



Oxfam Together Against Poverty multi-country agriculture and climate change adaptation advocacy program evaluation

AJABU ADVISORS

Chris Allan, Violet Matiru, and Atalie Pestalozzi

July 12th, 2021



This is an evaluation of The Oxfam Together Against Poverty (TAP) multi-country agriculture and climate change adaptation advocacy program, Strand 2. This project has been operating in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria, Tanzania, Italy, The Netherlands, Brussels (focused on the EU), and Addis Ababa/Nairobi (focused on the African Union) since 2015 and in France since 2018. This evaluation covers the work undertaken between 2018 and 2021.

The major evaluation activities took place from April to July 2021. The evaluation was carried out by Ajabu Advisors LLC following a competitive bidding process and reflects the findings as reported by them. The evaluation process was managed by Lisa Hilt, Senior Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning Advisor, from Oxfam America, and commissioned by Eric Muñoz, Senior Manager, Food and Climate Justice, with funding from Oxfam America.



Table of Contents

- List of Acronyms i
- Executive Summary 1
- I. Introduction..... 3
- II. Evaluation Framework..... 4
 - A. Goals and Theory of Change 4
 - B. Evaluation Questions..... 5
 - C. Methodology..... 6
- III. Evaluation Findings..... 7
 - A. Africa 10
 - B. Europe 15
 - C. African Union..... 20
 - D. Factors that Inhibited Progress Towards Outcomes 22
- IV. Conclusions and Recommendations..... 23
 - A. Conclusions 23
 - B. Recommendations..... 23
- V. Appendices..... 25
 - A. Appendix A – Patterns of Outcomes..... 25
 - B. Appendix B – Program Research Reports and Learning Products 27
 - C. Appendix C – Key Informant Interviews 30

List of Acronyms

AATS	Africa Agriculture Transformation Scorecard
AFD	Agence Française de Développement (AFD) (French Alliance for Development)
APF	AgriProFocus
ASSAPIN	The Association of Small-Scale Agro-Producers in Nigeria (ASSAPIN)
AU	African Union
BADF	Agricultural Bank of Burkina Faso
BR	Biennial Review
C2A	French Civil Society Coalition
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CAN	Climate Action Network (France)
CAPSR	The Rural Private Sector Actors' College (Collège des Acteurs Privés du Secteur Rural)
CFS	Committee on Food Security of EU
CNC	CAADP Non-State Actors Coalition
CONCORD	European Confederation of Relief and Development NGOs
COVID-19	Coronavirus Disease 2019
CPF	Confédération Paysanne du Faso (Burkina Faso)
CSO	Civil Society Organization
D66	Democrats 66
DG DEVCO	Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development
ECOWAS	Economic Commission of West African States
EIP	European Investment Plan
EP	European Parliament
EU	European Union
EWA	Empowering Women in Agriculture Initiative
FFH	Female Food Hero
FMARD	Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Nigeria
G20	Group of 20
G7	Group of 7
GCAP	Global Call to Action Against Poverty
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GRB	Gender Responsive Budgeting
GTLC	Ghana Trade Livelihood Coalition
HEDA	Human and Environmental Development Agenda
MFF	Multiannual Financial Framework
NAIP	National Agriculture Investment Plan
NDICI	Neighbourhood Development and International Cooperation Instrument
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PFAG	Peasant Farmers Association of Ghana
RAIP	Regional Agriculture Investment Plans
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community
SPONG	Permanent Secretariat of NGOs (Burkina Faso)
TAP	Together Against Poverty
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

Executive Summary

The Oxfam Together Against Poverty (TAP) multi-country agriculture and climate change adaptation advocacy program has worked to improve support to small scale farmers, especially women, in five African countries, three European countries, and at the African Union (AU) and European Union (EU). This report is an evaluation of the most recent three-year phase of the program (2018-2021). It examines how the program has contributed toward progress in influencing the adoption and implementation of policies and practices, and increasing citizen engagement – particularly of women small scale producers – with policymakers.

The program focused on three primary outcomes:

- a. *African governments in Nigeria, Tanzania, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Ethiopia implement budgets and policies that protect the rights and needs of women and men small scale producers;*
- b. *Key donors in France, Italy, The Netherlands, and the EU improve the quantity and quality of aid and climate adaptation finance for women and men small scale producers, to reduce poverty, hunger, and inequality;*
- c. *African Union and target member states institutionalize the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) Biennial Review Process and improve mutual accountability among African member states.*

The evaluation provides a meta-level review of progress over the last three years in contributing to the desired outcomes across the different geographies, looking for patterns across all countries. The focus was on outcomes rather than outputs – that is, rather than what the program did, the evaluation examines what the results of activities were.

The evaluation found that the program contributed to important outcomes in quantity and quality of Official Development Assistance (ODA) in Europe, and in small scale farmer and female farmer friendly policies in Africa. As with all advocacy programs, no outcome can be attributed to a single source, since policy change is subject to so many complex forces. Instead, this review looks at what the contribution of the program was to the outcomes that actually occurred. While some outcomes are intermediary – such as verbal commitments by policy makers, or new platforms for civil society representation – they are nonetheless potential stepping stones to future ultimate outcomes. There were fewer outcomes around the CAADP Biennial Review process, though participation of civil society at AU deliberations on it have been active, and recommendations from civil society organizations have been incorporated into official meeting statements.

For strategies and tactics, the production of evidence and use of civil society coalitions have been among the most effective strategies for producing these outcomes. The incorporation of farmers associations into these coalitions brought heightened legitimacy to advocacy efforts, and could be developed further in future work. The design of the program created great potential for linkages between African and European civil society organizations and governments, though the potential was not always realized. Decentralized management allowed country programs to pursue what made the most sense locally, but nonetheless reduced the synergy that the program could have achieved in injecting African voices into European policy debates. Although not always reported on in the TAP progress reports, interviews and discussions showed significant, mutually beneficial interaction between TAP and other Oxfam programs, especially at the country levels.

For future work, we propose the following recommendations:

1. Improve local to global linkages, and build joint activities explicitly into work plans. Better coordination would create stronger campaigns, as African voices bolster work in Europe, and as European assistance supports the work Oxfam programs in Africa are doing. Staff could consider creating a management team that can make program-wide decisions that maximize the synergy of programs. Beyond the current functions of the core group or advisory committee, this team would have the ability to make decisions based on consensus, but with greater efficiency and timeliness. This team would also link the parts of Oxfam that work on aid and development finance activities to ensure complementarity and coordination. If staff can build linked activities into their work plans, however, then there is no need for another management structure.
2. African country programs need to integrate CAADP work into their dialogue with governments, or abandon engagement with the AU around it. Engagement with regional bodies like ECOWAS or SADC may help, but only if there is conscious advocacy within countries to make African governments more accountable to the results shown by the Biennial Review. If the program opts to continue using CAADP as a tool, then more resources to the civil society coalition at the African Union would multiply the program's influence.
3. The program has shown encouraging initial results on using Gender-Responsive Budgeting as a way of integrating gender issues more directly in government programs. Expanding the use of the method shows promise, especially in training key government officials across countries on how to do it, raising awareness among stakeholders and the general public on what it is, establishing better collaborations between NGOs and other stakeholders on the method, and strengthening NGO work on increasing women's agency and creating mechanisms for farmers to have input into budgets.
4. Documents and interviews showed a concern for more explicit support to climate change adaptation. The review found that work on climate change adaptation is already built into the program in its promotion of women in agriculture and in promoting agroecology. The program can emphasize it more explicitly, but it is already there. If staff and partners want to expand their work on adaptation, the program could promote a wider set of resilience building activities for rural residents, beyond agriculture. Climate finance, on the other hand, is partly provided in Official Development Assistance and partly in other European institutions. The focus of this program on climate adaptation solutions delivered through ODA specifically makes sense, leaving other Oxfam programs to work on different institutions responsible for climate finance, developing the relationships and skills sets necessary for that specialized work.
5. The evaluation confirmed that the use of media has been a key tool to disseminate research results, draw public attention, educate the general public, set political agendas, and do direct advocacy, especially at country level. In the future, we recommend sharing media resources across countries, and developing the capacity to assess the results of media engagement.
6. The TAP program has already seen some of the benefits of building the capacity of women and smallholder farmers to advocate on their own behalf. The program has worked well with farmers organizations in advocacy campaigns, especially in Africa. However, reports and interviews gave the impression that Female Food Heroes were speaking as individuals, rather than as members of larger organizations and coalitions. Building the capacity of farmer groups, rather than just individuals, and facilitating them to form strong coalitions can have long term benefits. Oxfam can play a facilitating role with strengthened groups and coalitions. The skill imparted to the farmer groups can be used to also advocate for other services from government that are relevant to enhancing their resilience, such as health facilities and job opportunities. This strategy can make it clearer to target policy makers which respective farmer groups they are engaging with when Oxfam facilitates sessions for interaction. It can also increase the participation of smallholder farmers in high-level meetings with government officials and fashioning work plans with civil society coalitions.

