

EVALUATION OF THE “MORE AND BETTER” NETWORK

Final Report, 9 December 2015

Asbjørn Eidhammer

Contents:

1. Introduction	2
2. The More and Better Network	2
3. Concepts and Issues	5
4. Key International Processes. Main Changes, Main Results	7
5. Main Strengths and Weaknesses of MaB	11
6. The Efficiency of the Coordination of the Network	12
7. The Main Added Value as perceived by Members	13
8. The Main Added Value as perceived by Stakeholders	14
9. The Relevance of the Processes for DF’s Policies and Advocacy	14
10. Are there any Conflicting Approaches or Activities?	16
11. Links to the Country Level	16
12. How to improve the More and Better Network	17
13. How can DF make better Use of the Network?	18
14. Summary of Findings	19
15. Recommendations	21
Annexes:	
1. The Terms of Reference for the Evaluation	23
2. Brief Note on Methods	25
3. List of People Interviewed	26
4. Documents	27
5. Survey Questionnaire	29

1. Introduction

After having been the main funder of the More and Better Network for Support of Food, Agriculture and Rural Development for more than a decade, the Development Fund feels the need for an evaluation of the network in order to assess its contribution and the relevance of the network to the policy goals of the Development Fund. The questions in the terms of reference clearly reflect a dual purpose of the evaluation. The first is to evaluate the More and Better Network as such, how it is working, its strengths and weaknesses, what influence the network has had, and which results have been produced. The second part is an analysis of the relevance for and value of the More and Better Network to the Development Fund.

The methods used in this limited evaluation is outlined in a brief note as Annex 2. I have used a mix of document studies (listed in Annex 2), interviews of 16 leading members of the network and 10 staff of the Development Fund and Norwegian authorities (listed in Annex 3), and a short survey of registered member organisations. Of about a 100 recipients of the survey, I received 35 responses, which is acceptable, although the selection is likely to be biased toward the active members of the network.

In the collection of information I have tried to focus on some of the processes that MaB has been involved in; the policies and actions after the food price crisis in 2008/2009 and the Rio +20 Conference and Process. As far as publications are concerned, I have used some of the key documents, in particular “Agricultural Transition – a different logic”, in questioning MAB members on the value and use to them of MaB publications. I have also tried to use three partner countries of DF as cases, interviewing responsible officers in DF and reviewing DF country programmes. These are Ethiopia, Malawi, and Nicaragua.

The structure of the report is based on the terms of reference, except that the questions are to a certain extent restructured to better distinguish the two parts of the evaluation. After this brief introduction, I present the More and Better Network in a descriptive way. Section 3 contains a presentation and some discussions on the main issues in the international debate on food security and agriculture. Sections 4 - 7 present findings and analysis on evaluation questions about the MAB Network as such. Chapters 8 - 11 contain findings and analysis on evaluation questions concerning the relationship between the MaB Network and the Development Fund. Section 12 concerns findings on improvement of the network, while section 13 is on what the Development Fund can do to utilise the network better. In section 14 there is a summary of the findings, and in section 15 the recommendations are presented.

2. The More and Better Network

The background for establishing “More and Better” was a drastic reduction of the proportion of international aid that was used for agricultural development and food security, from above eight per cent in bilateral aid in the late 1980s to four per cent in the early 2000s. There was a strong perception among civil society organisations and small farmers’ associations that food and agriculture was not on the international development agenda. The Food and Agriculture Organisation was seen to be in somewhat of a crisis, and the World Bank had totally forgotten about agriculture, according to one prominent MaB member. There was a need for more investment in agriculture, to lobby for more funding and to consider what kind of support that agriculture needs. There was also a need among the organisations for a strategy towards FAO. MaB was meant to be a response to these needs.

The Purpose

At a meeting in Rome in May 2003, with fifteen civil society organisations present, a proposal for an international campaign for “More and Better Aid for Agriculture to Eradicate Poverty and Hunger” was agreed upon. Funding was subsequently secured from the Norwegian government through the Development Fund, with some additional support from the Rome-based organisations FAO, WFP and IFAD. The first global meeting of the network, with 26 organisations present, held later that year, agreed on common principles for the campaign.

The common goals of the MaB Network were, and still are:

- a substantial decrease in the number of hungry and undernourished people and people living in poverty, through
- a major increase in support for agriculture, rural development and food in developing countries, and
- significant improvements in the quality of support for agriculture, rural development and food.

International and national organisations supporting these goals were invited to be members.

According to the briefing notes for this evaluation, the network has focused more or less equally on the two main goals, More support, and Better support, for agriculture, which are also the tools for contributing to a substantial decrease in poverty. The campaign grew in numbers, and in 2010 it was decided to change the name of More and Better from a campaign to a more permanent network, maintaining the same objectives.

Membership and structure

At the general meeting in 2010 there were above thirty participants, and at the general meeting in 2015 representatives of 18 member organisations and 30 observers attended. In 2015 the address list of the network consists of 117 international and national organisations from five continents. The largest proportion of the registered addresses are in Africa, followed by Asia. The membership is broad, with farmers’ associations as the largest group (about 20 per cent of registered addresses). Development organisations and environmental organisations form two other important groups, but there are also a number of youth associations, training institutions and faith-based organisations as members, in addition to a handful of organisations that define themselves with *organic* or *agro-ecological* in their names.

The MaB Network is not formally registered. A general meeting of the campaign is held every two years, usually in connection with some large international meeting. A coordination committee of up to 15 members, representative of the membership, was established at the first meeting in 2003. Aksel Naerstad of the Development Fund was the Coordinator from 2006 up to 2010, when it was decided to have two co-coordinators. These are at the time being Aksel Naerstad and Elisabeth Atangana, who is the president of the regional farmers’ association for Central Africa, PROPAC, and the president of the farmers union in Cameroun, CNOP-Cam. The Coordinating Committee communicates mainly through e-mail and Skype.

Among important international member organisations are Bread for the World (US), Brot für die Welt (Germany), Terra Nuova (Italy), International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM), Forum for World Fisher Peoples (WFFP), World Forum of World Fish Workers and Fisherpeoples (WFF), Via Campesina (a global farmers association working for the rights of peasants and marginalised groups), Movement of Catholic Agri-Rural Youth,

International Federation of Rural Adult Catholic Movements (FIMARC), USC (Canada), Action Aid International, UK Food Group, and of course Development Fund of Norway.

The MaB Network has a secretariat of two employees. One officer, Alessandra Sgrò (half to full time), is attached to the Italian organisation Terra Nuova, and an administrative employee is working for the second Co-Coordinator in Yaoundé, Cameroon. In addition, 30 per cent of the salary of the DF Coordinator is earmarked for work with MB, outside of the MaB budget.

Activities

The focus of the network is on policy and advocacy activities for more and better support for agriculture and rural development. Most of the work of the network is, according to the secretariat, carried out by members in their own countries and regions, a work that is supported by MaB by capacity-building. There is, however, no overview of such activities in the reports to the general meetings.

MaB follow international processes and meetings in order to influence at international and national level. Key processes have been the international discussions after the food price crisis in 2008/2009, the aid effectiveness process under OECD/DAC (Paris, Accra), the Rio +20 Conference on Sustainable Development, and the reform of the Committee for World Food Security (CFS) in Rome.

Representatives of the network have attended a number of international meetings, like the Rio +20 conference, UN Climate Change conferences, FAO conferences, and other UN organised high level conferences, the World Social Forum, international symposia, and regional meetings. MaB has taken part in organising a number of workshops and thematic meetings, like an international symposium in Tunisia in 2005 and the Nyéléni International Forum for Food Sovereignty in Mali in 2007. In more recent years, organising side events at bigger international meetings has been a more common way of creating attention to the issues the network is concerned with.

