



August 30, 2016

COUNTRY GUIDELINES
FOR PUBLIC SECTOR WINDOW PROPOSALS:
FOURTH CALL FOR PROPOSALS

1. Focus of the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program

1. The focus of the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) is on the longer-term agenda to improve the income and food security of poor people in developing countries through more and better country-led public and private sector investment in raising agricultural productivity, linking farmers to markets, reducing risk and vulnerability, and improving non-farm rural livelihoods, and through technical assistance. The objective of this mechanism is to fill the financing gaps in country and regional agriculture and food security strategies, thereby contributing to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals to end poverty and hunger by 2030.

2. GAFSP is comprised of two financing windows: (i) the Public Sector Window that, through grants, finances public investment and technical assistance to **support implementation of country-led initiatives**, giving priority to those with evidence of stakeholder participation from project design to implementation, and (ii) the Private Sector Window that provides long- and short-term loans, credit guarantees, equity investment, and technical assistance to the private sector for activities in agricultural development and food security. For the scope of eligible activities see the GAFSP Framework Document: [http://www.gafspfund.org/sites/gafspfund.org/files/Documents/GAFSP%20Framework%20Document%20FINAL%20\(external\).pdf](http://www.gafspfund.org/sites/gafspfund.org/files/Documents/GAFSP%20Framework%20Document%20FINAL%20(external).pdf)

3. While the bulk of the Public Sector Window proposals financed to date have focused on projects aimed primarily at raising agricultural productivity, the Steering Committee would like to continue to emphasize that there is no particular preference for any of the five key components described in the Framework document. Technically sound proposals that reduce risk and vulnerability and increase the impact of agricultural interventions through emphasis on key cross-cutting themes such as nutrition (direct nutrition interventions or nutrition sensitive agricultural activities) or gender equality (as reflected in Annexes 1 and 2) or climate smart agriculture are fully eligible for GAFSP funding, as are public-private partnerships. The Steering Committee looks forward to receiving a broad range of proposals in this Public Sector Window Call. Priority will be given to proposals that are able to demonstrate high likelihood of effective implementation given the specific country context.

2. Eligible Countries

4. The call for proposals will be open to all members of the International Development Association (IDA) that are eligible to receive financing from IDA and not IBRD (“IDA-only countries”) and that are not in non-accrual status¹. This currently includes 56 countries:

Africa <i>(32 countries)</i>			East Asia and the Pacific <i>(11 countries)</i>	ECA <i>(3 countries)</i>	Latin America <i>(4 countries)</i>	Middle East <i>(1 country)</i>	South Asia <i>(5 countries)</i>
Benin	Guinea	Rwanda	Cambodia	Kosovo	Guyana	Yemen	Afghanistan
Burkina Faso	Guinea-Bissau	Sao Tome & Principe	Kiribati	Kyrgyz Rep.	Haiti		Bangladesh
Burundi	Kenya		Lao PDR	Tajikistan	Honduras		Bhutan
CAR	Lesotho	Senegal	Marshall Islands		Nicaragua		Maldives
Chad	Liberia	Sierra Leone	Micronesia, FS				Nepal
Comoros	Madagascar	South Sudan	Myanmar				
Côte d’Ivoire	Malawi	Tanzania	Samoa				
Djibouti	Mali	Togo	Solomon Islands				
DRC	Mauritania	Uganda	Tonga				
Ethiopia		Zambia	Tuvalu				

¹ Nonaccrual status occurs when the oldest payment arrears are six months overdue. Once all arrears are cleared, all loans to, or guaranteed by, the country are generally restored to accrual status.

Gambia Ghana	Mozambique Niger		Vanuatu				
-----------------	---------------------	--	---------	--	--	--	--

3. Country Selection Criteria

5. With limited resources available, not all country proposals can be financed. Priority will be given to IDA-only countries with greatest need, with a conducive policy environment, and to those which are more implementation ready. The Technical Advisory Committee will use cross-country benchmarks (such as those referenced below) and the information provided in individual country proposals to undertake a relative assessment of country submissions. Decisions on country allocations will be based on a relative weighting of 30:30:40 assigned to measures of country need, country readiness, and proposal readiness. These measures will include:

- **Country Need (Overall weight of 30):** Countries with greatest need will be given priority, as assessed by their IDA-only status, as well as indicators associated with the Sustainable Development Goals to end poverty and hunger, specifically: (i) the proportion of people below the \$1.90 (2011 PPP) per day poverty line; (ii) the poverty gap ratio; (iii) the prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age, and (iv) the percent of the population below the minimum dietary energy consumption.
- **Country Readiness (Overall weight of 30):** Much of the country readiness assessment will be through the evaluation of individual country proposals, which will also include an assessment of the policy environment. A current² Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) National Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (NAIP), and an associated CAADP technical review report is a pre-requisite for African countries to apply for GAFSP financing. For those African countries that have completed implementation of a CAADP NAIP, a summary of implementation performance and achievements of the completed investment plan should be provided in the proposal submission, in addition to their new/current Investment Plan. If a new investment plan has not been finalized, country submissions must instead include a Malabo Declaration country implementation Roadmap that captures the intent of both an investment plan and a multi-year spending plan, based on the June 30, 2016 African Union Commission/NEPAD Planning and Coordination Agency (AUC/NPCA) ‘Under Malabo’ CAADP guidelines³. For non-African countries a current comprehensive agriculture and food security strategy and an associated investment plan that has undergone an independent technical review⁴, covering similar technical aspects as the CAADP reviews, will be used to assess country readiness⁵ and will need to be provided as a pre-requisite for submission. For all submissions, if the technical review highlights significant shortcomings, the government should indicate how these have been or will be addressed. For all countries, a summary of implementation

² The CAADP NAIP should be under implementation and within the timeframe of the implementation period originally set out within the plan.

