

Global Agriculture and Food Security Program

March 1, 2013

COUNTRY GUIDELINES
FOR PUBLIC SECTOR WINDOW PROPOSALS:
THIRD 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 MDG1 to cut hunger and poverty by half by 2015¹. **GAFSP supports only country-led initiatives**, giving priority to those with evidence of stakeholder participation from project design to implementation. For the scope of eligible activities see the GAFSP Framework Document:

<http://www.gafspfund.org/gafsp/sites/gafspfund.org/files/Documents/FrameworkDocument.pdf>

2. While the bulk of the proposals financed to date have focused on projects aimed primarily at raising agricultural productivity, the Steering Committee would like to emphasize that there is no particular preference for any of the five key components. Technically sound proposals that reduce risk and vulnerability and increase the impact of agricultural interventions through emphasis on key components 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. The Steering Committee looks forward to receiving a broad range of proposals in this Call.

2. Eligible Countries

3. 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 status². This currently includes 63 countries:

Africa (37 countries)		East Asia and the Pacific (12 countries)	ECA (4 countries)	Latin America (4 countries)	Middle East (1 country)	South Asia (5 countries)
Angola	Liberia	Cambodia	Kosovo	Guyana	Yemen	Afghanistan
Benin	Madagascar	Kiribati	Kyrgyz Rep.	Haiti		Bangladesh
Burkina Faso	Malawi	Laos PDR	Moldova	Honduras		Bhutan
Burundi	Mali	Marshall Islands	Tajikistan	Nicaragua		Maldives
Cameroon	Mauritania	Micronesia, FS				Nepal
CAR	Mozambique	Myanmar				
Chad	Sao Tome & Pr	Samoa				
Comoros	Senegal	Solomon Islands				
DRC	Sierra Leone	Timor-Leste				
Djibouti	South Sudan	Tonga				
Congo, Rep.	Tanzania	Tuvalu				
Cote d'Ivoire	Togo	Vanuatu				
Eritrea	Uganda					
Ethiopia	Zambia					
Gambia						
Ghana						
Guinea						
Guinea-Bissau						
Kenya						
Lesotho						

¹ Extract from the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program Framework Document.

² 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.

4. If additional resources become available, and where there is a compelling case, the GAFSP Steering Committee may decide on an additional call for proposals from IDA blend countries, and non-members of IDA.

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 who 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. In addition to their IDA-only status, other indicators to assess country need are those associated with the first Millennium Development Goal, specifically: (i) the proportion of people below the \$1 (PPP) per day poverty line; (ii) the poverty gap ratio; (iii) the percent of the poorest quintile in national consumption, (iv) the prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age, and (v) 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. Completion of a Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) Post-Compact investment plan, with a subsequent CAADP technical review report and business meeting is a pre-requisite for African countries to apply for GAFSP financing. For non-African countries the completion of a comprehensive agricultural development strategy and investment plan that has undergone an independent technical review, covering similar technical aspects as the CAADP reviews will be used to assess country readiness³. An independent and thorough peer review of the investment plan, comparable to that provided by a CAADP Post-Compact technical review report, must be included with the non-African country submissions⁴. If the technical review highlights significant shortcomings, the Government should indicate how these have been or will be addressed. Supplementary information on the CAADP technical review process can be found at:
<http://www.nepad-caadp.net/pdf/POST%20COMPACT%20GUIDELINE%20-%20English.pdf>
http://www.nepad-caadp.net/pdf/POST%20COMPACT%20GUIDELINE%20_French.pdf
- **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) activities to be financed, (iii) implementation arrangements, (iv) amount of financing requested, (v) time frame of proposed support (vi) risks and risk management, and (vii) consultation with local stakeholders and development partners (detailed on pg. 9-11).

4. Outline of Proposals from Eligible Countries and Available Financing

³ Guidance on the elements of the technical review is provided in the second last column of the Annex 1 table on “Part 1: Summary of 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.

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. African countries should have finalized a CAADP Post-Compact investment plan, with a subsequent CAADP technical review report, and summarize the outcome of that process, including steps being or to be undertaken to address issues raised in the technical review report. For non-African countries, an external CAADP-like review report undertaken by independent experts (see Annex 1, Part 1, column 3, and Annex 2) of the agriculture and food security strategy and associated investment plan must be provided as an integral part of the proposal⁵. This must also include evidence of the consultation process underpinning the development of the plan. When the strategy and investment plan are not recent, countries should review implementation progress and update their plan for inclusion in and prior to submitting their proposal to GAFSP.

