessed through scientifically robust frameworks, methodologies, and tools. It was imperative that a common approach was accepted by all consortium partners at the beginning of the programme; they did so by building upon existing work and experience from related programmes, such as the aforementioned 'Putting Lessons into Practice'.

Year 3 activities are briefly described below, followed by detailed accounts of outputs and progress made on the four pillars of SD=HS, between 1 April 2016 and 31 March 2017. The activities as outlined in the Annual Workplan submitted to Sida in the interim report on 3 November 2016 are used as guidance in this report.

MID-TERM REVIEW

Year 3 presented an opportunity for the Seeds programme to reflect on current practices and make improvements. Oxfam Novib and Sida agreed on terms of reference for a mid-term review (MTR) and an evaluator for the Seeds component of the Sida SeedsGROW programme. Oxfam Novib commissioned South Research Centre (Brussels, Belgium) to conduct the MTR. The MTR found that the Seeds programme had a well-defined and evidence-based approach to achieve its mission; in particular, the evaluators noted the nutrition component (Pillar 3) as an innovative enhancement to the overall initiative and the remarkable achievements in Pillar 1 – the scaling-up approaches and the over achievements on the farmer field schools. South Research Centre provided

a review with insightful recommendations and observations, while acknowledging the key role and value-add of the Oxfam Novib programme management team in The Hague. South Research Centre provided a review with insightful recommendations and observations.

Oxfam Novib appreciates the conclusions of the MTR team on the high relevance and strong conceptual foundations and elaboration of the SD=HS programme. The Oxfam Novib Management Response to the MTR findings will:

1. **Re-define consortium foundations:** Oxfam Novib will present and discuss changes on SD=HS governance document to better reflect the advisory role of the Global Programme Committee;
2. **Elaborate further on PGRFA conservation focus and FFS:** Oxfam Novib will include more detailed text on scale-up pathways on how efforts on PGRFA conservation and use can be optimally directed towards the wider livelihood improvement agenda;
3. **Assess interlinkages between pillars 1 and 3:** Oxfam Novib appreciates the recommendation to integrate Pillars 1 and 3, but believes that full integration is not desirable as NUS and nutrition are relatively new topics that need special attention, and integrating gender issues in wider approaches may compromise a more balanced and gender-sensitive approach; however, Oxfam Novib will work on adjusting the processes and activities undertaken in these two pillars;
4. **Review the unit costs for FFS to explore efficiencies:** Oxfam Novib appreciates the attention to the cost-efficiency of FFS. However, the figures the evaluators used to calculate costs may not be correct, as the calculation combined two pillar budgets with additional, unrelated costs. Oxfam Novib proposes to work with CTDI in Zimbabwe to facilitate a farmer-led assessment of FFS to better understand their needs, successes and potential improvements, and this will form the basis for improving the scale-up pathways

and alliances needed to support this effort. Oxfam Novib will also document FFS costings in relation to reach, and annex the calculation to the Year 4 Annual Progress Report to Sida;

5. **Continue to forge partnerships** from the national to local levels to support scaling-up strategies;
6. **Review ways to include youth:** Oxfam Novib will work with partners to consult several FFS on how to attract more youth, as well as consulting its own Youth as Active Citizens team;
7. **Ensure gender mainstreaming includes men:** Oxfam Novib reconfirms its commitment to gender mainstreaming and will consult with appropriate gender experts within Oxfam to inform this process;
8. **Remain aware of challenges related to FSE implementation:** Oxfam Novib will ensure FSE implementation is complementary with FFS activities and farmer seed systems as a whole. Some of the customer base of Champion Seeds is anticipated to be the CTDT FFS participants, further facilitating Oxfam Novib's ability to track and document the activity. SD=HS will develop a sustainability plan for beyond the programme period;
9. **Articulate more clearly the Pillar 3 goal around improved nutrition:** Oxfam Novib agrees that improved nutrition is the overall goal of Pillar 3, for which work with NUS and investments in gender balance are instrumental. Rather than changing the approaches or activities of Pillar 3, Oxfam Novib will better describe how NUS and gender contribute towards improved nutrition;
10. **Encourage consortium partners to create more cooperation and synergies in relation to national and international policy advocacy:** Oxfam Novib concurs with the recommendation and acknowledges that Pillar 4 partners felt that the MTR may have focused more on the experience of country partners. Oxfam Novib called a Global Programme Committee meeting

in May 2017 (following the reporting period) to discuss a more coordinated approach;

11. **Upgrade the M&E system:** Oxfam Novib agrees that the MEAL systems need to be upgraded by incorporating indicators and targets of the methodological workshop and will include the revised targets for monitoring in the Annual Workplan and Budget for Year 4.

Oxfam Novib will discuss progress and plans following the MTR review and discussion with Sida in Year 4.

PILLAR 1: SCALING-UP MODELS

Strengthen the adaptive capacities of indigenous peoples and smallholder farmers in seed conservation, access and sustainable use by scaling up innovation and engendered models of biodiversity management.

Pillar 1 coverage: Zimbabwe, Peru, Vietnam, and Laos

Year 3 witnessed important achievements under *Outcome P1.1: IPSHF in the SD=HS countries have enhanced capacity to develop and implement innovative PGR adaptation strategies, concepts and tools, integrating traditional and scientific knowledge and gender perspective, and benefiting from greater access to PGR*. The FFS curriculum for lead farmers' training of trainers was a game changer, accelerating the scaling up of the SD=HS programme. In Zimbabwe, it enabled vast expansion of farmer-mobilised FFS, from 20 to 300 in one season.

Overall in Year 3, there was a significant scale-up of the FFS participatory plant breeding on plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (FFS PPB on PGR). Far exceeding the Year 3 target of 117 FFS, a total of 394 FFS have now been formed in Laos (10), South Vietnam (12),

Peru (6) and Zimbabwe (366, of which 131 are in Sida-funded sites), up from 78 in Year 2. The user-friendly ToT curriculum empowers farmers to become independent FFS facilitators themselves. On the basis of mutual concerns, a trained lead farmer will be able to form a new FFS and, with the members, jointly define the crop focus and research and development objectives. In Year 3, 288 lead farmers were trained in Zimbabwe (274 farmers across 11 districts)¹⁹ and Laos (14). The expansion of farmer-mobilised FFS has been important in regions facing highly stressful conditions. Zimbabwe has recently been hit by the worst drought and floods in decades. In the Mekong Delta, Vietnam, saltwater intrusion has become more prominent in SD=HS sites in Soc Trang and Hau Giang provinces.

Outcome P1.2: Gender sensitive participatory plant breeding (PPB) and IPSHF adaptation strategies are mainstreamed in key relevant institutions saw positive progress on concrete outputs and recognition of the formal sector in Year 3. Through the FFS in Zimbabwe, farmers have successfully broadened the diversity of their crops and varieties, having more possibilities to cultivate drought-tolerant crops such as pearl millet and sorghum as alternatives to maize. These small green cereals had been grown 30 years ago, but mostly replaced by government-subsidised hybrid maize. Farmers evaluated 12 advanced lines of sorghum and nine of pearl millet, of which three lines for each crop were selected for early maturity and tolerance to drought, pest and disease. In 2015-16, 11 out of 33 lines of maize distributed to the FFS survived the worst drought, so in Year 3 farmers subjected these varieties to strong selection pressure for drought tolerance. It

was also reported that from 33 CIMMYT stable maize lines, two lines of OPVs outperformed hybrids particularly in low-rainfall areas.

In Peru, farmers have widened their access to varieties of maize and potato that are more resistant to pests and diseases, which are increasingly becoming an issue due to climate change. In FFS participatory varietal selection in Ccachin and Choquecancha, the farmers evaluated 100 maize cobs for resistance to a fungus that commonly affects local varieties. FFS in Rosaspata carried out participatory varietal enhancement with yield as a breeding objective. Participatory varietal selection on potato was done in Pampacorral as a follow up of Year 2: seven of 17 potato varieties distributed by INIA were selected for resistance to *Phytophthora infestans* ("Rancha"), a common disease affecting potatoes. The importance of farmers' capacities to select and develop improved varieties cannot be overemphasised: in Year 3, *Phytophthora infestans* did not emerge but delays in the rainy season and lower amounts of rainfall created new threats, and farmers had to evaluate 10 new potato varieties from local collections in response. Another focus of the FFS in Peru is seed conservation. In Year 3, a total of 381 varieties of native potato transferred from the International Potato Center (CIP) and the Potato Park were sown in Pampacorral, enabling farmers to conserve and increase biodiversity in the community.

In the Mekong Delta of Vietnam, the FFS PPB, PVS and PVE on rice focused on selecting and/or developing farmer varieties with tolerance to saline conditions²⁰ in Tien Giang and Kien Giang provinces, and enhancement of a farmer variety with high eating quality and desirable

19. These lead farmers are in 11 districts covered by SD=HS (UMP, Goromonzi, Tsholotsho, Chiredzi districts), Netherlands Postcode Lottery (Mudzi, Rushinga, Mt. Darwin, Matobo districts), and the FAO Benefit Sharing Fund (Murehwa, Mutoko, Chipinge districts)
20. TC7 and ND4 varieties

red grain colour.²¹ Together with the seed clubs and the Mekong Delta Institute, FFS farmers generated 63 successful crosses²² and selected 177 promising rice lines from their existing F3-F6 nurseries. Three varieties²³ have been prepared for local seed certification.

In Laos, the FFS PVS on rice, maize, cassava and yard-long bean aimed at adaptability testing in different agroecosystems. Through the PVS, farmers evaluated and selected 15 varieties of rice provided by the Department of Agriculture and ARC, five varieties of maize, one variety of cassava and one variety of yardlong bean. They adopted all 15 selected varieties of rice, four grown for production and 11 for seed multiplication purposes. In Xayabouly province, one farmer's selected rice variety, Mueng Phieng (MP) 1m, is currently being registered as a district variety.

Year 3 identified several concerns raised by farmers that will be addressed in Year 4 in terms of *engaging farmers in policy change (output P1.3)*. In particular, the Farmer Technical and Policy Conference (FTPC) in South Vietnam and Laos identified the need to reassess the implications of seed laws (and specifically seed registration) for farmers' practices of using, saving, exchanging and selling seeds. Farmers in Vietnam voiced concerns that marketing of uncertified seeds produced by the FFS spin-off seed clubs will be hindered in the future, despite having been officially permitted until now at provincial level. This concern was heightened by the fact that 38 varieties of rice have recently been protected with PVP, although plant breeder's exemptions would still allow farmers to use PVP-protected varieties as parent materials for their breeding or create new varieties for market

purposes. A workshop targeting decision makers on this issue will be held in Year 4.

In Peru, a national workshop on seed law in Year 3 resulted in the national seed authority agreeing to carry out a participatory review of implementation of Article 10 (on class and categories of seeds) and Article 11 (on regulating seed production) with the aim of better recognising the roles and rights of smallholder farmers related to seed management concerning ancestral and/or traditional seed systems.

LESSONS LEARNED AND REFLECTIONS

Tailoring the FFS ToT curriculum to focus on practical issues important to lead farmers who may have little or no formal background in plant breeding has proved to be a game-changer for the programme. The earlier version was more technical and intended for a broader audience, such as extension services, partners, and other practitioners who have more exposure in plant breeding. The new, tailored version of the curriculum aims to assist lead farmers in forming and organising an FFS PPB, providing practical information on establishing FFS research plots, and basic background on plant breeding and weekly data collections. SD=HS will develop an updated version of this tool in Year 4, aiming to be even more user-friendly and engaging via a more visual approach combining illustrations and text: complex information about topics such as plant biology can be more effectively conveyed through pictures.

RISK ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION

A major reorganisation in SEARICE, which oversees partners in Vietnam, Myanmar and Laos, has had implications

21. HNOE variety

22. At F2

23. AG-Nep, ND1, LH8 farmers' varieties

CASE STUDY: FARMERS ENHANCE PEARL MILLET IN ZIMBABWE

Several long-established FFS in UMP district, Zimbabwe, illustrate the success of the FFS approach in strengthening farmers' seed systems and adaptive capacities. During its seven seasons, the FFS in UMP district has experienced how continued access to diverse genetic materials is indispensable for farmers to continuously innovate to adapt to climate change. The SD=HS programme in Zimbabwe shows that farmers have great interest in carrying out participatory varietal enhancement, specifically in relation to improving the yield level and drought tolerance of their local varieties.

The PVE carried out in an FFS group in Vukunzele of Tsholotsho district has shown how well farmers can perform in plant breeding. The farmers applied strong selection pressure based on clear breeding objectives to enhance a local pearl millet variety with improved traits, outperforming the original variety by making use of the heterogeneity that is still present locally. Farmers' apparent interest in selection from heterogeneous varieties was positively received by ICRISAT, which is considering supplying segregating populations (F3 to F5) to the FFS groups to select from.

for SD=HS. There was an urgency to finalise the reorganisation process, as Year 4 would be critical for deliverables. As part of the mitigation strategy, the Executive Director of SEARICE – who has extensive knowledge about the SD=HS operations in the countries – took over the management and operation of SD=HS, while new technical staff with a strong plant-breeding background were recruited. Close coordination between SEARICE and Oxfam Novib with the country partners on technical matters has been agreed to ensure coherence of the country implementation with the global methodologies and tools. The Project Leader has had two meetings with the Board of Directors of SEARICE to discuss these concerns and to assess the annual workplan and budget against the outputs targeted by Years 4 and 5.

MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING

From October 16 to 29, 2016, Oxfam Novib and SEARICE made a joint visit to Laos, South and North Vietnam and Myanmar to review the progress to date of SD=HS implementation in countries managed by SEARICE and

to support planning for implementation in Years 3 to 5. The visit identified successes, challenges and concrete supports needed for the countries to build on achievements in Years 1 to 3. It reaffirmed the FFS crop-specific focus and research and development objectives and identified ways for partners to adjust resource allocations and time invested by the farmers and the FFS facilitators to increase the rigour, efficiency and effectiveness of FFS implementation. Based on this discussion, an increase in the number of FFS in South Vietnam and Laos was projected, to 50 and 30 respectively by Year 5, a significant increase on the initial target of 12 and 20.

PILLAR 2: FARMER SEED ENTERPRISES

Enhancing the livelihoods and seed security of indigenous peoples and smallholder farmers by producing and marketing good-quality and diverse seeds through public-private partnerships.

Pillar 2 coverage = Zimbabwe

Original plans to establish pilot farmer seed enterprises in Myanmar and Zimbabwe were altered when Sida announced a budget reduction for Year 3. In order to ensure high quality, a decision was made to decrease the number of FSE pilot sites and to focus on Zimbabwe. In Year 3, the FSE aimed to focus on contributing to ensuring IPSHF's reliable access to diverse, good quality, locally adapted seeds.

Training modules were developed for management and IPSHF, with a gender approach integrated, and used to train a total of 96 farmers, four Agritex officers and seven CTD field officers in seed production in three districts. The training was run by qualified trainers from CTD, the Crop Breeding Institute and Seed Services Institute.

In support of *outcome P2.1, Farmer Seed Enterprises contribute to IPSHF's reliable access to diverse, good quality, locally adapted seeds*, Year 3 saw the establishment of the FSE in Zimbabwe, Champion Seeds. The FSE pilot in Zimbabwe will continue to demand rigorous innovation and experimentation based on the experiences of the private seed sector and other initiatives. The establishment process yielded many lessons learned and productive discussions. The business plan and model of the FSE were developed through an evidence-based and consultative process. This activity served as a strong learning experience. As an example, the FSE governance structure, namely how to manage new roles and responsibilities between CTD, Oxfam Novib, and the new staff of Champion, has proven to be an exciting challenge in reflecting on and adapting ONL's way of working with partners. This process has also required a fast-paced business minded approach with more flexibility but also more intensive monitoring and management to address key decisions of the FSE set up and first growing season. CTD and ONL worked closely on the joint recruitment,

which proved constructive and successful however line management of the project implementation was unclear until senior management was brought in to take a more active role in the joint management committee. As a result, the joint management committee now meets quarterly to assess and troubleshoot on the company's development. Conforming to regular CTD procedures also caused delays such as slow and inefficient budget approval for urgent supplies, such as additional herbicides when weeds grew out of control during the rains. According to the farm manager in one project site, delay in applying the herbicide resulted in 2 percent crop loss per day. The herbicide was procured about 10 days late, ultimately affecting 20 percent of the crop.

A lesson learned is to allow more time for the preparatory phase. For example, with the late start of Pillar 2, it could have been more effective to reduce the preparation time and start implementation sooner, despite certain risks. There will now be only two growing seasons possible with the remaining project period, so it could be difficult to draw meaningful lessons from the pilot.

On a technical level, breeder and foundation seed acquired from the national breeding institute and parastatal company were of poor quality. For the next season, Champion Seeds will procure seed directly from CIMMYT and ICRISAT while still securing a small portion from CBI to maintain good relations with the national breeding institute.

As for gender mainstreaming, efforts were made to ensure gender mainstreaming in the business plan development. However, 70 percent of the farmers trained were male so this will be a major point of attention as Champion prepares for its next season. The farmers themselves proposed both male and female heads of household participate in future trainings, also to ensure

knowledge and skills within the family are cohesive since the seed production is usually done jointly. Equitable distribution of shares between men and women will be carefully monitored when the shareholding structure is rolled out in Year 4.

RISK ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION

Developing an FSE comes with intrinsic challenges, such as unifying two different ways of working. For example, the development had to conform to regular CTDT procedures, which caused some delays. One such consequence of not having a more streamlined and efficient budget approval process for urgent supplies led to delays in procuring additional herbicides when weeds grew out of control during the rains. According to the farm manager in one project site, delay in applying the herbicide resulted in 2percent crop loss per day. The herbicide was procured about 10 days late, ultimately affecting 20 percent of the crop. These systems will be monitored and improved to ensure that such processes can be more responsive to urgent requests.

MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING

Pillar 2 has had intensive monitoring from Oxfam Novib with visits to Zimbabwe in July and October 2016 and the quarterly management meetings. In addition, the new Pillar 2 seed production expert participated in the Global Methodological Workshop in February 2017, which was a major learning event on SD=HS as a programme and for the rest of the SD=HS team on Pillar 2. The process of the business plan development was also an excellent learning experience and involved numerous external stakeholders in the peer review process, which helped improve the plan. Documentation has been strong for all processes for future referencing.

SD=HS PILLAR 3: WOMEN, SEEDS AND NUTRITION

Empower women to reclaim their role in food security through strengthening their capacity in seed management, nutrition and global policy engagement enabling them to claim their right to food.

“Sharing power with women is a shortcut to reducing hunger and malnutrition, and is the single most effective step to realising the right to food.”

Oliver de Schutter, the former UN Special Rapporteur for Right to Food.

Pillar 3 coverage: Peru, Zimbabwe, Myanmar, Laos, Vietnam

In planning the programme based on the Sida budget reduction, SD=HS deprioritised aspects of the programme that would require more time to deliver, more engagement from already stretched specialist resources at Oxfam and were not poised to implement on schedule. As such, support to one partner that implemented work in Mali, Senegal, and India was ceased along with related Oxfam Novib support costs. In Year 3, considerable progress has been made towards outcome P3.1: *Women farmers are empowered to enhance their knowledge, access and use of bio diverse sources of nutrition, contributing to building stronger seed systems of important nutritional crops (NUS) for household food security.* Year 3 began with the consolidation and publication of Pillar 3 baseline survey findings from Zimbabwe and Vietnam. The report calls for interventions to increase the dietary diversity of the households and identifies NUS as a suitable approach. The report also presented data on the frequency and nature of the hunger period in the SD=HS communities and the coping strategies that are used. In addition, the report highlights the community situation in relation of women diverse nutrition (plant) sources, and women’s specific knowledge on the nutrition and medicinal values of these plants. Data was

collected using innovative participatory tools, such as the 'resource flow map for NUS', which was designed and validated for the programme, and collects gender-disaggregated data. In Quarter 3, the Pillar 3 baseline survey in Peru was completed and the findings were captured in a high-quality report and published on the SD=HS website. Together with the findings of Myanmar, these results will be consolidated with the results from Zimbabwe and Vietnam for the global Pillar 3 baseline report in Year 4.

The baseline studies were validated with the communities and served as the basis for participatory diagnosis and planning with local communities and stakeholders (e.g. alliances with governments and research institutions). The results fed into the development of a Pillar 3 FFS curriculum for women and biodiverse nutrition. As with the Pillar 1 FFS curriculum, the content is composed with the full and active participation of the (women) farmers, local partners and key stakeholders. In Zimbabwe for example, a workshop was organized in Quarter 2 that included Agricultural Extension workers, District Nutritionists and CTD field staff. Together with the farmers, diagnostic and monitoring tools were developed and tested, and activities to improve the management of NUS species were designed. This process is very important for community ownership and empowerment. As the CSO partner, Oxfam Novib guided this process and wrote the curriculum.

The curricula included a diagnostic phase wherein farmers assess in a participatory manner the nutrition situation in their community and the locally available food biodiversity, which could contribute to improved nutrition. The next step is to prioritize (neglected and

underutilized) crops, using criteria set by the farmers, such as nutritional value or market value. For the prioritized NUS, farmers conduct a barrier analysis of the utilization and management of the NUS. The development objectives for the Pillar 3 Farmer Field School aim to address the barriers identified in this analysis (linking with *Result P3.1.1 Women farmer and NUS focused concepts and tools are developed, and piloted, integrating traditional and scientific knowledge*).

In Year 3, six FFS (out of eight planned by Year 5) were established in Peru, 18 (out of 68 planned in Year 5) in North Vietnam, and 170 in Zimbabwe²⁴ (out of 240 planned for Year 5)²⁵. In the FFS, women received training on topics such as nutrition and health, gastronomy, nutritional value of locally available biodiverse crops, using NUS for maternal and child nutrition, medicinal plants, value addition and hygiene for food preparation and storage. Topics varied across the countries as they are in line with specific needs and request of the communities. As a result, approximately 140 farmers (majority women) in Peru, 385 farmers in Zimbabwe (86 percent women in Sida districts and 74 percent women in NPL districts), and 360 farmers in North Vietnam (87.5 percent women) have been trained in FFS on plant biodiversity, NUS and good micro-nutrient content. Pillar 3 implementation in Myanmar began only at the end of Quarter 2 of Year 3 since being put on hold since the beginning of Year 2. The full last quarter of Year 3, Metta, the local partner in Myanmar, has been training FFS facilitators on FFS principles, seed management, community dynamics, agrobiodiversity, nutrition, hygiene and climate change. A workshop for village authorities to again touch base prepared the

24. In Zimbabwe, additional funding of the Dutch Postcode Lottery was used to set up 162 FFS. Out of these 162, 8 women-led FFS have started working with the Pillar 3 Women, seeds and nutrition curriculum.

25. This target for Zimbabwe includes the FFS planned with the funding from the Dutch Postcode Lottery (200) and Sida funding (40).

ground for the establishment of 20 FFS planned for Year 4.

The implementation of the Pillar 3 approach has been monitored and received technical backstopping by local partners and Oxfam Novib. Joint monitoring trips took place in Zimbabwe, Myanmar and North-Vietnam, whereby progress towards results were discussed and solutions for issues encountered. Farmers were always included in the process.

To enhance the robustness of the curriculum for women and biodiverse nutrition and align the programme with national initiatives, new linkages with research institutes and government agencies were established for Pillar 3 in Year 3. For example, in North Vietnam, the project partners with the National Institute for Nutrition for the nutritional content analysis of NUS that have not yet been analysed in past research. In Peru, the National University in Cusco helped with a review of nutrition data for NUS, and training of botany and taxonomy for community leader who will use a geographic Information system to collect ethnobotanical data. In Zimbabwe, CTDI collaborated with the Ministry of Health and Child Care, for trainings on nutrition and NUS.

The second outcome for Pillar 3 supports women farmers to share their gained knowledge and innovative bio-diverse nutrition strategies, concepts and tools with other communities. In Year 3, knowledge and strategies have been shared in a variety of ways. One of them being through video documentation, a suitable tool to share knowledge and strategies beyond village or district borders. In Zimbabwe, women have produced their own video diaries on topics such as community seed banking, cooking demonstrations and recipes, nutrition training, and field days. After editing and translation, the diaries will be shared with Ministry of Health officials in

the project sites for distribution to health centres and schools. Copies will also be shared during seed and food fairs and important meetings attended by stakeholder and policymakers.

The Programme is grounded in the belief that leadership skills will enable women to take a more active role in their leadership potential. Participation in the FFS combined with women's leadership, contribute to knowledge and skills transfer. Leadership skills are also part of the Pillar 3 implementation strategy (women-focused FFS, participatory assessments, FFS capacity building based on women's knowledge and mainstreaming of women and nutrition in participatory research development). In line with this, in North Vietnam, leadership training was organized in Quarter 4 for women farmers who participate in the FFS and members of the women's union. Correspondingly, an important change was reported in Zimbabwe: whereas women usually do not participate in the presence of men following culture demands, they have started to discuss issues more freely in the presence of men; 'The women-led FFS approach had given to women farmers' voices to air their view on issues regarding seed systems and nutrition at household and community levels. Women are now able to speak and make choices of what they want to grow and eat.'

Radio programmes in the Andes and the organization of Women Groups in communes in North Vietnam served as other means through which women farmers' innovative bio diverse nutrition strategies are described and made publicly available for adaptation and use by other communities. North Vietnam actively engaged commune authorities to support the project and/or implement similar interventions on collective community management of biodiversity and promotion of locally available NUS to improve nutrition of families through the Women's Union.

The second result under outcome 2, *Women farmers, including in other communities, access to bio diverse sources of nutrition is facilitated (P3.2.2)* has been achieved mainly through seed and food fairs and community seed bank (the latter only in the NPL-funded districts). In Year 3 the building of community seed banks in the NPL funded districts has started (3 out of 4 planned are completed). The communities have been heavily involved throughout the construction process of the seed banks and this has proved to be effective. The communities managed to contribute locally available material such as bricks, river and pit sand, quarry stoned and both skilled and unskilled labour while the programme supported them with building materials such as cement and roofing materials. During the El Nino induced drought, the worst drought in the past 20 years, the important role of community seed banks (for access to diverse sources of nutrition) was demonstrated; in districts where the community seeds banks were established, farmers could withdraw seed for re-planting (after the crops failure due to the drought) and in some cases the farmers were able to harvest. A 67 percent of the community seeds bank committee members are women. This is critical as decision making tilt towards what women want thereby addressing imbalances that existed in the most communities. The photo exhibit with portraits of women farmers in Zimbabwe attracted interest of private donors, who have provided funding for two additional seed banks.

Through the seeds and food fairs, farmers, as the custodians and conservers of PGR exchange knowledge, seeds and ideas, can increase their access to biodiverse source of nutrition. In Peru, following FFS training on hygiene, use and seasonality of NUS, a Biocultural festival was organized in Q4. The festival featured

a gastronomy contest, NUS uses and seasonality, an exhibition of medicinal plants and legends of wild plants, and presentation of dishes prepared with local plants by a local chef. The festival attracted more male participants in Pillar 3 activities. The recipes are very popular, as farmers report that even children will eat the NUS they usually decline. Also, during local events, the NUS are now being served during lunches and prepared according to the recipes of the chef.

Similarly, food fairs in Zimbabwe led to the development of a recipe book. Recipes with local NUS have been collected from all districts and the book will also be distributed in other communities. It was reported that the recipes promote consumption of nutritious traditional varieties especially by the younger generation. Seed and food fairs in Zimbabwe have contributed to increased crop diversity at household levels as farmers exchanged or sold seed to each other. The number of crops per household within the project districts has changed from a baseline figure of 3 to 5²⁶ as a result.

Under outcome P3.3, *Women farmers' knowledge and contribution served as catalysts of international awareness on biodiversity based diets, and they have increased their engagement in policy dialogue on claiming the Right to Food*. The results of the Pillar 3 baseline in Peru were captured in a policy brief 'Evidence of the use of NUS to cope with food scarcity and climate change in the Peruvian Andes', published in December 2016 and shared during the CBD COP 13, in Cancun, Mexico. The findings of the baseline were presented during a side event called "Strengthening women's capacity in biodiversity and nutrition through farmer field schools", of the 15th meeting of the Commission for Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture

26. In the NPL funded districts

(CGRFA) in Rome, Italy. The presentation highlighted the role of biodiversity for farmers and in particular NUS to diversify the diet and as a coping mechanism during the hunger period and sparked a discussion on how Farmer Field Schools can be a platform to optimize utilization of biodiversity for household food and nutrition security by building on traditional knowledge. In this way, NUS focused concepts were used as model for international awareness and represented in local and national policy engagement (P3.3.1).

In North Vietnam, the national coordinator has promoted the use of NUS of nutrition security in national platforms and pushed for integrated and inclusive approach to agro-biodiversity conservation and management, especially PGRFA, and moving away from mono-cropping.

In Year 3, women leaders were empowered to engage with national and international policies (P3.3.2). During Quarter 3, Sonia Quispe Ttito from Choquecancha and Carolina Silva Loaiza from Ccachin, active FFS participants and women leaders were selected by their communities, and participated in several important events in Mexico. They took part in working groups in the Voice of Maize gathering, with the objective to establish a network of indigenous communities cultivating maize and biodiversity and foster knowledge exchanges and come together to support each other in maintaining maize agrobiodiversity and biocultural connections to this sacred crop. During this meeting, a joint declaration was written to rise the voice of the communities during the upcoming COP13-CBD. The women farmer representatives read out the declaration during the COP13-CBD and presented the findings of the Pillar 3 baseline in a side event, with the title “Women smallholder farmers: Guardians of Biodiversity”. In the months prior to the events, Sonia and Carolina had received extensive training in public speaking in the context of international events.

GLOBAL METHODOLOGICAL WORKSHOP

In February 2017, Oxfam Novib organised a major learning event, the 3rd SD=HS Global Methodological Workshop. The workshop’s objective was to bring together partners from Pillars 1 and 3 to strategise and carefully plan changes to the activities for the final two years of the Sida programme. Workshop participants discussed the conceptual and methodological challenges of innovative aspects of our work (see examples below) and how to best measure the Programme’s outputs and outcomes.

Regarding Pillar 1, the workshop reaffirmed that to ensure efficiency and rigour, each FFS will focus on a combination of one crop and one research objective (for example, participatory plant breeding on rice, or participatory varietal selection on rice). The number of FFS planned in South Vietnam increased to 50 and in Laos to 30 by Year 5, from 12 and 20 respectively. The workshop planned the finalisation of the field guides for South Vietnam and Laos on rice and vegetables (including maize for Laos and sesame and mungbean for South Vietnam), as with those developed for Peru and Zimbabwe. Other planned activities include preparation of a module on biocultural heritage territory in Peru’s FFS field guide, while in Year 4, Zimbabwe will prepare a disaster risk reduction module for its guide. This shows the continued adaptation and innovation of the FFS tools, responding to the evolving context of the farming communities. The field guide is one of the key outputs of the programme, contributing to the first scaling-up pathway, ‘PGRFA Participatory Toolkit’, which will ensure uptake and replication of the FFS approach by other communities beyond the programme areas.

Regarding Pillar 3, the Global Methodological Workshop was a key moment to consolidate partners’ commitment to and understanding of Pillar 3’s approach. The Pillar 3 countries that made most progress on their activities

(i.e. Zimbabwe and Peru) shared their experiences with developing a FFS curriculum for Pillar 3.

The workshop also gave direction on Pillar 3-related concepts need further research and understanding, e.g. the concept of NUS and the hunger period. Initially, the tools for Pillar 3 encouraged the community to come up with their own definition of NUS, but the baseline results suggest that defining the communities' concept of NUS and classifying the wild plants and minor crops according to this concept were challenging. NUS were defined as "those wild food plants for which no human management is required" during the first SD=HS methodological workshop, and all partners agreed that we will no longer ask communities to come up with their own definition of NUS, but instead explain the SD=HS working criteria better. This includes emphasising that while NUS tend to be neglected by science and the market, they are also important for the communities.

Similarly, the concept of the hunger period also required better understanding, as the definition used for the baseline varied across countries resulting in some unrealistic findings being reported for its duration.²⁷ The definition of the hunger period is often related to the availability of the preferred staple crop, and not necessarily to a lack of calories or the nutritional value of the diet. Therefore, it was decided to use the term *scarcity period*. In Year 4, a literature review of the seasonal scarcity period action research through FFS will be conducted to deepen the understanding of this predictable but preventable phenomenon, which causes more hunger and acute malnutrition than conflicts and natural disasters. Caution needs to be used as the concepts

of 'hunger' and 'scarcity' can be very sensitive²⁸ among SD=HS communities.

RISK ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION

Pillar 3 is also affected by the reorganisation in SEARICE, which oversees partners in Vietnam, Myanmar and Laos. As part of the mitigation strategy, the Executive Director of SEARICE – who has extensive knowledge about the SD=HS operations in the countries – took over the management and operation of SD=HS, while new technical staff with a strong plant-breeding background were recruited. Close coordination between SEARICE and Oxfam Novib with the country partners on technical matters has been agreed to ensure coherence of the country implementation with the global methodologies and tools.

Another issue raised through discussions at the Global Methodological Workshop was that a commonly-accepted definition for NUS may require more time and may need further discussion and consultation in order to create strategies that would be well-accepted by communities and that would minimise any associated stigma. This approach also applies to the terminology "scarcity" and "hunger" within communities, and development of further tools, trainings, and materials will be mindful of the sensitivities.

LESSONS LEARNED AND REFLECTIONS

A lesson learned for Pillar 3 through implementation is that promoting diversification at household level in Zimbabwe needs to include the head of the household. During discussion, women highlighted that their male counterparts were not interested in nutrition security

27. e.g. In Zimbabwe, a hunger period of 8 months was reported

28. The term "scarcity" (which is "escasez" in Spanish) does not have an equivalent in Quechua, and is often equated with poverty. Asking about food scarcity would, in the local context, be like asking about the poverty of households, which is taboo in the communities.

CASE STUDY: PERUVIAN WOMEN ATTEND VOICE OF MAIZE

In Year 3, women leaders were facilitated to participate in debates in national and policies; during Q3, Sonia Quispe Ttito from Choquecancha (pictured) and Carolina Silva Loaiza from Ccachin, both active FFS participants and women leaders who were selected by their communities, participated in important events in Mexico after receiving extensive training in public speaking. They took part in working groups at the Voice of Maize gathering, which aimed to establish a network of indigenous communities cultivating maize to foster knowledge exchanges and mutual support in maintaining agrobiodiversity and biocultural connections to this sacred crop. During this meeting, a joint declaration was written to raise the voice of communities during the upcoming COP13-CBD. The women farmer representatives read out the declaration during COP13-CBD and presented the findings of the Pillar 3 baseline in a side event entitled 'Women smallholder farmers: Guardians of Biodiversity'.



but rather food security, mostly due to failure to differentiate the two. It is therefore essential to find platforms to educate males, who in many instances are hard to locate as they do not attend educative gatherings such as FFS sessions. Similarly, in the poorest regions of the Andes in Peru, men often cannot attend the FFS trainings as they are away looking for work, so they cannot be equally trained on the importance of nutrition security and related practices.

MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING

In addition to monitoring visits, the key monitoring activity for Pillar 3 was the baseline survey. Implementation of the work under Pillar 3 starts with a baseline in order to obtain insight into conditions and trends, and thus help shape the vision and scenarios for the work in support of the pillar and the overall Programme. Outcomes from the baseline are used to design responses and activities, and to evaluate program impact by comparing the baseline with

the findings of endline survey. The global report, consolidating the country work, will be completed early in Year 4. In addition, the partners submitted quarterly reports to give updates on their respective activities.

