|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CRITERIA/BASIS FOR SUCCESS | INDICATORS/  EVIDENCE | POSITIVE/FACILITATING FACTORS | NEGATIVE/HINDERING FACTORS |
| 1. Participation in GAFSP and other public processes | -proactively seeking information about project (Cambo)  -informed and involved other CSOs (Cambo)  -strong geographical and sectoral participation (Nepal)  -setting up of broad platform of FOs and associated CSO (CSA)  -making use of established platform to take part in public programs  -FOs not involved in policy and project dev and implementatn due to absence of strong FOs (Bangladesh) | CSA/ASIAD:  -willingness and capacity to explain need for participation  -design of GAFSP project (annex 3) and awareness of it  -sharing of experiences by farmer leaders from GAFSP countries  -linking of global/ opportunities processes to local processes/ opportunities  AFA:  -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  AFRICA:  -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 | 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  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) |
| 1. CSO/FO consolidation and platform building | -coordinated efforts  -presence of unified platform  -institutional agreement-institution of CSO engagement in strategic plans  -no common structure/ platform/ agenda among CSOs yet (Cambo) | -info from AFA  -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 |  |