I. Introduction

The Oxfam TAP multi-country agriculture and climate change adaptation advocacy program is nearing the end of a three-year phase. Consequently, Oxfam seeks to learn from the last three years of the program in order to improve the next phase of this work, taking into account the changes in context that affect its work such as COVID-19 and civil conflicts. Oxfam seeks to understand how the program has contributed toward progress in influencing the adoption and implementation of policies and practices, and increasing citizen engagement – particularly of women small-scale producers – with policymakers.

The program focused on three primary outcomes:

- a. *Target African governments (Nigeria, Tanzania, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Ethiopia) respond to the influence of active citizens by implementing budgets and policies that meet their commitments and protect the rights and needs of women and men small scale producers;*
- b. *Key donors (France, Italy, The Netherlands, the EU) maintain or increase the quantity and improve the quality of aid and climate adaptation finance for women and men small scale producers, to reduce poverty, hunger, and inequality;*
- c. *African Union and target member states act to popularize and provide political leadership to institutionalize the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) Biennial Review Process and improve mutual accountability among African member states by monitoring implementation of the key standards of the Malabo Declaration.*

There have been two cross-cutting objectives that are core to this work. The first is the focus on ensuring that budgets, policies, and practices related to agriculture, climate change adaptation and other areas that affect small scale producers, are gender-responsive and contribute to increasing women’s rights. The second is a focus on increasing the accountability of governments to citizen demands, increasing space for civil society engagement with policymakers, and in the target African countries, also supporting citizens, particularly women, with the tools, knowledge, and resources they need to become effective advocates in their own right.

Key stakeholders have been Oxfam staff in the countries mentioned above, as well as NGO partners and allies in those countries and at the African Union (AU) and European Union (EU). This program focuses on agriculture and food security programming in selected countries in Western Europe and Africa; a companion Oxfam program advocates for more and better Official Development Assistance in general.

The evaluation focuses on the current phase of the program, which began on July 1st, 2018 and ends on June 30th, 2021. The evaluation provides a *meta level review of progress* in achieving the desired outcomes across the different geographies. As a result, we analyzed results in individual countries only as they contribute to the overall results of the program. We were looking for patterns across all countries, focused on outcomes rather than outputs – that is, rather than what the program did, we were looking for what the results of activities were.

II. Evaluation Framework

A. Goals and Theory of Change

The evaluation is based on the goals and theory of change developed by program staff and partners. The goals are summarized below. Note that the goals include intermediate goals, such as “strengthened voice of citizens,” even in cases where actual policy had not yet changed.

1. Long Term Goals¹

- a. *Target African governments respond to the influence of active citizens by implementing budgets and policies that meet their commitments and protect the rights and needs of women and men small scale producers.*

Intermediate goals:

- i. Policy agendas of target countries reflect increased salience of priority issues related to agriculture and climate adaptation
- ii. Strengthen voice and influence of civil society organizations (CSOs) and citizens, particularly women small scale producers, in policy influencing spaces (e.g., national budget forums, CAADP Biennial Review process) to ensure their demands are communicated directly to policymakers
- iii. Government officials engage with and/or respond to demands of citizens in relation to policies that are designed to address the needs of small scale producers

- b. *Key donors maintain or increase the quantity and improve the quality of aid for women and men small scale producers including climate adaptation finance, to reduce poverty, hunger, and inequality.*

Intermediate goals:

- i. Increased awareness of and understanding by target audiences (e.g., policymakers, media, influencers) of current practices (budget and program implementation) and challenges facing women and men small scale producers, based on evidence
- ii. Aid/development policy agendas of target countries reflect increased salience of priority issues
- iii. Donors commit their support to improve agriculture spending and policies to support smallholder farmers

- c. *The African Union and target member states act to popularize and provide political leadership to institutionalize the CAADP Biennial Review Process and improve mutual accountability among African member states by monitoring implementation of the key standards of the Malabo Declaration.*

1 Taken from 2018 Theory of Change document

Intermediate goals:

- i. Heads of State and governments demonstrate increased support for implementation of the CAADP Biennial Review process and strengthening policies in the regional and national agriculture investment plans that support small scale producers
- ii. AU Institutions increase engagement with and utilization of CAADP Biennial Review Africa Agriculture Transformation Scorecard (AATS) findings and data and input from non-state actors on current progress toward CAADP compliance and efforts needed to improve benefits for women and men small scale producers
- iii. Increased and more meaningful engagement by non-state actors, particularly media, CSOs, farmers organizations, and women's rights organizations, in the Biennial Review process

The program focus includes the two cross-cutting themes noted above: emphasis on gender-responsive policies that support small scale producers, and increasing accountability and building the advocacy capacity of African women.

B. Evaluation Questions

The Terms of Reference pose the following evaluation questions:

1. ***What are the main outcomes of the program and to what degree have the following desired outcomes been achieved?***
 - a. *In target African countries, passage or implementation of budgets, policies and practices to protect the rights and respond to the needs of women and men small scale producers.*
 - b. *Target donors adopt and/or implement budgets, policies and practices that support women and men small scale producers and promote gender equality, sustainable agriculture and food security. Increase donor financing for climate change adaptation funding.*
 - c. *African Union and target member states popularize and provide political leadership to improve implementation of the CAADP Biennial Review process in order to increase mutual accountability for their CAADP commitments.*
 - d. *Strengthen voice and influence of CSOs, farmer organizations, and women small scale producers with policymakers and in important decision-making spaces (e.g., CAADP Biennial Review process, budget process, policy dialogues, national/international fora).*
 - e. *Target policy agendas, media and other influencing spaces reflect increased salience of priority issues related to agriculture, food security and climate change adaptation.*
2. ***What have been Oxfam's primary contributions and added value to the main outcomes achieved?***
3. ***What strategies, tactics, and/or external factors (including other actors) have contributed to achieving the main outcomes?***
4. ***What external and/or internal factors have inhibited progress towards the outcomes?***
5. ***Based on the learning above, how can Oxfam improve and/or strengthen our work going forward?***

The first question asks about the outcomes of the program itself, while the remaining ones focus on Oxfam's role, and the value of different approaches in producing the outcomes (or not). The final question focuses on how to work in the future.

C. Methodology

The core method in this *meta-level review of progress* in achieving the desired outcomes was Outcome Harvesting. Outcome Harvesting collects (“harvests”) evidence of what has changed (“outcomes”) and, then, working backwards, determines whether and how an intervention has contributed to these changes. Outcome Harvesting has proven to be especially useful in complex situations when it is not possible to define concretely most of what an intervention aims to achieve, or even, what specific actions will be taken over a multi-year period.² The primary sources of outcomes were interviews and review of program documents – primarily reports, strategic plans and reviews, and supporting evidence documents such as press reports. We conducted 28 interviews with the major stakeholder groups: 13 Oxfam staff, nine Oxfam partners and allies, and six relevant government officials. Sixteen interviewees were male, 12 were female, 13 were African, 13 were European, and two were American. For each interview, we provided an Informed Consent form for each person’s signature that explained the purpose of the interview and what we would do with the information.

We used a standard outcome harvesting definition of an outcome: *changes in the behavior, relationships, practices, policies, or actions of an individual, group, or institution.*³

These outcomes do not claim causation – no outcome can be attributed to a single factor. The outcomes instead document what happened, and then the review attempts to trace what the program’s probable contribution was. Given the short time period for the evaluation and the limited budget, substantiation of outcomes was not possible other than in triangulation through interviews and consultation of other available resources through internet searches.

The evaluation team consisted of Chris Allan, Violet Matiru, and Atalie Pestalozzi. We harvested and analyzed the outcomes along the lines of the goals and theory of change. We conducted a Sensemaking Workshop with the program core team at an early stage of the analysis, the results of which contributed to this report.

The evaluation produced outcomes from all countries and regions in the program. While it is possible to count outcomes, Outcome Harvesting is a qualitative evaluation method, so the actual numbers in each category are at best indicative of trends, and should not be assessed statistically. Harvesting outcomes involves considerable judgment and interpretation, so we present numbers simply to give an overview of where the program has been particularly productive. We analyzed the outcomes along the following parameters: Outcome Description (what was the outcome itself), Contribution (what role did the program play in achieving the outcome, and Significance (how important was the outcome in promoting the Theory of Change). Within those categories, we analyzed the outcomes and contributions by Who Changed, What Changed, When, and Level of Outcome (subnational, national, and regional/continental).