SD=HS PILLAR 4: GOVERNANCE AND KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS

Strengthen the capacities and knowledge base of developing countries and their indigenous peoples and smallholder farmers to secure national and global legislation and policies for the full implementation of farmers' rights and the right to food.

Pillar 4 coverage = Peru, Zimbabwe, Laos, Vietnam, global

In light of the Sida budget reductions, Pillar 4 partners (i.e., GRAIN [Canada], Third World Network

[TWN; Spain], South Centre [Malaysia], and ETC Group²⁹ opted to implement for a period of four years (at the same budget level) rather than five years (at a reduced level) in order to maintain quality and level of outputs. Pillar 4 continued to monitor developments in the field of emerging technologies (e.g. synthetic biology), free trade agreements (e.g. Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership, RCEP, in the Asia-Pacific region), and market concentration and consolidation in the seed sector (e.g. impact of patents on plant material). Through side-events, workshops and publication materials, the Pillar 4 programme partners have helped raise awareness and build capacity on these topics amongst farmers, policymakers and the general public. Partners produced numerous reports³⁰ and organised several capacity-building activities in fulfilment of programme outcome 4.1. *to improve knowledge and capacities of stakeholders to influence seed systems and related national and international policies, aimed at improving PGR governance, facilitating innovation and cooperation in farmers' seed systems, increasing farmers' freedoms to operate, thus contributing to the right to food.* For example, GRAIN and TWN co-organised a capacity- and alliance-building workshop for regional CSOs in Kuala Lumpur in October, which was attended by 80 participants from 18 countries.³¹ The workshop informed

the participants about the potential impacts on farmers and biodiversity of the RCEP negotiations between the countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and their biggest trading partners in the region.³² As a result, a series of follow-up national advocacy and campaigning activities have taken off in several countries. South Centre provided expert advice to the South African Ministry of Science and Technology on the Protection, Promotion, Development and Management of the Indigenous Knowledge Systems Bill, which is pending adoption in the National Assembly.³³ It also assisted Bolivia³⁴ and other developing countries in elaborating provisions on farmers' rights and access to seeds in the UN Draft Declaration on the Rights of Peasants.

In Year3, the SD=HS partners contributed to:

- monitoring the developments and consequences of concentration in the agribusiness sector;
- placing the topic of synthetic biology and 'dematerialisation' of genetic resources firmly on the international policy agenda (e.g.: COP13 of the CBD in Cancun, 2016);
- highlighting the (dis)balance between Farmers' Rights and plant breeder's rights during the 'Symposium on Possible Interrelations Between the ITPGRFA and UPOV' in Geneva, October 2016, with some countries and

29. Another Pillar 4 partner, the Centre for Agroecology, Water and Resilience (CAWR), Coventry University, UK, was not included in this report due to ongoing negotiations between CAWR and Oxfam Novib.

30. Some examples are: Some examples are: ETC Group. *What is Synthetic Biology? The Comic Book. Engineering life and livelihood.* May 2016. Available at: <http://www.etcgroup.org/content/what-synthetic-biology-comic-book>; GRAIN. *New trade deals legalise corporate theft, make farmers' seeds illegal.* July 2016. Available at: <https://www.grain.org/article/entries/5511-new-trade-deals-legalise-corporate-theft-make-farmers-seeds-illegal>; South Centre. *Implementing Farmers' Rights in Relation to Seeds.* Research Paper 75, March 2017. Available at: https://www.southcentre.int/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/RP75_Implementing-Farmers-Rights-Relating-to-Seeds_EN-1.pdf; TWN. *Proposed Plant Variety Regulations inconsistent with ARIPO's Protocol, violates sovereign rights.* June 2016. Available at: http://www.twn.my/title2/intellectual_property/info.service/2016/ip160610.htm; Oxfam. *Reconciling farmers' and plant breeders' rights.* October 2016. Available at: <https://www.sdhsprogram.org/assets/wbb-publications/568/Oxfam%20Publicatie%20Reconciling%20Farmers%20S%20Plant%20Breeders%202016.pdf>

31. https://www.grain.org/bulletin_board/entries/5528-asia-pacific-peoples-movements-come-together-to-challenge-rcep

32. Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam.

33. <https://www.parliament.gov.za/storage/app/media/Docs/bill/97bb18f4-66c2-4c4a-9908-fb4a88f9d8cb.pdf>

34. Bolivia is the chair of the UN Human Rights Council working group on the draft declaration.

observers proposing follow-up actions along the lines of the SD=HS recommendations;

- the SD=HS proposal for a voluntary guideline on national implementation of Farmers' Rights being included in the Co-chairs' recommendations of the second Global Consultation on Farmers' Rights in Bali, September 2016, which will be presented to the 7th session of Governing Body of the ITPGRFA in Rwanda later this year.

The SD=HS partners have made some important achievements on influencing policy agendas (programme output 4.2).³⁵ One example is the critical attention raised for potential consequences of synthetic biology and the 'dematerialisation' of genetic resources, which was taken up by contracting parties of the CBD at COP13 in Cancun and by FAO member states at the CGRFA16 in Rome, placing this topic firmly on the international policy agenda. Since 2010, the ETC Group has warned that the rapid development of digital information systems and new genomics technologies can circumvent access and benefit-sharing arrangements as included in the CBD, its Nagoya Protocol and the ITPGRFA. After repeated interventions and advocacy activities, governments have now recognised this threat and the CBD is actively considering its implications and options. ETC Group and other programme partners are working closely with governments and the CBD and ITPGRFA secretariats to develop solutions to this problem.

The case study below presents one successful illustration of the programme's 'inside-outside' influencing strategy. Less successful have been our efforts to get

a seat at the table of the African Regional Intellectual Property Organization (ARIPO), whose process towards establishing a regional PBR system has been very non-transparent and inaccessible for CSOs. Nevertheless, TWN has supported the advocacy of African partners on the Draft Regulations on the Arusha Protocol and has reached out to the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, who sent an open letter to the ARIPO and its member states on the importance of engaging farmers in the discussions on the draft regulations. This resulted in ARIPO member states deferring adoption of the draft regulations and calling on the secretariat to engage with relevant stakeholders.

Also in the programme countries, important achievements regarding influencing policy agenda's (programme outcome 4.2) have been realized. For example, ANDES' advocacy activities in Peru have resulted in the organization being invited to support the National Seed Authority in the implementation of Article 11 of the Regulation of the National Seed Law, which deals with traditional seed systems in Peru. CTDI organised a Stakeholders Consultative Workshop on Farmers' Rights for delegates of the Africa Group at the ITPGRFA in Harare, Zimbabwe, in June 2016. The meeting was aimed at gathering views, perceptions, options and possible approaches and strategies to advocate for the implementation and promotion of farmers' rights. SEARICE, together with most of the other SD=HS partners, provided several presentations, a photo exhibit, and a movie as inputs to the second Global Consultation on Farmers' Rights in Bali, Indonesia, September 2016. Here, the various 'local to global' and evidence-based policy advocacy pathways of the SD=HS programme came

35. P4.2: Changes in national and international agendas, policies and practices enhance farmers' freedom to operate, positively strengthen innovation in plant breeding and promote plant genetic diversity and Farmers' Rights, contributing to the right to food.

CASE STUDY: INFLUENCING ON FARMERS' RIGHTS

After interventions of programme partners at various meetings, UPOV and the ITPGRFA organised a Symposium on Possible Interrelations Between the ITPGRFA and UPOV in Geneva, October 2016. Oxfam Novib and TWN were the only speakers invited to focus on farmers' needs and interests. The presentations triggered discussions on the balance – or imbalance – between plant breeders' rights (PBRs) and the rights of farmers to freely save, exchange and trade farm-saved seed amongst themselves.

Following the symposium, UPOV's Consultative Committee invited members and observers to provide suggestions on possible further actions. In response, two governments (Norway and Ecuador) and one observer organisation (European Seed Association) submitted proposals in line with some of the key recommendations made by Oxfam Novib and TWN. In addition, the Dutch and European seed industry started to explore with Oxfam possible options to reconcile farmers' and plant breeders' rights, for example by defining the groups of farmers that should be allowed the full execution of their right to save, exchange and sell farm-saved seed of protected varieties.

together and resulted in some of our policy asks³⁶ being included in the co-chairs' recommendations, which will be presented to the Governing Body of the ITPGRFA at GB7 later this year.

RISK ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION

The US ratified the ITPGRFA in September 2016. Together with the incoming US President Trump's administration, this may negatively affect programme efforts in support of Farmers' Rights within the context of the ITPGRFA and other policy fora. Yet, with respect to regional trade agreements, the Trump administration has pulled out of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), which was also heavily criticised by CSOs in Asia.

MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING

Monitoring visits have been conducted for all four Pillar 4 partners to assess their performance and areas where Oxfam Novib as contractor could be improved. Regular communications with partners, in addition to visits, have been used to shape and adjust future planned activities and to strategise for the next phase of the SD=HS programme, and continue this collaboration and coordination amongst them, with Oxfam Novib and the pillar 1, 2 and 3 partners also for project Year 4, even if their direct Sida-funding will have ended (due to the budget cuts).

36. E.g. point 2.b: Developing, in an inclusive and participatory manner, voluntary guidelines on the realization of Farmers' Rights at the national level, having in view submissions of Contracting Parties and other stakeholders; Point 7: Calling on Contracting Parties to revise, as necessary, seed laws, intellectual property laws and other legislation that may limit the legal space or create undue obstacles for the realization of Farmers Rights.



CHAPTER 3

PROGRESS REPORT ON GROW

APRIL 2016–MARCH 2017

This chapter focuses on the activities and accomplishments of the GROW campaign during the reporting period to which Sida made a direct contribution. Sida's contribution builds upon and strengthens Oxfam International's GROW campaign, which has focused since 2011 on policies from local to global level on climate change, land rights and agricultural investment. Sida's contribution is allocated to the first two of these spearheads. The policies are reflected in each of the SidaGROW objectives:

- **Specific Objective 1:** Building a multi-stakeholder movement;
- **Specific Objective 2:** Improving global policies and governance; and
- **Specific Objective 3:** Improving national policies and governance, as well as linking these with global-level campaigning

Oxfam uses a multi-strategy approach in its campaigns, combining research, alliance-building, media outreach, public actions and direct engagement with stakeholders. It tries to link local, regional, national and global issues to accomplish coherent campaigns grounded in the realities of its ultimate beneficiaries.

Due to the budget cut, Oxfam reprioritised the GROW campaign, taking into account the lessons learned from the GROW evaluation 2013-15 (which served as a Midterm Review for the Sida grant). This resulted in a revised logical framework for 2016-17, as submitted to Sida in July 2016 with an explanation about which areas were deprioritised. The logical framework was linked to Oxfam's GROW advocacy objectives 2016-19, which serve as the thematic framework for the campaign. Box 1 provides an overview of how Sida funds support these objectives.

When comparing the Logical Framework 2016-17 submitted to Sida in July 2016 and the progress to March 2017, reported upon below, it should be noted that Oxfam will not be able to implement a maximum of three large (global and multi-country) public actions in the project period, but has to limit it to two. This is due to the time investment required for designing a public action from the bottom up, with the participation of Southern countries and allies. Oxfam still expects to generate 275,000 actions from the general public in response to (global) campaigns launched.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 1: BUILDING A STAKEHOLDER MOVEMENT

To help build an influential, global multi-stakeholder movement focused on addressing and improving the broken food system.

"Land Rights Now has enabled us to gain more allies, people who were not previously aware of the campaign and have identified it with us upon seeing those banners – it has assisted in galvanising collective actions on land rights in Asia."

Joan Carling, former Secretary General of the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact.

Online and offline public mobilisation and the use of social media are part of Oxfam's broader campaign trajectories, mostly used in support of advocacy towards companies, governments and international agencies. For 2016-17, this section focuses on two major trajectories: one, on land rights, that is being implemented; and one, the private sector campaign, that is being prepared. Meanwhile, the previous private sector campaign, Behind the Brands, continued with a shift in focus from reform to monitoring implementation of commitments made.

RESULT 1.1. INTERNATIONAL STAKEHOLDERS AND CONSUMERS

INTERMEDIARY OUTCOMES PLANNED FOR 2016–17
41,503 people took action in response to the public actions launched by Oxfam (target = 40.000).

BOX 1. CAMPAIGNING TRAJECTORIES AND GROW OBJECTIVES

OXFAM GROW ADVOCACY OBJECTIVES 2016-19		SIDA SUPPORT TO GROW FOR APRIL 2016-MARCH 2017	UNDER SIDA OBJECTIVE
1.	By 2019, there will be an increase in the quantity and quality of international public financial support from both Northern and Southern donors for both small-scale sustainable agriculture and climate change adaptation.	Global advocacy on UNFCCC process on climate finance/ adaptation	2
2.	By 2019, there will be an increase in the quantity and quality of domestic public financial support in three countries for both small-scale sustainable agriculture and climate change adaptation.	Country GROW campaigns of at least Niger and Pakistan under objective 3.1 For Niger this (2016-17) was the last year.	3
3.	By 2019, at least three actors in the financial sector will be investing more in sustainable renewable energy projects than in fossil fuels; and/or will have adopted policies and practices that protect and promote women's and communities' land rights, while being held accountable to communities in at least five cases through access to justice.	Global advocacy on land towards financial intermediaries such as IFC, FMO and AIB	2
4.	By 2019, policy and practice changes will be adopted by three governments and/or international bodies to protect and secure the land rights of women and marginalised communities.	Land priority campaign in 2016 under Sida objective 1	1
5.	By 2019, five private sector actors from the food sector will have set science-based targets to reduce their supply chain emissions, and/or made commitments that recognise and safeguard the land rights of women and communities across their supply chains, and/or taken steps that increase their supply chain transparency.	Behind the Brands	1
6.	By 2019, the EU's 2030 Climate and Energy Package will include correct GHG emissions accounting and binding sustainability criteria, in particular FPIC, so that the projected share of land-based bio-energy in achieving the EU's 2030 renewable energy target will be reduced to sustainable levels.	Towards Renewable Energy Directive (RED-II). Only for the year 2016-17.	2
7.	By 2019, a new international coordination mechanism for climate-forced displacement and relocation will be established (e.g. within the UNFCCC Warsaw International Mechanism on Loss and Damage). [Or alternative regional/national-level policy change objective related to climate-forced migration].	Indirect alignment	NA
8.	By 2019, policy changes in the rice sector that support the transition towards sustainable agriculture and resilient livelihoods will have been secured in two countries and amplified through engagement at the CFS.	Indirect alignment	NA
9.	By 2019, one private sector company will have reversed egregious malpractice on contract farming, and the experience used as a model for others in the industry. [Or alternative objective on influencing private investment in agriculture.]	The private sector public campaign	1
10.	[Value chain-related public and/or private sector advocacy objective related to the new priority public-facing campaign, tbc]	The private sector public campaign	1

#STANDFORLANDRIGHTS

Between 26 September and 7 October 2016, Oxfam conducted a multi-country public action on land rights. The action highlighted six land rights cases in Australia, Honduras, India, Mozambique, Peru and Sri Lanka, so a wider international public could pressure national governments to address the issues. The spike had a reach of 7.7 million people, engaged half a million people and resulted in 41,503 actions, mostly online.³⁷ Hence, Oxfam met the annual objective set for this year.

The public response was satisfactory. The multi-million reach was fuelled through a Facebook paid-promotion, which garnered 50 percent of the signatures; the other half came from existing constituencies. The involvement of a Jordanian artist, Shamekh Al Bluwi, also engaged a new audience (almost 300K followers and 13,000 likes). Oxfam and partners have been involved in the six cases on a longer-term basis, and the spike contributed to moving them towards a solution for the involved communities. For the first time in Peru's recent history, the regional government of Loreto recognised that there are ancestral rights in the area on which the campaign focused: the public action placed land rights back on the agenda in the dialogue between CSOs and government on the case, the dialogue previously having been dominated by environmental issues such as pollution. In Sri Lanka (see case study), the land case was on the agenda for discussion in the national parliament, and the government was asked to live up to its commitment of returning the land to the rightful communities. In Honduras, the public action supported the alliance campaign 'Defenders of

Mother Earth', and helped to stop a hearing that would have cancelled penal charges against the Deputy Ministry for Natural Resources.

The #StandforLandRights campaign took place in the context of the wider land alliance Global Call to Action (GCA), which was launched in 2016. The GCA is led by Oxfam, International Land Coalition (ILC), and Rights & Resource Initiative (RRI) and aims to build a global movement that promotes and secures land rights for indigenous peoples and local communities. So far, 553 organisations have signed up to the call, including the Dutch government. The GCA defined a number of "collective" campaign moments including activity on social media such as Facebook and Twitter and increasing the individual supporter base. The #StandforLandRights campaign was one such moment: many partners dispersed the narrative, reaching out to a much broader audience. The other collective moment (non-Sida funded) was aligned with World Indigenous Peoples' Day in August 2016: coordinated implementation of 60 grassroots events in 29 countries highlighted cases in Bangladesh, Liberia, Panama, and Thailand.

PRIVATE SECTOR CAMPAIGN

In Year 3, Oxfam began preparations for its new private sector campaign, to be launched in 2017-18, complementing the ongoing BtB campaign by holding companies accountable for inequality in their value chains. Drawing on lessons from the GROW evaluation, the campaign was co-created by Northern and Southern Oxfam affiliates. Oxfam is now operationalising the campaign by conducting research and engaging the different stakeholders.

37. Reach is defined as the number of people who could have seen the campaign's messaging. Engagement refers to the number of people who absorbed the messages as dispersed by the campaign (as evidenced by a visit to the website, liking, retweeting etc). Actions taken refers to the number of people who signed the campaign petition.

CASE STUDY: THE PAANAMA CASE IN SRI LANKA³⁸



Paanama, a coastal village in eastern Sri Lanka, from lands they had cultivated and lived on for over 40 years. The lands were taken over by the military to establish camps, and are now being used to promote tourism.

The Regional Office of the Sri Lanka Human Rights Commission and the local Magistrates Court have both determined that the land should be returned to the community; and, after the change of government in 2015, a cabinet decision was taken on 11 February 2015 to return the lands. But, to date, no action has been taken. The community continues to be displaced.