Limited financial support has been given to a number of activities by members, including support for a regional conference on food sovereignty for Latin America in 2008, and regional events for Asia in Sri Lanka the same year. Small financial support was given to national seminars in Cameroon, Kenya and Mozambique in 2005 and 2006. Further support was given for the formation of PROPAC, a regional umbrella for farmers' association in Central Africa, a regional meeting for food sovereignty in Yaoundé in Cameroon in 2009, and launching the Pan African Farmers Organisation (PAFO) in Lilongwe, Malawi, in 2010. In 2013 MaB has supported meetings to promote family farming in Africa for sustainable food systems, and a forum meeting for African rural women. After 2011, members of the network have represented farmers towards global (World Bank) and regional (African Union, CAADP) agricultural programmes. Limited funding from the MaB Network seems to have been crucial in establishing two sub-regional associations of farmers in Africa, and enabled them to represent small farmers in their work towards the larger regional agricultural actors.

Since 2012, MaB has been working to create alternative models for investment in agro-ecological farming, and has initiated a pilot project to that effect in Mozambique with the national farmers' union in the country. The Development Fund decided not to support this project, which started in July/August 2015 in smaller scale than originally planned, with support from MaB and Coventry University.

The MaB Network works closely with some other networks and organisations. The most important are the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty, the Civil Society Mechanism that meets in Rome before the meeting of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS), and Via Campesina. There is a certain overlap between these networks. However, IPC works towards FAO, while MaB are usually engaged in broad processes like Rio +20.

In recent years the Network has produced an increasing number of publications and documents. The most prominent of the publications are:

- Good or Bad Aid for Agriculture and Rural Development? Case studies and overview of support for agriculture and rural development (in English and French versions), 2009
- Policies and Actions to Eradicate Hunger and Malnutrition (English, French and Spanish), 2009
- Rio +20. What are the Options – when “Business as Usual” is not an Option? Time to Act.
- Agricultural Transition – a different logic (English, French and Spanish), 2012

In addition, a considerable number of leaflets and other promotional material has been produced.

From 2010, the More and Better Network publishes about 10 newsletters on the web each year. A website <http://ag-transition.org> in English, French and Spanish are kept in cooperation with other organisations, with the main purpose of publishing reports and articles on different forms of sustainable agriculture for member organisations and the public in general, making available as of now about 50 reports and 200 case studies. According to information from the secretariat, the website had 15 000 visitors the first nine months of 2015. MaB also have their own webpage, www.moreandbetter.org, with other news for the network members.

3. Concepts and Issues

It would be very pretentious to aim at presenting the main issues, viewpoints, conflict lines and ideologies related to food and agriculture in this report. Issues and viewpoints are certainly entangled, and the definition of concepts may vary much. Still, in order to consider the position of the network, and in particular the relations between the Development Fund and the MaB Network, it is necessary to outline some main concepts and issues and, and try to place them in relations to each other.

Key concepts that define organisations within the More and Better Network are food sovereignty, agro-ecology, and to a lesser extent organic agriculture.

Agroecology can be defined¹ as the application of ecology to the design and management of sustainable agro-ecosystems. It is a whole-systems approach to agriculture and food systems development based on traditional knowledge, alternative agriculture, and local food systems experiences. It links ecology, culture, economics, and society to sustain agricultural production, healthy environments, and viable food and farming communities. In a MaB pamphlet, agro-ecology is defined as “the participatory action and change that brings

¹ <http://www.agroecology.org/index.html>

sustainability, security, equity and resilience to all parts of the food system – from ecological, to economic, to social components.”

Agroecology is regarded as opposed to yield maximizing high-input technologies, which allegedly creates environmental and health problems that often do not serve the needs of producers and consumers. It is argued that in developing countries, in addition to causing environmental degradation, many technologies have bypassed the circumstances and socio-economic needs of large numbers of poor farmers.²

Food sovereignty is in the MAB pamphlet defined as “the right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods, and their right to define their own food and agriculture systems. It puts the aspirations and needs of those who produce, distribute and consume food at the heart of the food systems and policies rather than the demands of markets and corporations.”

What is clear for these definitions, from the publications produced by the MaB Network, and through interviews, is that prominent member organisations in MaB are opposed to high-input technologies used in modern agriculture, including use of (artificial) fertiliser and hybrid seeds. There is further a strong scepticism to large-scale agriculture, and to relying on markets, and in particular international trade, to solve the food challenges in developing countries. It should, however, also be said that MaB members are not opposed to the use of fertiliser under all circumstances.

The MaB Network distances itself clearly from the African Green Revolution, which is seen to be too dominated by fertiliser companies. This brings them also into a possible conflict with the African Union promoted Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP). In this programme, which aims at raising agricultural productivity in Africa to at least six per cent annually, private sector developments and improved trade and market access are key elements.

Members of the MaB Network regard themselves as staunch supporters and defenders of small and marginalised peasants and farmers, and of small-scale agriculture.

In the international processes on food security, *climate smart agriculture (CSA)* has become a dominating model. A broad *Global Alliance for Climate Smart Agriculture* was launched in New York in 2014, of which governments, civil society organisations, farmers’ organisations, research institutions and the private sector may be members. The Norwegian government is one of two co-chairs of the Alliance. A FAO produced pamphlet defines CSA as “an approach to help guide actions to transform and reorient agricultural systems to effectively and sustainably support development and food security under a changing climate (...) CSA is not a new production system – it is a means of identifying which production systems and enabling institutions are best suited to respond to the challenges of climate change for specific locations, to maintain and enhance the capacity of agriculture to support food security in a sustainable way.”³

Most of the members of the MaB Network are sceptical to the global alliance for CSA. The concept is found to be too loose, and allows for groups that the network members tend to see

² http://nature.berkeley.edu/~miguel-alt/what_is_agroecology.html

³ <http://www.fao.org/gacsa/members/en/>

as their enemies, in particular fertiliser companies and commercial agricultural corporations, to join and get influence in the Alliance. The question they pose is: Who benefits from climate smart agriculture? They are concerned that CSA may undermine what farmers do on the ground.

Still, the views on CSA vary among CSOs and other actors. The supporters of the concept and the alliance regard the resistance to CSA as ideologically more than based on real positions and practice, although they agree there are some policy differences. These relates for instance to the use of fertiliser, and sometimes pesticides, and the room for large-scale agriculture within efforts to promote food security. But they believe that agro-ecology and organic agriculture are important elements in the efforts to create food security.

4. What are the key international policy processes MaB try to influence, what are the main changes in those processes MaB lobby for, and what are the main results achieved so far?

Through these 12 years, the MaB Network have been involved in a number of international processes and events, and worked with a number of issues. The most important of them are:

- International dialogue and efforts after the food crisis in 2008. In this process, the network, together with other organisations, produced the document “Policies and Actions to Eradicate Hunger and Malnutrition”, in English, French and Spanish in 2009. 284 organisations signed on to the document.
- The reform of the Committee for World Food Security (CFS) at FAO, and establishment of Civil Society Mechanism
- Rio +20 Conference. In this process, MaB and other organisations developed “Rio +20. What are the Options – when “Business as Usual” is not an Option? Time to Act”, in four languages. 188 organisations signed on to it.
- The preparation of the sustainable development goals
- The Aid Effectiveness Agenda, in particular the Accra conference in 2008 and in Korea in 2011.

It is through these processes, in addition to work done at country level by members, that MaB has focused its efforts to reach its goals. The most visible part of the work is the Network’s publications, the most important of which were listed in Section 2. Most of them have been linked to one or more of the processes which MaB has been involved with.

More

One of two main goals for MaB has been a major increase in support for agriculture, food and rural development. This includes increased development aid as well as increased government budgets for agriculture in developing countries. In efforts to increase such funding, the MaB Network is one player among many, and a small one when it comes to resources.

Official Development Aid (OECD) for agriculture and rural development increased from between 6 and 7 billion US dollars in the years 2004 and 2005, to between 12 and 13 billion

dollars in the years 2012 and 2013.⁴ However, as percentage of all sector allocable aid the increase was rather slight, from about 8 per cent in 2008/2009 to above 10 per cent around 2010, and then down again to about 9 per cent by 2012/2013. Considering the overall very strong increase in development aid over these years, not least related to the Millennium Goals, this is still not a bad result.

