**Session 2 Workshop Outputs**

**Success of FOs in being involved in GAFSP processes:**

* Yes, we are successful (Africa, Nepal, Cambodia)
* Partly successful (AFA, AsiaDHRRA, CSA)
* Not yet successful (Mongolia)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria/Basis of Success** | **Indicators/Evidences** |
| 1. GO recognition/appreciation of FOs/CSOs role/openness | * Expressed realization of government that it needs FO participation * (Factor: Link with political parties contributed to the pressure/recognition) * FOs/CSOs invited to meetings by government in GAFSP and other public projects |
| 1. Consolidation of FOs/CSOs | * Coordinated efforts of FOs/CSOs |
| 1. Solidary among FOs/CSOs | * Presence of unified platform * Functional core group * Regular meetings * Institutional commitment/agreement/consensus * Inclusion of involvement in platform in the strategic plan of the organizaton |
| 1. Level of Participation  * Proactive participation in the process through access of information from partners * Able to mobilize other FOs to participate | * Different levels of participation (geographical – district, central; sectoral – women, gender) |
| 1. FO ownership | * Expressed comment of farmers that GAFSP is our project |
| 1. Existence of strong and dynamic FO | * Partnership/relationship among FOs, NGOs, donors * FOs able to demand/exact accountability from government |
| 1. Opening democratic space | * Access to space for participation which allows FOs to access resources |
| 1. Mainstreaming of agricultural project/agenda in broader national/regional development framework/government instruments | * CAADIP – Comprehensive Agriculture Development Project * EPA – opportunity to negotiate trade agenda of FOs |
| 1. Leveraging existing experience/initiatives | * Application of previous linkages and initiatives to GAFSP |
| 1. Level of partnership with government | * Access to relevant project information * Openness to actual partnership in implementing GAFSP project by becoming service provider (bidding) |
| 1. Institutionalized participation of FO  * Broader platform/alliance * Participation of FO in mainstream GAFSP * Participation in other public programs * Linking participation at various levels (local, national, regional, global) | * Part of GAFSP SC * Government responds to CSO GAFSP SC comment * Participation in consensus decision making * Access to resources for informing constituencies * Annex 3 guideline which includes FO participation in GAFSP processes |
| 1. Responsiveness to the needs of small-scale farmers | * Comments of FOs included in the GAFSP project |
| 1. Healthy partnership among FOs and NGOs | * Presence of platform where FOs and NGOs work together * (factor/recommendation: Warm-up/seed fund to catalyze the formation of platform |
| 1. Capacity building | * Presence of training * Number of leaders who participated in training |
| 1. Access to resources | * Able to get budget for consultation process * Link with other resource agencies engaged in GAFSP which can be mobilized by FOs |

**Others**

* Contribution to broader agenda of food sovereignty
  + GAFSP as an instrument to achieve food sovereignty
  + Access to resources for food sovereignty
* Healthy relationship among FOs/CSOs
  + Presence of platform of FOs/CSOs
* Improve transparency
* Participation in management of resources
  + Decision making/control over resources
* Partnership with government
* Increased capacity to engage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **(+) Facilitating Factors** | **(-) Hindering Factors** |
| * Strong FO/leadership of FO (2) * Link with relevant groups with information and influence over government (2) * AFA as one of CSO reps in GAFSP SC (3) * Political parties (1) * NGOs/personalities (Dr. Koma) * Agri-agencies * FO regional groups (ROPPA) * Availability of warm-up/seed fund that supports the initial mobilization of broader CSO (IFAD/Agricord/WB) (2) * Experience/capacity in past engagement was capitalized/leveraged (2) * Contacts/links * Existing mechanism/\_\_\_ * Social capital/trust (1) * Maximize strategic position (AFA being member of GAFSP SC representing CSO Asia) (1) * Existing capacity to synergize * Capacity building/trainings * Learning from other groups * Investment in improving capacity for constructive engagement * Institutional commitment of FO/CSO to join/participate in the platform * Inclusion of its participation in the platform in its strategic plan * Assigned representative to attend activities/meetings * Willingness and capacity to explain/convince other FOs/CSOs to participate in public programs and link various local and global processes/synergize (1) * Program design included participation (1) * Sharing and strategic coordination among regional FOs (ROPPA, AFA, etc.) (1) * Linking/transforming global opportunities and processes to local (1) * Policy dialogue * Transparency in government * Clarify of broader agenda/vision * Link engagement with specific instrument with broader agenda * Capacity of farmer leader to push government/convince government leaders/negotiate * Buy-in of government at all levels * National, local unit * Key leaders, technical staff * Build relationship at different levels of government bureaucracy * Executive * Legislative * Monitoring process * Clarity/agreement on indicator between FO and NGO * Complementation/balancing of roles between FO and NGO as basis of good partnership * Solidarity * Sharing of roles/responsibilities in broader development work * Timing (political context, democratization) * Timely sharing of info * Complementation * Trust/relationship * Diplomacy/pragmatism * GAFSP as an instrument that provides opportunity to collaborate and build capacity to engage in other public programs | * Absence of strong FO/fragmented FO/NGO-led FO * Historical/cultural context (both positive and negative) * Weakness of FOs/lack of readiness to engage with government * For government openness: * Absence of mechanism/policy for participation * Lack of transparency (2) * Have own partner FOs and CSOs; those who will not disagree with them * Inadequate skills, knowledge on government processes and bureaucracy * Absence of common agenda and platform among FOs/CSOs * Lead government agency has no working relationship with FOs/CSOs * Lack of coordination among government agencies (Agri vs. Finance Department) * “undiplomatic” approach * Political constraint – e.g. GAFSP suspended due to election * Lack of proactive action from FOs/CSOs * Lack of clarity of priority pillar/agenda (including indicators for) * Food sovereignty * Access to resources * Transparency, etc. * Not leveled off on indicators/expectations * Competition over resources |

**Some Lessons Learned**

1. Strong FO
   1. FO leadership
   2. Strategic positioning
   3. Proactive coordination among FOs from global to national/local
2. Political Context
   1. Democratic space
   2. Government openness/transparency mechanism
3. Capacity + Attitude + Paradigm
   1. Clarity of objective/broader agenda
   2. Skill
4. Trust/relationship/social capital/solidarity
5. Networking/coordination platform
   1. Within FOs/CSOs
   2. Among GOs
6. Maximizing existing mechanisms and initiatives + past experiences
   1. Existing strategic relationship/position
   2. Leveraging
7. Design that include FO/CSO participation
8. Resources/catalytic fund