The public action was owned by the People's Alliance for Right to Land (PARL), calling for the immediate implementation of the decision to return 340 acres to the community. In a direct response to the demands, members of the Sri Lankan Parliament raised questions on the Paanama case and government reconfirmed they will implement the decision taken in 2015. In June 2017, PARL handed over a petition of 20,000 signatures to the Presidential Secretariat office, with the participation of community members from Paanama.

The BtB campaign ranks the 10 biggest international food and beverage (F&B) companies on the strength of their policies on transparency, women, agricultural workers, farmers, land, water and climate change. Whereas the BtB campaign was about getting com-

mitments from the F&B companies, as discussed in previous annual reports to Sida, the focus in Year 3 was on implementing policies in BtB priority countries: India, Indonesia, Thailand, Ghana, Malawi and Brazil. In many cases, Oxfam collaborates with companies to conduct

38. For more information, please refer to https://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/file_attachments/bn-development-dispossession-land-sri-lanka-260916-en.pdf



risk assessments. Oxfam supports the companies to ensure their policies are comprehensive; to provide guidance and roadmaps towards implementation in priority countries; and to develop new models or work with companies where a best practice has yet to be identified, such as Oxfam’s work on social norms and gender through its forthcoming System Innovation for Women’s Economic Empowerment (SIWEE) programme, or work with smallholder farmers in palm oil in Indonesia through FAIR Partnerships.

In support of the campaign, two major reports were released: ‘The journey to sustainable food’³⁹, and ‘Land Rights and Soda giants: Reviewing Coca-Cola and PepsiCo’s land assessments in Brazil’.⁴⁰

The first looks back over three years of BtB and shows that the ‘Big 10’ F&B companies have made significant new commitments to improve social and environmental standards in their vast supply chains, pushed by over 700,000 actions by concerned consumers. Progress has been most evident in the areas of protecting land rights, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and tackling gender inequality. Yet these companies must now ensure that their suppliers actually change their practices in line with the commitments made.

The second report evaluates Coca Cola’s and Pepsi’s efforts to ascertain how they can improve future prac-

39. See <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/journey-sustainable-food>
 40. See <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/land-rights-and-soda-giants>

tice. The report found that Coca-Cola’s baseline study was comprehensive in scope; and, prior to publication of the report, Coca-Cola published elements of a plan for how it will address findings of its study, including steps to ensure suppliers adhere to its land policy. PepsiCo’s approach requires improvement, particularly around its scope, stakeholder engagement and disclosure; prior to publication of the report, PepsiCo recognised that it needs to go further in Brazil and adopted a new approach for all future assessments based on good practice.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 2: GLOBAL-LEVEL POLICIES AND GOVERNANCE

To effectively steer relevant stakeholders to improve global-level policies and governance regarding climate change and its impact on food security, the land use rights of local communities, and the negative impacts of biofuels on food security.

This chapter describes progress under the GROW campaign’s two spearheads: climate change and land rights.

CLIMATE CHANGE

“Adaptation finance is not just an abstract numbers game. It’s about providing women farmers in Africa with seeds to plant drought-resistant crops and feed their families; it’s about building seawalls so millions who live in coastal areas survive rising sea levels. Developing countries are doing their fair share. The Climate Vulnerable Forum, a group of 47 countries most at risk, announced their commitment to 100 percent renewable energy. We need developed countries to live up to their end of the bargain.”⁴¹

Isabel Kreisler, Oxfam Climate lead.

In Year 3, Sida funds were used for three focal areas under this thematic spearhead.

(I) CONTINUING ADVOCACY IN RELATION TO THE UNFCCC PROCESS

After the Paris Agreement was signed, COP22 in Marrakech was the next opportunity for Oxfam to raise the neglect of adaptation finance as a major issue. Oxfam published its climate finance shadow report⁴² clearly established that adaptation is lagging behind, thus creating a sense of urgency. The report is critical about

RESULT 2.1. FOOD AND CLIMATE JUSTICE

INTERMEDIARY OUTCOMES PLANNED FOR 2016–17

Oxfam confederation agrees on joint position regarding climate/agriculture and land.

Oxfam forges alliances on climate (CAN) and land (EuroIFI, NGO Forum on ADB, Global Call to Action on Land).

Global stakeholders incorporate Oxfam asks in their policy propositions:

- a) UNFCCC and AIIB (adaptation targets);
- b) European Union (ETS review);
- c) WB (revised safeguard on land and resettlement; safeguards to be completed mid-2016);
- d) IFC (reforms to financial intermediary lending), AIIB (progress on accountability mechanism and information disclosure policies), FMO (intermediary lending);
- e) A number of governments (including Netherlands and UK) take up Oxfam’s positions on land and climate in preparation of regional/global summits.

41. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/pressroom/pressreleases/2016-11-18/rich-countries-turn-blind-eye-needs-climate-vulnerable-countries>

42. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/climate-finance-shadow-report-2016>

the US\$100 billion roadmap, its accounting standards, and the ways it is to be reported by donors. New commitments to increase finance for adaptation in least developed countries are urgently needed.

Oxfam's biggest success was to attract attention to this issue. The message was picked up by diverse media (1,137 hits) including Reuters, the Independent, France 24, AFP, Die Welt and Spiegel. Government officials used Oxfam's narrative on climate change during the Finance Ministerial that took place during the COP. The President of Zambia made a keynote speech referring to net climate finance being only 20 percent of US\$100 billion, which Oxfam had been the first to point out. Oxfam received direct positive feedback from the Chairs of the Africa and Least Developed Country (LDC) groups, OECD key staff and various negotiators from developed countries (EU, US, UK, Germany). Oxfam had a substantial number of Southern staff participating (from Pakistan, Bangladesh, Malawi, Philippines and Vietnam). Oxfam's overall priority, climate finance, was aligned with the national agendas of the country teams.

Oxfam worked closely with allies, in particular, the Climate Action Network (CAN). It participated in various CAN working group meetings and three press conferences, giving prominence to climate finance in CAN's public messaging, and adaptation finance was included in its final assessment.⁴³

Disappointingly, there was no concrete outcome on adaptation finance: no new commitments were made,

only reconfirmations of previous ones. However, the outcome on the discussion of the US\$100 billion roadmap was more satisfactory, as the present accounting methods of developed countries were not accepted – although nor were they rejected – and the same applies to climate finance relevance. Overall, developed countries after COP22 felt more pressure to increase their adaptation finance, boosting the chances of future progress at the next COP in Bonn, Germany in 2017. Oxfam will follow up on this in 2017.

(II) LINKING AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT TO CLIMATE FINANCE ADAPTATION ON NATIONAL LEVEL

Whereas GROW's global advocacy is geared towards climate finance adaptation, national campaigns link it with agricultural investment in their advocacy towards their governments. Five national campaigns – Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria, Pakistan and Philippines – were supported to develop meaningful advocacy to engage their government on climate change adaptation and agricultural investment. For this purpose, funds from Sida, Gates Foundation and the Dutch government were pooled together. Sida's contribution is supporting research in Pakistan and the Philippines on effectiveness of financial flows from international donors and government in agricultural development and climate change adaptation. Pakistan launched its research in October 2016, whilst the other country papers will be released in the autumn of 2017. Around the same time, a synthesis paper is to be launched combining the results of the five country research outcomes.

43. <http://www.caneurope.org/publications/blogs/1273-climate-finance-at-cop22-not-just-a-numbers-game>

(III) EUROPEAN UNION ETS AND RED-II

Oxfam's engagement with the European Union was on two topics – the Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS)⁴⁴ and the revision of Renewable Energy Directives (RED-II) – as part its advocacy strategy to influence the EU's 2030 climate and energy package into alignment with the EU's commitments under the Paris Agreement and SDGs.

For the ETS review, Oxfam promoted amendments to create a fund for international climate action among members of the European Parliament's committees for the Environment, Industry and International Development. The position adopted by the European Parliament in plenary on 15 February 2017 includes a recommendation to member states to allocate ETS revenues to international climate action, but does not include binding provisions to set aside a share of ETS revenues for this purpose. It is very unlikely that binding provisions will be included at a later stage in the legislative procedure, given member states' opposition and the lack of a majority in the European Parliament to go beyond encouragement. The main reason for Oxfam's failure to achieve its objective is that decision-makers, and other civil society actors trying to influence them, focused instead on the sections of ETS that will influence the price of carbon after 2020 and its impacts on European industry.

For the RED-II revision, Oxfam released a new report entitled 'Burning Land, Burning the Climate – The biofuel

industry's capture of EU bioenergy policy' in October 2016.⁴⁵ The report seeks to influence the proposed new Renewable Energy Directive for 2021–2030 to end the use of unsustainable bioenergy, which threatens the access to land and food security of people in developing countries. A month after the report was released, on 30 November 2016, the European Commission tabled a new legislative proposal and sustainability framework for the EU's 2030 bioenergy policy as part of an advocacy strategy coordinated with allies (Birdlife Europe, Climate Action Network-Europe, FERN, Greenpeace EU, Transport & Environment, WWF EU, Zero Waste Europe). Oxfam participated in a series of high-level meetings with the European Commission between the launch and the adoption of the legislative proposal, when negotiations on the most sensitive elements of the proposal – such as the phase-out of food-based biofuels – were taking place at cabinet level.

The EC's proposal for RED-II partially included the provisions advocated for by Oxfam: (a) decrease in the use of food and feed crops for biofuels from 7 percent of the demand for energy in transport in the EU in 2020 to 3.8 percent in 2030 (Oxfam wanted a complete phase out); (b) extending existing biofuels sustainability criteria to all agricultural biomass (Oxfam wanted to broaden the existing criteria to include a social dimension); and (c) tightening GHG savings requirements (Oxfam wanted also to include emissions generated by the displacement of agriculture for food production into a new "indirect land use change"). Overall, the outcome is significant given

44. *EU ETS is a greenhouse gas emissions trading scheme applying the principle of 'cap and trade'. A maximum (cap) is set on the total amount of greenhouse gases that can be emitted by all participating installations. 'Allowances' for emissions are then auctioned off or allocated for free, and can subsequently be traded. Installations must monitor and report their CO2 emissions, ensuring they hand in enough allowances to the authorities to cover their emissions. If emissions exceed what are permitted by its allowances, an installation must purchase allowances from others. Conversely, if an installation has performed well at reducing its emissions, it can sell its leftover credits. This allows the system to find the most cost-effective ways of reducing emissions without significant government intervention. Derived from Wikipedia, visited 13 July 2017, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_Union_Emission_Trading_Scheme.*

45. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/burning-land-burning-climate>

the imbalance of power between Oxfam and its allies, advocating for a sustainable policy, and the biofuel industry and its allies. However, much remains to be improved during the legislative process that will unfold in 2017-2018.

RESULT 2.2. LAND

“The reason we fight for the rights of the earth is because we know who we are because of the earth, it is our identity. Mother earth made us as humans to protect her. We, people and earth, are washing each other’s hands, that is how we do it.”

Nonhle Mbuthuma, Amadiba Crisis Committee, Xolobeni Community, South Africa.

Following the completion of policy frameworks such as the World Bank, IFC and AIIB safeguards on land and resettlement, Oxfam has focused on the implementation and monitoring of these safeguards. On 4 August 2016, the World Bank’s Board of Executive Directors approved the safeguards revision as part of its new Environmental and Social Framework. Although the revised policy is significantly improved, Oxfam expressed disappointment⁴⁶ about the lack of policies fully guaranteeing the rights of communities affected by World Bank-funded projects.

Pending the full implementation of the safeguards, per 1st January 2018, Oxfam has stressed the need to work with civil society on the further development of guidance notes to close gaps and determine how the safeguards will function. The World Bank considers 2016-17 as a preparation period for transitioning to the new framework through supporting and strengthening the capacity of borrowers; training Bank staff and borrowers to

implement the framework; strengthening the Bank’s environmental and social risk management system; and strengthening strategic partnerships with development partners. The World Bank followed up on Oxfam’s call for involving CSOs, and invited Oxfam to be part of working groups developing implementation and monitoring methods to support the ESF implementation.

Meanwhile, Oxfam continued engaging financial intermediaries on their lending practices in the reporting year. One year on from the launch of Oxfam and partners’ paper ‘The Suffering of Others’ at the Spring Meetings in April 2016, Oxfam convened a panel discussion that shared new research revealing more evidence of the link between the IFC and socially and environmentally damaging projects through financial intermediary lending. The panel included high-level speakers from the IFC, the head of Environmental and Social Governance, and the Vice-President of the IFC watchdog, the CAO. The panel attracted a large audience with over 20 IFC staff including senior decision-makers, Board members and advisers.

A major aim of Oxfam over recent years is that IFC should be more transparent on its lending practices, such as disclosing information on clients it is working with. Oxfam’s advocacy contributed to IFC starting to ask for disclosure from its leading clients on a voluntary basis as reported to Sida in 2015-16. A sound win in this year is that IFC has now also committed itself to take steps towards better due diligence by improving its screening of its top high-risk financial intermediary clients. All these measures are part of an overall reform of its policy on managing environmental and social risks.

46. Oxfam International. (4 August 2016). After approving new safeguards, World Bank must work with civil society to guarantee rights will be protected. Media reaction: <https://www.oxfam.org/en/pressroom/reactions/after-approving-new-safeguards-world-bank-must-work-civil-society-guarantee>

Apart from IFC, Oxfam continued to engage with Dutch lender FMO. This concerned not only following up on the Aqua Zarca Dam Project in Honduras, but also on the revision of its sustainability policy. These are related, as the dam project gave FMO a strong impetus to review its existing policies on environmental and social sustainability. FMO committed to develop a human rights and land rights position statement by mid-2017.

FMO currently considers to include on human rights impact assessments, FPIC, and references to human rights treaties and contextual risk. This reflects Oxfam's comments, submitted as part of FMO's sustainability policy review in 2016. A specific part of FMO's new sustainability policy is devoted to protecting human rights and environmental defenders, following the Agua Zarca case and statements on it by Oxfam and other CSOs. Apart from FMO, Oxfam participated in and signed a banking sector agreement in the Netherlands which included respect for the principle of FPIC for any intervention affecting indigenous peoples.

Oxfam is working with a new actor, the Asian Infrastructure and Investment Bank (AIIB), which adopted its environmental and social framework (ESF) in February 2016. Oxfam managed to influence the AIIB to adopt extensive coverage of communities to be protected, and unambiguous criteria for assessing client systems. Since then, Oxfam has focused on monitoring the implementation of the ESF and organised meetings with shareholders

including the governments of Australia, Germany and United Kingdom to raise attention for monitoring the ESF. Oxfam coordinated its advocacy with other CSOs working with the AIIB, among others by attending a Civil Society Forum on AIIB in November 2016. Oxfam will follow AIIB's progress in implementing its ESF in the years to come, though as yet Oxfam is not well positioned to play a significant role in influencing AIIB policies and Oxfam will not make substantial investments on advocacy around this stakeholder.

Not planned for Year 3, but included in the last quarter, is Oxfam's preparations advocacy in the run up to the High Level Political Forum (HPLF) in summer 2017, convened under the auspices of the United Nations. This forum will review six SDG goals⁴⁷ related to "eradicating poverty and promoting prosperity in a changing world", two of which – SDGs 1 and 5 – contain land indicators.⁴⁸ Oxfam's advocacy trajectory aims to influence this event to embed the land rights of women, indigenous people and communities in the monitoring and reporting methodologies developed for these indicators. Oxfam is working to develop common positions in relation to these indicators with a loose network of civil society actors working on land and women's rights issues; this overlaps with the wider alliance of state and non-state actors brought together by the Global Land Indicator Initiative, of which Oxfam is a part. In the run-up to the HPLF, in Cape Town, South Africa in January 2017, Oxfam participated in an expert group meeting on the methodologies for the SDG

47. *SDG 1 (End poverty in all its forms everywhere), SDG 2 (End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture), SDG 3 (Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages), SDG 5 (Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls), SDG 9 (Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialisation and foster innovation), SDG 14 (Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development).*

48. *1.4.2: Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognised documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure.*

5.a.1 (a): Proportion of total agricultural population with ownership or secure rights over agricultural land, by sex; and (b) share of women among owners or rights-bearers of agricultural land, by type of tenure.

5.a.2: Proportion of countries where the legal framework (including customary law) guarantees women's equal rights to land ownership and/or control.

indicators. The input provided in this and other informal meetings resulted in draft documents on methodology incorporating provisions proposed by Oxfam including: (a) forms of secure tenure rights beyond 'ownership', which is important for indigenous and other communities with communal land systems; and (b) carrying out individual interviews to complement household surveys, which is essential to pick up intra-household and gender differences in the enjoyment of land rights.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 3: NATIONAL POLICIES AND GOVERNANCE

To effectively steer relevant stakeholders to improve global-level policies and governance regarding climate change and its impact on food security, land use rights of local communities, and reduction of negative impacts of biofuels on food security.

"I am fully convinced that climate change is a bigger threat to Pakistan than terrorism, and Pakistan can experience severe impacts of extreme climate disasters, with water stress affecting food and energy security."

Dr Qamar-uz-Zaman Chaudhry, International Climate Change Specialist at the Asian Development Bank.⁴⁹

NIGER

The GROW campaign in Niger (Cultivons) focused, in its last year of receiving Sida support, on one area: agricultural investment and resilience. The political context in Niger has been turbulent: President Mahamadou Issoufou was re-elected in March 2016 after a tumultuous election campaign and run-off elections that were boycotted by the opposition. The election results, and thus the legitimacy of the new government, were contested by the opposition, which created an unstable political scene; however, one of the major opposition parties, MNSD, has declared that it will join the government, which could provide a somewhat more stable platform for the government to implement reforms in critical areas. Civil society has become increasingly politicised, with many CSOs affiliating themselves with one of the major political parties.⁵⁰ For Oxfam, it is key not to be perceived as taking sides whilst implementing Cultivons, hence the preference to work with broad alliances: the campaign continues to serve as a platform for 28 CSOs.

