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| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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/ opportunitiesAFA:-maximization of position in global steering committee-capacity of staff, members, partners to provide technical assistance-linking with others-resources for building capacity-leveraging resourcesAFRICA:-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/NGOsAFRICA:-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 |  |