We defined Level of Significance to the Theory of Change as follows:

- **high** – policy change or change in practice affecting large numbers of people, or setting precedents that will have wide application. Change in discourse only if from an extremely influential source
- **medium** – local level policy change, or national level change in policy and practice affecting fewer people. Change in discourse or organizational capacity
- **low** – meaningful to a small number of people, or one of many steps on a path to outcomes of more significance
- **none** – no change in the situation.⁴

2 See https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/outcome_harvesting for more information on the method.

3 Ricardo Wilson-Grau and Heather Britt, Outcome Harvesting, May 2012 (Revised November 2013).

4 Note that only four outcomes were classed as “none,” since the emphasis in the analysis is on what actually did change. In an advocacy program, it is far more likely that efforts will produce minimal or no result in the short time span of a program, so we devoted far more effort to documenting what did change rather than what did not.

III. Evaluation Findings

Each of the key evaluation questions is addressed in the sections below. *As with all advocacy programs, no outcome can be attributed to a single source, since policy change is subject to so many complex forces. Instead, this review looks at what the contribution of the program was to the outcomes that actually occurred.*

What are the main outcomes of the program and to what degree have the following desired outcomes been achieved?

The analysis showed that African policy makers had changed in roughly a third of the outcomes, and European policy makers in another third. Policy makers included decision makers on important issues, and typically included Members of Parliament, civil servants with decision making power, and politicians such as ministers and presidents. This result reflects the theory of change well, which targets national level policy makers in Africa and Europe. The evaluation also observed changes in farmers organizations and other civil society organizations, and others as indicated in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Who changed?

As Figure 2 indicates, the majority of these changes occurred at national level. Again, this is appropriate for a program that seeks systems and policy change. Note that there were also significant outcomes at regional level – the EU and AU – state level, and local level, both of which we will discuss in the analysis below.

At what level did the outcome occur?




Figure 2. At what level did the outcome occur?

We also assessed outcomes in terms of their significance to the theory of change. The majority of high significance outcomes were at national level, followed by regional level, of which most were in Europe. These were largely around improvements in the quantity and quality of Official Development Assistance (ODA). Appendix A shows the most important results of this analysis.

The most common strategies and tactics used to achieve these outcomes are listed here. We discuss them more in depth in the analysis below in examining which ones were cited in connection with specific outcomes.



Strategies and Tactics

- Public meetings with duty bearers
- Research studies
- Private meetings with duty bearers
- Media engagement
- Alliance building or strengthening collaborations⁵
- Training
- Organizational strengthening
- Citizen organizing

⁵ Note that nearly every outcome involved some kind of collaboration. Coding for this tactic referred to specific outcomes that described strengthened coalitions, not simply the use of collaborations.

Of these strategies and tactics, the ones in Figure 3 were the most common across the whole program.

Three most used strategies



Figure 3. Three most used strategies

In analyzing what changes the outcomes described, we categorized them into three major themes, with subcategories for each:



Discourse, Policies, and Practices Changed

- Discourse – commitments/recommitments made by policymakers
- Policy – policy or budget enacted (or progress made)
- Practice – improved implementation



Duty Bearers Engaged

- Direct engagement with civil society in general (e.g., meeting, policy dialogue, planning/budgeting process)
- Direct engagement on CAADP Biennial Review Process specifically



Strengthened Voice and Influence of CSOs and Citizens – divided into ten categories of actors strengthened

Across the whole program, the majority of outcomes – nearly two thirds – were changes in policy and practice. We discuss them below, first for Africa, and second for Europe. This division corresponded to a reality of the program: while it was conceived as an integrated program, the activities in Africa and Europe mostly functioned independently, so outcomes were rarely the result of joint work between the two continents.

A. Africa

In target African countries, passage or implementation of budgets, policies, and practices to protect the rights and respond to the needs of women and men small scale producers.

Strengthen voice and influence of CSOs, farmer organizations, and women small scale producers with policymakers and in important decision-making spaces (e.g., CAADP Biennial Review process, budget process, policy dialogues, national/international fora).

What have been Oxfam's primary contributions and added value to the main outcomes achieved?

Target policy agendas, media and other influencing spaces reflect increased salience of priority issues related to agriculture, food security and climate change adaptation.



Discourse, Policies, and Practices Changed

The program contributed to a number of outcomes in Africa which changed both government policies and practices. There were also significant outcomes in “discourse,” that is, commitments of government officials to take action, or to accept a new understanding of the issues more in line with the goals of the program.

At the level of **policy**, the clearest results were in influencing increases in government budgets or changes in programs to better support small scale farmers, especially women. All but one change in policy was of high or medium significance. One example comes from February 2019, when the Tanzanian Parliament included the four issues that Oxfam presented at the opening of debate on the reform of the Water and Sanitation Act of 2009. The following year, the Tanzanian government's national budget increased agricultural sector spending by Tanzanian shilling 83 billion (US\$35 million), eliminated several levies and fees related to agriculture, and increased duties for horticulture from outside of Tanzania to protect local products and promote employment for the local population, in part thanks to the advocacy work the program had been doing.

In Nigeria, the program produced policy results at state level rather than national, since staff saw higher promise there for engaging citizens and demonstrating the potential of increased investment and policies. (This shift to include local level action showed good adaptive management, which was echoed in Ghana and Ethiopia.) In Katsina State in 2020, the budget for the Agriculture Development Program, which focuses primarily on linking smallholder farmers with extension services and inputs, more than doubled from 2019. And in Nasarawa State, funds for the Agriculture Development Program increased by 75%, and the budget for the unit responsible for providing support to smallholder farmers went from zero funds for capital expenditure in 2019 to US\$235,000 in 2020.

Figure 4 illustrates the pathway of change that produced these results. Oxfam and allies conducted Agricultural Budget Priority Workshops, which brought together government officials, farmers, and other members of civil society. In part as a result of these workshops, the next budgets included these increases. In addition, the Nasarawa State Governor personally saw to it that the largest farmers association in the state, The Association of Small-Scale Agro-Producers in Nigeria (ASSAPIN), be included in the state committee on agriculture development and youth empowerment. The government also set up a rice mill for Nasarawa farmers. The following year,

Nigerian states improve support to smallholder farmers




Figure 4. Nigerian states improve support to smallholder farmers

the government invited the same farmers to a townhall on citizen perspectives on the budget that they organized, inspired by the example of the meeting the previous year.

Interviews and program documents showed similar results for all African countries in the program, at both local and national levels.

About one fifth of outcomes in Africa in this category constituted changes in **practice**, as opposed to overall government policy. Gender-responsive budgeting and community participation in state level budgeting was adopted by some governments in both Nigeria and Ghana. Because this work was done at state level, it was possible to achieve faster progress than trying to change national budgeting processes. Other significant changes were seen in both Burkina Faso and Ghana, where women gained greater access to land, as well as better access to inputs, finance, or markets for all small scale farmers. Only in Burkina Faso did the program focus on the CAADP reporting process. Oxfam’s emphasis on the CAADP Biennial Review process led the government to involve CSOs, as well as to request continued support from international partners for the upcoming review process. No other country program used the CAADP reporting process as an accountability tool in their advocacy with governments. As a result, there were few, if any, outcomes explicitly related to CAADP in other African countries.

The analysis was designed to capture outcomes, whether planned or not, so this report may give the impression that the program succeeded in everything it did. Of course, all countries reported disappointments with their advocacy, which is normal. In Ghana for example, in 2020, Oxfam-supported partners SEND Ghana and Peasant Farmers Association of Ghana (PFAG) advocated for small scale farmers to be included in the proposed government stimulus package in response to COVID-19. However, in the package that was passed, the government only made provision for people in agri-businesses. Or in Burkina Faso, Oxfam partner farmer organizations pushed for the creation of the Agricultural Bank of Burkina Faso (BADF), which was launched on March 29th, 2019 to finance the agricultural sector. Yet once it opened, the bank functioned like a commercial bank, with interest rates higher than normal for the agricultural sector, making it difficult to finance agricultural projects of small-scale farmers. Though advocacy efforts were effective at establishing an agricultural bank, one staff member of a farmer organization observed that “the bank is in place but does not respond to the needs of farmers,” so the next challenge is to advocate for better banking terms and access.

Along with changes in policy and practice, the largest set of outcomes in this category (about half) in Africa cited changes in **discourse**, that is, commitments made by policymakers, whether verbally or in documents. While these outcomes are not changes on their own, they are indicators of shifts in attitude or intentions, which are intermediate milestones toward actual changes. Because they represent words rather than action, all were of medium or low significance.