RESULT 3.1. BUILDING GROW WITH LOCAL STAKEHOLDERS IN TWO COUNTRIES

INTERMEDIARY OUTCOMES PLANNED FOR 2016–17

Niger:

- Government of Niger reflects the asks of Cultivons in its laws on social protection and agriculture.

Pakistan:

- 5,000 people take action during public action;
- National government takes position during COP 22 in which Oxfam asks are reflected;
- Two provincial governments draft climate policies in which Oxfam asks are reflected;
- 11 district governments take over and implements parts of local action plan

49. Taken from interview conducted on 26 January 2017 with newspaper Dawn (<https://www.dawn.com/news/1310736>).

50. Derived from 'Concept Note Country Programme 2017-2021 Niger', Royal Danish Embassy in Ouagadougou. <http://um.dk/en/-/media/UM/English-site/Documents/Danida/About-Danida/Danida%20transparency/Consultations/2016/Niger.pdf>

In engaging the parliament and government, the campaign followed through on its 'ALKWALI Niger Manifesto',⁵¹ as signed by several political parties prior to the March 2016 elections, including the party of President Issoufou.⁵² The focus was on laws on agriculture (Loi d'Orientation Agricole, LOA) and social protection (Loi sur la Protection Social). For LOA, Cultivons supported one of its members, the network organisation *Réseau des Chambres d'Agriculture du Niger* (RECA), by conducting a study on agricultural investment. The results of the study were used to engage new members of parliament in adapting this legal framework, which will be relevant for agricultural investment policy in the coming years, and in a meeting with the *Commission Développement Rural* (rural development commission). With the help of the commission, the draft became a bill in 2017.

The law on social protection is expected to be presented to the assembly in the near future. Cultivons and its members have campaigned for three years for this law, and took the lead in developing a draft text for the bill. Based on this draft, the Council of State, a government apex body, formulated many recommendations for further refinement of the bill. Once adopted, it will provide a legal framework for protection of vulnerable groups such as small producers.

Advocacy towards government and parliament in 2017 involved a wide range of media and public actions supported by Sida. Examples are the production of a documentary on the quality of agricultural investment in Niger, facilitating debates on television and radio, and organising a media contest.

Given the end of Sida funding for Cultivons, Oxfam Niger took the lead in attracting other donors to support parts of the campaign. It is hoped that Cultivons will continue to function as a platform, bringing together CSOs working on issues such as land rights, agricultural investment and climate adaptation. In the autumn of 2017, Oxfam Niger will conduct an evaluation of Cultivons for 2014-17.

PAKISTAN

The provincial government of Punjab moved forward on establishing a provincial climate change policy. In March 2017, the 16 departments of the provincial government approved a policy draft, to which Oxfam and its partner, LEAD, facilitated inputs from civil society.⁵³ The next step is to present the policy to the provincial assembly. Policy reform in the other province, Sindh, is going at a much slower pace and it is not expected that a draft will be released soon.

GROW conducted a detailed review of climate public expenditure in both provinces. The report was launched by the Provincial Minister of Environment Protection Agency in Punjab, and a Provincial Assembly member in Sindh.⁵⁴ The provincial government vowed to raise the voice of small farmers and ensure an increase in the budget in the agriculture sector, particularly focusing on women. The review and related methodology is based on CPEIR (2010-2014) research conducted by UNDP at the national level. Also at national level, Oxfam conducted a study entitled 'Tracking of Public Agricultural Investments and Climate Change Adaptation Finance Flows in Pakistan' (for 2015-2016). The primary objective of the research was to inform Oxfam and partners' advocacy

51. Please refer to the SeedsGROW annual report 2015-16 as submitted to Sida.

52. Parti Nigerien pour la Democratie et le Socialisme (PNDS)

53. For the draft, refer to <https://pnd.punjab.gov.pk/system/files/PCCPDraft2.2Feb2017-clean%20version%20%285%29.pdf>

54. For Punjab see <https://www.pakistantoday.com.pk/2017/02/01/minister-vows-to-raise-voice-for-small-farmers-hit-by-climate-change/se>. For Sind <https://tribune.com.pk/story/1340881/sindh-vulnerable-province-climate-change/>

CASE STUDY: ONLINE CAMPAIGNING FOR CLIMATE CHANGE

In the week of World Food Day (16 October 2016), GROW in Pakistan launched a new public campaign to demand action on climate finance to enable the most vulnerable to adapt to the devastating effects of climate change. Oxfam and partners organised 11 rallies and marches throughout the country, which each attracted between 500 and 2000 participants and engaged small-scale producers. For example, in Karachi PFF organised fisher and peasant communities to march from the city centre to the Press Club Karachi.



Credits: Fahim Sadiqqi/White star

and campaigns for improved national, provincial and district-level climate finance and administrative setups for agricultural investment in Pakistan. The findings showed that women small-scale farmers play a significant role in food production, yet policies and investments fail to recognise their contribution, meet their needs, or support their enormous potential to eradicate hunger. This research fits in with a wider Oxfam initiative to hold governments in Asia and Africa accountable for ensuring sufficient agricultural investment (see also under objective 2, climate change).

GROW representatives participated in the COP 22 event in Marrakech, aiming to engage the Pakistan delegation and mobilise them to participate in the South-South climate cooperation agenda. This presented an opportunity to explore and establish a partnership with the government and other stakeholders on climate finance (see objective 2).

Oxfam's GROW campaign is inspired by inputs from the local level, reflecting the true issues of small-scale producers. In Pakistan, the development of Local Adaptation Plans of Action (LAPA) as an advocacy tool play a key role, and these plans have been finalised for

11 districts. They were translated into the relevant local languages and made available to district authorities for broader consultation and integration in district Annual Development Plans (ADPs). Two mainstream TV talkshows discussed the messages and demands of small farmers, creating an immense impact on the recent development of the climate change policy formulation process.

The linchpin in local to provincial advocacy is the provincial steering committee. The two provincial committees finalised the charter of demands, which served as input to the provincial governments. In Punjab, the charter was presented to the environment minister during the provincial budget launch ceremony.

In support of its advocacy, GROW Pakistan launched various public actions throughout the year. In October (see box) a national spike was launched to target the urban middle class to pressure the government and political leaders to prioritise the climate change agenda, through short videos, shareable graphics and policy briefs.

ANALYSIS AND RISK MANAGEMENT

The risk of political instability remains a relevant factor in both Niger and Pakistan, and may disturb the move-

Campaign activities included distribution of flyers in shopping malls to engage students, participating in radio and TV debates, and engaging the Pakistani urban middle class through online channels such as YouTube, Twitter, Facebook, and the GROW Pakistan’s website page leading visitors to an online petition site.

The digital campaign was a new element for the GROW campaign in Pakistan, and led to some useful learnings. The petitions site gathered 4,098 signatures, which was somewhat lower than anticipated given that over 3 million people took note of the campaign messages. Oxfam Pakistan conducted an internal review which pointed out both internal reasons (for example, technical issues with the petition interface) and external reasons (it is relatively new for the Pakistan audience to be engaged in this way).



ment of staff from Oxfam, its partners, and the government. The presidential elections in Niger in 2016 resulted in the opposition boycotting the re-elected President Issoufou, creating increased political instability with many CSOs aligning themselves with a political party. In this environment, Oxfam was careful not to politicise its involvement through Cultivons, and opted to work on a broader level. Pakistan, on the other hand, has demonstrated some tangible commitments to addressing climate change on the provincial and national levels; it is hoped that these developments remain a priority.

MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING

The MEL framework for GROW includes three levels:

1. Balanced scorecard cycle (sphere of interest), focused on budget depletion and progress on activities and outputs;
2. Annual cycle (sphere of influence), focused on progress towards (interim) outcomes, with ample attention to campaign risk management; and

3. Programme cycle (sphere of influence/interest), focused on gauging progress towards long-term outcomes, with ample attention for strategic learning and sustainability as an important criterion for success.

In 2016, Oxfam conducted an evaluation of the GROW campaign for 2013-15, which served as mid-term review for this Sida grant: Sida provided basket funding to the GROW campaign for 2014-15, which predominantly matched the second part of the GROW strategic framework 2011-15. As the Sida contribution and objectives are not to be seen as distinct from the overall GROW campaign, it was decided with Sida to cover the overall campaign. The evaluation report was positive about the work and the achievements of the GROW campaign in 2013-15, with the evaluators acknowledging its relevance, effectiveness and added value within civil society alliances and networks, the expertise provided by its high-quality research, its credibility due to being grounded in field realities, the stronger local-to-global

linkages established, its insider-outsider approach towards the private sector, and its capacity to reach out to the public and attract the attention of the media. The evaluators remarked that the use of the Sida grant was fully aligned to the strategic priorities of the GROW campaign, especially in building local-to-global linkages.

At the same time, Oxfam appreciated the constructive feedback provided by the evaluators in their conclusions and recommendations. Oxfam agreed to various extents with the ten conclusions, except for one: it did not agree to adopt a broader climate campaign agenda, covering both adaptation and mitigation. Oxfam continues to focus on specific themes such as climate finance, to avoid the risk of spreading sources too thinly, highlight issues not taken up by other CSOs, and above all to work on issues which are most relevant for Southern Oxfams and partners – especially given opportunities to combine agricultural investment and climate change in national campaigns.

Issues raised by the nine other conclusions included:

- a recommendation to define an overall strategy for allies. Oxfam is careful not to apply a 'one size fits all' approach for movement building; it rather makes strategic choices on how to engage in alliance building in different campaigns given the specific policy and social environment.
- the evaluation strengthened Oxfam's confidence in applying the strategy of linking local to global in the GROW campaign, which benefited from substantial investments in 2013-15, to which the Sida grant made a significant contribution. A major challenge for the years to come remains the shrinking space for CSOs to conduct campaigns that challenge vested national and international interests.
- on gender, the evaluation challenges Oxfam to be more ambitious in putting women's rights at the heart of the campaign. In response, Oxfam will apply a 'comply or explain' principle: for all GROW campaign activities, it will be clarified how these will contribute to the advancement of women's rights, a rationale will be provided when there is no contribution.
- the evaluators remark that MEL is based at country level but not always well established. Oxfam concurs: although it has a rich variety of MEL tools and guidelines specifically designed for campaigns, the extent to which GROW campaign can apply and work with them depends on having adequate externally funded resources – for example, having designated MEL staff at national and/or global level. One concrete measure Oxfam has committed to is that any funding plans include adequate time and resources for MEL. The GROW management team is also determined to raise its standards on applying MEL in campaigning, and has reviewed its system with the help of an external consultant, which should guide GROW staff in integrating MEL in their plans.



CHAPTER 4

SEEDSGROW PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT

While the SeedsGROW programme is committed to finding as much synergy as possible between SD=HS and GROW, they are managed differently at both strategic and operational levels. SD=HS has been implemented within an international consortium of nine partners, of which Oxfam Novib is the lead. Within Oxfam International, SD=HS is the responsibility of Oxfam Novib, as is coordination with the relevant Oxfam country offices. On the other hand, the Sida funding for GROW is embedded in the Oxfam International GROW campaign, which is managed by the Oxfam confederation. Given these differences, more of the management activities under SeedsGROW are undertaken as part of the SD=HS component.

HUMAN RESOURCES

Year 3 has seen a number of changes in human resources compared to Years 1 and 2. Due to Sida budget cuts announced in early 2016, three positions on the SD=HS team were phased out. At the end of Year 2, the programme leader of SeedsGROW fell ill and did not return to the position, which involved being the primary point of contact for Sida and overseeing the implementation of both the SD=HS and Sida GROW programmes. During her absence, Oxfam Novib filled the position with interim programme leaders, and a new Contract Manager position for the Sida SeedsGROW programme was hired at the close of Year 3. The GROW team at Oxfam International experienced some turnover: new Global Land Policy and Global Climate Leads were recruited to replace staff who accepted other positions. In The Hague, the Policy Lead for Land Governance and Land Rights departed and was replaced by another highly-qualified expert, and the Senior Lobbyist on the Climate Team replaced another team member who shifted roles internally.

PROGRAMME REPORTING AND GOVERNANCE

Under the SD=HS component, GPC meetings are normally held twice a year for each funding source (Sida and IFAD) to discuss project progress, concerns and upcoming key deliverables. In Year 2, there were two Sida-focused meetings due to the programme budget reduction, with the second meeting taking place in March 2016. In April 2016, a meeting with three representatives from the SD=HS Global Programme Committee took place in The Hague. The main points of discussion included the Sida SeedsGROW funding reduction and expectations and clarifications on decision making and implementation of budget reductions. The Oxfam Novib Steering Committee could endorse part of the suggestions made by the GPC on how to address the budget cuts, but not all (i.e., decisions related to phasing-out CAWR and its mini-consortium of local partners). This led to diminishing trust levels between Oxfam Novib and esp. the pillar 4 partners, but did not affect the implementation speed as such.

The Sida-funded part of the GROW team effectively participated in the discussions of GROW's Oxfam International global governance structures (within the confederation's Economic Justice Campaign Management Team) and at the regional level. In addition, team members played key roles in alliances related to food and climate justice, land and biofuels. The chair of the SeedsGROW Steering Committee, as well as the Oxfam Novib GROW campaign manager, take responsibility for aligning high-level decision making in Oxfam International GROW and the GROW strategy and interventions.

SeedsGROW reports programme progress to its steering committee, which has changed during Year 3 due to the members taking on new roles outside of Oxfam Novib. The SeedsGROW steering committee continues to be comprised of two senior-level Oxfam Novib staff, Arnold Galavazi (Director of Operations) and Gerard Steehouwer

(Manager, Food, Land, and Water Thematic Unit). The steering committee works with an eye on the overall management of the programme, the linkages between SD=HS and GROW, the relationship with the GPC for SD=HS, and also on the relationship to broader Oxfam policy and change processes. Due to the staff changes in Year 3, the steering committee briefing did not occur regularly but ad hoc as required. It is anticipated that the regular reporting will be resumed in Year 4.

PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT

The Oxfam Novib GROW team successfully mobilised funds during Year 2, mostly from US foundations via Oxfam America, which were mostly used for the global call for action on land and indigenous people. In Year 2, SD=HS submitted a concept note to IFAD for phase 2 of the IFAD project; however, by the end of Year 2, no feedback had been received from IFAD. Oxfam Novib reapplied in September 2016. Both SD=HS and GROW have benefited from the funding that Oxfam Novib received under the Dutch governments' Strategic Partnership, which started on January 1st, 2016. The SD=HS funding strategy, which was to be agreed on at the March 2016 GPC, was not discussed as time was dedicated to the news and planning regarding the absorption of the Sida funding cuts. The strategy was taken up at the next GPC meeting, in the third quarter of 2016 and resulted in outlining a process and plan. SD=HS has not been successful yet in continuing its IFAD-support, but has attracted Oxfam Novib innovation funds and public fundraising support in the Netherlands.

CREATING SYNERGIES

Both SD=HS and GROW work on the broken food system, but through different interventions. They tackle the same issues faced by small farmers in agricultural

systems, but through different topics. An example is corporate concentration: where SD=HS focuses on recent massive takeovers in the seed sector, GROW focuses on corporate concentration in the food trading industry, where e.g. the so called ABCD-traders control 75-90 percent of the global grain trade. Key in our approach to the broken food system is the agency of indigenous people and smallholder food producers. Both elements of the SeedsGROW programme have this perspective at the core of all activities. As an example, this can be seen in the participative methodology of SD=HS (Pillar 1) or the land campaign Land Rights Now that Oxfam organised in an international coalition with many local participants.⁵⁵ Climate change is another collective focus: from the GROW perspective, it is one of the topics that requires extensive advocacy at all levels to realise a cut in the exhaust of greenhouse gasses and sufficient funding for adaptation for smallholder food producers. Within SD=HS, climate change is a reality for the farmers the consortium partners work with. Together with farmers produce seeds that are more resilient to the unpredictable weather patterns, is one of the challenging task we have set ourselves. We will also be exploring to bringing together the different strands of work in Oxfam on the rice-value chain in the Mekong (both at policy – multi-stakeholder meetings and on-the-ground work on NUS, SMEs).

At the global level, both programmes find opportunities for synergies. The Pillar 4 partners and Oxfam colleagues of both programmes share information and strategies.

55. <http://www.landrightsnow.org/en/participants/>





CHAPTER 5

SEEDS- GROW FINANCES

In this chapter, information is provided about actual cash expenditures versus budgets in the period 1 April 2016 – 31 March 2017. In this section, we present a consolidated analysis for the SeedsGROW overall programme and separate detailed analyses for SD=HS, SidaGROW, and the Dutch Postcode Lottery (NPL) funding. In addition, to detailing the cash-flow position and foreign currency gains and losses we also describe the beginning of the Sida systems audit of Oxfam Novib.

SEEDSGROW FINANCIAL SUMMARY

The total expenditure for the Sida-funded SeedsGROW activities was EUR 3,565,529. The amount of NPL support for activities in Year 3 was EUR 579,641. In total, the absorption rate was 87 percent.

TABLE 1. SEEDSGROW FINANCIAL SUMMARY, APRIL 2016 - MARCH 2017

SEEDS GROW VS ACTUALS YEAR 3 (IN €)	FROM APRIL 1, 2016 UNTIL MARCH 31, 2017			
	BUDGET	ACTUAL	VARIANCE	ABSORPTION
1 Pillar 1. Scaling up models	504.593	491.757	12.836	97%
2 Pillar 2. Starting up farmer seeds enterprises	352.499	323.688	28.811	92%
3 Pillar 3. Women, seeds and nutrition	673.675	562.317	111.358	83%
4 Pillar 4. Global policy engagement	678.205	615.032	63.173	91%
TOTAL DIRECT PROGRAMME SDHS	2.208.972	1.992.794	216.178	90%
1 Building a stakeholder movement	196.349	224.169	-27.820	114%
2 Global level policies and governance	594.719	445.316	149.403	75%
3 National level policies & governance	487.567	350.851	136.716	72%
TOTAL DIRECT PROGRAMME GROW	1.278.635	1.020.336	258.298	80%
0 Contract management SD=HS	207.247	191.979	15.269	93%
0 Contract management GROW	141.948	127.162	14.787	90%
TOTAL PROGRAMME COSTS	3.836.802	3.332.270	504.532	87%
Indirect: Admin fee 7%	268.576	233.259	35.317	87%
TOTAL OVERALL	4.105.378	3.565.529	539.849	87%

TABLE 1 shows that the total expenditure for SeedsGROW was EUR 3,565,529, an absorption of 87 percent. Most of the under-expenditure is explained under GROW Objective 2 (Global level policies and governance) and Objective 3 (national-level policies and governance, and linking with global policies).