Interestingly, a report on agricultural development in 16 African countries on the continent where the food security situation is most precarious, shows that the proportion of aid to agriculture for these 16 African countries increased from an average of 3.8 per cent in 2002 to an average of 7.8 per cent by 2010, indicating a strong positive trend in the aid for agriculture to African countries.⁵

In 2003, African heads of state committed to spend at least 10 per cent of their budgets for agriculture. In the year 2003, only two of the 16 countries (Ethiopia and Burkina Faso) spent above 10 per cent on agriculture, according to the above mentioned report. This number increased to five by 2006 and seven by 2008. Thereafter the data are more uncertain, but there seems to be a downward trend. In six of the countries there was a clear upward trend during the period.

It is of course impossible to ascertain what influence the MaB Network has had on this generally positive development in mobilising resources for agriculture and rural development. A problem in evaluating is that much of this work will have taken place in the various countries. Even if, according to the secretariat, “most of the activities in More and Better (MaB) are carried out nationally by the organisations taking part in the campaign/network”, the reporting at general meetings only concerns the activities that the coordination committee is involved in. In Norway, the DF has been heavily involved in such lobbying, and are among the leading agencies in lobbying for more development aid to food and agriculture.

In the questionnaire survey, 12 out of 34 members responded that the MAB Network had contributed significantly to positive change in areas where their organisations were engaged. 18 respondents said MaB had had some positive impact, while four could not see any change. The member organisations were also asked to what extent their organisations had intensified its advocacy and lobbying for increase in support of agriculture (in aid and national budgets) after the establishment of More and Better. 10 respondents said that they had intensified their advocacy considerably, 17 said that MaB had led to some increase in their efforts to advocate increased support for agriculture, and 7 said there had been no change. Most of the responding members may be assumed to be in the more active half of the membership, and this result is probably more positive than would be the average of the hundred or so members.

The views of the members interviewed varied. Some felt MAB has contributed to a shift in the whole debate about financing, and were convinced the network has had influence. Others

⁴ [Aid to Agriculture and Rural Development - OECD;](http://www.oecd.org/dac/.../Aid%20to%20agriculture%20and%20rural%20dev...)
www.oecd.org/dac/.../Aid%20to%20agriculture%20and%20rural%20dev...

⁵ The Africa Agriculture Status Report 2013 - AGRA, agra-alliance.org/download/533977a50dbc7/

were clear that MaB had contributed through its lobbying and other activities, but that it was difficult to assess how much.

Better

The “Better” part of the goals is broader and more political. There is of course no international agreement on what is “better” agriculture is. For the purpose of this evaluation, the only possible way of defining “better” is to say that it is the policies, approaches and methods promoted by the More and Better Network. The question is therefore: Has More and Better over the last ten to twelve years managed to influence the international agenda and the practice on the ground towards its policies and approaches?

The Rio +20 Conference, and the leading up to it, is the most frequently referred to case where the MaB Network is seen to have influenced development. At the outset, food and agriculture was not strong on the agenda for the conference, and what was included, was in the view of the network members dominated by the agroindustry. The MaB network took on the task to do something about that. There was no other civil society organisation or network ready to take on the job. On their own each organisation would be too weak, and not unfrequently they fight among themselves, I was informed. The MaB Coordinating Committee had three goals for this process: Firstly, to get agriculture on the agenda, secondly, include positive recommendations on what kind of agriculture was desirable, and thirdly, to prevent carbon trade to be part of the agenda. For this purpose, the above referred to document and open letter were prepared, and a lot of work was done in New York and at regional preparatory conferences. The result was that 188 organisations putting their names to the open letter. These efforts resulted in a final document from the Rio +10 conference which, in the view of the network, was fully satisfactory.

According to leading members, the MaB Network, and in particular the DF Coordinator, played an essential role in securing this positive outcome. It was not least due to the leading role of the DF-coordinator, who negotiated his way successfully also among the various members of the network, not trying to take the merit for it, and not seeming to be in the forefront. There seems to be full agreement among members and some other partners that MaB had an impact on this process. The «Time to Act»-document was reported to be used fairly broadly.

Another process where the MaB Network was active, was the preparation of the new Sustainable Development Goals 2030, which resulted in a document where food and agriculture were included in a satisfactory way. It cannot be ascertained, however, to which extent MaB was instrumental for those results.

The network also played a role in the reform of the UN/FAO Committee on Food security, where MaB contributed to bringing in new thematic areas. MaB provided the space and continuity necessary for the members to have influence. It was argued in the interviews that these processes also contributed to FAO becoming more aware of the issues MaB works on, and to the establishment of a unit in FAO dealing with such issues. It was emphasised that MaB was a flexible and easy forum for its member organisations, enabling them to play proactive roles in the Civil Society Mechanism.

On a more general level, it was said in the interviews that Climate Change had made the issue of sustainable agriculture emerge again. In this context, the concept of agro-ecology seems to

have gained some ground, including in FAO. It was the view of members that MaB has contributed to a change of the agenda concerning issues of quality in support of agriculture. Some argued that agro-ecology had got a real push from MaB bringing people together.

The qualitative approach of the network was particularly appreciated by members. Most of them seemed to agree that MaB has had real influence on main processes, such as Rio +20, the sustainable development goals, and in general the international debate on policies for food and agriculture. In some cases, MaB seemed to have been there first, raising the issues.

It was pointed out that MaB, through its initial support for African organisations in 2005, had key influence of the development of these organisations in Central Africa, and helped them to prepare for cooperation with and support from the AU/Nepad CAADP programme. The direct support to PROPAC for women was especially appreciated. More in general, it was argued that member organisations have gained momentum from the processes that MaB facilitates broadened the agenda of the organisations.

Publications and Web

The publications and documents of the MaB Network seem to be particularly appreciated by leading members. Publications are seen by members to be relevant and accessible. “Agricultural Transition – a different logic”, seems to have been spread quite widely, although initially not much referred to in international fora. Later, however, the document has been picked up of member states of FAO. Organisations linked to the Catholic Church have used such documents as the “Agricultural Transition”, and gained momentum from them.

It was pointed out that to process and agree on documents in the bigger civil society organisations and networks was very time-consuming. The MaB secretariat could prepare such documents much more quickly, and through energetic consultation manage to bring everybody on board. Also, it was felt that it was possible for the members to contribute to the documents, increasing their “ownership” of the final product through an inclusive process. The “Agricultural Transition” document was often referred to a model for such a good process, but also for its influence on the international discussion. Another good example was the Case Studies document. One prominent member of the network said the publications were “priceless”, another said that they are very, very important. A third pointed to the specificity in the publications, and the value of telling stories.

In the survey, respondents were asked to what extent they know the “Agricultural Transition” document and to what extent the document was used in their organisations. This document was chosen because it seemed to be the most appreciated of the publications from MaB. Of the 35 respondents, half (18) said that they knew the content very well, 12 said they had knowledge of what it contains, and 5 said they did not know the document. Six respondents said that they used the “Transition” document often in policy or programme work in their organisations. 19 said they used it sometimes, while 10 do not use it. The respondents must be assumed to be among the more active members, and the result cannot therefore be said to confirm a very wide use of the document.

Members were also asked whether they had contributed to (provided inputs, comment on) any of the publications of MaB. Seven answered that they had contributed a number of times, 13 had contributed once or twice, and 14 said they had not contributed. This is a fairly good participation for a loose network, about what could be expected.

Finally, members were asked whether the newsletter was read in their organisations. 11 of 33 said it was read regularly by many of the office holders, 20 answered that it was read by some office holders, while two said it was not read. Again, not far from what could be expected in a network of this kind, but not really confirming a wide circulation of the publications and newsletters among members.

5. What are the main strengths and weaknesses of MaB?

To respond to this evaluation question, I simply asked the members, through interviews, what they see as the strengths and weaknesses of the network. The response on strength vary from the almost lyrical *“helps to dream and develop”* and *“the bottom line is that they love MaB”*, to the more prosaic *“facilitation, flexibility, informality, no bureaucracy”*.

