**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