³ The submitted country Roadmap document should cover the same elements outlined in Annex 1, Sections 1.1 through 1.5, so that it can be assessed in a comparable way to other submissions as part of the country’s Overall Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and Associated Investment Plan.

⁴ Guidance on the elements of the technical review for non-African Country Investment Plan consistent with the CAADP approach is provided in Annex 2.

⁵ Guidance on the elements of the technical review is provided in the second to last column of the Annex 1 table on “Part 1: Summary of Overall Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and Associated Investment Plan”.

performance of their current investment plan should be provided in the proposal submission. Supplementary information on the CAADP technical review process can be found at⁶:

<http://www.nepad-caadp.net/content/country-caadp-implementation-guidelines-under-malabo-declaration>

<http://www.nepad-caadp.net/content/directives-mise-en-oeuvre-du-pddaa-pays-sous-la-d%C3%A9claration-de-malabo>

- **Proposal Readiness (Overall weight of 40):** The specific proposal for GAFSP financing will primarily be assessed against: (i) specific objectives, expected results, and targeted beneficiaries, (ii) justification for proposed approach, (iii) activities to be financed, (iv) implementation arrangements, (v) amount of financing requested and time frame for implementation, (vi) post-project sustainability and exit strategies, (vii) risks and risk management, and (viii) consultation with local stakeholders and development partners (detailed on pg. 11-15). The project proposal is not expected to be equivalent to an appraisal stage document, but rather to be at a pre-appraisal stage. The proposal document will serve two purposes, first to provide information to guide the proposal assessments by the Technical Advisory Committee, and second to provide information to the selected supervising entity(ies) to help speed preparation (with the provision of upfront information), and guide the subsequent more detailed design.

4. Outline of Proposals from Eligible Countries and Available Financing

6. *Two part proposal:* Country proposals will have two parts (see Annex 1 for more details).

Part 1: *Summary of Overall Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and Associated Investment Plan.* All eligible countries that apply for GAFSP financing should summarize the country's overall agriculture and food security strategy and associated investment plan in Part 1 of their proposal. *African countries* with a current CAADP National Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (NAIP) and associated CAADP technical review report should summarize the outcome of that process, including steps being or to be undertaken to address issues raised in the technical review report. For those African countries that have completed implementation of a CAADP NAIP, summarize the current comprehensive agriculture and food security strategy and any new investment plan that has been prepared, including evidence of the consultation process underpinning the development of the plan, and the steps being or to be undertaken to address issues raised in the independent external technical review. *If a new investment plan has not yet been finalized,* the proposal must include a summary of implementation performance and achievements of the completed investment and a summary of the Malabo Declaration country implementation Roadmap⁷ that captures the intent of both an investment plan and a multi-year spending plan, based on the June 30, 2016 AUC/NPCA 'Under Malabo' CAADP guidelines. For non-African countries, summarize the current comprehensive agriculture and food security strategy and an associated investment plan, including evidence of the consultation process underpinning the development of the plan, and the steps being or to be undertaken to address issues raised in the independent external technical review. The technical review, covering similar technical aspects as the CAADP reviews, will be used to assess country readiness and will need

⁶ 2016 is considered a transitional year with updated CAADP guidelines, following the Malabo Declaration, recently shared by the NEPAD CAADP Secretariat at the links above. For future Calls for Proposals, full consistency with these new CAADP guidelines will be expected.

⁷ The country Roadmap document should cover the same elements outlined in Annex 1, Sections 1.1 through 1.5, so that it can be assessed in a comparable way to other submissions as part of the country's Overall Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and Associated Investment Plan.

to be provided as a pre-requisite for submission (for non-African countries, see Annex 1, Part 1, column 3⁸). For all countries, a summary of implementation performance of their current investment plan should be provided in the proposal submission.

Part 2: Specific Proposal for GAFSP Financing: Provide details on the specific proposal for GAFSP financing. The proposals should be part of a clear, coherent, appropriately scaled, and inclusive strategy and investment plan that will contribute to improving food security, including through enhancing smallholder production and incomes. Countries applying for a second or subsequent GAFSP grant will need to provide evidence of implementation performance, impact, and additionality of previous GAFSP grant(s). If the country is requesting a project preparation grant (see paragraph 9), this should be included as an annex to Part 2 of the country proposal (see Annex 5 for more details). The GAFSP proposal is expected to provide the GAFSP Steering Committee with sufficient information to allow financing prioritization to country-led proposals.

7. *Sections and content:* The sections and content guide for the GAFSP proposal is provided in Annex 1 (Part 1 and 2). All sections must be completed for the GAFSP Steering Committee to be able to make an informed decision on resource allocations.

8. *Engagement with preferred supervising entities:* The preferred supervising entity (or entities) to support implementation of the project (African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, International Fund for Agricultural Development, Inter-American Development Bank, or the World Bank for investment and technical assistance, and/or Food and Agriculture Organization and World Food Programme for technical assistance – always in association with a parallel investment) needs to be specified. Countries should engage with the supervising entity (or entities) on the preparation of the proposal. Where applicable, the proposal should clearly specify the anticipated share of the proposed project that will focus on investment and the anticipated share that will focus on technical assistance, in consultation with the country's preferred supervising entity (or entities if more than one). For successful proposals, grant amounts will be awarded by the Steering Committee, with the final share of the proposed project that will focus on investment and on technical assistance to be reviewed and finalized during the joint detailed project formulation and appraisal.