The processes in the network are seen to be collective, inclusive, and participatory. It was said that planning together means that people get to know what to do and say to authorities. Things get done. MaB is seen as the easiest place to go to come to a formal position. Other networks, including the Civil Society Mechanism and Via Campesina, are hard to move quickly. No other network can replace MaB in this regard. One emphasised, as a strength, that MaB leaves a lot to its members,

Some underline MaB’s capacity to lobby and negotiate, and the capacity to influence politics together with others. Some highlight the ability to connect a diverse group of actors, managing to pull together issues of trade, agroecology and sustainable development goals, and then move into action. Several underline the personality, ability and dedication of the DF Coordinator as a strength.

It is also seen by some as a strength that the publications of MaB are of good quality and are widely used.

Weaknesses mentioned by members are considerable fewer. Most of those interviewed underlined the limited resources as a main weakness. A lot of resources are required to follow up ideas, while most MaB member organisations are small and weak. MaB does not have the capacity to support direct initiatives. The Network also lacks the capacity to get more sponsors.

Funding mainly from one source is seen as a limitation by some members, although, as one said, if they were to have one funder, it had to be Norway. A few felt that it made the Development Fund too powerful, also in the light of the DF Coordinator being, as one put it, a very senior guy. Some felt there was a need to delegate more to other members. One saw it as a weakness that the network only provided support (tickets etc.) to members from low income countries.

Some felt there was a danger of domination by the North, and that the Development Fund was too powerful, although others emphasised that the DF Coordinator worked incredibly hard to include the South. But some were of the opinion that too much of the work was done by the DF Coordinator. One pointed to the fact that the activities are led from Norway and Italy, with little involvement from others or opportunities to get involved. There is a lack of consultation and effort to work collectively, and the work of members was seldom presented as part of the work that MaB undertakes, he argued. The limited ability of MaB to disseminate information

widely among farmers was seen as a limitation by some, in that farmers in Asia and Africa often do not know English, French or Spanish.

6. How efficient does the coordination of the network function

Efficiency is the relationship between results produced and the resources used. The accounts for the More and Better Network during the period 2004 to 2014 shows expenditures between 67 000 and 196 000 euros per year. The expenditures were fairly stable below 100 000 euros up to 2010, when relatively large extra amounts were granted from the Norwegian government for 2010 and 2012. From 2012 onwards, there has been a shift upward of the total budget due to funding from the German Heidehof Stichtung, resulting in a level just above 110 000 euros in 2014.

From 2005 till 2010 the Norwegian Government part of the total funding varied from 68 per cent (2006) to 100 per cent (2010). From 2011 to 2014 the Norwegian Government proportion varied between 71 and 82 per cent, due to additional funding from Heidehof, which contributed with 20 000 in 2011 and 30 000 thereafter. The UN organisations in Rome supported the network at the start, but this support did not continue beyond 2006. Venues for meetings of MaB are, however, provided free of charge by these organisations. Diversifying the funding has been a constant issue at the MaB Network meetings over the years, but whatever efforts have been put into it, which is unclear, has so far been without much success.

Between 19 per cent (2005) and 67 per cent (2014) have been used for running the secretariat, from 2010 divided between Rome and Yaoundé. It is worth noting that the salary of the DF Coordinator (30 per cent) and administrative expenses are not counted in in these accounts. Support for national and regional seminars etc. counted for about a third or more of the expenses up to 2009, when there was a sharp decrease in such support. Instead, publications took more of the expenses, up to 25 per cent from 2011. The biannual meetings took about a third of total resources those years they were organised. It goes without saying that to run a global network costs, and the expenses for administration and general meetings are absolutely defensible. In light of the activities carried out, and the publications, meetings and achievements outlined in Section 4, again measured against the goals of MaB, there is little doubt that the money and other resources have been well spent.

The activities and the achievements have been possible through two or three measures. One, and probably the most important, is that many of the activities of the network has been organised back-to-back with other international meetings, thereby saving enormously on travel and other expenses. Secondly, the work of the Coordinating Committee has to a large extent been done online. Thirdly, the possibilities of having indirect support in kind have been exploited, like free venues etc. A fourth reason should be added, the generous offer of the Development Fund to allow the DF Coordinator to work 30 per cent for the network, and pay for his expenses. The resources of the Development Fund has also been drawn upon for services related to publications.

One could always discuss the relative spending on various sorts of expenditures. One marked change over the years has been to replace support for national and regional seminars etc. with covering costs of publications. It is assumed that this is a willed development, necessary for the network to engage in and to have impact on international processes. A minimum secretariat is absolutely necessary for such a network to function. Administration may have taken larger portions of the income in certain years, but that is more due to the fluctuation of

the income. There is no indication that the funds have not been spent diligently. Several of the interviewees made remarks to the effect that resources were used very efficiently, some said it was amazing to see how much was done with little money.

How efficient is the MaB Network run as an organisation? The leadership, management and coordination of the network may be done in a more or less efficient way. There is no doubt that the DF Coordinator plays the main role in the network. He seems to be recognised by all members as having authority and working professionally, putting enormous efforts into his role, for getting messages across, for getting things done and achieving results. He is by some seen as facilitating, diplomatic, and strategic with unique entrepreneurial capacity. On the other side he is also seen to be stubborn – mainly in a positive way – but also a bit heavy handed at times.

To run a Coordinating Committee with up to 15 members by e-mail and skype is very challenging. The technical issues with skype is in itself a problem. When meetings are convened attached to international meetings and events, it is, of course, likely that many will not attend, because they are not at the meeting. Such a situation means that misunderstandings may easily arise, and it may even open for manipulation, or that some push through issues without proper consultation. In spite of some misgivings about Northern domination, there is no indication that this has been the case.

7. What is the main added value (benefits) of MaB as perceived by member organisations?

The added value of the MaB Network is naturally linked to the perception of the strength of the network. It is described in different ways by its members. MaB is seen as a platform on how support to those in need can be improved. MaB brings the voice of farmers to the attention of governments. MaB had the capacity to understand the big issues, and ability to bring people from different background together. One said MaB had helped people to breath. One characterised MaB as a solidarity cooperation to push governments. Some said the network gives a certain visibility. But the word used most often in explaining the value of the MaB Network was *space* or *spaces*. MaB is a network to facilitate spaces. Space to interact with others and to learn. Space to work with others, and to go places (like Rio), where they would not otherwise have gone. It occupies spaces where others are not.

Some underlined the value of having MaB is a neutral player among the civil society organisations. The network is never used to impose, one said, the members melt themselves with the process. It is a loose network, it is not aggressive, but cool and calm. Some pointed at the very wide and differentiated membership, ideal for building alliances of social movements, food producers and NGOs. MaB was characterised as a friendly place, a safe place, creating the environment and flexibility for doing things.

One said that the MaB Network is exceptionally good in bringing issues into the international dialogue. The Civil Society Mechanism and the International CP have cumbersome procedures. MaB is a more agile network, takes issues to policy makers, due in part to the DF Coordinator, who gets the ideas across. MaB has a very effective interface with policy makers, and is not confrontational. Membership in MaB is important because it enables members to align themselves with others.

8. What is the main added value (benefits) of MaB as perceived by key stakeholders (DF staff, allies, decision makers)

This Section is based on interviews with members of the DF staff and officials of the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and FAO. Among the staff of the Development Fund the views on the value of the MaB Network for them in their work is strikingly different from how it is seen by the active members of the network. While everybody were aware of the network, it did not figure prominently or at all in their strategic thinking or everyday work. Several had skimmed through the publications, but hardly anyone used them in their work, and they did not find them very relevant.

Some felt that the radical views expressed by the network and in its publications did not interact much with the day-to-day reality of the target groups of the Development Fund. The publications were seen to be critical and controversial. One cannot oppose everything, as one put it. It was felt that leading organisations in the network, like Via Campesina, try to find enemies, and that the network was a lot more about communicating beliefs than anything else. African partners are not familiar with agro-ecology, it is not used as a concept in the countries where DF is active, it was argued.