SDHS absorption was 90 percent, which illustrates timely implementation and expenditures. Please find listed below a summary of the main deviations: 1) there was a delay in the Oxfam Novib programme implementation for EUR 79,000

mainly due to Pillar 4 postponed activities on national workshops for policy intervention and validation; 2) delay in contract negotiations in Myanmar (managed by SEARICE) led to an under expenditure of EUR 32,458; 3) an under expenditure for the CAWR managed countries, Mali and India, of EUR 75,000 was a result of not being able to complete activities as the contract between ONL and CAWR was closed early by ONL. These costs will be reported in Year 4; 4) the expert meeting in Geneva found savings against the planned budget in the amount of EUR 24,771; and, 5) the costs of the Mid Term Review will be reported in Year 4 (EUR 59,333).

SidaGROW absorption was 80 percent, which illustrates sound implementation. The main deviations that occurred in Objective 1 with an over expenditure of EUR 27,820 due to some over expenditure on private sector campaign, which will be compensated in Year 4; the under expenditure for Objective 2 of EUR 149,403 is due to some activity delay that will be carried forward to Year 4. And in Objective 3, which includes the Oxfam country offices Niger and Pakistan, there is an under expenditure of EUR 136,716, of which EUR 64,500 is seen in Pakistan as Pakistan opted to reduce activities and costs in Year 3 to implement more in Year 4 (as a result of the budget reduction). The unspent funds in Pakistan include human resources/travel and studies/publications costs, activities such as a stakeholder workshop, campaign material development, and grants to partners. In Niger, Year 3 activities (i.e. study on investments in the agricultural sector and advocacy meetings) were implemented but were not fully finalized by the end of Year 3; therefore, the expenses (EUR 31,700) will be accounted in Year 4. The external auditor, Mazars, audited these expenditures and agreed that these costs can be accounted for in Year 4. For Niger, expenses in Year 4 will be incurred for closing the Sida contribution to the GROW campaign in Niger (i.e., final evaluation and audit). Niger also has underspent EUR 40,400 on other activities that will no longer be implemented (e.g., costs for travel and alliance building).

SIDA SD=HS FINANCE

TABLE 2: SD=HS FINANCIAL SUMMARY, APRIL 2016 – MARCH 2017

SD=HS BUDGET VS ACTUALS YEAR 3 (IN €)	FROM APRIL 1, 2016 UNTIL MARCH 31, 2017			
	BUDGET	ACTUAL	VARIANCE	ABSORPTION
0 SD=HS Contract Management				
1,1 Hum. Res. for Contract Management	167.281	148.022	19.260	88%
1,2 Activities ON Project Management & Governance	21.528	22.012	-484	102%
1,4 <i>External audit</i>	18.438	21.945	-3.507	119%
SUBTOTAL PROJECT CONTRACT MANAGEMENT	207.247	191.979	15.269	93%
1 Pillar 1. Scaling Up Models				
2,1 Hum. Res. ON Programme Implementation	73.294	81.437	8.144-	111%
2,2 Consultancies (Scientific validation)	34.375	32.637	1.738	95%
2,3 Activities Global (ON) Programme Implementation	73.000	50.123	22.877	69%
3.1.1 Activities Country1: Peru	63.149	70.508	7.359-	112%
3.1.2 Activities Country2: Zimbabwe	67.043	71.626	4.583-	107%
3.1.3 Activities Country3: Vietnam	94.665	89.224	5.441	94%
3.1.4 Activities Country4: Laos	84.234	96.201	11.967-	114%
MEL Activities Pillars 1-4	14.833	-	14.833	0%
SUBTOTAL PILLAR 1	504.593	491.757	12.836	97%
2 Pillar 2. Starting up Farmer Seeds Enterprises				
2,1 Hum. Res. ON Programme Implementation	93.094	94.758	1.664-	102%
2,2 Consultancies (Scientific validation)	34.375	32.637	1.738	95%
2,3 Activities Global (ON) Programme Implementation	1.500	1.253	247	84%
3.2.1 Activities Country Zimbabwe	208.697	195.040	13.656	93%
3.2.2 Activities Country2: still to be selected	-	-	-	
MEL Activities Pillars 1-4	14.833	-	14.833	0%
SUBTOTAL PILLAR 2	352.499	323.688	28.811	92%
3 Pillar 3. Women, Seeds & Nutrition				
2,1 Hum. Res. ON Programme Implementation	141.144	142.068	924-	101%
2,2 Consultancies (Scientific validation)	34.375	32.637	1.738	95%
2,3 Activities Global (ON) Programme Implementation	12.000	6.662	5.338	56%
3.3.1 Activities Country1: Peru	82.796	89.910	7.114-	109%

SD=HS BUDGET VS ACTUALS YEAR 3 (IN €)	FROM APRIL 1, 2016 UNTIL MARCH 31, 2017			
	BUDGET	ACTUAL	VARIANCE	ABSORPTION
3.3.2 Activities Country2: Zimbabwe	75.220	78.947	3.727-	105%
3.3.3 Activities Country3: Vietnam	114.881	118.479	3.598-	103%
3.3.4 Activities Country5: Myanmar	123.426	93.615	29.811	76%
3.3.5 Activities Country6: Mali	66.321	-	66.321	0%
3.3.6 Activities Country7: Senegal	-	-	-	
3.3.7 Activities Country8: India	8.679	-	8.679	0%
3.3.8 Contingencies				
MEL Activities Pillars 1-4	14.833	-	14.833	0%
SUBTOTAL PILLAR 3	673.675	562.317	111.358	83%
4 Pillar 4. Global Policy Engagement				
2,1 Hum. Res. ON Programme Implementation	89.679	66.827	22.852	75%
2,2 Consultancies (Scientific validation)	34.375	32.637	1.738	95%
2,3 Activities Global (ON) Programme Implementation	66.928	16.023	50.905	24%
4,1 Activities GLOBAL : Counterpart Grants	-	-	-	
4.1.1 Research: Global trends & policies	171.976	162.140	9.836	94%
4.1.2 Research: Country trends & policies	23.541	25.264	1.723-	107%
4.1.3 Stakeholders' capacity building	60.700	81.218	20.518-	134%
4.1.4 Develop, test and publicise innovative models that facilitate innovation and cooperation in farmers' seed systems and increase farmers' freedoms to operate.	7.418	9.995	2.577-	135%
4.1.5 Policy engagement and/or capacity building outputs and initiatives grounded in SD=HS programme outcomes and/or contributing to strengthening other elements of the programme	5.031	7.851	2.820-	156%
4.2.1 Public Advocacy & Alliance Building	47.820	84.586	36.766-	177%
4.2.2 Targeted Advocacy	56.402	56.490	88-	100%
4.3 Workshop held by Peru and Laos	30.000	27.272	2.728	91%
TWN Geneva expert meeting	69.500	44.729	24.771	64%
MEL Activities Pillars 1-4	14.833	-	14.833	0%
SUBTOTAL PILLAR 4	678.205	615.032	63.173	91%
TOTAL 4 PILLARS	2.208.972	1.992.794	216.178	90%
TOTAL DIRECT SDHS	2.416.219	2.184.772	231.447	90%

SD=HS BUDGET VS ACTUALS YEAR 3 (IN €)		FROM APRIL 1, 2016 UNTIL MARCH 31, 2017			
		BUDGET	ACTUAL	VARIANCE	ABSORPTION
5	TOTAL all 4 PILLARS				
1,1	Hum. Res. for Contract Management (Progr Devt. & Fundraising)	167.281	148.022	19.260	88%
1,2	Activities ON Project Management & Governance	21.528	22.012	484-	102%
1,4	External audit (ON Group Audit)	18.438	21.945	3.507-	119%
2,1	Hum. Res. ON Programme Implementation	397.211	385.090	12.121	97%
2,2	Consultancies (Scientific validation)	137.500	130.548	6.952	95%
2,3	Activities Global (ON) Programme Implementation	153.428	74.061	79.367	48%
3,1	Activities Country1: Peru	155.945	168.081	12.136-	108%
3,2	Activities Country2: Zimbabwe	350.960	345.613	5.347	98%
3,3	Activities Country3: Vietnam	209.546	207.703	1.843	99%
3,4	Activities Country4: Laos	104.234	115.810	11.576-	111%
3,5	Activities Country5: Myanmar	123.426	93.615	29.811	76%
3,6	Activities Country6: Mali	66.321	-	66.321	0%
3,7	Activities Country7: Senegal	-	-	-	
3,8	Activities Country8: India	8.679	-	8.679	0%
4,1	Activities GLOBAL: Pillar 4 Activities (Grants)	372.889	427.544	54.655-	115%
	TWN Geneva expert meeting	69.500	44.729	24.771	64%
5	MEL Activities Pillars 1-4	59.333	-	59.333	0%
	Contingency				
TOTAL DIRECT SDHS PILLARS 1-4		2.416.219	2.184.772	231.447	90%
	Indirect: Admin Fee 7%	169.135	152.934	16.201	90%
TOTAL OVERALL		2.585.354	2.337.706	247.648	90%

PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT SPENDING

Contract management had an absorption rate of 93 percent. The under expenditure was, to a large extent, due to the vacancy of the new Contract Manager position (which has been filled and will be reported in Year 4). Some overspending in audit fees occurred due to the division between SD=HS and SidaGROW; GROW has an under expenditure, so in total the audit budget is balanced.

PILLAR 1

Pillar 1 had an absorption rate of 97 percent. There was an underspending in ON implementation as some activities did not take place: analysis of experiences in report, lessons learned for communities (publications), technical backstopping on liaison with gene banks, and a side event on farmers rights in Indonesia. Peru had a little overspending on joint scientific and IPSHF assessment of climate change trends and traditional PGR coping strategies for food security at local levels. For MEL activities, the costs for the mid-term review were

budgeted but it finished in June 2017 and the costs will fall in Year 4.

PILLAR 2

Pillar 2 had a spending rate of 92 percent, with under expenditure for MEL activities. As mentioned under Pillar 1, these costs will appear in Year 4 as the MTR was completed after the end of Year 3.

PILLAR 3

Pillar 3's total spending rate was 83 percent. Some Oxfam Novib implementing activities turned out to be less expensive, and one activity – global consolidation of an extended baseline for Pillar 3 – has not yet been finished, and its costs will appear in Year 4.

Vietnam had an over expenditure. Myanmar had an under-expenditure due to delays in contract negotiations over the indirect cost rate; those negotiations have now been finalised now, though we expect not all the planned activities can be completed before the project ends. SEARICE has decided with their partners in Vietnam to increase the activities there.

Mali and India also had under expenditure. As the contract with CAWR was stopped, we expected some costs to be incurred to finish the project, though after discussion with CAWR it was decided not to execute these final activities and the funds will be returned to Oxfam Novib. Another purpose for these funds will be proposed to Sida during Year 4.

PILLAR 4

Pillar 4 had an expenditure rate of 91 percent. There was a little under expenditure on salary costs, due to the vacancy for an IPR (lobby) expert that was filled during the year. Also, there was under expenditure on Oxfam Novib implementing activities, as we had to postpone the national workshops for policy intervention and validation (EUR 51,928). A total over expenditure on Pillar 4 partner activities of 115 percent is explained by TWN advocacy for farmers' rights to audiences who can influence national and international policies; these costs will be reduced on the Year 4 expenditures. TWN organised a meeting in Geneva that was implemented under budget. MEL costs for Pillar 4 will be included in Year 4.

GROW FINANCE

TABLE 3: SIDAGROW FINANCIAL SUMMARY, APRIL 2016 - MARCH 2017

SEEDS GROW BUDGET VS ACTUALS	FROM APRIL 1, 2016 UNTIL MARCH 31, 2017			
PROGRAMME, OUTCOME & ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION (IN EURO'S)	BUDGET	ACTUAL	VARIANCE	ABSORPTION
GROW Contract Management				
Human resources for contract management	102.448	99.895	2.553	98%
Travel including per diems	12.500	4.304	8.196	34%
External audit	27.000	22.963	4.037	85%
SUBTOTAL PROJECT CONTRACT MANAGEMENT	141.948	127.162	14.787	90%
Building A Stakeholder Movement				
Human Resources implementing the activities	63.787	67.168	3.381-	105%
Travels including per diems	5.500	2.185	3.315	40%
Publications on websites and social media	99.562	128.581	29.019-	129%
Others - organizing allies meeting	-	-	-	
1/2 of project MEL and Evaluation Expenses	27.500	26.235	1.265	95%
SUBTOTAL SUB-PROGRAMME	196.349	224.169	27.820-	114%

SEEDS GROW BUDGET VS ACTUALS	FROM APRIL 1, 2016 UNTIL MARCH 31, 2017			
PROGRAMME, OUTCOME & ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION (IN EURO'S)	BUDGET	ACTUAL	VARIANCE	ABSORPTION
Improving Global Level Policies and Governance				
Human Resources implementing the activities	360.008	351.407	8.601	98%
Travels including per diems	54.000	28.670	25.330	53%
Contribution to local office operating costs	6.130	3.322	2.808	54%
Publications	10.000	-	10.000	0%
Studies, research	103.848	35.682	68.165	34%
Translation, interpreters (french & Spanish)	-	-	-	
Project activities	33.233	-	33.233	0%
Engagement with Allies	-	-	-	
1/2 of project MEL and Evaluation Expenses	27.500	26.235	1.265	95%
SUBTOTAL SUB-PROGRAMME	594.719	445.316	149.403	75%
Improving National Level Policies and Interlinking with Global level policies				
Human Resources implementing the activities	100.786	89.835	10.950	89%
Travels including per diems	69.517	31.184	38.333	45%
Publications	19.218	15.778	3.440	82%
Studies, research	15.845	646	15.199	4%
Translation, interpreters	3.300	-	3.300	0%
Project activities	84.753	48.471	36.283	57%
Contribution to the National Network of alliances	22.320	10.723	11.597	48%
Grant to partners	171.828	154.214	17.614	90%
MEL and Evaluation Expenses			-	
SUBTOTAL SUB-PROGRAMME	487.567	350.851	136.716	72%
TOTAL DIRECT PROGRAMME COSTS	1.420.583	1.147.498	273.085	81%
Indirect administration costs (7%)	99.441	80.325	19.116	81%
TOTAL OVERALL GROW BUDGET	1.520.024	1.227.823	292.201	81%

CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

Total expenditure rate for contract management was 90 percent, with some under expenditure on travel as less was needed for monitoring.

OBJECTIVE 1: BUILDING A STAKEHOLDER MOVEMENT

The total spending rate for Objective 1 was 114 percent, due to more funds than budgeted being spent on publications, the website and social media for the private sector campaign of GROW to be launched in Year 4. This will be compensated in Year 4.

OBJECTIVE 2: GLOBAL LEVEL POLICIES AND GOVERNANCE

For Objective 2 the total spending rate was 75 percent as the support to five Southern countries in launching public campaigns for climate and agricultural investment (targeting both governments and private sector), resulting in under expenditure for travel and no expenditure for project activities. A planned publication on food and climate justice was delayed.

OBJECTIVE 3

Objective 3 consists of the activities of Niger and Pakistan. There was under expenditure for Niger of EUR 72,000 and Pakistan for EUR 64,500. Both balances will be carried into Year 4.

DUTCH POSTCODE LOTTERY

The Dutch Postcode Lottery (NPL) has donated extra funds, additional to the Pillar 3 activities in Zimbabwe.

TABLE DUTCH POSTCODE LOTTERY: SOWING GOODS IN ZIMBABWE, APRIL 2016 - MARCH 2017

BUDGET/ EXPENDITURE IN EURO		TOTAL YEAR 2			Q4	ABSORPTION
		BUDGET	EXP	VARIANCE	VARIANCE	
0	Personnel Cost	197.985	202.471	(4.486)	(18.058)	102%
Activity 1	Inception period and awareness raising	-	-	-	-	
Activity 2	Baseline Survey	-	-	-	-	
Activity 3	FFS	62.250	63.408	(1.158)	(9.187)	102%
Activity 4	Video Exchanges	17.594	13.650	3.943	383	78%
Activity 5	Establish Community Seed Banks in 4 districts	70.603	66.171	4.432	(19.035)	94%
Activity 6	PPB/PVS/FFS training of trainers (ToT) workshop; bulking to produce progeny (Planted ear to row); Evaluation Trials (Preliminary Variety Trial at two sites) Each site will be 0.5ha;	44.797	42.698	2.098	(714)	95%
Activity 7	Research the role of Women	25.202	21.016	4.186	461	83%
Activity 8	Monitoring and Evaluation	43.377	28.964	14.413	1.017	67%
	Communications	145.793	102.658	43.135	(2.009)	70%
	Project management and audit	15.207	12.583	2.624	(1.742)	83%
TOTAL		622.806	553.621	69.186		89%
	Admin fees (4,7%)	29.272	26.020	3.252		89%
GRAND TOTAL		652.078	579.641	72.438		89%

The total absorption rate is 89 percent, with under expenditure is seen on monitoring and evaluation and communications. All the planned activities for communications have been completed and cost savings were realized. For Year 4, additional activities for publications are planned for the remaining communications budget.