9. *Project Preparation Grant:* A country has the option to request project preparation funds from GAFSP in the event that it is difficult to source sufficient and timely funds through the government budget process and if no other funding sources are available to finance project preparation. If countries need to request project preparation funds, a preparation grant request should be included as a specific annex in the country's overall proposal submission. The preparation grant request will be considered at the same time as the overall proposal financing awards (see Annex 5 for more details). The preparation grant will not be additional; it will be considered as part of the overall award and will therefore reduce the amount that could otherwise be used for other aspects of the government program. There are no GAFSP grants available for proposal preparation.

10. *Available resources for this Call:* Available resources in the GAFSP Trust Fund for 2016 are approximately \$125 million⁹ which will likely be allocated to 3 to 5 proposals among those submitted by

⁸ In the case of non-CAADP countries, the government can appoint an organization to undertake the review of the Country Investment Plan. The organization appointed should be independent from those organizations that helped prepare the investment plan and should be a recognized organization in the field of agriculture and food security. In addition, the organization should not be potential GAFSP supervising entities for investment activities (i.e. MDBs and IFAD). Reviews should be carried out by organizations and not by individuals in their personal capacity.

⁹ The total amount is tentative and may increase depending on further donor commitments received between now and the time of allocation. There is no guarantee that all deserving proposals will be funded given the limited availability of funds.

eligible countries. In order to better guide Steering Committee decisions in case resources permit only partial financing by GAFSP, it is important to prioritize the investment financing requests as required by the document template (Annex 1).

11. *Disclosure policy:* Please note that following the disclosure policy of GAFSP, successful proposal documentation will be publicly disclosed. However, if the proposal documentation includes confidential or sensitive text or data that the government does not want disclosed publicly, this should be highlighted in the submission.

12. *Language of proposal:* English is the operational language of GAFSP, thus submissions are expected in English. While the GAFSP proposals are always required to be in English, supporting documents may be submitted in French or Spanish. In exceptional cases, the Steering Committee may allow countries to submit supporting documents such as the full strategy and investment plan in other major languages. For planned submissions in other major languages please contact the GAFSP Coordination Unit (info@GAFSPfund.org).

5. Proposal submission

13. *Submission documents:* Table 1 (pg. 6-7) lists the documents required to be included in the submission package to the GAFSP Coordination Unit. The Document Checklist should clearly indicate which of the submitted documents corresponds to the items required in the list in Table 1, using the template in Annex 4.

14. *Form and deadline of submission:* Submission should be via e-mail to info@gafspfund.org. Submission documents must be in Microsoft Word, Excel, or PDF. An acknowledgement email will be sent upon confirmation of receipt. Submissions must be received by: 11.59pm, Monday January 9th, 2017 (Washington, D.C. time). No exceptions will be made on the deadline or document formats. We encourage countries to submit a few days earlier in case of any technical problems in the submission process.

Table 1: List of documents required to be included in a GAFSP submission package

For African countries	For Non-African countries	Details
(1) Document Checklist	(1) Document Checklist	Use template in Annex 4
(2) Cover letter with endorsement signature from Minister of Finance, and at least one technical ministry.	(2) Cover letter with endorsement signature from Minister of Finance, and at least one technical ministry.	Examples of relevant technical ministries: agriculture, rural development, health, women and child welfare, environment/natural resource management, etc.
(3) Evidence of support from the in-country Sector Working Group, such as a letter	(3) Evidence of support from the in-country Sector Working Group (or equivalent), such as a letter, where such groups exist (or from a major donor if such Groups don't exist).	Support from the in-country sector working group for agriculture and food security or equivalent that includes donor partners, as reflected by the signature of the Chair of the group (or a major donor if there is no official Chair). The endorsements should note that GAFSP funding builds on and complements existing programs and will not displace or duplicate other sources of funding.
(4) Statement of readiness from preferred Supervising Entity(ies) ¹⁰	(4) Statement of readiness from preferred Supervising Entity(ies)	Statement of readiness from proposed Supervising Entity(ies) indicating that they have discussed the proposal with the government, that they are willing and ready to serve as Supervising Entity, with preliminary view of the financing structure of the project (e.g., stand alone, or additional financing to an existing project). The letter should include a list of projects supported by the Supervising Entity(ies) with their associated amounts under implementation (with implementation status) and in pipeline for the country.
(5) <u>GAFSP proposal</u> (Parts 1 & 2)	(5) <u>GAFSP proposal</u> (Parts 1 & 2)	GAFSP Proposals Part 1: Summary of the Country's Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and associated Investment Plan; and Part 2: Country Proposal for GAFSP Financing (see Annex 1)
(6) Agriculture and Food Security Strategy	(6) Agriculture and Food Security Strategy	When the strategy and investment plan are not recent, countries should review implementation progress and update their plan as needed for inclusion in and prior to submitting their proposal to GAFSP.
(7) Current CAADP Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (NAIP). For African countries that have completed implementation of a CAADP NAIP: an updated comprehensive Agricultural and Food Security Investment Plan, <i>or, if this is not yet finalized</i> , a Malabo Declaration country implementation roadmap ¹¹ based on the June 30, 2016 AUC/NPCA CAADP	(7) Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan	Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan must include evidence of the consultation process underpinning the development of the Investment Plan.