Representatives of the Norwegian government can appreciate MaB for its broad network and the energy and efforts of its leading figures. The MaB Network is seen as an important voice in the Committee on Food Security (CFS). To some extent, however, the models promoted by the network seem to be outside of the mainstream international efforts to support and develop food security and sustainable agriculture. They pointed out that agroecology in itself is largely climate smart. One has, however, to listen to the marginalised farmers themselves, although they are not, of course, always right. They also questioned the perceived conflict between small farmers and large scale agriculture. Sometimes small farmers have a lot to learn from large-scale agriculture, for instance in coffee growing.

Officials in the Norwegian government perceive agro-ecology as a relatively marginal theme in the big debate today, but there is no animosity against the concept as such. The MaB Network could, however, sometimes be more forthcoming to dialogue about these issues.

In FAO there seems to be a growing understanding for the issues promoted by the MaB Network, and the dialogue with the network is appreciated.

9. How relevant are these processes for DF's policy and advocacy work internationally?

The valid strategic documents for the Development Fund covers the period 2012-2016, which means that they were prepared four years ago. The DF is now about to develop new strategies from 2016 onwards. In the introduction to the strategy from 2012, it is stated that DF shall advocate more attention to food sovereignty, food security, genetic modification and immaterial rights and sustainable environment in Norwegian and international aid and policies. Agro-ecological production is mentioned together with other forms of sustainable agricultural development to be promoted by the DF. In the DF application for support from NORAD for 2012-2016, it is said that "core funding on relevant international networks and organizations working on enhancing food security, food sovereignty and the right to food (like the Via Campesina and More and Better) will be provided." This is the basis on which support for the two international bodies have been granted.

In the DF application document under “international advocacy” it is stated that the main focus will be on getting wider acknowledgement and support for small-scale sustainable agriculture through political advocacy. In 2012, particularly, the Rio +20 process will be important, it is stated. It should be obvious from the above that the processes that MaB has been involved with should be relevant to the stated aims of the Development Fund in its 2012 documents.

But the perception among key managers and staff at DF, asked about the relevance of MaB today, strongly indicate there has been a development in the DF thinking. Some say outright, for instance, that they doubt that the Development Fund should spend money on following the Rio +20 process. One said DF has to choose, to be more selective. FAO processes are relevant. There seemed to be some resistance to getting involved in processes at the global level the way it is done now through MaB.

Some stated clearly that the priority for them is how things develop on the ground, and the policies that are relevant to peasants and rural population in DF’s partner countries. One should not start the policies in Oslo, one should start with the policies in the partner country. The feeling is that the discussion of concepts promoted by the MaB Network is of little meaning for the activities the Development Fund is supporting on the ground.

The DF MaB Coordinator, on the other hand, is disappointed of the lack of engagement from DF to get partner organisations to join the network. The interest to follow the Network was greater in the beginning of the present planning period. He points at the variety of members in More and Better, with their different background and views, which should be of interest to the Fund staff to interact with. Through MaB, DF has access to a very broad network, and gets information back from its various members. It could give DF personnel contacts and prestige.

The perception of a widening policy gap between the More and Better Network and the Development Fund is behind the questions from the DF management whether the issues MaB is promoting are the right ones, and whether MaB is in the mainstream of the international discourse on food and agriculture. Or whether it is the way the issues are raised and the questions asked that creates the distance.

In the Editorial of the DF Annual Report for 2014, the Executive Director of DF, Kari Helene Partapuoli, outlines some of the present thinking in the Development Fund. Climate change adaptation and climate smart agricultural methods are highlighted, and sustainable agriculture and rural development are key concepts that are promoted. She points out that local farmers and peasants in partner organisations themselves are able to have views on the impact of climate change, and to consider what the best measures are to withstand and adapt to the weather changes that are on the way.

There is nothing here that is directly against MaB policies, but the vocabulary is different. The openness to new ways of thinking is also apparent in the discussion paper published by the Development Fund in November 2014, titled in English translation “How many farmers do we need?” Over the last few years, the Development Fund seems to have moved away from promoting food sovereignty and agro-ecology as the only solution to the food and agricultural challenges. The ideal is to become a learning organisation looking for different approaches to agriculture. This has, according to the executive Director, been a conscious move from the management and the board of the Development Fund.

It is clear that today many in DF do not see much relevance for them in the MaB Network's engagement in international processes. They believe that DF is moving on, and is more open to wider processes. It is my conclusion that the gap is more than use of a different vocabulary, there is a difference in the approach to issues of food security and sustainable agriculture at country level between DF and MaB. Which does not mean that their policies cannot converge over time.

10. Are there any conflicting approaches or activities between MaB and DF? If yes, can they affect DF's work in other areas?

As should be clear from the previous sections, officers of the Development Fund see, if not outright conflict, at least clear lack of connect between the MaB Network and DF. They think MaB has become too ideological, and that it has painted itself into a small corner of radicalism. They feel strongly that a pragmatic approach should be taken. Access to markets is a key issue. The target group should be in focus, and it is better to leave rhetoric behind.

A relatively large portion of DF's resources on advocacy are being used for MaB. For DF, it may be time to prioritise more than in the past. DF is looking wider and getting involved with or considering engaging in lobbying towards a number of international and regional initiatives. The Alliance for Climate Smart Agriculture is one of them. The African Union/Nepad CAADP programme is another. In Africa there are also various sub-regional initiatives, like the Southern Africa Commercial Agriculture Union. These are initiatives that many in MaB are very sceptical to, although some members are working constructively with them. First of all this is an expression of the new pragmatism of DF. But in this way DF may easily come into conflicts with the MaB Network, and at international meetings the DF may find itself in a somewhat awkward situation, with different policies promoted from DF proper and DF through MaB.

11. What are the links between MaB and the DF's country programmes? Are the changes MaB is lobbying for relevant to DF's country strategies, and are there any significant and positive results MaB have contributed to? To what extent is DF's support to MaB relevant for DF's target groups? Has it contributed to positive changes for the target groups?

I have combined the evaluation questions on the relevance of MaB at the country level, since the issues are intertwined. There is little evidence of links between the More and Better Network and the DF programmes in partner countries. Of two DF partner organisations in Malawi, who are registered as members of MaB, an officer of one said they were not aware that his organisation was a member, the other had been to a MaB organised meeting some years back, but was not aware of any contacts after that.

Of the three partner organisations in Ethiopia being registered as members, one is not aware of the membership, one participated in the Rio +20 process, but was not satisfied with the information received thereafter, while one is making use of the network.

There is not necessarily a good match between the countries of the member organisations of MaB and the DF programme countries. Over the last years DF has become more concentrated on Africa. In Africa many of the MaB members are from Central and West Africa, which also are the regions which have received most support globally from MaB funding. But the Development Fund is not active in these countries. The country directors find it difficult to

encourage their partners to be members of MaB, since it is difficult to explain the benefits of membership. Particularly in Africa it is challenging enough to support local networks and keep them going. In case there are member organisations in partner countries, DF staff does not necessarily find these organisations to be the best partners.

In some cases DF supports travel of partners to regional and international meetings, like the COP 21 in Paris, or the World Social Forum. It is then done on local initiative, where local representatives are part of wider representation from the country.

The main goals of MaB are in general relevant to the target groups of the Development Fund's programmes. The concrete approaches that the network is promoting in its main publications are not necessarily as such in conflict with those of the Development Fund for instance in Malawi. But the network is seen to be too far away from the field level at which DF is working. The mismatch is not primarily in the practical policies and approaches on the ground, but more on the vocabulary. Terms like *climate smart agriculture* may also have different meaning for different actors.

DF staff emphasise the broad and open approach they use. In DF supported programmes peasants are taught different techniques, and then they have to decide themselves what to do. This does not mean they are against much of what MaB is supporting. Organic agricultural production in Central America is, for instance, very commendable. Laws to protect ecological agriculture have been successfully promoted. Agroecology may be a method, while climate smart agriculture is the overall goal.

I should hasten to add here that to connect the global and local level more than in a conceptual way is not easy in any area, and probably more difficult in agriculture than in health or education. The distance from grassroots to globe is enormous. In low income countries, the struggle to connect locally and nationally, to do policy work and exchange is a big challenge in itself. To then to try to engage in global processes may easily be seen as farfetched.