CASH-FLOW FROM DONORS

TABLE BALANCE OF INCOME VERSUS EXPENDITURES, OCTOBER 2013 - MARCH 2017

CASH FLOW FROM DONORS	GRANTS TO RECEIVE UNTIL 31 MARCH 2017		GRANTS RECEIVED		FX GAINS /LOSSES ON DONOR GRANTS	BALANCE
	EURO	SEK	EURO	SEK		
SIDA						
2013						
SD=HS	3.520.362	32.172.587	3.663.837	32.172.587	143.475	0
GROW	1.731.854	15.827.413	1.803.134	15.827.413	71.280	-0
2014-15						
SD=HS	2.346.908	21.448.391	2.259.081	21.448.391	-87.827	-0
GROW	1.154.569	10.551.609	1.110.936	10.551.609	-43.633	-0
2015-16						
SD=HS	1.100.113	10.053.933	1.091.731	10.053.933	-8.382	-0
GROW	541.204	4.946.068	537.040	4.946.068	-4.164	0
2016-17						
SD=HS	1.669.871	15.628.803	1.566.469	15.628.803	-103.402	-
GROW	787.581	7.371.197	770.630	7.371.197	-16.951	-
TOTAL SIDA	12.852.463	118.000.001	12.802.858	118.000.001	-49.605	-1
FX RATE	9,181		9,217			
SD=HS - NPL 2015-17	1.586.463	-	1.586.463	-	-	-
TOTALS (SIDA & NPL)	14.438.926	118.000.001	14.389.321	118.000.001	-49.605	-2

The table below shows that all funds expected from Sida and the Dutch Postcode Lottery by March 2017 were received. From the start of the project until now we have an exchange loss of EUR 49,605. This was adjusted in the budget and allocated pro rata to partners. Upon receipt of the second transfer in December 2016, a foreign exchange loss of EUR 120,353 was realised. Fortunately, we could anticipate this for the Year 4 budget.

BALANCE OF RECEIPTS VERSUS EXPENDITURES	EURO	SIDA	NPL	TOTAL
		10-2013 - 03-2017	04-2015 - 03-2017	
Total donor Receipts received		12.802.858	1.586.463	14.389.321
Interest Receipts Year 1		18.532		18.532
Interest Receipts Year 2		10.734		10.734
Interest Receipts Year 3		-556		
RECEIPTS		12.831.569	1.586.463	14.418.032
Actual expenses year 1: 1 October 2013 until 31 March 2015		3.743.571		3.743.571
Actual expenses year 2: 1 April 2015 until 31 March 2016 - SIDA		4.044.024		4.044.024
Actual expenses year 3: 1 April 2016 until 31 March 2017 - SIDA		3.565.529		3.565.529
Actual expenses year 1: 1 April 2015 until 31 March 2016 - NPL			451.796	451.796
Actual expenses year 2: 1 April 2016 until 31 March 2017 - NPL			579.641	579.641
BALANCE		1.478.444	555.027	2.033.471

The SeedsGROW cash balance is sufficient until the second instalment of the contracts with the partners must be transferred in January 2018. We expect to receive the annual transfer from Sida in December 2017.

SIDA SYSTEMS AUDIT

Sida contracted external auditors to conduct a systems audit of Oxfam Novib to review the soundness of the existing control environment to manage programs funded by Sida Stockholm. The audit commenced at the

close of Year 3 and was completed by the end of Quarter 2 in Year 4. The results will be included in the Year 4 progress report to Sida as well as follow up actions.





ANNEX 1

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR SD=HS

INTRODUCTION

This document presents the adjusted Logical Framework (LF) & budget in relation to the Sida grant to the Sowing Diversity = Harvesting Security (SD=HS) programme for the years 2013–2018. This adjustment is a direct consequence of Sida's decision to reduce the overall budget for 2013–18 by 22% (see letter from Sida dated 8 March 2015, reference 13/000818); a reduction of 3.223.630 Euro from 14.617.635 Euro to 11.394.006 Euro.

As the budget reduction is affected midway through the SeedsGROW programme and, for SD=HS, will be absorbed the forthcoming three years, Oxfam Novib had to reduce the Sida budget for SD=HS 2016–18 by 38%.

CRITERIA APPLIED AND CHOICES MADE

In drafting the adjusted Logical Framework & budget, Oxfam Novib considered a combination of criteria which are listed below:

- **Keep intact the structure of the unique 4 Pillars approach of SD=HS**, which caters to the programme's reliable impact in Pillar 1: Farmer Field Schools and Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (PGRFA) that feeds into grounded evidence-based policy engagements of Pillar 4: governance. At the same time, we want to deliver on new topics of innovation in Pillar 2: Farmer Seed Enterprise (FSE) and Pillar 3: Empowering women to use biodiversity based nutrition and Neglected and Underutilised Species (NUS). The main selling points of these 4 pillars should be prioritized: a track record of advanced implementation on the ground, local to global policy engagement, and innovations and risk taking.
 - **Keep intact the elements that are central to the successes to date** and form the foundation of the programme's theory of change: the dual technical and political aspects; the local to global scale; working with 60 alliances of multi-stakeholder institutions; and the inter-disciplinary approach.
 - **Prioritize parts of the programme where work with the target communities is well underway**, we want to minimize having to halt FFS work with communities where high expectations have been raised already. Within the Pillar 1 and 3 work, we aim to prioritize SD=HS swift response and innovations in climate change under Pillar 1 and soon in Pillar 3 and to minimize cuts in these pillars.
 - **De-prioritize elements of the programme that have** (a) structural delays that severely **limit potential deliverables and impacts**; or (b) disproportionate cost structures on governance and management; or (c) that demand extra-ordinary support from the Oxfam specialist team whilst weighing down and endangering the progress and impact of the overall programme.
 - **De-prioritize** work areas of partners that consist of longer term ongoing activities under a new SD=HS hat i.e. that are related to the themes but not part of the SD=HS framework.
 - **Maintain to the maximum extent the expert character for the programme**, by maintaining the core specialist team of Senior Programme Manager, Pillar leads, researcher and 2 part-time senior advisors that could credibly service and add value to the nature and demands of SD=HS programme and partners and complement the Oxfam brand name.
- Considering these criteria, the following choices have been made on allocating Sida support to the SD=HS programme (as compared to the log frame submitted on 27th of February 2015):
1. *Under Pillar 1 (Scaling up models)*
 - Cuts were made to HR of Oxfam Novib Programme Implementation.
 2. *Under Pillar 2 (Farmer Seeds Enterprises)*
 - Cuts were made to HR Oxfam Novib Programme Implementation.

- FSE will no longer take place in Myanmar. As a result of this decision Oxfam Novib implementing costs were also cut.

3. Under Pillar 3 (Women, Seeds and Nutrition)

- Cuts were made to HR Oxfam Novib Programme Implementation.
- One partner, CAWR, working in India, Mali and Senegal was cut from the programme. As a result of this decision some related Oxfam Novib implementing costs were also cut.

4. Under Pillar 4 (Global Policy Engagement)

- Cuts were made to HR Oxfam Novib Programme Implementation.
- Partner activities will now take place over 2 years (2016-2017) rather than 3 years (2016-2018) as originally planned. Activities will also be focused on food sovereignty, corporate concentration and public access to PGRA, as agreed in Geneva by all partners and a wider set of stakeholders on the global policy strategy meeting.

THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK SD=HS 2013-18: WHICH CHOICES WERE MADE

The choices made above resulted in an adjusted Sida Logical Framework 2013-18 as presented below. Where simplification of indicators or outputs was possible, we have done this, for example where we could use fewer indicators to show the outcomes of a pillar were met. First we describe how the Sida grant is utilized for and contributing to the SD=HS programme 2013-18.

OVERALL OBJECTIVE:

We reduced the indicator for the overall objective of 300,000 households, to 150,000 households. The cut of the work in the three countries that were lagging behind, Mali, Senegal and especially

	INDICATOR	VERIFICATION (INFO ABOUT INDICATOR)	EXTERNAL FACTORS / RISKS
GOAL/OVERALL OBJECTIVE:			
To uphold, strengthen and mainstream the rights and technical capacities of indigenous peoples and smallholder farmers (IPSHF), and to influence local to global policies and institutions on the access to and sustainable use of plant genetic resources for food and nutrition security under conditions of climate change.			
INDICATOR: 150,000 households reached with at least 50% women.			

PILLAR 1:

To strengthen the adaptive capacities of IPSHF in seed conservation, access and sustainable use by scaling up innovative and engendered models of biodiversity management

PILLAR 1 OUTCOMES			
P1.1 IPSHF in the SDHS countries have enhanced capacity to develop and implement innovative PGR adaptation strategies, concepts and tools, integrating traditional and scientific knowledge and gender perspective, and benefiting from greater access to PGR.	<p>17,500 households (men and women) with demonstrated capacities to adapt to various challenges on access and use of diverse of seeds and PGR materials</p> <p>Increased diversity on farm for food security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crop diversity: 20% more crops cultivated in the farming system⁵⁶ • Varietal diversity: 15% more varieties of staple crops and 20% more varieties of minor crops in farmers' fields • Potentially climate resilient varieties: 10% of varieties in the farming system showing better climate adaptation. 	<p>Baseline survey report</p> <p>FFS curricula</p> <p>FFS Monitoring reports</p> <p>Progress report and end term report</p> <p>Evaluation reports</p>	<p>The amounts of rainfall each season are not sufficient for crops reach physiological maturity;</p> <p>Farmers are not willing to try and grow some of the introduced climate resilient crops or crop varieties.</p> <p>Women farmers are hindered in attending the FFS.</p>
P1.2 Gender sensitive participatory plant breeding (PPB) and IPSHF adaptation strategies are mainstreamed in key relevant institutions.	<p>Formalized partnerships with a total of 26 key stakeholders and/or institutions in the four countries in the context of PGR conservation, management and use for climate change adaptation.</p>	<p>Publications produced and shared in hard copies and electronically, including gender-sensitive PPB modules.</p> <p>Protocols and/or MoUs formalized with partners</p> <p>Minutes of meetings.</p>	<p>Policy makers are not willing to participate in the workshops to discuss gaps in national policies, and to accept the proposed changes and for farmers to actively share experiences and recommendations.</p>

56. For example, in Laos there will be at least 3 additional crops (sweet corn, beans, vegetables) tested on-farm for each household and in Vietnam 4 additional crops (sesame, beans, corns, vegetables).

	INDICATOR	VERIFICATION (INFO ABOUT INDICATOR)	EXTERNAL FACTORS / RISKS
	<p>At least a total of 40 researchers extension agents and educators⁵⁷ with capacities to provide support to on farm management of agricultural biodiversity</p> <p>At least 4 systems and mechanisms⁵⁸ that ensure active participation of farmers in PPB and local seeds management in key relevant institutions</p> <p>At least 3 types of protocols⁵⁹ developed between farmers and research institutions.</p>		
P1.3 IPSHF are empowered to engage in and contribute to policy change at local, national and global level.	At least 7 local, national and global policies reviewed and/ or amended with input from the project, contributing to local to global policy engagement on the Right to Food.	<p>Presentations for policy fora</p> <p>Back to office reports</p> <p>Policy briefs that are produced</p> <p>Workshop/training reports</p>	<p>Lack of willingness of communities to participate in meetings and training workshops.</p> <p>Government officials and policy makers are not willing to attend all policy related workshops and/or do not agree on the proposed change.</p>
PILLAR 1 OUTPUTS UNDER OUTCOME 1.1			
P1.1.1 IPSHF's PGR adaptation strategies' concepts and tools are strengthened, integrating traditional and scientific knowledge.	At least 18 engendered scaling up tools refined, piloted and adapted. ⁶⁰	<p>Progress reports</p> <p>FFS curricula including:</p> <p>Training tool and materials</p> <p>Community meeting reports</p> <p>FFS attendance registers</p> <p>FFS publications</p> <p>Back to office reports</p> <p>Technical reports</p>	Lack of willingness of scientists and farmers to jointly develop adaptation strategies, which integrate science and traditional knowledge.

57. In Laos and Vietnam.

58. FFS, seed fairs, community seed banks, Biocultural Heritage Territories (BCT).

59. Biocultural Protocol, repatriation guidelines, Biocultural Heritage Territories (BCT) in Peru.

60. i.e. baseline tool, diversity wheel, biodiversity registers, seed fairs, different FFS curriculum, ToTs.

	INDICATOR	VERIFICATION (INFO ABOUT INDICATOR)	EXTERNAL FACTORS / RISKS
P1.1.2 IPSHF's technical capacity for management of PGR at different scales (crop, farm and landscape) for climate change adaptation is strengthened.	At least 117 FFS established ; wherein IPSHF's actively participating, catered to specific crops and/or to specific stresses. ⁶¹ At least 4 country specific FFS curricula.	FFS attendance registers Project progress reports Back to office reports FFS curricula	Lack of availability of enough quantities of seed of new adaptable crop varieties from research and gene banks to test in the FFS plots. Trained farmer trainers are not willing to train other farmers and other communities.
P1.1.3 IPSHF's innovative PGR adaptation strategies are developed, tested and used by the communities.	At least 13 of innovative PGR adaptation strategies and models for seed and food security developed, tested and used by IPSHF, 50% women, with support from scientists	Attendance registers Progress reports FFS curriculum PGR training materials	Lack of willingness of communities to adopt innovative PGR adaptation strategies and models. Severe Weather conditions (droughts and in some cases floods) negatively affect project implementation.

PILLAR 1 OUTPUTS UNDER OUTCOME 1.2

P1.2.1. IPSHF's innovative PGR strategies are documented and made publicly available for adaptation and use by other communities.	At least 18 engendered scaling up tools documented and published (for adaptation by other communities) (See P1.1.1) Formal/informal peer reviews	Baseline survey tools Baseline survey reports FFS curriculum PGR training materials Photo exhibit	Lack of willingness of beneficiary and non-beneficiary communities to adopt introduced PGR adaptation strategies.
---	--	---	---

PILLAR 1 OUTPUTS UNDER OUTCOME 1.3

P1.3.1 IPSHF's PGR adaptation strategies are included at local and national policy discussions (Linked to Output 4.1.5).	At least 13 local, national and global policy discussions participated; wherein IPSHF's adaptation strategies are included.	Workshop attendance registers. Workshop proceedings reports. Newspaper articles	Lack of willingness of policy-makers to attend workshops and contribute to policy discussions.
--	--	---	--

PILLAR 2: To enhance the livelihoods and seeds security of IPSHF by producing and marketing good quality and diversity of seeds through Public-Private Partnerships

PILLAR 2 OUTCOMES

P2.1 Pilot Farmer Seed Enterprises potentially contribute to IPSHF's reliable access to diverse, good quality, locally adapted seeds.	% increase in availability of good quality seeds. % increase in reliable access to seeds for IPSHF. % increase diversity in seeds available.	Market research Farmer feedback / assessment Pilot case study evaluation.	Provincial and national policies are too restrictive for farmer seed enterprises.
---	--	---	---

61. With clear framework, approaches, applied research techniques, tools, learning modules; for diffusion to other communities.

	INDICATOR	VERIFICATION (INFO ABOUT INDICATOR)	EXTERNAL FACTORS / RISKS
	% increase in distribution of locally adopted seeds Maintain or % genetic base of the FSE crops (stock).		
P2.2 IPSHF, Private Sector, governments and CSOs have access to lessons and advice from SDHS FSE experience	No. of lessons, publications and/or presentations provided to a diversity of stakeholders. Improved FSE business model.	Lessons, publications, presentation provided to stakeholders. Report of national multi-stakeholder consultations.	Private sector collaboration is too negatively perceived by CSOs and farming communities.

PILLAR 2 OUTPUTS UNDER OUTCOME 2.1

P2.1.1 Local pilot FSE is established with a viable business plan that reliably offers diverse, good quality, locally adapted seeds.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 Scoping Study reports • 1 Feasibility report • 1 Business plan • 1 FSE pilot established & operating with social responsibility policies • No. of seed varieties produced & marketed • No of high quality seeds produced & marketed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scoping Studies, Feasibility Study, market research, supply chain analysis and Business Plan • Product marketing strategy developed • Company constitution and registration • Mgt & Fin accounts 	Farmers do not have the capacity to produce high quality certified seeds.
P2.1.2 Local pilot FSE established with good capacities in staff and management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seed production training module produced with a gender focus. • FSE management with seed business experience • No of IPSHF trained in FSE production and operations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance lists • Training module produced • Guideline for FSE staff in monitoring and providing support to farmers. • Guidelines for FSE staff for seed processing, storage, packaging and distribution systems. 	Seeds and business experts are not available and/or not willing to cooperate and share their expertise.
P2.1.3 Local pilot FSE established with good linkages and alliances to national and local relevant networks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No of FSE management interactions with other businesses in the sector identifying and establishing linkages • No of consultations and discussions with stakeholders identify and addressing common issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance in networking opportunities • Meeting minutes of multi-stakeholder consultations 	<p>There is no interest in interactions to identify and establish linkages.</p> <p>There is no opportunity to consultant stakeholders with and address common issues.</p>

	INDICATOR	VERIFICATION (INFO ABOUT INDICATOR)	EXTERNAL FACTORS / RISKS
PILLAR 2 OUTPUTS UNDER OUTCOME 2.2			
P2.2.1 Lessons and guidelines on establishing FSEs are published and disseminated internationally.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of guidelines and lessons learned published and distributed to international sources • Peer review from the private sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential guides/Lessons Learned • Establishing a farmer seed enterprise: a pilot case • How national seeds laws support / hinder FSEs <p>Potential research paper and/or FSE materials published in collaboration with other relevant FSE initiatives.</p>	
P2.2.2 Lessons feed into policy discussions (link to output P4.1.5).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of national policies strategy contributions identified at national level • # of international policies strategies contributions identified at international level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in national level dialogues on seed business issues • Win-win arrangements explored with business and other relevant networks. 	