¹⁰ Eligible Supervising Entities are Multilateral Development Banks (currently limited to the World Bank, African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, or Inter-American Development Bank) or IFAD (International Fund for Agricultural Development) for investment operations and/or technical assistance. For technical assistance activities only, FAO (Food Agriculture Organization) and WFP (World Food Programme) may also be identified as preferred Supervising Entities. More than one Supervising Entity per proposal is possible, but the requested division of labor must be clearly specified.

¹¹ The submitted country Roadmap document should cover the same elements outlined in Annex 1, Sections 1.1 through 1.5, so that it can be assessed in a comparable way to other submissions as part of the country's Overall Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and Associated Investment Plan.

guidelines.		
(8) CAADP Technical Review Report of the Investment Plan (or an updated version). For those African countries that have completed implementation of a CAADP NAIP: an independent and thorough technical review report of their current investment plan.	(8) An independent and thorough technical review report of the investment plan	In the case of non-CAADP countries, the government can appoint an organization to undertake the review of the Country Investment Plan. The organization appointed should be independent from those organizations that helped prepare the investment plan and should be a recognized organization or experts in the field of agriculture and food security. In addition, the organization should not be a potential GAFSP supervising entity for investment activities (i.e. multilateral development banks and IFAD).
(9) Country response to the independent review observations	(9) Country response to the independent review observations	Country response to include views on independent review observation, and how it intends to take forward the review recommendations

Annex 1

Sections and Content Guide for the GAFSP Proposal Request

Part 1 Summary of Overall Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and Associated Investment Plan [about 5-7 pages]		How this will be assessed by the GAFSP Steering Committee:	
		Overall assessment of the extent of alignment of the summary with the actual country Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and associated Investment Plan (or country Roadmap for relevant African countries ¹²), including the outcome of the CAADP or CAADP-like review and the subsequent responses to the review findings.	
Section	Content to include		Aspects of each component to be reviewed:
1.1 Overall sector strategy and investment plan, and past performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • overall agriculture and food security strategy objectives and alignment with the Sustainable Development Goals. • investment plan to achieve objectives (components, activities, indicative cost) • monitorable framework and indicators • evidence of past performance of sectoral programs • share of investment plan being financed by source, and the estimated financing gap • when the strategy and investment plan are under implementation provide a summary of implementation performance and achievements to date • for those African countries that have completed implementation of a CAADP NAIP, a summary of implementation performance and achievements of the completed investment plan. 	<p>For African countries: Review CAADP¹³ National Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan and Technical Review Report or similar external review for second phase NAIPs</p> <p>For non-African countries: Review of investment plan and an independent and thorough external peer review report of the investment plan, such as the CAADP Post-Compact technical review report.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • realism of sector plan (objectives, results, budget, national capacity, partners) • CAADP or other independent review of investment plan • Government response to independent review recommendations • actual implementation performance against stated indicators

¹² For those African countries who have completed implementation of a first CAADP NAIP and are preparing their next investment plan, it is requested that the country Roadmap covers the same elements outlined in Sections 1.1 through 1.5 in this table, so that it can be assessed in a comparable way to other submissions, as part of the country's Overall Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and Associated Investment Plan.

¹³ Including alignment with the 2014 Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods.

1.2 Key elements of the policy environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • current policies enhancing or constraining the returns to planned investment (e.g. land and water rights, trade policies, subsidies, social inclusion policies/gender, environmental policies) • pending policies/legislation envisaged to enhance planned investment returns. 	This includes review of ¹⁴ :	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidence of policies that support the sector investment plan (reference to relevant evaluations, preferably peer reviewed, attesting to impact of the policy environment) • IFAD Rural Sector Performance Scores. (https://webapps.ifad.org/members/eb/104/docs/EB-2011-104-R-50-Add-1-Rev-1.pdf)
1.3 Government commitment to agriculture and food and nutrition security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relative financial commitments to the agriculture sector and/or food security goals • poverty focus of agricultural investments • summary of agriculture sector/food security and nutrition public expenditures (current and recent trends of public spending shares on agriculture and food security, composition of spending, and budgeted compared to actual expenditures) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Likelihood for the investment plan to realize growth and poverty reduction 2. Technical realism (alignment of resources with results) and adequacy of institutional arrangements to implement 3. An inclusive review and consultation process 4. Consistency of country budgetary and development assistance commitments with the country investment plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • current actual and 5-year trend of public spending shares on agriculture and food security • budgeted compared to actual expenditures and explanations for differences • measures such as agricultural research intensity from the Agricultural Science & Technology Indicators (http://www.asti.cgiar.org/data/) • Hunger and Nutrition Commitment Index (www.hancindex.org) • other evidence of government commitment to improving food and nutrition security¹⁵.
1.4 Process by which the strategy and investment plan were developed and, where relevant, updated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • process used to develop the agriculture and food security strategy and investment plan, including depth of consultation with domestic stakeholders, especially smallholders and women farmers, producer organizations, and vulnerable groups (youth indigenous groups etc). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Adequacy of institutional arrangements for effective and efficient delivery, including M&E 6. Coherence and or consistency between policies, implementation arrangements and delivery mechanisms, and investments areas, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • quality of participation and consultation with local stakeholders (smallholders and women farmers, farmer organizations, civil society, private sector, other grassroots groups, and parliament). • clear and verifiable evidence of participation by key self-selected civil/stakeholder groups, including farmer groups, the private sector and other civil society organizations, in the preparation of the strategy and investment plan and a mechanism to facilitate such participation in the execution of the proposed activities. [See Annex 3 for list of verifiable criteria upon which this will be assessed by the Technical Advisory Committee]. • whether the strategy and associated investment plan present clear and verifiable evidence that they are country-owned and country-led and that the country is fully committed to their implementation.