In Burkina Faso, Tanzania, and Ghana, the program took advantage of the opportunities posed by election campaigns to influence candidates and political parties. In **Tanzania**, for example, in a meeting with civil society organizations on the nexus between gender and climate change, Members of Parliament committed to mainstream concerns about gender and women in their advocacy for government to upgrade its climate action. Representatives from political parties also committed to take into consideration the recommendations contained in the CSO Elections Manifesto related to climate change adaptation and agriculture.

On adapting to COVID-19, governments in every African country publicly stated their commitments to supporting small scale farmers and the poor through the pandemic. Oxfam teams in nearly all countries called on governments to do so. For example, in July of 2020, Oxfam organized a webinar with the Nigerian Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development with over 117 participants to discuss the challenges of COVID-19 on smallholder farmers and share information on the Nigerian government's new economic development plan and its implications for agricultural policy. Other online efforts involved the dissemination of short videos including interviews capturing farmers' difficulty in making a living. These videos were viewed 18,987 and garnered over 10,000 impressions.



Duty Bearers Engaged

Another stepping stone outcome was engagement with duty bearers to advocate for their constituencies. Duty bearers include decision makers on important issues, typically Members of Parliament, civil servants with decision making power, and politicians such as ministers and presidents. Activities included meetings, policy dialogues, and participation in planning or budgeting processes. Two thirds of outcomes among African governments were in this category.

In some cases, duty bearers took up program positions, while in others they were exposed to CSO positions, though they did not take them up. The theory of change recognized that for advocacy to succeed, it was important to engage with decision makers and express positions to them. In Ethiopia, Oxfam focused on the Female Food Heroes program to bring issues prioritized by women producers to the attention of the local and federal governments. In 2019, Female Food Heroes from five regions addressed key government officials, including the Director of the Gender Directorate in the Ministry of Agriculture, and Bureau heads/delegates of the regional Bureaus of Agriculture and of Women and Children Affairs at regional events. The officials expressed their respective offices' interest and keen desire to support the program and small scale female food producers.

Other forms of engagement included civil society organizations participating in official meetings or conferences on government policy, or government officials participating with civil society in media appearances. Despite being intermediary outcomes, nearly a quarter of outcomes in this category were scored as high significance since they resulted in subsequent policy changes. As noted above, there were instances where *timing* of engagement was important – during elections, officials are particularly receptive to suggestion – but in general, most outcomes were the result of long term, strategic contact and a combination of tactics to support the meetings.



Strengthened Voice and Influence of CSOs and Citizens

Another intermediate set of outcomes important to the theory of change is the increased capacity of civil society organizations and citizens to influence decision makers. In all five African countries, the program contributed to strengthening the influence of different types of organizations: Coalitions of CSOs, Farmers Organizations, Media, NGOs, and Women's Rights Organizations. In Nigeria, the program also increased the capacity of Nigerian policy makers at state and local level to improve budgeting practices to support small farmers.

This increased capacity took many forms: groups of NGOs or Oxfam alone led research or advocacy activities; farmers organizations spoke in public spaces or influenced local authorities or policy makers; coalitions of civil society organizations got together for joint research, positions, presentations, or meetings with government officials; and civil society organizations used media to amplify their views, or media outlets picked up and spread CSO views. Through the bridging capacity of the program, Oxfam staff in Nigeria, Burkina Faso, and at the EU office set up an opportunity for African farmers to speak directly to European Commission and European Parliamentarians in a virtual dialogue in March 2021. And in Nigeria in May of 2020, Oxfam and partner Farm and Infrastructure Foundation made it possible for Female Food Heroes Chinasa Asonye and Chijoke Ihuoma to appear on television to raise awareness of the impacts of COVID-19 on smallholder farmers. This and other media appearances by female farmers were part of a broader Oxfam-supported effort to share joint statements by civil society and farmers associations on the inadequacy of government's actions towards improving support for farmers at the height of the pandemic.



Strategies, Tactics, and External Factors

|| **What strategies, tactics, and/or external factors (including other actors) have contributed to achieving the main outcomes?**

Program staff, partners, and allies used a wide range of strategies and tactics to produce these outcomes. The most frequently cited tactic was **public meetings with duty bearers**. These meetings were often effective, as noted above, though it was difficult to assess the impact of any one conference, meeting, or ceremony. Some program staff noted that **private meetings with duty bearers** were often more effective, especially at local level. Advocacy at local level was often more productive than national level, given the smaller scale of government operations. This was especially true in Ghana and Nigeria. Public and private meetings were cited in half of all outcomes, with many outcomes involving both. However, meetings with duty bearers did not guarantee outcomes of high significance – the significance of the result did not highly correlate with this tactic, producing outcomes of high, medium, and low significance in about equal proportions (and two outcomes of no significance).

Drawing on one of Oxfam's strengths, the program produced a variety of **research, evidence, and learning products** such as reports and webinars to document and publicize the issues. Use of these reports was the next most frequent tactic associated with outcomes. Across all countries, a series of more than 30 research reports produced by Oxfam and/or partners and allies proved invaluable to show policy makers the reality of the situation, building credibility of the program, and recommending alternatives. Examples include *Gender-Responsive Budgeting in Ghana: An analysis of GRB implementation and its existing and potential impacts on women small scale farmers*; *Assessing the effectiveness of private finance blending in ensuring that small scale farmers are not*

left behind; and *The Hunger virus: how COVID-19 is fueling hunger in a hungry world*. Not all were funded by this program, but all proved useful in advocacy. We present a list of these documents in Appendix B. Programs in Ethiopia, Nigeria, and Tanzania used individual voices like Female Food Heroes to publicize issues and change the narrative around the power of women farmers. In Ghana, the program conducted original research to show that the government’s flagship One Village, One Dam program often fell short of delivering on its promises due to poor planning and substandard work by contractors. And Burkina Faso organized field visits with media to bring public attention to the challenges small-scale farmers face.

Staff and allies described **coalition building** as essential. The coalitions in each country were unique to the local CSO landscape, but all were important and effective. The inclusion of strong engagement with farmers organizations (especially in Burkina Faso and Ghana), increased program credibility and connections with farmers themselves. On the other hand, there was a surprising lack of women’s rights organizations involved, given the program themes; women’s organizations in Burkina Faso and Ghana were important to some outcomes nonetheless. Staff noted the difficulty of balancing urban and rural voices in coalitions, since in general, voices in capitals tend to be stronger than rural voices. Staff also noted that since working in coalition tends to be slower and require more heavy lifting to get CSOs working toward the same objectives, it is important to devote sufficient staff time to working through them, especially when turnover is high. In some cases, coalition partners noted that more long-term planning would be helpful, rather than redoing the agenda every six months. The program in Burkina Faso and at the AU also built the capacity of media and CSOs to understand the Malabo Declaration and the CAADP Biennial Review process. The effectiveness of the CAADP Non-State Actors Coalition (CNC) to bring policy maker attention to program priorities at the AU was also noteworthy, though its effectiveness was undermined by a lack of technical and financial support.




Figure 5. Ghana improves national budget and economic policy

While this discussion treats these tactics and strategies individually, in fact outcomes were the product of a combination of many approaches, and it is not possible to say with any certainty which were most important at which time. It was more likely the combination of tactics and strategies, as well as forces outside the program’s control, that determined the form and timing of outcomes. Figure 5 provides a graphic representation of a typical pathway of change that the program contributed to, in this case in Ghana. In preparation for the 2020 national budget in Ghana, Oxfam staff and its partner, SEND Ghana, held two forums in Greater Accra and Northern regions, based on SEND Ghana’s analysis of the proposed budget. The Ministry of Food and

Agriculture and the District Agriculture Directorate made presentations, and small holder farmers, fisherfolks and CSOs provided their proposals. Three of these proposals were reflected in the 2020 national budget and economic policy. Specifically, the government agreed to provide additional agricultural machinery and equipment to improve small scale farmers' access to agricultural mechanization services and to make advances in the establishment of Agriculture Mechanization Service Centres; to increase subsidies for farm inputs; and to improve road networks in rural communities for better access to markets to sell produce.

Notes of staff discussions showed a concern that the program was not addressing climate change explicitly enough. To the evaluation team, this seemed a minor concern, since the program's emphasis on agroecology and neglected small scale farmers, especially women, was already addressing climate change adaptation. It is possible to build resilience further through increasing diversity of income and markets, accompanied by other efforts that mitigate droughts, pests, and floods, which could be considered in any future work.