Part 2: *Specific Proposal for GAFSP Financing:* Provide details on the specific proposal for GAFSP financing. The assessment of a GAFSP proposal is not intended to provide an in-depth judgment on all aspects of a country's entire agriculture and food security strategy and investment plan. It is, however, intended to provide the GAFSP Steering Committee with sufficient information to allow financing prioritization to country-led proposals. These 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.

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. *Financial support for preparation of proposals:* Resources from the GAFSP Trust Fund are not available from preparation of proposals, only for implementation. There are various sources of financing that could be used to assist preparation of country proposals, such as FAO-TCP (provided that the respective country agrees to use its allocation for this purpose <http://www.fao.org/tc/tcp/>); FAO Donor Trust Fund in support of country strategic planning and investment development (requests to be made through the FAO Country Representative); and the CAADP multi-donor trust fund, in the case of CAADP countries.

9. *Available resources:* Available resources in the GAFSP Trust Fund for 2013 are approximately \$175 million which will likely be allocated to 4 to 5 proposals among those submitted by 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).

10. *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

⁵ 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.

or sensitive text or data that the Government does not want disclosed publicly, this should be highlighted in the submission.

11. *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 and 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

12. *Submission documents:* Table 1 (pg. 6) 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 the Table 1, using the template in Annex 4.

13. *Form and deadline of submission:* The preferred form of submission is via e-mail to info@gafspfund.org, or alternatively, electronic device such as a CD or a flash drive may be submitted by courier to the GAFSP Coordination Unit, MSN MC5-510, The World Bank Group, 3301 Pennsy Drive, Landover, MD 20785 USA. Submission documents must be in Microsoft Word, Excel or PDF. Submissions must be received by: June 5, 2013 midnight (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	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. The endorsements should note that GAFSP funding builds up and complements existing programs and will not displace or duplicate other sources of funding.
(4) Letter of readiness from preferred Supervising Entity(ies) ⁶	(4) Letter of readiness from preferred Supervising Entity(ies)	Letter 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).
(5) GAFSP <u>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 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 for inclusion in and prior to submitting their proposal to GAFSP.
(7) CAADP Post-Compact Agricultural Sector Investment Plan	(7) Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan	Agricultural Sector Investment Plan must include evidence of the consultation process underpinning the development of the Investment Plan
(8) CAADP Post-Compact Technical Review Report of the Investment Plan	(8) An independent and thorough peer 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 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) Signed CAADP Compact	-	-
(10) Communique or resolution from the CAADP Business Meeting.	-	-

⁶ 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.

Annex 1

Sections and Content Guide for the GAFSP 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, including the outcome of the CAADP or CAADP-like review and the subsequent responses to the review findings.	
Section	Content		Aspects of each component to be reviewed:
1.1 Objectives, indicators, and past performance	Clearly state the overall agriculture and food security strategy objectives and associated investment plan, with monitorable indicators. Provide evidence of past performance of sectoral programs.	For African countries: Review CAADP Post-compact Technical Review Report	Realism of the specific targets relative to past performance, potential, and capacity to implement, including the current and planned level and composition of human resources. Evidence of past performance of sectoral programs.
1.2 Key elements of the policy environment	Clarity/assurance on the policy environment, including in relation to regional trade, (and on any proposed policy changes envisaged) to enhance planned investment returns.	For non-African countries: Review of an independent and thorough external peer review report of the investment plan, such as the CAADP Post-Compact technical review report.	Potential impact of the policy environment, including in relation to regional trade on returns to the overall investment plan. The IFAD Rural Sector Performance Scores will be used as an input in assessment of the policy environment. (https://webapps.ifad.org/members/eb/104/docs/EB-2011-104-R-50-Add-1-Rev-1.pdf)
1.3 Plan components to achieve the objectives	Key policy, institutional and other issues that constrain the achievement of the objectives (including environmental sustainability, capacity, and gender equality considerations), and how the proposed components address these constraints, and which government ministries/entities will be responsible for delivery.	This includes review of ⁷ : 1. Likelihood for the investment programs to realize growth and poverty reduction 2. Technical realism (alignment of resources with results) and adequacy of institutional arrangements to implement	Clarity of the causal link to the proposed objectives, good practice approaches in proposed components, the extent to which environmental sustainability, governance, and gender equality issues have been addressed, and government co-ordination arrangements for delivery.
1.4 Planned composition and level of spending to implement the components	Indicative cost of the components to achieve objectives, and how this compares with past public spending. Clarity on how (and why) the composition and level of public spending in agriculture and food	3. An inclusive review and consultation process 4. Consistency of country budgetary and development assistance commitments with	Costs of proposed activities, the past record of budget execution (capacity to utilize funds), realism on future capacity to utilize funds, Government commitment to the sector as reflected in public spending shares on agriculture and food security,

⁷ See Annex 2 for Guidelines for Review of non-African Country Investment Plan Consistent with the CAADP approach.

	security will change from previous years. The trend in the share of public spending on agriculture and food security, and trends in the composition of spending within agriculture and food security.	the country investment plan	and its composition. Measures such as agricultural research intensity from the Agricultural Science & Technology Indicators (http://www.asti.cgiar.org/data/) and other evidence of Government commitment to improving food and nutrition security will be used as an input in the assessment.
1.5 Financing sources and gaps	Source of financing for the investment plan by Government and development partners (who will finance what). Extent of the financing gap.	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, priorities or program objectives	Estimates of total financing gaps and extent to which donor contributions have been committed.
1.6 Process by which the strategy and investment plan were developed	Clarity (and reasons) for the 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, farmer organizations, and vulnerable groups (youth indigenous groups etc). When the strategy and investment plan are not recent, countries should review implementation progress and update their plan for inclusion in and prior to submitting their proposal to the GAFSP.	7. Appropriateness and feasibility of the indicators for impact and system for capacity improvement and accountability 8. Extent and quality of dialogue, (peer) review and mutual accountability system	Quality of participation and consultation with local stakeholders (smallholders and women farmers, farmer organizations, civil society, private sector, other grassroots groups, and parliament). Whether the proposal presents 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 investment plan presents clear and verifiable evidence that it is country-owned and country-led and that the country is fully committed to its implementation. Extent to which implementation lessons have been reflected in the investment plan.
1.7 Implementation arrangements and capacity to implement	Clearly state the institutional arrangements and inter-ministerial co-ordination, reflecting actual or planned capacity to implement (including identifying channels of accountability, capacity gaps and proposed remedies, the role of other stakeholders, including civil society groups, farmer organizations and private sector). Summarize relevant ministry structure and staffing numbers, gender,		Whether the roles of the state, the private sector and civil society in the implementation of the proposed activities are clearly articulated. Compare the country capacity and institutional arrangements with the proposed investment plan, assessing its likelihood of being implemented. Assess the extent to which the institutional arrangements are designed to incorporate the outcomes of inclusive consultations with relevant stakeholders. [See Annex 3 for list of verifiable

	and qualifications.		criteria upon which this will be assessed by the Technical Advisory Committee].
--	---------------------	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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 (beneficiary numbers disaggregated by gender and/or other targeted vulnerable groups).	Clarity on the specific objectives and expected results of the proposal and how it links with the overall sector strategy and investment plan. Clarity on how the objectives will integrate gender equality, governance, and environmental sustainability (including climate change adaptation and mitigation if applicable). Provide evidence of past efforts to reach women and vulnerable groups. Specify the M&E framework to be used to assess progress on these objectives. Be explicit on the number and type of targeted beneficiaries, including their disaggregation by gender.	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). Proposals with a stronger results/M&E framework and an integration of gender equality and environmental sustainability will be given priority.
2.2 Activities to be financed	Activities to be financed. Clarity on the causal link between the proposed activities and objectives, including explaining the expected pathways that will lead to a reduction of poverty and hunger and improved nutrition. Explicit linkages with the overall sector strategy and investment plan, and the scope of the GAFSP framework document (and for Africa, the links with the four technical pillars of CAADP), and their environmental sustainability. Reasons why these activities were selected. Provide evidence of performance and impact of the models being proposed. Clear rationale for public versus private financing, providing specific reasons to justify public financing and the mechanism to ensure long-run sustainability.	Assessed against the causal link between the proposed activities and objectives, including the expected pathways that will lead to a reduction of poverty and hunger, and improved nutrition. Specifically whether the proposal provides a clear causal pathway from the proposed activities to improved food security and nutrition of low-income population groups. Whether the proposed activities are identified as high-priority activities in the country's agricultural development strategy and investment plan, and the likelihood of success based on evidence of performance and impact of the models being proposed. For Africa, assessed against alignment with the four technical pillars of CAADP, which overlap with the scope of the GAFSP framework document, and in particular to the country investment plan. For non-African countries, assessed more explicitly against alignment to the GAFSP Framework Document (raising agricultural productivity, linking farmers to markets, reducing risk and vulnerability, improving non-farm rural livelihoods, and technical assistance, institution building, and capacity development). In addition, assessed against linkage with the overall country strategy and investment plan for the sector, likely environmental and financial sustainability, integration of gender equality, and strength of co-ordination arrangements among entities responsible for delivery.