¹⁴ See Annex 2 for Guidelines for Review of non-African Country Investment Plan Consistent with the CAADP approach.

¹⁵ Countries may wish to reference guidance such as the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) principles for responsible investment in agriculture and food systems, and other relevant guidelines: [Products | Committee on World Food Security](#)

<p>1.5 Implementation arrangements and capacity to implement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • institutional arrangements for implementation (including inter-ministerial co-ordination) • human resources to implement (including agriculture researchers, extension services/officers, management and co-ordination, education, agriculture-nutrition linkages – staff number, gender, qualifications). • role of central and local government, private sector (particularly in public-private partnerships), civil society, and development partners. • implementation performance of past program/projects <p><i>Mandatory for countries that have received a past GAFSP grant allocation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide a section that clearly outlines evidence of past implementation performance and the impact of activities from previous GAFSP projects in the country. 	<p>priorities or program objectives</p> <p>7. Appropriateness and feasibility of the indicators for impact and system for capacity improvement and accountability</p> <p>8. Extent and quality of dialogue, (peer) review and mutual accountability system</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assessed against the adequacy of the human resources available to implement the agriculture and food security investment plan • agricultural Sector Working Group membership, other committees • ministerial institutional reviews • list of major donor-funded projects, funding size, and their implementation status <p><i>For countries that have received a previous GAFSP grant allocation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • implementation performance and impact of previous GAFSP projects in the country.
--	--	--	---

Part 2 Specific proposal for GAFSP financing [about 10-15 pages]		
Section	Content	How this will be assessed by the GAFSP Steering Committee
2.1 Specific objectives, expected results, and target beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specific objectives • expected results • links with the overall sector strategy and investment plan • indicative beneficiary numbers disaggregated by gender share and/or other vulnerable groups • indicative M&E framework and indicators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assessed against the objectives of the GAFSP Framework Document and its results framework, including the emphasis on women, and smallholder farmers (http://www.gafspfund.org/gafsp/content/monitoring-and-evaluation). • extent of link of project objective with sector investment plan • priority given to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - clear objectives - clear indication of results and disaggregated indicators - clear identification of beneficiaries (disaggregated by gender and other social criteria) - design that is within existing implementation capacity (rather than design complexity that exceeds implementation capacity) - logical framework or indicative results
2.2 Justification for the overall approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • description of overall approach chosen (combination and choice of components and activities), based on evidence of prior success or feasibility • causal link between expected results and the combination of activities/components, including the expected pathways to reduce poverty and hunger and improve nutrition • clarity on priority of this project within the broader investment plan, including links with other projects and/or government programs • policy impact (positive or negative) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assessed based on reference to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - project evaluations and performance of similar projects (for scaling up activities) - reports and scientific references supporting the approach and technologies proposed (especially new activities) • implementation performance of similar sized agriculture and food security projects, with similar design complexity in the country <p><i>For countries that have received a previous GAFSP grant allocation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - implementation performance and impact of previous GAFSP projects in the country (can reference section 1.5 and provide more detail if directly related to the GAFSP proposal being prepared e.g. type of activities, size, complexity, beneficiaries reached, impacts).

<p>2.3 Activities to be financed and their justification</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • description and rationale of components and activities chosen to be financed <p><i>For each component/activity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidence of past performance and impact of activities/models being proposed • links with the investment plan, and the scope of the GAFSP framework document • links with other projects and government programs/activities • approach to gender equality and environmental sustainability <p><i>For specific types of investments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for grants and subsidies: provide rationale for public financing (including objectives, intended beneficiaries, approximate subsidy rates, transfer modality, mechanism to eventual exit/sustainability). • for value chain projects: provide market diagnosis (reference to analysis) • for activities targeting public-private partnerships: clarify public and private roles, and how the partnership is intended to be structured. 	<p>Component/activities assessment to be based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clear presentation of each activity, including evidence for the approach taken: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - for scaling-up activities: reference to evaluation results of similar activities in-country - for new technologies: reference to evaluation results in other countries/ similar settings, or referencing scientific support for the technologies • clearly defined and explained concepts beyond the use of terms (e.g. climate smart technologies, conservation agriculture, pro-poor technologies, value chain approach and SRI) to reduce ambiguity and increase specificity of meaning • clear presentation on how activities/components are linked (justifying all activities/components) • linkages with other projects/investments, alignment with GAFSP Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for activities involving subsidies, grants or asset distribution, a clear description of the program (modalities and beneficiaries) and rationale for public financing • for value chain projects, references to associated market studies and to anticipated returns • for public-private partnerships, clear delineation of public and private roles, and how the partnership is intended to be structured • clear explanation of gender approaches to be used for each activity, beyond beneficiary numbers • clarity on environmental sustainability of activities
<p>2.4. Implementation arrangements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • institutional arrangements and inter-ministerial co-ordination • role of non-government stakeholders (civil society groups, farmer organizations and private sector) • management team and implementation • expected effect of project on capacity of implementing parties 	<p>Assessed based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clear roles defined with all implementing partners • evidence of good past co-ordination across ministries and departments • management team identified and ascribed responsibilities • institutional capacity assessment and capacity development plans <p>[See Annex 3 for list of verifiable criteria which will be included in the assessment of implementation by the Technical Advisory Committee]</p>