Interviews and documents reviewed revealed some missed opportunities. The program did not seem to take sufficient advantage of its nation-spanning scope to link African and European activities. At times it almost appeared that there were two programs, an African program and a European one. While there was plenty of communication and consultation, concrete coordinated activities seemed rare. Examples of missed opportunities include engaging local EU delegations in Africa in what they should be funding with EU money, as recommended by Oxfam EU advocacy staff in Brussels, or feeding African positions into meetings with European policy makers.

B. Europe

Target donors adopt and/or implement budgets, policies and practices that support women and men small scale producers and promote gender equality, sustainable agriculture, and food security. Increase donor financing for climate change adaptation funding.

Strengthen voice and influence of CSOs, farmer organizations, and women small scale producers with policymakers and in important decision-making spaces (e.g., CAADP Biennial Review process, budget process, policy dialogues, national/international fora).

Target policy agendas, media and other influencing spaces reflect increased salience of priority issues related to agriculture, food security and climate change adaptation.



Discourse, Policies, and Practices Changed

As in Africa, the program contributed to an impressive number of changes in **policy**. About 40% of outcomes in this category among European target countries were changes in policy, especially around ODA budgets, policies, and priorities. The majority of these changes had high significance, since policy change was the purpose of the program. Only three were of low or no significance, describing disappointing outcomes of advocacy.

In the Netherlands, the budget published in September 2019 maintained its previous level of €340 million for food security and agriculture, and included an increase in climate finance to €570 million, an increase of €110 million from the previous year. Given a new Dutch government from October 2017, there was concern that aid would decrease, but Oxfam Novib and its allies defended

aid levels. Around the same time in France, in August 2019, the government committed to double its Green Climate Fund (GCF) contribution to €1.584 billion, and to increase the percentage given in the form of grants from 56% to 80%, in part due to advocacy by Climate Action Network (CAN) France and Oxfam.

Also in the Netherlands, following advocacy efforts of Oxfam and its allies, Democrats 66 (D66), a social liberal political party in the Netherlands, added an amendment to its election program in November 2020 to include “eradication of hunger and malnutrition by investing in small scale (female) farmers and contributing to increasing the sustainability of the agriculture sector worldwide” under its “Policy priorities for development cooperation.”

In Italy, the program contributed to a number of policy outcomes. The topic of climate adaptation was included as a priority in agriculture and food security for Italian Development Policies through the Three-Year Programming and Policy Planning Document – the main strategic plan for Italy used by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation. This commitment was a shift in policy, since when the program started in 2018, Italian cooperation did not cover Climate Adaptation Funding. Advocacy work by Oxfam Italy highlighted the interconnections between climate change and food security. As part of this work, in 2020 Oxfam Italy contributed to a report with allies in the Global Call to Action Against Poverty (GCAP), illustrating specifically how climate change is affecting food security at the global level. Finally, Italy reaffirmed its commitment to climate change adaptation at the Climate Ambition Summit in 2020 with a financial allocation of €30 million to the UN Adaptation Fund.

The program also influenced the quality of aid. In 2019, the European Parliament (EP) used language explicitly referencing the importance of supporting smallholder agriculture, land rights, and agroecology in its Neighborhood Development and International Cooperation Instrument (NDICI), in keeping with program recommendations.

European governments and the EU made a number of encouraging statements during the last three years supporting positions advocated by the program. **Discourse** had the most changes in this category in Europe, more than half. In the last few years, attitudes within the European Union on agroecology have shifted from dismissive and uninformed to being more supportive. In addition to changes in discourse, the EU has now budgeted for a specific focus on agroecology under the EU joint research unit, and as of 2021 there is specific funding for agroecology projects in calls for proposals. The European Commission’s Department for International Cooperation and Development (DG DEVCO) representative and Head of Food Security Unit, Leonard Mizzi, declared in 2019 that EU’s aid to agriculture under the next Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) of the European Union (2021-2027) should be aligned with agroecological principles. A shift to supporting agroecological approaches has been a key position of Oxfam and its allies for several years at the European Commission, European Parliament, and in some member states.

Also at the European Commission, there are indications that the initial enthusiasm for “blended finance” – the promotion of development objectives through funding to private and public sector cooperation – has cooled following publication of position papers and advocacy by Oxfam and its allies. This issue extends beyond agriculture and food security to include the health and education sectors as well. European Commission staff are now seeing that blended finance “is not the silver bullet that is going to solve all funding problems and all development,” noted one Oxfam staff member. And Oxfam has been invited to speak on the topic of blending finance in agriculture by three European governments, based on its report, *Accountability Deficit: Assessing the effectiveness of private finance blending in ensuring that small scale farmers are not left behind*.

Despite the many hurdles that came with COVID-19, the pandemic also provided some opportunities to cast light on the connections between social protection issues, climate change and development. Oxfam published the *Hunger Virus Report* in 2020 which brought to light the intersection of climate change and food insecurity, using the COVID-19 crisis to focus attention on the issues. While the report was produced by other Oxfam staff members outside of this program, TAP teams, particularly in Europe, used this report to raise awareness of these linkages among policymakers and the public. Oxfam Italy also collaborated with GCAP to make the linkages between food security, climate, and agriculture more prominent, and to strengthen the collaboration of environmental and development NGOs. This effort included the publication of two related annual reports with GCAP on food security and migration and food security and climate change. Since the G20 meeting in October 2021 will be in Rome, the Italian organizing committee Civil20 continues to raise these themes. These developments led one Oxfam staff member to observe that “awareness has risen one step further, [there is] growing space in the link between food security, agriculture and climate change – environmentalist NGOs and developmentalist NGOs are working more closely based on understanding that climate change and food security are strongly interconnected.”



Duty Bearers Engaged

As in Africa, the program in Europe conducted a number of engagements with policy makers that acted as stepping stones to progress. Some generated policy outcomes, though many did not, which is normal for an advocacy program. The majority of these engagements were of medium significance, since it is rare that an engagement produces a result directly.

In 2020, in a joint radio interview together with Oxfam Novib staff, Sigrid Kaag, the Dutch Minister for Development Cooperation, expressed the importance of going back to 0,7% of ODA, saying “we do strive for much more additional resources for international cooperation, including development cooperation.”

Interviews showed a distinction between the needs for advocacy targeted at civil servants versus politicians. A coalition partner interviewee noted that “there needs to be a voice that can contradict the government when they’re not walking the talk,” so “naming and shaming” is sometimes what it takes to make sure that commitments are honored. Among civil servants however, some were mystified about the sometimes confrontational nature of the advocacy. One European civil servant observed “It’s ok that NGOs make this lobbying – it’s their job, their role, maybe it’s useful. But what could be more useful from our perspective is more technical collaboration between us to make evidence of the efficiency of sustainable agriculture and agroecology, the efficiency of the focus on smallholders...Basically, we *agree*, on the big priorities and the big strategical priorities...to advocate together for common priorities.” On the other hand, one Oxfam staff member noted that “We don’t really put political pressure on governments in donor countries. Our advocacy is quite technical, focused on policymakers. Public advocacy/campaigning is hardly part of our strategy.” So this finding suggests that a differentiated advocacy strategy is necessary: facts and evidence for civil servants, public campaigning for politicians.



Strengthened Voice and Influence of CSOs and Citizens

The program generated a number of outcomes related to strengthening the ability of CSOs and citizens to influence European decision makers. As in Africa, the program’s ability to generate evidence and publish research reports was an important contribution. Several European

government officials – those most often the people the reports were trying to influence – gave mixed reactions to these documents. On the one hand, some noted that the most helpful part of the program’s advocacy to their work was the gathering and reporting of evidence, while others were unsure why reports had to be so confrontational. On the role of blended finance, for example, one civil servant noted: “We’re the ‘do-good’ unit with a focus on food security and small holder farmers. If Oxfam wants to address some of the things that the government is supporting through private sector that could be harmful to small holders, I don’t know the extent to which they are talking to the Trade Department,” or the other departments concerned with promoting private sector trade and industry.

Others cited the ability of a program that spans two continents to bring African farmers to Europe to speak and meet with public officials as a strength. Examples include bringing Female Food Heroes to the Netherlands, Italy, and Belgium to talk directly to policy makers in 2019, or a virtual dialogue between female farmers and EU Parliamentarians and European Commission staff organized in March 2021. However, it was surprising to us that the program did not make more use of this capacity to bring policy people and representatives of farmers associations to Europe for direct discussions. We encountered few instances that used this natural link, and did not see many joint advocacy plans between African and European offices or coalitions. On a related point, one European ministry staff member complained that because Oxfam is not a membership organization, it was not clear who they or the partners they brought represented. It did not help that the program did not emphasize more connections between Female Food Heroes and the farmers organizations they belonged to. At times it seems that the Female Food Heroes were speaking as individuals – which can be effective in humanizing issues – but little connection was made with the institutional base needed for long-term advocacy.