12. How to improve the More and Better Network

The general meetings of MaB have discussed how to improve the work of the network. The meeting in 2015 pointed at the following measures for improvement:

- More direct engagement from member organisations, with active inputs in various processes and on the web site,
- Strengthening of the Coordination Committee through assigning specific responsibilities to members, more regular Skype meetings, and improved plans for the activities,
- Securing a broader financial base.

Let it be said that many think the MaB Network is great as it is. Most said that continued funding is essential. Still, in the interviews and in the survey responses, members raised a wide spectre of issues. Some missed a bigger common vision for MaB, others felt the need for linking policies and action better. The need to define better the goals was mentioned. Some suggested a strategic plan to be developed for the network. Some proposed a five year plan or a plan of action.

A challenge is how to disseminate policies and approaches to the grassroots, to create awareness and understanding among peasants. Some proposed to do more action on the

ground, and for MaB members to get together at national level, among others to share experience. Links to the global level would give members more ammunition. In order to give the global vision to the farmers, training centre for agroecology for young people could be established. It was important also to recognize the need to deal directly with governments

Several mentioned the need to focus on a few issues, which could reinforce the influence of the network. Some wanted specific campaigns, for instance on seeds, agroecology, food sovereignty, youth and women. There is giant work to do, as one member put it, in research on seeds etc. Through focusing, MaB can find new people and contacts.

Several mentioned the need for meetings at regional level, and to work more with regional institutions. It was an issue for some that the funding to such an extent was dependent on the Development Fund, but it was also recognised that finding funders was not easy. A five year plan could help as a basis of attracting donors. There is a need for a “network” of funders, it was argued. One member called for activities in North Africa, which seems to have been excluded, since there are no publications in Arabic.

One saw it as a problem that the Coordinator of the network was also the representative of the main funding agency. That could undermine the independence of the network. Some argued the need for taking a new look at the governance structure. There should be more physical meetings. Some said there was a need to consider the North/South issue, and restructure the decision-making. Several argued for more delegation to regional and national level.

Several saw the need to increase the budget, and some wanted to allocate funding to regions and countries. More and Better has achieved a very strong position, argues one, and now it is important to decentralise, and to help members to implement their programmes. It was also suggested to have focal points in each country. Some wanted training in lobbyism, including letting members better understand the issues, and on preparing them to fulfil their objectives.

13. How can DF make better use of the potential for learning and experience sharing?

This evaluation question is closely linked to the issue of benefits for or potential benefits to the Development Fund of its support for MaB. The future of DF support for MaB has been discussed in DF for a number of years. Some believe there is a need for a broad international non-governmental network that DF may contribute to and benefit from. Some ask, however, why DF, a relatively small Norwegian organisation, should fund such a network.

Some staff argue that for MaB to be relevant, it should be less ideological, less preoccupied with concepts as food sovereignty and agroecology, listen more to the farmers in the field, and base an open and pragmatic approach on the situation for the farmers themselves, which may vary very much from continent to continent, from country to country, and even among various product sectors in each country. The relevance of the network in the long term has to be assured, and also that MaB's approaches have impact.

Some leading members of MaB have noticed this absence of involvement from DF, and wonders why the DF does not utilise better its unique position in a well-functioning and rather unique network.

It is widely recognised that the Development Fund has not managed to engage the organisation in the network in a satisfactory way. The internal communication on MaB issues

does not seem to be good. This is not strange, internal communication is difficult. And when there is a feeling of gaps in thinking and approaches, the situation is what is to be expected. In case DF decides to continue its support for DF, DF officers argue, more has to be done to involve DF staff in the processes, for instance related to publications. There also seems to be a need to improve the reporting from MaB to DF, particularly on achievements.

14. Summary of Findings

There has been a considerable increase, in real terms, of development aid for food and agriculture over the last decade. There is also a small increase in aid to agriculture as percentage of total aid, but it must be kept in mind that Official Development Aid increased extraordinarily during this period, mainly due to the efforts to achieve the millennium development goals. In key African countries there has also been a significant increase in government budgets allocation to agriculture in relation to total budgets.

On the basis of information collected from members, there is reason to believe that the MaB Network has influenced the agenda and the cooperation between actors in the civil society significantly, a civil society that again has lobbied governments, and thereby contributed to the above development. Data on members' activities are, however, very scarce. A survey, covering a third of MaB members, indicate that four out of five members have intensified their advocacy for increased allocations to agriculture and for change in agricultural methods, either significantly or somewhat during the existence of MaB.

What has been achieved, have been done by bringing together farmers' organisation, social movements and development NGOs, and to give them a platform from where to lobby during main international processes. It has been done through events, publications and open letters, which have drawn broad support from the international civil society.

The support from More and Better has also contributed to the strengthening of farmers' organisations in Central Africa through limited support for meetings and capacity building.

The More and Better Network is much appreciated by most of its active members. It is first of all seen as a place where its variety of members can come together, where they have the space to discuss and agree, in order to try to influence the wider agendas and arenas. It is seen as a flexible and friendly place, neutral among its members, and with minimum bureaucracy. The secretariat is commended for its ability to lobby and negotiate, to bring a diverse group of people together, and to influence politics. There is, according to many of its leading members, no other place where this could be done so efficiently.

The limitation of resources is seen by its members as the main drawback. Some members regard it as a potential problem that most of the funding comes from one organisation. A few felt that the North was dominating the running of the network, although others pointed to the efforts made to give the South a bigger room in MaB.

MaB has organised meetings and seminars, produced publications and pamphlets, and lobbied at major international processes. In relation to the activities carried out towards its stated goals, there is little reason to doubt that the available resources have been used efficiently. A

lot has been done with what is, in a global context, very limited funding. The administrative expenses have not been higher than necessary to keep the network going.

There is a relatively strong ownership of the More and Better Network among the leading member organisations. The feeling of ownership naturally diminishes as one moves out among the 100 or more registered members of the network. Many of them are not active, some of those registered are not even aware of their membership. There are probably 30 – 50 members who have an active relationship to the network, many of them significant actors in international movements for food and agriculture. That is not too bad for a loose network with very limited resources.

It is a problem that MaB to such an extent is funded by one agency, and in addition that the same organisation is both the main funder and the main coordinator. Even if there is some dissatisfaction with this domination, major conflicts have been avoided through a competent leadership reaching out to members. It is also clear that without the support from DF, and the efforts in particular of the DF Coordinator, the network could hardly have existed in its present form. But the present model is not a lasting solution.

The ownership of the network in the Development Fund, apart from the DF MaB Coordinator, is almost non-existent. Officers responsible for programmes do not see any benefit in relating actively to the network. There are a number of reasons for that. Some are structural. The active MaB members are not from countries where DF has most of its programmes. Very few of DF's partners are active members of MaB.

Some reasons for the gap are political. In the DF, there has been some move from rights to development, not in its stated goals, but as a result of a shift in its activities, not least its stronger focus on Africa. Staff at DF feels that the views expressed by the network and its publications do not interact much with the day-to-day reality of the target groups of the Development Fund. The publications are seen to be critical and controversial, and some believe MaB is painting itself into a corner of radicalism. The concepts of food sovereignty and agroecology are seen as too limiting, and to not be very relevant in Africa.

There seems to be a widening policy gap between DF and MaB. This may be due to a mixture of differences in vocabulary, but also in policies and approaches on the ground. In recent years the DF has been keen to open up, and to get engaged in broader processes. The realities for the farmers in the field should be guiding policies, not the other way round, it is argued. The DF is therefore also interested in considering other initiatives than those MaB engages in, like the Alliance for Climate Smart Agriculture and various regional initiatives, particularly in Africa. By pursuing such openness, while still being the main funder of MaB, DF may find itself in a contradictory situation, where the Fund is seen to speak with different voices in different fora.

MaB members present a broad array of suggestions to improve the functioning of MaB, although many think it is good as it is. They want more engaged members. Some want clear visions and plans. Several think MaB should prioritise better, and focus on a few main issues. A few, particularly from Asia and Latin America, want reform in the management, with a

greater say for associations from the South. Some would like more direct support to national and regional associations. Most of these suggestions, although not all, require more funding and more human resources. Such increased funding does not seem to be forthcoming.