<p>2.5 Amount of financing requested and time frame for implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall financing requested from GAFSP, including project financing and preparation grant if applicable, other co-financing sources, and its size relative to the cost of the country's overall investment plan • provide a summarized cost table (including all relevant financing sources) and estimated unit costs for major investment items • do not include separate line items for contingencies in project cost tables (instead factor into component costs) • expected implementation period/duration of proposed financing/activities • list of past major donor funded agricultural project sizes (\$m) and implementation status • demonstrate additionality of GAFSP funding in support of the Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (and specifically additionality to financing already provided by GAFSP if the country has a previous GAFSP grant) • detailed information on the project preparation grant request, if applicable, should be included as an Annex to Part 2 of the Country Proposal (see Annex 5 for details) 	<p>Assessed based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-financing amounts and sources are clearly indicated, including government contributions, together with the likelihood of generating additional funds from other sources • summarized indicative cost table, based on indicative unit costs for larger items. Government, donor, private sector and other contributors should be included • confirmation that GAFSP funds are additional and not displacing other donor or potential private sector financing • realism of overall costs, and unit costs (recognizing that more focus will be given to this in subsequent and more detailed design and appraisal by selected supervising entities) • realism of size of project relative to past project sizes and implementation status • additionality of financing, in particular with respect to previous GAFSP financing, if already received a GAFSP grant • evidence that no other sources of funding are available to finance project preparation • Any financing that is expected to be leveraged from the private sector more broadly and in particular from the GAFSP Private Sector Window
---	--	---

<p>2.6 Preferred supervising entity (not scored)</p>	<p>Specify preferred supervising entity (African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, International Fund for Agricultural Development, Inter-American Development Bank, or the World Bank, for investment and technical assistance, and/or FAO and WFP for technical assistance) to support implementation of the project and also engage with them on the preparation of the proposal. Where applicable, the proposal should clearly specify the anticipated share of the proposed project that will focus on investment and the anticipated share that will focus on technical assistance, in consultation with the preferred supervising entity (or entities if more than one). For successful proposals, grant amounts will be awarded by the Steering Committee. The final share of the proposed project that will focus on investment and on technical assistance will be reviewed and finalized during the joint detailed project formulation and appraisal.</p>	<p>Stronger consideration will be given to country preferences, together with an additional assessment against comparative advantage of supervising entities, considerations of safeguard policies (e.g. environment and governance), leveraging of other resources, and historical relations with the recipient country. Evidence of prior discussion with the preferred supervising entity.</p>
<p>2.7 Post project sustainability and exit strategies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • project asset and services: how will assets and services be maintained after the project? • institutions and management structures: identify capacities needed to continue providing support/coordination and assurances or strategies to ensure these will be in place. • social access and inclusion: what arrangements are being put in place to ensure that social and gender equity gains on the project persist? 	<p>Assess based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clarity/indication on how the project services and assets are proposed to be sustained when the project ends, and assurance that assets will be maintained or equitably divided at the conclusion of the project (to be further detailed during project design) • clarity on how roles and responsibilities change in the course of project implementation, on capacity to assume responsibilities at end of project, and on how the project intends to proactively support capacity for continued service delivery after project completion • clarity on how the project intends to ensure that social inclusion/gender gains made in the project (e.g. decision-making, active participation, income opportunities, asset creation) continue when the project ends

2.8 Risks and risk management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • process used for the risk analysis, including who participated and their role • major risks to achievement of the specific objectives, and to each component (activity), and identification of mitigation measures • includes political, economic, institutional, environmental, social inclusion, gender, market risks that are relevant to the project 	<p>Assessed based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • describe process for conducting risk assessment/who participated and their role • narrative discussion of major risk that may affect achievement of objectives • risk matrix attached as appendix, by activity • mitigation measures reflect thorough thinking of management team • mitigation measures are described in the project and included in the budget; if external to the project, identify what organization is responsible • whether there are omissions of obvious risks
2.9 Consultation with local stakeholders and development partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • describe the process and extent of consultation with stakeholders (central and local government, private sector, farmer groups, individuals, development partners) • clearly indicate how vulnerable groups (e.g. women, landless, youth, pastoralists, pregnant and lactating women, ethnic or social minorities) were involved and any special measures to engage them • document the extent to which the consultation added value to the project design 	<p>Assessed based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participation is inclusive and representative: how were participants selected; what efforts to include women and/or vulnerable groups; were meetings decentralized/in local languages? • participation has an impact on proposal design: how has project design been improved through these consultations? <p>[See Annex 3 for list of verifiable criteria upon which this will be assessed by the Technical Advisory Committee]</p>
3.0 Plan for detailed preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • list of full time government team members who will prepare and finalize the project with the supervising entity. The list should include their current roles • expected project preparation time (including time needed for reviews and any subsequent clearances needed from government committees and parliament) • identify sources of funding necessary for project preparation (for feasibility studies, environmental safeguards, operations manuals) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear preparation plan

Annex 2

Guidelines for Review of non-African Country Investment Plans Consistent with the CAADP approach