Strategies, Tactics, and External Factors

What have been Oxfam’s primary contributions and added value to the main outcomes achieved?

What strategies, tactics, and/or external factors (including other actors) have contributed to achieving the main outcomes?

As in Africa, all interviews were unanimous that **coalitions of civil society organizations** were essential. In every country CSOs got together to develop joint research, positions, presentations, or meetings with government officials. In France there were alliances of Oxfam with CAN France and the French civil society coalition C2A, in Italy with Civil 20 and GCAP Italy, in the Netherlands there was the AgriProFocus (APF) network, and CONCORD at the EU level. Moving forward, some European interviewees emphasized that coalitions should build narratives that are more cross-cutting and better link issues of food security, agriculture, climate change, even health, in their advocacy.

Meeting with duty bearers both privately and publicly was the most frequently cited strategy. Given the diversity of interests and the strengths of other lobbies in Europe, it is difficult to trace individual meetings to outcomes, but Oxfam and their allies had carved out known positions and good contacts with government officials in all countries. Longstanding relationships in government also provided continuity despite turnover, for example in Italy where there were three governments within the span of three years. Oxfam France and CAN France met privately with presidential and ministerial teams working on climate finance in 2019 in the lead up to the G7 summit, issued press releases, and then attended the G7 environment ministerial meeting in Metz

in May 2019. At the summit, France announced a doubling of its commitment to the Green Climate Fund (GCF). This example also shows the European version of the tactic used in Africa of seizing opportunities, in this case using the fact that France was hosting the G7 Summit, and as host was interested in making a big announcement at it, especially to keep up with earlier GCF commitments from Germany and Norway. Figure 6 illustrates this pathway to change, which was typical for many outcomes observed.




Figure 6. France increases climate adaptation budget

As noted above, **research reports** supported advocacy positions, and at times gave government allies evidence they could use in internal discussions or to support positions externally. The program both produced its own research reports, and used reports done by allies and other Oxfam programs in support of its advocacy. One example of success came in 2020, when the Agence Française de Développement (AFD) climate strategy cited the 2018 Oxfam France report *Lift the veil on fossil fuels*. A list of reports useful to advocacy is in Appendix B.

European work emphasized a strategic use of **media**, tracking media hits from research reports and announcements, and leveraging opportunities to be on the international stage, especially in France and Italy. For example, considering the role of the Catholic Church in Italy, Oxfam took advantage of the access to media stemming from the strong interest the Church takes in issues of poverty, hunger, and food security. Advocacy efforts by Oxfam facilitated media coverage by the international radio of the Vatican and from the Catholic Press. While a media analysis was beyond the scope of this evaluation, the ability to track influence in the media was important in assessing progress and planning future action.

Looking across all the tactics and strategies, there is no correlation between the approaches used and the significance of outcomes. That is, it would not be accurate to say that using one method or another was the most effective. In fact, outcomes were the result of a patient, strategic application of a variety of approaches, often over many years. The three pathways to change infographics in this report attempt to illustrate the complexity of the interactions of strategies, actors, and opportunities that go into any advocacy success. Commenting on Oxfam’s strategies, a European civil society interviewee noted that using a variety of tactics is exactly what makes NGOs strong, and that Oxfam is “an organization that is extremely efficient in making their messages heard” because they do just that.

There seemed to be missed opportunities to use the program’s South-North linkages more. The focuses of Oxfam programs in Europe and in Africa often do not build on each other to create

something greater than the sum of the parts. For example, the negotiation of the EU’s Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) during this period – which only happens once every seven years – was a tactical opportunity for African staff and allies to visit their local EU delegations to influence how those funds are programmed at home, and to bring African allies to Europe to present African perspectives. These opportunities did not become a priority for many Oxfam staff in the program. In part, there are just too many issues on agriculture and food security to focus on everything, so staff noted the need to focus on the things that hold the most promise. Unfortunately, there was not as much planning on what makes sense both in Africa and Europe in making those necessary choices. On linking better among country programs, one staff member noted that “If we don’t get better at that, we’ll be a collection of seven teams with independent work with a set of common objectives.”

C. African Union

African Union and target member states popularize and provide political leadership to improve implementation of the CAADP Biennial Review process in order to increase mutual accountability for their CAADP commitments.

Strengthen voice and influence of CSOs, farmer organizations, and women small scale producers with policymakers and in important decision-making spaces (e.g., CAADP Biennial Review process, budget process, policy dialogues, national/international fora).

Target policy agendas, media and other influencing spaces reflect increased salience of priority issues related to agriculture, food security and climate change adaptation.

The third goal of the program – *The African Union and target member states act to popularize and provide political leadership to institutionalize the CAADP Biennial Review Process and improve mutual accountability among African member states by monitoring implementation of the key standards of the Malabo Declaration* – produced the fewest outcomes of the three, only three percent. Since the African Union is limited in its ability to establish policy with teeth, most results here take the form of discourse.

As with the program results in African and European target countries, we assessed three major themes: Discourse, Policies, and Practices Changed, Duty Bearers Engaged, and Strengthened Voice and Influence of CSOs and Citizens.



Discourse, Policies, and Practices Changed

In terms of **practices**, Burkina Faso was the only program which explicitly used the CAADP Biennial Review process as an accountability tool with its government. No other Oxfam program member in Africa showed outcomes around the AU or the CAADP process. The most notable outcome from this effort came in 2019, when the Burkina Faso government Permanent Secretariat of Agricultural Policy Coordination supported the process with funds, a technical team including three Non-State Actor representatives – the Peasants Confederation of Faso/Confédération Paysanne du Faso (CPF), the Permanent Secretariat of NGOs/Secrétariat Permanent des ONG du Burkina Faso (SPONG) and The Rural Private Sector Actors' College/Collège des Acteurs Privés du Secteur Rural (CAPSR) – and a mechanism to incorporate CSO and rural community input. He also requested other Secretaries General to participate in the process, and for international partners and NGOs to allocate funding. During the validation workshop of the Burkina Faso CAADP Biennial Review report in July 2019, the Burkina Faso Minister of Agriculture said the President had reiterated the commitment to invest at

least 10% of the national budget in the agricultural sector.

Discourse was the most productive area of engagement with the AU and the CAADP process. As a venue for international discussion of issues, this result is appropriate, and not surprising. CSOs, led by the CAADP Non-State Actors Coalition (CNC), had success in both 2018 and 2019 in getting their recommendations included in the official closing ‘Decisions and Declarations’ of AU summits. Among these was a statement to improve the accountability of funding to agriculture, to increase finance for climate adaptation, and keep a strong focus on women smallholder farmers. Also included was a declaration urging the parties to the UNFCCC process to consider the special circumstances of Africa. These results were not unique – CSOs participated effectively in AU processes, and AU delegates took up their positions multiple times. Yet because the AU outcomes remained at the level of discourse, the significance was always low or medium.

There were no **policy** changes noted related to the AU work of the program.



Duty Bearers Engaged

The program made strides within the Economic Commission of West African States (ECOWAS) as well. At the People’s Agriculture Budget Summit held in Abuja in December 2018, the ECOWAS Parliament committed to more capacity building on the CAADP Biennial Review process, including unanimous agreement to the women’s resolutions on the need for increased access to agricultural development and land rights for women.

ECOWAS endorsed the idea of setting up platforms like the agriculture consultative meetings and the Budget Summit as the arenas for discussing issues that will address youth and women issues in the agriculture sector. They observed that additional capacity building on the CAADP Biennial Review process should involve more and different stakeholders within the region to have more quality data in future processes.



Strengthened Voice and Influence of CSOs and Citizens

The program also created spaces for African farmers to speak, including the appearance of six small scale women producers from across Africa at the High-Level Meeting on the Initiative Empowering Women in Agriculture (EWA) at an African Union summit.

In 2018, the ECOWAS Parliament launched the Gender Network of ECOWAS Parliamentarians on Agriculture and Food Security. The Parliament also committed to institutionalizing the ECOWAS People’s Agriculture Budget Summit to enable critical stakeholders to take stock of progress being made in the agriculture sector towards economic development and poverty reduction.



Strategies, Tactics, and External Factors

What have been Oxfam’s primary contributions and added value to the main outcomes achieved?

What strategies, tactics, and/or external factors (including other actors) have contributed to achieving the main outcomes?