2.3. Implementation arrangements	Clearly state the institutional arrangements and inter-ministerial co-ordination identifying the role of other stakeholders in implementation (including civil society groups, farmer organizations and private sector). State how the proposed implementation arrangements will strengthen ministerial capacity to deliver core public services sustainably after project completion.	Assess whether the structure of the institutional arrangements has sufficient capacity and appropriate composition to implement the proposed activities. [See Annex 3 for list of verifiable criteria upon which this will be assessed by the Technical Advisory Committee]. Determine whether the proposal presents clear and verifiable evidence that the capacity required to implement the proposed activities is in place, to ensure that the proposed financing is used in an effective and efficient manner.
2.4 Amount of financing requested	Prioritize/rank activities with the US\$ amount being requested from the GAFSP Trust Fund, and the basis for indicative cost estimates. Detail linkages with other cofinancing sources and its comparable size relative to the cost of the country's overall investment plan (prioritization will be important to guide allocation if Trust Fund resources are not available to finance the total request). Provide a summarized cost table (including all relevant financing sources) and estimated unit costs for major investment items.	Assessed against: (i) alignment with the agriculture and food security investment plan, (ii) the expected results, (iii) available Trust Fund resources, (iv) confirmation that funds are additional and not displacing other donor or potential private sector financing, (v) interdependence and complementarity with other programs in the investment plan. Assessment of cost estimates (at a broad programmatic level, to avoid duplication of effort in subsequent and more detailed design and appraisal by selected supervising entities (MDBs, and IFAD)), and (vi) realism of estimated unit costs.
2.5 Preferred supervising entity and Government team	Specify preferred supervising entity (African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank, or IFAD) with associated reasons, and describe engagement on the development of the proposal. In addition, countries may select entities other than the above, to assist in design and implementation, but they will need to be agreed to by the preferred supervising entity. List of full time Government members of the team that will prepare and finalize the project along with the supervising entity. The list should include their current roles.	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 and a pre-identified government team can reduce delays in engagement by the supervising entity.
2.6 Time frame of proposed support	Expected duration of the proposed activities.	Assessed against the expected life of the GAFSP Trust Fund (currently to end 2019) and the country's agriculture and food security strategy.
2.7 Risks and risk management	Major risks that may affect the achievement of the specific objectives, and implementation of each component (activity), including environmental risks, and mitigation measures in place.	Assessed against the significance of the risks and the mitigation measures in place.

<p>2.8 Consultation with local stakeholders and development partners</p>	<p>The process and the extent of consultation with local development partners, and domestic stakeholders, especially smallholders and women farmers, farmer organizations, rural health workers and/or other vulnerable groups (e.g. pastoralists, pregnant and lactating women). Document the extent to which the consultation added value to the project design.</p>	<p>Assessed against the quality of participation and consultation with local stakeholders (e.g. farmer organizations, civil society, private sector, other grassroots groups, rural health workers, and parliament). What was the nature of the outreach effort to stakeholders (particularly small producer organizations), what was the process of obtaining input from them? Whether the proposal presents 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 proposal 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].</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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 Millennium Development Goal of halving extreme poverty and hunger by 2015?
Technical realism (alignment of resources with results) and adequacy of institutional arrangements to implement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does it establish evidenced-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 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 investments 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 1.6 and 1.7 of Annex 1) and GAFSP proposals (section 2.3 and 2.8 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
1. Participation is inclusive/representative	Description in proposal and/or documents such as:
<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. 	<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. - Invitations and meeting announcements.
2. Participation is well planned and more than a one-off activity	Description in proposal and/or documents such as:
<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 GASFP proposal. - There are specific plans and platforms to ensure participatory processes during implementation. 	<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 announcement.
3. Participation is meaningful and transparent	Description in proposal and/or documents such as:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation opportunities employ methodologies to ensure equal voice of men and women, 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. 	<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/or 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 GASFP proposal. - There is evidence that the agriculture and food security strategy, the investment plan and the GASFP proposal are responsive to gender concerns. - There is evidence that input received from all actors involved in participatory processes was reflected in the investment plan and in the GASFP proposal. - There is ownership/broad political support for the agriculture and food security strategy, for the investment plan and for the GASFP 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 technical ministry	
(3) Endorsement letter from the in-country Sector Working Group	
(4) Letter of readiness from preferred Supervising Entity	
(5) GAFSP proposal (part 1 and 2)	
(6) Agriculture and Food Security Strategy	
(7) CAADP Post-Compact Agricultural Sector Investment Plan	
(8) CAADP Post-Compact Technical Review Report of the Investment Plan	
(9) Signed CAADP Compact	
(10) Communique or resolution from the CAADP Business Meeting	
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 technical ministry	
(3) Endorsement letter from the in-country Sector Working Group (or equivalent)	
(4) Letter of readiness from preferred Supervising Entity	
(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	
Notes:	