Areas of Review	Content of Review of Country Investment Plans
Likelihood for the investment programs to realize growth and poverty reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it aligned with the growth and poverty reduction targets in the country strategy? • Is it aligned with the internationally-agreed Sustainable Development Goals to end poverty and hunger by 2030?
Technical realism (alignment of resources with results) and adequacy of institutional arrangements to implement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does it establish evidence-based feasibility, efficacy and sustainability of the proposed programs? • Has the financial and economic merit been articulated by applying specific analytical tools such as cost-benefit analysis, risk assessment and beneficiary analysis?
An inclusive review and consultation process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does it demonstrate commitment to gender integration and inclusiveness of vulnerable populations? • Does the plan present clear and verifiable evidence of participation by key stakeholder groups, including farmer groups, the private sector and other civil society organizations, in the preparation of the strategy and investment plan, and a mechanism to facilitate such participation in the execution of the proposed activities? • Does it present a plan for engagement with the private sector and civil society organizations/NGOs?
Consistency of country budgetary and development assistance commitments with the country investment plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the investment plan present a feasible financing plan with respect to both resources from the country (from public and private sources) and resources from the international donor community? • Has the phasing of individual programs within the plan been presented based on priorities and donor funding scenarios and a clear indication of any interdependence among projects? • Has a financing “gap” been put forward on which donors are expected to make programming commitments?
Adequacy of institutional arrangements for effective and efficient delivery, including M&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does it sufficiently describe inter-agency and inter-sectoral coordination (agricultural and non-agricultural sectors, such as health/nutrition, natural resource management)?
Coherence and or consistency between policies, implementation arrangements and delivery mechanisms, and investment areas, priorities or program objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are outstanding policy issues required to achieve the desired change clearly presented? • Does it demonstrate the means and capacity for effective implementation given the level of resources from the country and donor community? • Does it establish, for each investment area, clear delivery mechanisms and institutional arrangements (who does what, when) taking into consideration country policies, and program objectives?
Appropriateness and feasibility of the indicators for impact and system for capacity improvement and accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defines anticipated results and presents targets and standards by which performance will be assessed during Plan implementation • Presents a data collection and analysis system/plan to effectively monitor and report progress against the planned targets.
Extent and quality of dialogue, (peer) review and mutual accountability system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who is responsible for implementation and what is the accountability system for results, including peer review arrangements?

Annex 3

Quality of Participation Guidelines

These guidelines will be used by the Technical Advisory Committee to assess the extent to which the country investment plans (section 1.4 and 1.5 of Annex 1) and GAFSP proposals (section 2.3 and 2.9 of Annex 1) were developed in a participatory manner. These guidelines are intended to be used by governments and supervising entities to finalize and implement GAFSP supported projects and ensure regular, sustained, inclusive, and meaningful participation of relevant actors.

Key Elements and Indicators	Means of Verification
<p>1. Participation is inclusive/representative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Key actors are identified and representatives of each sector are allowed to self-select who will represent them in the participatory processes. - All interests/sectors connected with food security are invited to participate (e.g. women, smallholder producers, CSOs, private sector, public sector institutions, technical experts, donors, and others). - Particular attention has been paid to ensure the voice and participation of small scale producers. - Participation opportunities also include stakeholders from outside the capital. 	<p>Description in proposal and/or documents such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Description of selection criteria and details about how actors were selected to be included in the country proposal. - Lists of participants in key meetings. - Minutes or meeting summaries that demonstrate participation by participants. - Invitations and meeting announcements.
<p>2. Participation is well planned and more than a one-off activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is an agreed process for scheduling and organizing participation. The decision making process, roles and responsibilities of actors are clearly defined ahead of opportunities for participation; and announcements of opportunities for participation are communicated widely in advance to ensure broad participation. - Self-selected representatives of key stakeholders (including civil society groups, farmer organizations and private sector) participate in the institutional/inter-ministerial co-ordination arrangements with clearly identified roles in implementation. Representatives of key producers' organization and CSOs should be invited to be members of these committees from the outset and should designate their own representatives. - Consultations and opportunities for participation are provided regularly throughout development of the agriculture and food security strategy, the investment plan and the GAFSP proposal. - There are specific plans and platforms to ensure participatory processes during implementation. 	<p>Description in proposal and/or documents such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Documents outlining agreed process endorsed by key actors, defining roles and stating who is responsible. - CAADP Post-Compact Review for African Countries, independent technical review report for non-African countries. - Evidence that the government is addressing the recommendations concerning stakeholder involvement from the CAADP Post-Compact review (for African countries) and from the independent technical reviews (for non-African countries [see Annex 2]) - Invitations and meeting announcements.
<p>3. Participation is meaningful and transparent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation opportunities employ methodologies to ensure equal voice across genders, and of smallholder farmers. - Dissenting voices are accepted and recorded. - Minutes of meetings are recorded, provided to the participants and disseminated broadly. - Support is provided to enable broad participation of key stakeholders in consultation, implementation and for capacity building. 	<p>Description in proposal and/or documents such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TOR, methodology, and agenda endorsed by stakeholders. - (CAADP Post-Compact Review for African Countries). - Meeting reports and distribution lists. - Description and/or documentation outlining in-kind, financial or donor resources available to

	support consultation implementation and for capacity building.
4. Participation impacts project design and implementation	Description in proposal and documents such as:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is evidence of meaningful participation by key actors in the planning and implementation of the agriculture and food security strategy, the investment plan and the GAFSP proposal. - There is evidence that the agriculture and food security strategy, the investment plan and the GAFSP proposal are responsive to gender concerns. - There is evidence that input received from all actors involved in participatory processes was addressed in the investment plan and in the GAFSP proposal. - There is ownership/broad political support for the agriculture and food security strategy, for the investment plan and for the GAFSP proposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Documentation from independent, self-selected civil society/stakeholders that provides an analysis and evaluation of the design and impact of the consultation process organized by the government.