Oxfam was one of the major players in both Burkina Faso and at the AU on CAADP related issues. In Burkina Faso, partners CPF, SPONG, and CAPSR represented farmers organizations, civil society, and the rural private sector, and participated actively in the 2019 CAADP Biennial Review process.

At the AU, Oxfam worked through the CNC. While underfunded, the CNC managed to engage AU officials and member states at high levels throughout the period under review. They organized side events at AU summits and numerous presentations.

Yet it was unclear to us the value of these investments, and only one country program devoted many resources to it. The goal is to use the African Union and the CAADP process as a way of keeping governments accountable. But to be effective, that accountability must take place at home – accountability to its own citizens – not at African Union summits, which few citizens follow. The AU meetings are important, but the real leverage is in using the AU CAADP process at home with government, media, and other supporters of small scale farmers as a measure of progress in agriculture. The process seems little known outside of agriculture specialist circles, and receives minimal press coverage. As an accountability tool, its leverage is therefore limited.

D. Factors that Inhibited Progress Towards Outcomes

|| What external and/or internal factors have inhibited progress towards the outcomes?

As with any program working on complex social change, there were many external and internal factors beyond the control of the program that inhibited progress. Because many of these factors overlap all three goal areas, we discuss them together here.

The biggest one was of course COVID-19. It interfered with 2020-21 work everywhere, diverted funds from agriculture and food security, and created new challenges for small scale farmers on top of what they were dealing with already. The program adapted as well as could be expected, and even managed to take advantage of the situation by setting up virtual meetings between farmers and policy makers that did not require international travel. The program also used it as a learning moment, issuing the *Hunger Virus* report, highlighting the linkages between food insecurity, social, economic and climate issues.

Also in the background was the migration crisis that ramped up from 2016. The need in Europe to manage many refugees diverted attention to Africa programs focused on reducing emigration, as opposed to food security.

At the level of the European Union, Brexit did *not* interfere with policy discussions, even the MFF. Negotiations over Brexit took place largely at the political level, while the majority of advocacy was with European Commission staff, who are more technically oriented.

Controlled space for civil society by government agencies was in evidence, especially in Tanzania and by extension to the AU when countries like Tanzania and Zimbabwe were involved. It became harder to get meetings with officials at the AU, and basic civil society function in Tanzania was minimal. The phasing out of the Oxfam program in Tanzania also inhibited the program's work in its last year.

In a related way, insecurity in Burkina Faso and parts of Ethiopia limited freedom of movement, including an internet shutdown by government in Ethiopia because of civil unrest in 2020. Several countries experienced elections and political turmoil or turnover in this period. Elections slowed down all processes due to campaigning, though several programs turned that constraint to their advantage by getting commitments from candidates and parties.

A perennial underlying issue was continued slow agricultural growth and extreme poverty. Of the five African countries, only three achieved agricultural sector growth above the target of 6% in the first Biennial Review. Lack of growth made it difficult to increase government budgets. In Europe, economic contraction due to COVID, and longer-term political trends that threatened ODA in several countries, made it difficult to expand ODA budgets.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

A. Conclusions

1. The program achieved important outcomes in quantity and quality of ODA, and in small scale farmer and female farmer friendly policies in Africa. While some outcomes have been intermediary – verbal commitments by policy makers, new platforms for civil society representation – they have nonetheless been significant stepping stones to future ultimate outcomes.
2. There were fewer outcomes around the CAADP process, though participation of civil society at AU deliberations on it are active, and CSO recommendations have been incorporated into official meeting statements.
3. Production of evidence and use of civil society coalitions have been among the most effective strategies for producing these outcomes. The incorporation of farmers associations into these coalitions brought heightened legitimacy to advocacy efforts, and could be developed further in future work.
4. The design of the program created great potential for linkages between African and European civil society organizations and governments, yet that potential was often not realized. Decentralized management allowed country programs to pursue what made the most sense locally, but nonetheless reduced the synergy that the program could have achieved in injecting African voices into European policy debates.

B. Recommendations

Based on the learning above, how can Oxfam improve and/or strengthen our work going forward?


1. Improve local to global linkages, and build joint activities explicitly into work plans. Better coordination would create stronger campaigns, as African voices bolster work in Europe, and as European assistance supports the work Oxfam programs in Africa are doing. Staff could consider creating a management team that can make program-wide decisions that maximize synergy of programs. Beyond the current functions of the core group or advisory committee, this team would have the ability to make decisions based on consensus, but with greater efficiency and timeliness. This team would also link the parts of Oxfam that work on aid and development finance activities to ensure complementarity and coordination. If staff can build linked activities into their work plans, however, then there is no need for another management structure.
2. African country programs need to integrate CAADP work into their dialogue with governments, or abandon engagement with the AU around it. Engagement with regional bodies like ECOWAS or SADC may help, but only if there is conscious advocacy within countries to make African governments more accountable to the results

shown by the Biennial Review. If the program opts to continue using CAADP as a tool, then more resources to the civil society coalition at the African Union would multiply the program's influence.

3. The program has shown good initial results on using Gender-Responsive Budgeting as a way of integrating gender issues more directly in government programs. Expanding the use of the method shows promise, especially in training key government officials across countries on how to do it, raising awareness among stakeholders and the general public on what it is, establishing better collaborations between NGOs and other stakeholders on the method, and strengthening NGO work on increasing women's agency and creating mechanisms for farmers to have input into budgets.
4. Documents and interviews showed a concern for more explicit support to climate change adaptation. The review found that work on climate change adaptation is already built into the program in its promotion of women in agriculture and in promoting agroecology. The program can emphasize it more explicitly, but it is already there. If staff and partners want to expand their work on adaptation, the program could promote a wider set of resilience building activities for rural residents, beyond agriculture. Climate finance, on the other hand, is partly provided in Official Development Assistance and partly in other European institutions. The focus of this program on climate adaptation solutions delivered through ODA specifically makes sense, leaving other Oxfam programs to work on different institutions responsible for climate finance, developing the relationships and skills sets necessary for that specialized work.
5. The evaluation confirmed that the use of media has been a key tool to disseminate research results, draw public attention, educate the general public, set political agendas, and do direct advocacy, especially at country level. In the future, we recommend sharing media resources across countries, and developing the capacity to assess the results of media engagement.
6. The TAP program has already seen some of the benefits of building the capacity of women and smallholder farmers to advocate on their own behalf. The program has worked well with farmers organizations in advocacy campaigns, especially in Africa. However, reports and interviews gave the impression that Female Food Heroes were speaking as individuals, rather than as members of larger organizations and coalitions. Building the capacity of farmer groups, rather than just individuals, and facilitating them to form strong coalitions can have long term benefits. Oxfam can play a facilitating role with strengthened groups and coalitions. The skill imparted to the farmer groups can be used to also advocate for other services from government that are relevant to enhancing their resilience, such as health facilities and job opportunities. This strategy can make it clearer to target policy makers which respective farmer groups they are engaging with when Oxfam facilitates sessions for interaction. It can also increase the participation of smallholder farmers in high-level meetings with government officials and fashioning work plans with civil society coalition.


V. Appendices

Appendix A – Patterns of Outcomes




Who Changed? – Since the definition of an outcome for this report is *changes in the behavior, relationships, practices, policies, or actions of an individual, group, or institution*, this chart shows who changed in each outcome.

At what level did the outcome occur?




At what level did the outcome occur? – This chart shows the primary place where the outcomes occurred in terms of hierarchy – national, regional/continental (which included the EU, AU, and regional organizations such as ECOWAS or the FAO Committee for Food Security), and subnational (state/district/county).

What policies and practices changed by region?



What policies and practices changed by region? – This chart shows outcomes broken down into the categories of discourse, practice, and policy in Europe, Africa, and African Union, following the three goals of the program.

Level of Significance to the Theory of Change



Level of Significance to the Theory of Change – We defined Level of Significance as follows:

- **high** – policy change or change in practice affecting large numbers of people, or setting precedents that will have wide application. Change in discourse only if from an extremely influential source
- **medium** – local level policy change, or national level change in policy and practice affecting fewer people. Change in discourse or organizational capacity
- **low** – meaningful to a small number of people, or one of many steps on a path to outcomes of more significance
- **none** – no change in the situation.

This chart correlates level of significance with the three goals of the program – changes among African governments, European governments, and the CAADP Biennial Review process. The colors correspond to the level of significance of each outcome, and the chart shows the number of each outcome by goal and level of significance.