15. Recommendations

Recommendations to the More and Better Network:

1. The More and Better Network plays a role within the global efforts to support and improve agricultural development and food policies that no other organisation or body can replace, and should therefore be supported to continue.
2. The prospects for future funding are not likely to allow for an expansion of the activities of the network. MaB should therefore concentrate on what it is best at; bringing farmers', social and development associations and networks together to create the basis for lobbying at the global and regional level.
3. Support for regional and national associations should be limited to enabling these associations to be active members of the network. All bodies would like to grow, but if there are no more human resources or funding available, it would not be easy to serve a bigger network than MaB is today.
4. Instead of using scarce resources for possible projects, MaB should leave it to members to initiate and manage projects. Projects would take too much of the human resources away from the key tasks of the network.
5. The present funding situation of MaB is neither sustainable nor wise from a political angle. The Coordination Committee should urgently start a discussion on how to broaden the financial base of the network. In the present climate direct funding for a network may not be easy to get from outside funders. A more realistic scenario will be that the more resourceful of the members agree to share expenses between them, bringing work time and some funding into the network. If six to eight members share expenses, it should be manageable for each organisation to accommodate the expenses even within slim budgets.
6. A formal registration of the network may be required to secure funds from more sources than today, and to agree on cost-sharing.
7. MaB should prepare and agree on a simple planning document for the next 3 – 5 years. The document should be flexible enough to accommodate the need to address new developments in the sector, but clear enough to serve as a basis for funding.

Recommendations to the Development Fund:

8. It is not up to an evaluator to express views on policies. Whichever policies the Development Fund decides to pursue, it should base its further support of the MaB Network on i. a. the following considerations:
 - whether DF policies and approaches could easily be accommodated within MaB, in other words, whether DF is or could be best served politically with a continued engagement with MaB
 - whether the membership of MaB does provide DF with an international network and contacts that could be useful for its policy and advocacy work nationally and internationally

9. If DF decides to continue its engagement with MaB, it should consider how much of its resources should be used for supporting the network, relative to other advocacy work internationally, independently of the total need of the network.
10. DF should then engage with some of the more resourceful members of MaB, and invite a discussion on sharing the resources required to continue the network.
11. If DF support of MaB is to continue, the DF as a Fund must be more engaged in issues discussed in MaB. Some depersonalisation of DF's MaB engagement is necessary for this to take place. A group headed by the Executive Director or a department head could meet before and after important meetings and events that MaB is involved with, and broader participation at key international events should be considered.
12. In that case, DF should also review its policies to consider whether to bring up issues of policy and approach to the MaB Network.

Annex 1 Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference
Evaluation of the More and Better Network (MaB)

1. Background:

More and Better (MaB) was established in 2003 as a global campaign for more and better support to food, agriculture and rural development. The network has 127 members and embraces social movements and non-governmental organizations in the fight to eradicate hunger and poverty. It is complementary to other campaigns and networks working for the same goal, and is linked to the purposes of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the Alliance against Hunger and Malnutrition (AAHM) and the 1st Millennium Development Goal (MDG). More and Better also recognises and cooperates with the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC), a global network of NGOs/CSOs concerned with food sovereignty issues and programs.

MaB is a policy and advocacy network that intends to influence and lobby decision makers to achieve changes in national and international policies geared towards:

- A substantial decrease in the number of hungry and undernourished people and those living in poverty
- A major increase in support for agriculture, rural development and food in developing countries
- Significant improvements in the quality of support for agriculture, rural development and food.

To achieve this, the members of the network in developing countries play the major role in defining what better support is from their point of view. They also work to increase the level and quality of support provided by their own governments and donors for agriculture and rural development. Members in developed countries lobby their own governments for a more and better support to agriculture and rural development in developing countries, basing their actions on the overall goals of the network and those policies that, at the national level, best address these goals. At the international level, the network approaches the different institutions on key issues of common concerns to the national campaigns, facilitate cooperation and the exchanging of experiences and viewpoints.

MaB has a secretariat comprising of one staff person based in Rome, Italy and one in Cameroun. It also has a coordinating committee that is elected by the bi-annual General Meeting.

The Development Fund is one of the founding organizations of MaB, and has supported the network and operation of the secretariat since 2004. The support to MaB is one of the approaches DF applies to strengthen its policy and advocacy work. The development goal of DF's policy and advocacy work is to influence international policies and development assistance to support sustainable agriculture and small-scale farmers.

2. Purpose of the evaluation

The main purpose of the evaluation is to assess the contribution and relevance of MaB to the Development Fund's policy and advocacy goals related to international policies and actions, and development assistance. It shall also assess the relevance of MaB for DF's programme work. The evaluation shall identify the main achievements of MaB and assess the functioning of the network. The evaluation shall also present recommendations for the strengthening of MaB and its work, and for the future collaboration between DF and MaB.

3. Evaluation questions

The evaluation shall assess the contribution and relevance of MaB to DF's policy goals. To be able to do so, the evaluation shall answer the following questions:

- 1) What are the key international policy processes MaB try to influence, what are the main changes in those processes MaB lobby for, and what are the main results achieved so far? How relevant are these processes for DF's policy and advocacy work internationally?
- 2) What is the link between MaB the DF's country programs? Are the changes MaB is lobbying for relevant for DF's country strategies, and are there any significant and positive results MaB

have contributed to? 3) To what extent is DF's support to MaB relevant for DF's target groups? Has it contributed to positive changes for the target groups? 4) What is the main added value (benefits) of MaB as perceived by member organisations and key stakeholders (DF staff, allies, decision makers) 5) Are there any approaches/activities that are contradicting between MaB and DF? If yes, can they affect DF's work in other areas? 6) What are the main strengths and weaknesses of MaB? How efficient does the coordination of the network function and how can it be improved? 7) How can DF make better use of the potential for learning and experience sharing?

4. Methodology and scope of the evaluation

The evaluation shall combine desk review of relevant documents, key informant interviews and surveys with a selected number of member organizations, MaB coordination unit members and staff, DF staff and other relevant stakeholders. Due to limited resources, the evaluation shall not conduct field visits and shall strive to conduct interviews by phone/skype/e-mail. It is desirable that the evaluator take part in the CSO-meeting in Rome, Italy on October 9-12 2015, prior to the meeting in the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) to conduct interviews with key actors.

5. Time frame:

A draft report shall be presented DF for feedback by 1st December 2015. DF and MaB shall present their comments within 7 days after the draft is presented. The final report shall be presented DF by latest 31 December 2015.

6. Expected outputs: - An evaluation report with a maximum of 20 pages, excluding executive summary and annexes. The report shall be written in English. The summary should be translated into French and Spanish.

7. Criteria for the evaluator: - Relevant experience on evaluation - Knowledge to international policy and advocacy work - Knowledge and experience from working with civil society (both from developed and developing countries) - Knowledge to international questions regarding food, agriculture and rural development. - Able to communicate in French and Spanish in addition to English.

8. Proposals for the evaluation, including budget, shall be presented DF by 31 August 2015. The budget shall include all costs related to the evaluation and not exceed NOK 50,000

Annex 2 Brief Note on Methods

The scope for the evaluation has been limited to 17.5 working days. The following methods have been used to compile this report:

- Studies of documents. The DF Coordinator had identified a good selection of documents from the ten years' of existence of the network, and in addition prepared some summary write-ups that has been of great use. The scope of the evaluation did not allow for any thorough perusal of archives or registers, but any information or documents requested were promptly made available by the staff at DF. The documents are listed in Annex 2.
- Interviews. Altogether, 25 semi-structured interviews were conducted in Rome and Oslo. This included interviews with 15 representatives of MaB member organisations during their attendance at meetings of the Civil Society Mechanism and the UN Committee on World Food Security in Rome 9 – 12 October 2015. The remaining interviews were done with officials of the Development Fund and the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. A list of interviewees are found in Annex 3.
- Brief Survey. All organisations in the More and Better address registry were invited to respond to seven questions (eight for African organisations). The questionnaire was in English, French and Spanish. The purpose of the very limited survey was to get a sense of
 - to what extent the member organisations are active in their relationship with the network, and to what extent the publications produced by MaB are being used by the organisations,
 - to what extent their participation in the network has contributed to positive changes for the organisations' work, and
 - whether the organisations have intensified its advocacy and lobbying for increase in support for agriculture after the establishment of the network, and
 - to enquire about suggestions for improvement of the network to make it more relevant and useful for the organisations.