**Annex 4
Document Checklist**

Document Checklist for <u>African Countries</u>	File Name (files should be in Word, Excel, or PDF only)
(1) Document Checklist	
(2) Cover letter with endorsement signature from: a. Minister of Finance b. At least one relevant technical ministry	
(3) Endorsement letter from the in-country Sector Working Group	
(4) Letter of readiness from preferred Supervising Entity (or entities, if more than one)	
(5) GAFSP proposal (part 1 and 2)	
(6) Agriculture and Food Security Strategy	
(7) Current CAADP Post-Compact Agricultural Sector Investment Plan. For those countries that have completed implementation of a CAADP NAIP and have prepared an updated plan: a comprehensive Agricultural and Food Security Investment Plan. For those countries that have completed implementation of a CAADP NAIP and have not yet prepared an updated plan: a Malabo Declaration country implementation Roadmap, based on the June 30 2016 CAADP Guidelines and following elements described in Annex 1: 1.1-1.5	
(8) CAADP Post-Compact Technical Review Report of the Investment Plan. For those African countries that have completed implementation of a CAADP NAIP and have a new investment plan: an independent and thorough technical review report of the current investment plan.	
(9) Country response to the technical review observations	
(10) Signed CAADP Compact for those countries that have not completed implementation of a CAADP NAIP.	
Notes:	

Document Checklist For <u>Non-African countries</u>	File Name (files should be in Word, Excel, or PDF only)
(1) Document Checklist	
(2) Cover letter with endorsement signature from: a. Minister of Finance b. At least one relevant technical ministry	
(3) Endorsement letter from the in-country Sector Working Group (or equivalent) if these groups exist in-country	
(4) Letter of readiness from preferred Supervising Entity (or entities, if more than one)	
(5) GAFSP proposal (part 1 and 2)	
(6) Agriculture and Food Security Strategy	
(7) Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan	
(8) An independent and thorough peer review report of the	

investment plan	
(9) Country response to the independent review observations	
Notes:	

Annex 5

Project Preparation Grant

A recipient country may include in its proposal a request for a preparation grant to be used to assist the country in the subsequent detailed design of a project under the GAFSP Public Sector Window. The GAFSP Steering Committee will consider the preparation grant request if it awards financing to the overall proposal. The preparation grant request will be considered at the same time as the overall proposal financing awards.

Countries have the option to request preparation funds in the event that it is difficult to source sufficient and timely funds through the government budget process and no other funding sources are available to finance project preparation. A preparation grant request should be included as a specific annex in the country's overall proposal submission. The preparation grant will be made available to countries through their chosen Supervising Entities and is not additional to the GAFSP grant amounts, i.e. it will be considered as part of the overall award and will therefore reduce the amount that could otherwise be used for other aspects of the government program. The specific amount for the overall grant (excluding the preparation funds) and the funds for the preparation grant will be identified separately in the award from the GAFSP Steering Committee. The preparation grant request should include the following:

Justification: Specify the reasons for the request, including measures taken to secure alternative financing for preparation including through the public budget.

Proposed activities and associated budgets: Provide a detailed list and associated budget for the preparation activities proposed to be undertaken. The grant can only be used for the preparation of the GAFSP-financed project, which may include:

- Feasibility studies and detailed designs, including technical studies;
- Environmental and social impact assessments, gender studies and studies on project-related cross-cutting issues;
- Pre-contract services including revision of designs and tender documents;
- Institutional support, capacity development and human resource development during the project preparatory phase;
- Development of the project monitoring and evaluation framework;
- Carrying out the design and completion of the baseline studies;
- Preliminary studies for the structuring of Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) and concessions

Grant size requested: Preparation grant size is limited to a maximum of US\$500,000.

The grant must be used within 18 months from the date of Steering Committee approval. Any preparation funds that have not been disbursed after 18 months should be returned to the GAFSP Trustee. The undisbursed preparation funds cannot be added to the project grant. The recipient country should provide assurances in the preparation grant request that the preparation activities can be undertaken within the indicated time period.

The GAFSP Technical Advisory Committee will review the preparation grant request at the same time as it reviews the overall proposal requests, and will make combined recommendations to the Steering Committee. Upon approval by the Steering Committee of a preparation grant to a recipient country, the Supervising Entity requests the transfer of funds. Detailed processing of the grant will follow the policies and procedures of the same Supervising Entity that will support the government to implement the overall program, identified as the preferred Supervising Entity in the proposal submission.

A progress update on the use of and outputs financed by the preparation grant, and a final account of the use of funds should be submitted to the Steering Committee no later than 19 months after Steering Committee approval of the preparation grant. The progress update and final account of the use of funds will be submitted to the Steering Committee via the Coordination Unit for a 5-day no objection review. If no objections are received at the end of the review period, these documents will be accepted as final. If any funds remain unused, the Trustee will submit a refund request to the Supervising Entity for their return. The Supervising Entity must return any funds remaining to the Trustee upon receipt of the refund request.