Appendix B – Program Research Reports and Learning Products

Africa Centre for Energy Policy (ACEP) (2020) Making Petroleum Investments Work for Sustainable Agriculture and Education in Ghana. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep31201?refreqid=pub-view%3A67ebb53cc924efe52c5ce63a3f3150f8>

Alvin Munyasia (2020) The Impact of COVID-19 on Small-scale Farming, Food Security and Sovereignty in Africa. <https://panafrica.oxfam.org/latest/policy-paper/impact-covid-19-small-scale-farming-food-security-and-sovereignty-africa>

Bertha O. Koda and Lilian V. Mtasingwa (2020) Gender Responsive Budgeting in Tanzania. Research Report, Unpublished.

CAADP Non-State Actors Coalition (2019) CAADP BR Toolkit. <https://au.int/en/caadp/toolkit>

Camille Chalmers, Guelsonne Calixte, François Gérard Junior Denart, Tonny Joseph, and Marc J. Cohen (2020) Can Haiti's Peanut Value Chain Survive US Generosity? Political economy analysis. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/can-haitis-peanut-value-chain-survive-us-generosity-political-economy-analysis-620981>

DAB Development Research and Training PLC (2020) Research on Gender Responsive Budgeting in Agriculture. Oxfam Office in Ethiopia. Unpublished.

Faye Duan (2020) Policy Landscape for the Scaling-Up of Agroforestry in Mali. <https://www.oxfamamerica.org/explore/research-publications/policy-landscape-scaling-agroforestry-mali/>

GEMSOL SOCIAL (2021) Scoping study on policies, institutions and interventions to empower female food producers in Oromia and Gambella. Unpublished.

Hanna Saarinen (2020) The fight against hunger must top the EU agenda for a fair and green recovery. Blog. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/blogs/fight-against-hunger-must-top-eu-agenda-fair-and-green-recovery>

Hanna Saarinen and Claire Godfrey (2019) Assessing the effectiveness of private finance blending in ensuring that small-scale farmers are not left behind. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/accountability-deficit-assessing-the-effectiveness-of-private-finance-blending-620753>

Hélène Botreau and Marc J. Cohen (2019) Gender Inequalities and Food Insecurity: Ten years after the food price crisis, why are women farmers still food-insecure? Oxfam Briefing Paper. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/gender-inequalities-and-food-insecurity-ten-years-after-the-food-price-crisis-w-620841>

Hélène Botreau and Marc J. Cohen (2020) “Gender Inequalities and Food Insecurity” at the 4th International Conference on Global Food Security, held virtually on December 9, 2020.

Hélène Botreau, Valentin Brochard, and Pauline Verrière (2021) Une pincée d'agroécologie pour une louche d'agro-industrie : une recette à la française. Research Report. <https://www.oxfamfrance.org/rapports/une-recette-a-la-francaise-une-pincee-dagroecologie-pour-une-louche-dagro-industrie>

Ibrahim Akalbila, Emmanuel Ayifah, Lisa Hilt, Hafiz Muntaka, and Rebecca Rewald (2020) Gender-Responsive Budgeting in Ghana: An analysis of GRB implementation and its existing and potential impacts on women small-scale farmers. <https://www.oxfamamerica.org/explore/research-publications/gender-responsive-budgeting-ghana-analysis/>

Laté Lawson-Lartego and Marc J. Cohen (2020) 10 Recommendations for African Governments to Ensure Food Security for Poor and Vulnerable Populations During COVID-19. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12571-020-01062-7>

Laura Roper and Chris Stalker (2021) Exploring the Conditions for Effective Policy Implementation through CSO Advocacy. Unpublished.

Marc Anglade, Marc J. Cohen, and Tonny Joseph (2019) USAID's Appui à la Valorisation du Potentiel Agricole du Nord, pour la Sécurité Économique et Environnementale (AVANSE) Project in Haiti: An assessment of its conformity with aid effectiveness principles, Oxfam Research Backgrounder. <https://www.oxfamamerica.org/explore/research-publications/usaid-avanse-project-in-haiti/>

Marc J. Cohen (2019) Let them Eat Promises: Global Policy Incoherence, Unmet Pledges, and Misplaced Priorities Undercut Progress on SDG 2. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s41055-019-00048-2>

Marc J. Cohen (2020) Agriculture and Energy in Haiti: Sustaining Livelihoods and Natural Resources to Achieve Zero Hunger and Affordable and Clean Energy” during the virtual 32nd Annual Conference of the Haitian Studies Association.

Marc J. Cohen (2020) Oxfam Resilient Agriculture Programming in Haiti: At the Intersection of Nature, Wealth and Power. Presented at the Intersection of Nature, Wealth and Power at the virtual meeting of the Haitian Studies Association Working Session on Environment.

Nafkote Dabi (2021) The International Climate Adaptation Summit needs to deliver for developing countries adapting to climate change. Oxfam blog. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/blogs/international-climate-adaptation-summit-needs-deliver-developing-countries-adapting-climate>

Netherlands Agriculture and Horticultural Association (2020) The Impact of COVID-19 on food in Africa (in Dutch)

Oxfam (2020) Agriculture, food security and COVID-19: Oxfam's recommendations on how the EU and its member states can support effective responses to COVID-19 in partner countries and help create a fairer and more resilient food system. Unpublished.

Oxfam (2020) Gender tool on large scale land-based investment translated into Kiswahili. Mwongozo wa jamii - mwongozo wa ushiriki wa jamii unaozingatia jinsia kwenye uwekezaji mkubwa katika ardhi.

Oxfam (2020) The Hunger virus: how COVID-19 is fuelling hunger in a hungry world. Media Briefing. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/the-hunger-virus-how-covid-19-is-fuelling-hunger-in-a-hungry-world-621023>

Oxfam and 14 CSOs (2020) Raising the ambition on global aspects of the EU Farm to Fork Strategy. Civil Society recommendations. https://foodpolicycoalition.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Raising_ambition_global-aspects_EU-F2F.pdf

Oxfam in Burkina Faso (2018) Analyse du budget agricole de 2016 à 2018. Unpublished.

Oxfam in Ethiopia (2018) Spending Smart: Quality public spending and budget tracking on agriculture key drivers for change in Ethiopia. Unpublished.

Oxfam Novib (2019) Towards a world without hunger in 2030 – the Dutch contribution. A policy brief

Pauline Chetcuti, Marc J. Cohen, Emily Farr, and Mathew Truscott (2020) Later Will Be Too Late: How extreme levels of hunger have not been averted despite alarms. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/later-will-be-too-late-how-extreme-levels-of-hunger-have-not-been-averted-despi-621065>

Rebecca Rewald (2020) Making Gender-Responsive Budgeting Work for Women Small-Scale Farmers: Lessons from Ethiopia, Ghana, and Tanzania. <https://www.oxfamamerica.org/explore/research-publications/making-gender-responsive-budgeting-work-for-women-small-scale-farmers/>

SEND Ghana (2019) Analysis of the 2019 Food and Agriculture Sector Budget. Unpublished.

Sintad PITS PLC (2019) Undertaking a research on improving the quality of agriculture public spending and budget tracking.

Teferi Tolera (2019) Specific bottlenecks impeding small-scale female food producers' production and productivity in the smallholder agriculture sector: Insights from the experiences of Oxfam Female Food Heroes. Assessment Report.

Teresa Cavero (2019) Social accountability of climate and agriculture finance.

Tracy Carty (2021) The People being left behind in the climate emergency. Oxfam blog.

Tracy Carty, Jan Kowalzig, and Bertram Zagema (2020) Climate Finance Shadow Report 2020: Assessing Progress towards the \$100 Billion Commitment. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/climate-finance-shadow-report-2020-assessing-progress-towards-the-100-billion-c-621066/>

Appendix C – Key Informant Interviews

	Country	Gender	Type
1	Burkina Faso	M	Oxfam Staff
2	Burkina Faso	M	Government
3	Cross-Strand	M	Oxfam Staff
4	Cross-Strand	F	Oxfam Staff
5	Ethiopia	M	Oxfam Staff
6	Ethiopia	M	Government
7	Ethiopia	F	Partner
8	EU	F	Oxfam Staff
9	EU	F	Government
10	France	F	Oxfam Staff
11	France	F	Oxfam Staff
12	France	M	Government
13	France	F	Government
14	France	F	Ally
15	Ghana	M	Oxfam Staff
16	Ghana	M	Partner
17	Ghana	F	Community Member
18	Italy	M	Oxfam Staff
19	Italy	M	Oxfam Staff
20	Italy	M	Partner
21	Nigeria	F	Oxfam Staff
22	Nigeria	M	Ally
23	Nigeria	M	Partner
24	Pan-Africa Programme	M	Ally
25	Pan-Africa Programme	M	Oxfam Staff
26	The Netherlands	F	Oxfam Staff
27	The Netherlands	M	Government
28	The Netherlands	F	Ally