PILLAR 3: To empower women to reclaim their role in food security through strengthening their capacity in seeds management and nutrition and global policy engagement to claim their rights to food

PILLAR 3 OUTCOMES			
P3.1 Women farmers have increased knowledge, access and use of bio diverse sources of nutrition, contributing to building stronger seed systems of important nutritional crops for household food security.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 10,900 women farmers aware of the nutritional value of local biodiversity and NUS; • % increased biodiversity on farms and in gardens as compared to baseline; • % increased intake of nutritious foods based on local biodiversity and NUS as compared to baseline; • Decreased number of HH suffering from periodic hunger as compared to baseline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline and endline reports; • Project Evaluation. 	<p>Government: The government ministries responsible for food and nutrition issues not willing to promote NUS in their training modules and programmes.</p> <p>The stigma that NUS are looked down upon as “food of the poor” is not changed.</p>

	INDICATOR	VERIFICATION (INFO ABOUT INDICATOR)	EXTERNAL FACTORS / RISKS
P3.2 Women farmers share their gained knowledge and innovative biodiverse nutrition strategies, concepts and tools with other communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % increased biodiversity on farms and in gardens within other communities as compared to baseline; • % increased intake of nutritious foods based on local biodiversity and NUS within other communities as compared to baseline; • Decreased number of HH suffering from periodic hunger within other communities as compared to baseline. • Shorter hunger periods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline and Endline report; • Project evaluation 	The workload of women farmers may affect the time available to meet and share knowledge and experiences with others in their communities.
P3.3 Women farmers' knowledge and contribution served as catalysts of international awareness on biodiversity based diets, and they have increased their engagement in policy dialogue on claiming the Right to Food.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 4 local, national or international policy briefs integrating local women farmer's knowledge on nutrition, NUS and biodiversity published and distributed; • At least 3 contributions to local, national or global policies changes or debate on the Right to Food and biodiversity based with a nutrition influence. 	<p>Published policy brief specifically recognising the women's input.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event reports • Policy statements which include contributions / asks of the programme • Press releases 	<p>Policy makers not willing to participate in policy discussions on the Right to Food.</p> <p>Men and traditional leaders in the project areas not willing to allow women farmers to participate in policy dialogues.</p>
PILLAR 3 OUTPUTS UNDER OUTCOME 3.1			
P3.1.1 Women farmer and NUS focused concepts and tools ⁶² are developed, and piloted, integrating traditional and scientific knowledge.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 3 women farmer - focused tools developed • At least 3 NUS - focused tools developed 	Document tools	Scientists might not be willing to take part in the development of concepts and tools which integrate traditional and scientific knowledge on NUS or which are specifically focused on women.

62. E.g. improved Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS) survey, NUS flow maps, Women focused FFS curriculum, seed propagation of NUS; concepts such as integration of local knowledge in bio-diverse nutrition.

	INDICATOR	VERIFICATION (INFO ABOUT INDICATOR)	EXTERNAL FACTORS / RISKS
P3.1.2 Women farmers are trained in farmer field schools (FFSs) on plant biodiversity, NUS and good micro-nutrient content.	FFS established training for at least 5100 women farmers	Attendance registers to FFS. FFS curriculum and guidelines.	Men and traditional leaders do not allow women to take part on the training. Programme staff is not capable of assisting women farmers.
PILLAR 3 OUTPUTS UNDER OUTCOME 3.2	PILLAR 3 OUTPUTS	PILLAR 3 OUTPUTS	PILLAR 3 OUTPUTS
P3.2.1. Women farmers' innovative bio diverse nutrition strategies are described and made publicly available for adaptation and use by other communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 3 documents on innovative strategies produced and shared with other communities; • At least 4 events held where strategies are shared. 	Documents (papers, videos etc) produced. Event invitations and reports.	Stakeholders not willing to support and provide mechanisms for disseminating information for wider adoption and use.
P3.2.2 Women farmers, including in other communities, access to bio diverse sources of nutrition is facilitated.	* At least 121 seed banks, or similar, for accessing biodiverse sources of nutrition are established.	Verification of presents of the seed banks.	Stakeholders are not willing to support the development of seed banks.
PILLAR 3 OUTPUTS UNDER OUTCOME 3.3			
P3.3.1 NUS focused concepts and tools are used as model for international awareness, and represented in local and national policy engagement.	* At least 2 NUS tools/models available and used for local, national and international policy engagement.	Publications on tools/models	Policy makers not interested in using women farmers and NUS focused concepts and tools.
P3.3.2 Women farmers are empowered to understand the implications of and to engage with national and/or global policies and legislations.	* At least 176 women farmers attend national and international seminars related to NUS;	Attendance registers to meetings and conferences. Minutes of meetings with policy makers.	Women farmers might not be supported to disseminate and discuss their findings on the role of NUS in nutrition.



ANNEX 2

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR GROW

INTRODUCTION

This document presents the adjusted Logical Framework (LF) for two years (2016-17) in relation to the Sida grant to Oxfam's GROW campaign. This is a direct consequence of Sida's decision to reduce the overall budget for 2013-17 by 22% (see letter from Sida dated 8 March 2015, reference 13/000818); a reduction of 1.585.875 Euro from 7.191.195 Euro to 5,605,320 Euro. As the budget reduction is to be affected midway through the SeedsGROW programme and, for GROW, will be absorbed in the forthcoming two years, Oxfam Novib has reduced the Sida budget for GROW 2016-17 by 44%.

CRITERIA APPLIED AND CHOICES MADE

In drafting the adjusted Logical Framework and Budget, Oxfam Novib considered a combination of criteria which are listed below:

- Ensuring maximum synergy with other parts in the GROW campaign.
- 'Do more with less': to make a bold prioritization of what Sida is to support in the GROW campaign. In making the prioritisation, the *Economic Justice Campaign 2016-19 Strategic Framework* –coined as GROW, continues to serve as major reference with its three spearheads. Meanwhile, the Oxfam GROW management refined this framework into 10 advocacy objectives which have been used in applying this criterion.
- Sharing the burden of the budget reduction across implementing partners of GROW: Oxfam Novib, Oxfam International and Country teams of Niger and Pakistan
- Look for alternative funding sources to cover certain parts of the GROW campaign
- Taking out or reducing funding to those components which have experienced under expenditure and/or showed insufficient progress.

Considering these criteria, the next choices have been made to allocate Sida support to the GROW campaign (as compared to the LF submitted in September 2015):

1. Under objective 1 (building a stakeholder movement)

- Limit the number of global and/or multi country (cluster) public campaigns to a maximum of three for the period up to December 2017: one related to land (Global Call to Action), one cluster and one addressing the inequality in value chains (the successor of BtB).

2. Under objective 2 (to steer relevant stakeholders to improve global level policies and governance)

- Focus climate advocacy to two policy angles (out of 6): climate adaptation/resilience and financing.
- Focus the Oxfam global land right advocacy under GROW on mainly financial intermediaries (for example AIB, IFC and FMO). Oxfam's work on World Bank Safeguards (safeguards) and CFS (VGGTs) will be phased out and/or be sourced from other sources.
- As a consequence Oxfam's advocacy on EU bio energy will continue, but Sida's contribution will be indirect. Hence, no separate outcome on bio energy has been defined under this objective.

3. Under objective 3 (to steer all relevant stakeholders to improve national level policies and governance):

- The Sida support to the Niger GROW campaign is reduced and limited to one year only (2016). As a consequent Niger has reduced its campaign spearheads from four to one: agricultural investment. Pakistan will be supported for the period until December 2017. In this period, Pakistan will focus on climate finance and resilience and deprioritise its food security agenda in the campaign.
- Shift the focus of the technical support (advise, co-creation) towards other Southern GROW campaigns from direct in-country support to linking them to global advocacy and/or public campaigning. As a consequence, linking local to global activities will be removed from objective 3 and integrated in the objectives 1 and 2 in order to strengthen alignment with direct engagement to international stakeholders as well as public campaigning. Main implication is that direct technical support to countries such as Cambodia and Vietnam is discontinued for the remaining period and / or financed from other sources.

THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK GROW 2016-17

The choices made above resulted in the adjusted Sida Logical Framework 2016-17 presented below. In addition, an overview (annex 1) is presented describing how the Sida support to GROW relates to the Strategic Framework 2016-19 of the latter, in particular with the 10 Collective Advocacy Priorities as agreed by the GROW management team (EJCMT) in March 2016. First we describe how the Sida grant is utilized for and contributing to the GROW campaign 2016-19.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Within this spearhead, Sida funds are utilized with the aim to increase public financial support for sustainable agriculture and climate change adaptation as framed by the GROW campaign objectives 1 and 2. At donor level, this is mainly done through engaging in UNFCCC process – yet less intensive than with COP Paris 2015, including the Global Climate Fund and Standing Committee on Finance, the European Union and individual donors such as the Netherlands; for the latter the revision of the Emission Trading Scheme (ETS) is considered as an alternative source for climate financing. One research proposed is related to this.

This is to be linked with strong advocacy on national level to encourage governments to raise domestic sources. For this purpose a multi country public campaign will be launched in a group of up to 7 countries (with among others Pakistan); the accompanying research agenda is geared towards government spending in 5 Southern Countries of which 3 will be supported by Sida.

LAND

Within Oxfam's land campaign, Sida funds will be utilized for continued engagement with institutions involved in intermediary lending and the implications for affected communities' access to land and resources. The first

priority is with the International Finance Corporation (IFC) and European institutions such as the Dutch FMO; this might possibly be extended to the Asian Infrastructure Bank (AIIB). The research agenda will be aligned to this.

In the past two years, Oxfam had held these institutions accountable on the effects of their policies to land rights of communities, based on concrete cases. Example is a land case in Honduras, including the Agua Zarca hydroelectric project. As such, there is a strong local-to-global linkage in Oxfam's land campaign.

This will be strengthened by the Global Call to Action (GCA) – Land Rights Now!- which plans to launch a public campaign in multiple countries to support asking governments to double the area of land legally recognized as owned or controlled by indigenous peoples and local communities.

As the Sime Darby-Sanggau land case –as under mediation of RSPO- is near to a permanent solution, a small part of the Sida budget is to be allocated to this trajectory.

PRIVATE SECTOR ENGAGEMENT

As part of the Oxfam private sector engagement, a two track strategy will be implemented and supported by Sida. On the one hand, the Behind the Brands (BtB) will be continued through direct engagement with the Food and Beverage (FSB) companies which were included in the campaign over the last two years: focus is on monitoring them on implementation of commitments made relating to climate and land. On the other hand, Oxfam plans a further global priority public campaign engaging the private sector in addressing inequality of value chains and its impact on small scale producers. This campaign will be launched in at least 15 countries. In preparation of this campaign, two researches are planned.

GROW LOGICAL FRAMEWORK 2016-2017	INDICATOR	VERIFICATION (INFO ABOUT INDICATOR AND HOW TO MEASURE IT)	EXTERNAL FACTORS / RISKS
GOAL/OVERALL OBJECTIVE:			
To contribute to building a more gender-just, equitable, and sustainable global food system by empowering people living in rural poverty, particularly women, to increase their resilience and to claim their rights and opportunities.			

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 1:

To build an influential, global public movement focused on addressing and improving the broken food system.

OUTCOME			
1.1 International stakeholders and consumers are aware of the injustices of the food system and are empowered to advocate towards global institutions, national governments and the private sector to work towards a more equitable and sustainable food system.	By 31st December of 2017, the accomplishments are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A maximum of 275,000 people take action in response to the public actions launched by Oxfam (Inter)national media takes over messages resulting from researches and related media briefs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> After action reviews/ external evaluations as conducted after the public action. Media coverage (articles, references, etc). 	At occasion, power analysis shows that public empowerment may have a limited effect to influence global stakeholders, MSIs governments and the private sector. Therefore it may not always be prioritised in campaigns leading to cancellation of public actions.
OUTPUTS			
1.1.1. Development and launch of global online communication tools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A maximum of 3 country clusters and/or global public action are launched. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oxfam Media and campaign strategies strategy for the public action. Various products online developed (screen shots). 	National GROW campaigns and affiliates are committed and providing resources to run public actions.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 2:

To effectively steer relevant stakeholders to improve global level policies and governance regarding climate change & energy and land use rights of local communities.

OUTCOME			
2.1 Improved (or new) policies regarding climate change, land rights and agricultural value chains are adopted in order to promote a more sustainable food system and increased resilience of people, in particular women living in rural poverty.	By 31st December of 2017, the accomplishments are: On Climate change: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of cases where global and national stakeholders implement commitments made on climate financing and resilience as influenced by Oxfam. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final evaluation After Action reviews as conducted Policy documents from stakeholders Voting records of EP and council (for European Union) Debriefs Media coverage from international press 	<p>Weaker international agreements on land and climate change may create unfavourable setting to hold stakeholders to account.</p> <p>Decision making processes within global institutions require more time as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive bodies within do not reach timely consensus on the policy content and process to be followed.

GROW LOGICAL FRAMEWORK 2016-2017	INDICATOR	VERIFICATION (INFO ABOUT INDICATOR AND HOW TO MEASURE IT)	EXTERNAL FACTORS / RISKS
	<p>On Land rights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 2 (groups of) global and national stakeholders improve land rights policies in which Oxfam asks are reflected. <p>On inequality in the value chain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of companies making (and implementing) commitments in order to address inequality in the value chain. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To overcome resistance of cluster of countries or executive bodies towards legislation (EU).
OUTPUTS			
<p>2.1.1 Positioning within Oxfam. Oxfam affiliates agree and implement a common global advocacy agenda regarding climate change, land rights agricultural value chains.</p>	<p>GROW produces thematic campaign annual plans and reports.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GROW annual plans GROW (bi) annual reports Updated strategy documents. 	<p>Resources for and commitment of the OXFAM confederation to GROW remain stable for 2016-17.</p>
<p>2.1.2 Alliance building Oxfam agrees to a common agenda with other global alliances and take joint global advocacy towards stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of times allies participate in global advocacy moments of international events Oxfam and allies conduct joint advocacy on specific issues towards stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint Strategy paper/ statement as produced by the alliances Duty trip reports. 	<p>Allies are less interested to do joint advocacy work because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shifting their priorities to other topics or issues during key moments or in the aftermath of advocacy events. CSOs having limited opportunities/space to influence decision making processes within the international institutions concerned.
<p>2.1.3 Research/publication Research is conducted & (translated into) publications/briefing papers issued substantiating Oxfam asks for public actions and advocacy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oxfam concludes at least 6 researches until December 2017 on climate, land rights and/or value chains. Number of related publications/ researches/briefing papers as released by Oxfam. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 6 research reports concluded Publications and briefs issued Notes of meetings with stakeholders on the report. 	<p>Sensitivity of the research topic hampers conducting of data collection at country level.</p> <p>Limited (thematic) expertise among consultants and research topic on specific topics (i.e., supply chain)</p>

GROW LOGICAL FRAMEWORK 2016-2017	INDICATOR	VERIFICATION (INFO ABOUT INDICATOR AND HOW TO MEASURE IT)	EXTERNAL FACTORS / RISKS
2.1.4 Linking local to global National GROW campaigns (Oxfam and partners) make an active contribution to global events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of country cases prepared in support to regional or global events • # GROW national staff and/or partners participating in regional/global stakeholder meetings related to land. 		
2.1.5 Direct engagement with global/regional stakeholders Oxfam policy recommendations are delivered in a timely and direct way to key decision and policy makers of stakeholders prior and during key events.	Number of engagements with key staff/decision makers from international global stakeholders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conference reports/minutes from meets of global stakeholders • Duty trip reports • Debriefs 	GROW staff does not have access to internal document from stakeholders for verification.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 3: To effectively steer all relevant stakeholders to improve national level policies and governance and interlinked global policies and governance to address the resilience, livelihood needs and rights of those suffering most from the inequitable food system.

OUTCOME			
3.1 Local stakeholders, especially the citizens, in Niger and Pakistan are empowered to propose and successfully advocate for gender-just credible policy propositions of exposure and resilience of rural poor, smart climate agriculture, and agricultural models.	<p>By 31st December of 2017, the accomplishments are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National government in Niger and 2 provincial governments of Pakistan incorporate propositions made by national GROW campaigns on agricultural investment and on climate finance/resilience respectively. • These governments further endorse these propositions during international fora (i.e., UNFCCC). • Media forums engagements result in increased coverage on issues related to Right to Food and Climate Change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After Action Review/ Evaluation • Ministerial food security & climate documents • Local Adaptation Plan of Action (LAPAs) documents • Meeting minutes • Policies Ask • District/ PSC charter of demand • Petitions 	<p>Government policies in both countries do not result in reduced space/liberties of Civil society and Media.</p> <p>Political situation remains stable in the two countries. For Niger, this refers specifically to national elections in 2016.</p> <p>Possible insecurity in both countries will not lead to deprioritisation of food security and climate change agenda of government.</p>

GROW LOGICAL FRAMEWORK 2016-2017	INDICATOR	VERIFICATION (INFO ABOUT INDICATOR AND HOW TO MEASURE IT)	EXTERNAL FACTORS / RISKS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local governments (provincial/district) in Pakistan commit to and implement policies including propositions of the GROW campaigns. <p><i>(Within the 2 Provincial governments of Pakistan (Sindh and Punjab) the GROW campaign is active in a maximum of 12 districts.)</i></p>		
OUTPUTS			
3.1.1 Public campaigning	Number of public engagements taken by Pakistan and Niger GROW campaigns.	Public campaign products (video, chats, Facebook pages)	
3.1.2. Alliance building 2 National GROW campaigns agree on common agenda with allies and implement them	Oxfam and allies in Niger and Pakistan agree on GROW annual plans and implement them.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual plan Annual reports Joint statement/MoU as issued by alliances Charter of demands of Provincial steering committees Term of References (ToRs) of -Provincial Steering Committees 	
3.1.3 Research/publications Research is conducted & (translated into) publications/briefing papers issued substantiating Oxfam asks for public actions and advocacy	The number of researches conducted based on an agreed research agenda with allies in Niger and Pakistan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research documents Media briefs 	
Direct engagement with global/regional stakeholders	Number of contributions made from the two GROW campaigns to regional/global stakeholder meetings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conference notes Debriefs After Action Reviews 	

THE SD=HS CONSORTIUM PARTNERS ARE:

