|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CRITERIA/BASIS FOR SUCCESS | INDICATORS/  EVIDENCE | POSITIVE/FACILITATING FACTORS | NEGATIVE/HINDERING FACTORS |
| **Participation** | | | |
|  | +strong geographical and sectoral participation (Nepal) | -proactively seeking information about project (Cambo)  -willingness and capacity to explain need for participation (CSA)  -design of GAFSP project (annex 3) and awareness of it (CSA)  -sharing of experiences by farmer leaders from GAFSP countries (CSA)  -linking of global/ opportunities processes to local processes/ opportunities (CSA) |  |
|  | -FOs not involved in policy and project dev and implementatn (Bangladesh) |  | - absence of strong FOs (Bangladesh) |
| **CSO Consolidation** | | | |
|  | -coordinated efforts/ presence of unified platform (Mongolia)  -institutional agreement/ institution of CSO engagement in strategic plans (Mongolia)  -setting up of broad platform of FOs and associated CSO (CSA)  -making use of established platform to take part in public programs (CSA)  -no common structure/ platform/ agenda among CSOs yet (Cambo) | -informed and involved other CSOs (Cambo)  -info from AFA (Cambo)  -personal relationship with different groups/social capital (Nepal)  -timing/conducive political situation  -dynamic NGOs/FOs and good leadership (Nepal)  -professionalism of ANFPA and WOCAN (Nepal)  -initial/warm up fund from AFA and TA of Esther/AFA (Nepal)  -very inclusive leadership in CSO platform  -presence of the project facilitated the coming together of NGOs (Mongolia)  -global network support/solidarity/synergy  -mutual confidence building  -policy advocacy rather than just political action |  |
|  |  |  | -some misunderstandings (Nepal)  -lack of financial resources intended for CSO consolidation (Mong)  -lack of TA  -strategy not yet institutionalized; extenernal support can build on that (Mong) |
| 1. Openness of government/ Engagement with government in GAFSP and other public processes | -expressed realization of gov of the need for FO participation (Cambo)  -invitation from government to meetings (Cambo)  -link of FOs to political parties (Nepal)  -access to space for engagement and access of resources (Nepal)  -access to relevant project information  -actual partnership in proj implementation as service providers (bidding)  -MEF, CARD, and rural dev bank joined the national consultation (Cambo)  -gov still not organized to engage CSO (Cambo)  - | -democratic space in the country  -past experience with other programs  -IFAD grant for FO participation  -sharing of the global process to national government  -strong coalition of FOs with CSOs  -Esther/AFA sharing and spreading of info to FNN  -AFA, AsiaDHRRA, Agricord support  -influence by Dr Koma on gov policy, esp Agri Ministry; was invited by prime minister to dialogue with CSOs abt dev in Cambo  -transparency and inclusiveness | -historical/cultural context -weakness of FOs/lack of strong demand from FOs to be engaged |
| 1. Capacity building/ empowerment of FO/CSO | -FO ownership of project (expressed comment)  -existence of strong and dynamic FOs (partnership with other CSOs)  -institutionalized participation of FOs in GAFSP and other processes  --part of GAFSP SC  --gov responds to CSO GAFSP SC comments  --responsiveness to the need of small scale farmers | -sharing of resource persons from other regions  -learning from experiences and lesson from other countries  -strong FO leadership |  |
| 1. Access to resources/ Concrete gains from GAFSP and other public processes | - Mainstreaming of agricultural project/agenda in broader national/regional dev framework/gov instrument  --leveraging of existing experiences and initiatives  -able to get budget for consultations  -mobilizing resources for other agencies | -CAADIP  -EPA |  |
| **AFA (ESTHER)** |  |  |  |
| Institutionalized mechanisms for participation and involvement of FOs | --partly successful (present in Nepa; absent in Mongolia, Cambodia, Bangladesh)  --successful at global level:  --FOs represented in global GAFSP SC  --comments/ feedback considered  --decision making in GAFSP SC is by consensus  --resources for FOs/ CSOs in GAFSP SC to inform constituents  --at national level:  --partly successful:  --FOs in national (Nepal)  --government recognizes that FOs/NGOs have capacity to provide services (Cambo)  --not successful:  --participation not yet institutionalized (Mong)  --partly successful:  --there is FO in SC, but not from CSO platform (Bangladesh) | -maximization of position in global steering committee  -capacity of staff, members, partners to provide technical assistance  -linking with others  -resources for building capacity  -leveraging resources | AFA:  -varying government openness  -lack of openness by public sector window  -inadequate knowledge and skills of FOs  -FOs role in food sec not recognized by government  -some governments have preferences for gov-established FOs/NGOs |
| Supportive Policies | -FOs/ CSOs say GAFSP project responds to needs, but the implementation matters |  |  |
| Strong FOs (partly successful) | -Nepal is very good in demanding policies  -others just starting to exact accountability  -Bangladesh establishing participation for technical assistance |  |  |
| FO-NGO participation in country is farmer-directed and led | -successful: FO and NGO platforms in all countries  -partly successful: Bang, Mong FOs not that storng |  |  |
| **CSA (MAREK)** |  |  |  |
| Level of participation | Setting up of broader platform and associated CSOs |  |  |
|  | Participation in mainstream GAFSP program |  |  |
|  | Making use of newly established platform to take part in public programs |  |  |
|  | Linking of participation at local, national, global levels |  |  |
| Openness of government | -invitation of FOs in official committee  -meetings with government  -openness achieved in GAFSP in other public programs  -collaboration with regional and international entities helped open door |  |  |
| Capacity building | -GAFSP and public program |  |  |
| Access to resources | -some FOs able to access resources for strengthening themselves/platform  -access to GAFSP bidding for services  -some entities directly finance FO participation while mobilizing GAFSP fund |  |  |
| **ASIADHRRA (MARL)** |  |  |  |
| CSO consolidation | -national platforms created  -engaging government beyond GAFSP |  |  |
| Participation in regional and international process | -GAFSP CSO initiative  -openness to the process |  |  |
| Openness of government | -link with ADB and other institutions |  |  |
| Capacity building |  |  |  |
| **MONGOLIA (ADRA)** |  |  |  |
| CSO platform | -functional core group |  |  |
| Institutional agreement to pursue common agenda | -partnership agreement |  |  |
| Engagement of CSOs in platform reflected in their strategic plans | -strategic plan |  |  |
| **CAMBODIA (SOPHEAP)** |  |  |  |
| Level of participation | -participation in consultations  -informing others | -proactive information gathering | -government did not involve FOs/and CSOs |
| Level of partnership | -good relationship |  |  |
| Government recognition | -100 target communes shared | -FNN known through GAFSP cso SUPPORT |  |
| **AFRICA (MAMADOU)** |  |  |  |
|  |  | -policy dialogue among all actors for national development agenda  -all programs/actions refer to this; realize all external opportunities to realize national agenda  -past experiences (Nepal)  -basic understanding of the process | AFRICA:  -lack of capacity and common understanding of government executives (even with minister/president agreement)  -lack of transparency in gov (Mongolia)  -lack of info and transparency from gov  -project already designed  -changes in gov/political constraints (GAFSP suspended due to election)  -lack of proactive action from CSO (first time)  -FOs organized for specific issues and process that is the interest of NGOs; not concerned about sustainability of FOs after proj (Bang) |