Of the 117 organisations listed, two had no e-mail addresses, and e-mails to eight organisations did not reach the addressees. Seven organisations were excluded because they joined the network in 2015, and cannot be expected to report any experiences. Leaving out the Development Fund, 99 member organisations remained, of which 34 responded. A response of 34 per cent is less than what could be hoped for, but enough to present a fairly realistic picture. However, there is reason to believe that those 34 responding would tend to be more active in the network than the average, creating a certain positive bias. This has to be taken into account in analysing the figures. The questions of the brief survey are found in Annex 4.

In the collection of information I have tried to focus on some of the processes that MaB has been involved in in recent years; the policies and actions after the food price crisis in 2008/2009 and the Rio +20 Conference and Process. As far as publications are concerned, I have used the documents "Agricultural Transition – a different logic?", "Good and Bad Aid for Agriculture. Case studies and overview", and "Policies and actions to eradicate hunger and poverty", in questioning MAB members on the value and use to them of MaB publications. I have also tried to use three partner countries of DF as cases, interviewing responsible officers in DF and reviewing DF country programmes. These are Ethiopia, Malawi, and Guatemala.

Annex 3. Persons interviewed

1. Elisabeth Atangana, Cameroon, Co-Coordinator, President of CNOP and PROPAC
2. Alessandra Sgrò
3. Benjamin Graub, Rome, FAO, previous Swiss NGO
4. Judith Hitchman, URGENCI, The International Network for Community Supported Agriculture, USA,
5. Lalji Satya, India. World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples (WAMP)
6. Andrea Fernante, Rome, La Via Campesina
7. Maria Noel Salgado, Uruguay, MAELA
8. Albenta Guema, Rome, Action Aid International
9. Esther Puninia, Asian Farmers Association for Sustainable Development
10. George Dixon Fernandez, Internat. Fed. of Rural adult Catholic Movements, FIMARC
11. Nora McKeon, Terra Nuova, Italy
12. Antonia Onorati, International Planning IPC
13. Susan Welsh, Executive Director, USC, Canada
14. Pat Mooney, ETC Group
15. Christina Grande, International Federation of Organic Agricultural Movements, FOAM
16. Nadia El-Hage Scialabba, Rome, FAO
17. Inge Nordang, FAO Ambassador, Norwegian Embassy, Rome
18. Skarpeteig, Councillor, Norwegian Embassy, Rome
19. Inge Herman Rydland, Coordinator for Climate Smart Agriculture, Norwegian, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
20. Kari Partipolous, Executive Director, Development Fund
21. Rosalba Ortez, Development Fund, Oslo
22. Waranot Tungittiplakorn Strand, Development Fund, Oslo
23. Thor Oftedal, Country Representative for Development Fund in Malawi
24. Knut Andersen, Country Representative for Development Fund in Ethiopia
25. Elin Cecilie Ranum, Head of Department, Development Fund
26. Aksel Naerstad, Co-Coordinator More and Better, Senior Advisor, Development Fund,

Annex 4. Documents

MaB Secretariat: List of registered members,

MaB Secretariat: More and Better. Paper prepared for the evaluation, September 2015

MaB Secretariat: Plans for More and Better 2005-2017

MaB Secretariat: More and Better Accounts 2005-2014, Budget 2016

MaB Secretariat: Reports, 2015 form General Meetings for More and Better Network 2006-2015

MaB Secretariat: Reports of the activities presented at the General Meetings for More and Better, 2015

MaB Secretariat: Information material from More and Better Network 2005 - 2015

MaB Secretariat: The role of the More and Better Network – and the relationship to other networks and organizations, June 2015

More and Better Brochure (small)

More and Better Brochure (larger)

More and Better: Agroecology and Food Sovereignty, Brochure

MaB: Open letter: Policies and actions to eradicate hunger and malnutrition/ summary November 2009

The More and Better Website and Newsletters

Angela Hilmi: Agricultural Transition – a different logic. The More and Better Network

Good or Bad Aid for Agriculture and Rural Development? Case studies and overview of support for agriculture and rural development (in English and French versions), 2009

Policies and Actions to Eradicate Hunger and Malnutrition (English, French and Spanish), 2009

A Viable Food Future, Part I and II (English, French and Spanish), 2010, 2011

Rio +20. What are the Options – when “Business as Usual” is not an Option? Time to Act

More and Better: Family Farmers for Sustainable Food Systems. A synthesis of reports by African farmers’ regional networks on models of food production, consumption and markets

Development Fund: Climate Adapted Villages Honduras, 2015

Utviklingsfondet: Hvor mange bønder trenger vi? Et diskusjonsnotat om landbruk, fattigdom og utviklingspolitikk, 2014

Teshome Hunduma and Knut Andersen: Report on the La Via Campesina (LVC) review, April 2015

Utviklingsfondet: Utviklingsfondets strategi 2012-2016

Utviklingsfondet: Årsmelding 2014

Development Fund, Ethiopia. Strategic plan 2012-2016, September 2011

Development Fund. Malawi, Strategy 2012-2016

Development Fund. Programme strategy Central America 2012-2016, Draft February 2011

Development Fund application for cooperation agreement 2012-2016 (7: International Advocacy)

Nepad Administrator: Agriculture and Food Security, 2010

Food Sovereignty and Agroecology to mend broken food systems, Expo dei Popoli 2015

FAO: Climate-Smart Agriculture: What is it? Why is it needed?

Annex 5. Questionnaire

(In English, French and Spanish)

EVALUATION OF “MORE AND BETTER” NETWORK

Questionnaire for Member Organisations

1. To what extent do you know the document *Agricultural Transition – a different logic*?

I know the content very well	18
I have some knowledge of what it contains	12
I do not know the document	5

2. To what extent is the document *Agricultural Transition – a different logic* used in policy or programme work in your organisation?

We use it often	6
We use it sometimes	19
We do not use it	10

3. To your knowledge, to what extent is the *More and Better Newsletter* read among office holders in your organisation?

It is read regularly by many of the office holders	11
It is read by some office holders	20
It is not read regularly by office holders in my organisation	2

4. To what extent has you or your organisations contributed to (provided inputs, commented on) any of the publications of the More and Better Network? (for instance: Good and Bad Aid for Agriculture. Case Studies an Overview, Agricultural Transition – a different logic, Policies and actions to eradicate hunger and poverty)

We have contributed a number of times	7
We have contributed once or two times	13
We have not contributed	14

5. To what extent has, in your view, the More and Better Network (through your membership, exchange, discussions, publications, inputs to international processes) contributed to any *significant and positive change* for your organisations’ work or otherwise in the areas where your organisation is engaged?

Yes, it has contributed significantly	12
It has had some positive impact	18
I cannot see any change or impact	4

6. To what extent has your organisation intensified its advocacy and lobbying for increase in support for agriculture (in aid and national budget or in other forms) after the establishment of More and Better?

Yes, we have intensified our advocacy considerably	10
It has led to some increase in our efforts to advocate increased support for agriculture	17
No, there is no change in my organisations work in this area	7

For organisations in Africa:

7. To what extent is your organisation involved with AU/NEPAD Agriculture and Food Security programme?

We take part in or benefit from the AU/NEPAD Programme	2
We know of the AU/NEPAD Programme, and find it relevant to our organisation	7
We know of the AU/NEPAD programme, but do not find it relevant	3
We do not know the AU/NEPAD programme	5

8. Do you have suggestions as to how the coordination of the network can be *improved* in order to be more relevant for and useful to your organisation?

.....
.....