|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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) |