

## **GAFSP Interim Technical Advisory Committee (iTAC) Terms of Reference<sup>1</sup>**

June 11, 2010

### **Background<sup>2</sup>**

The Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) is a multilateral mechanism to assist in the implementation of pledges made at L'Aquila in July 2009, reaffirmed by the Summit of the G20 in Pittsburgh in September 2009. The focus of 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. GAFSP will complement ongoing efforts through other mechanisms to scale-up support to agriculture and food security. The objective of this new mechanism is to fill the financing gaps in country-led and region-led agriculture and food security strategies in a way that contributes meaningfully to the achievement of the MDG1 to cut hunger and poverty by half by 2015, and leverages other efforts to ensure verifiable results in this regard. It will do this by providing grants, loans, and equity investments in developing countries through a multilateral approach targeted simultaneously to the greatest needs and the best capacities to use such funding. The proposed GAFSP approach is to:

- provide a significant and unified source of additional development partner financing to developing countries that have demonstrated their commitment to a comprehensive approach for increasing agricultural growth and making lasting improvements in the food security of their populations;
- assist this approach through a country-led, aligned and harmonized multilateral and multisectoral response to country and regional requests for financing that helps ensure the successful impact of interventions, ensures coordination with other efforts at the country level, and follows a transparent and needs based process for gaining additional funding;
- include both a public and private sector financing window. The latter will provide long and short term loans, credit guarantees and equity to support private sector activities to improve agricultural development and food security.

The Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) Trust Fund has recently been established with funds provided by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Canada, the Republic of Korea, Spain and the United States as the initial donors. An external GAFSP Steering Committee has been set up to govern the fund. The GAFSP Steering Committee, composed of donor and recipient representatives as voting members, and representatives from the Fund Trustee, multi-lateral development banks, IFAD, FAO and WFP, the United Nations Secretary General's Special Representative on Food Security and Nutrition and CSOs as non-voting members, is the decision-making body of the GAFSP.

On May 20, 2010, the Steering Committee issued a call for proposals open to all IDA only countries to submit financing requests, following the guidelines provided, by June 14, 2010 or October 1, 2010 (see Annex 2: Call for Proposals). It is expected that several proposals will be received by June 14,

---

<sup>1</sup> This Terms of Reference was drafted by the GAFSP Coordination Unit at the World Bank ([gafspcoord@worldbank.org](mailto:gafspcoord@worldbank.org)) and incorporates comments on previous drafts received as of June 10, 2010, from the GAFSP Steering Committee.

<sup>2</sup> Background material is drawn from the GAFSP Framework Document.

2010. In anticipation of submissions, the Steering Committee at their Second Meeting on May 14, 2010 agreed that an Interim Technical Advisory Committee (iTAC) will be set up to review the received proposals. This Terms of Reference outlines the expected role of the iTAC.

For proposals received, at their next meeting, on June 21, the Steering Committee will need to make decisions on:

1. Which proposals to finance
2. How much to allocate to each proposal
3. What activities to finance
4. Which Supervising Entity to appoint for each proposal.

In this regard the role of the iTAC is to provide due diligence on the quality of submitted public investment plans and to submit to the Steering Committee a funding recommendation for their consideration.

iTAC members are not remunerated, nor are expenses—expected to be minimal—reimbursed. iTAC members are appointed by the GAFSP Steering Committee for a fixed term not to exceed June 30, 2010, and are not consultants of the World Bank.

## **Responsibility/Tasks**

Each iTAC member will need to undertake the following task:

### **1. Provide recommendations on which proposals to select based on ranked scores**

Each iTAC member will score each proposal following the Proposal Rating Form in annex 1. In addition, each member will prepare a short written summary (one paragraph) on the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal and this should be related to the numerical scoring. The proposal scores and written summary will be submitted in confidence to the Chair of the iTAC, who will share with other members of iTAC.

### **2. Provide recommendations on how much to be allocated to each proposal**

The current available resources in the GAFSP Trust Fund for 2010 are approximately \$350 million to be allocated to 7 to 10 proposals. It is expected that these fund will be allocated to proposals received by June 14 and October 1, 2010 (the two submission dates included in the call for proposals – see Annex 2). Not all of the \$350 million is expected to be allocation to the June 14 proposals, a large portion is expected to be available for the allocation to those proposal submitted by October 1. Financed proposals are expected to be of variable size. Each iTAC member will recommend how much to allocated to each country. In making this recommendation reviewers should consider.

- The country need (absolute measures from table in Annex 1: number of undernourished and poor people)
- How the activities proposed relate to the objectives of GAFSP and the scope of the facility in Section IV of the GAFSP Framework Document
- The quality of the proposal (in line with the scores from assessment in 1 above)
- Whether the indicative costs associated with each component are appropriate to the activities proposed based on the iTAC member's own experience, if applicable
- Other funds available from all sources

**3. Provide recommendations on which activities to finance (given that some members of iTAC may not agree with the appropriateness of full funding).**

Members of iTAC should indicate their priorities for funding within proposals, in addition to the total amount recommended. Even if the recommended amount is equal to the amount requested, other members may not agree and the iTAC as a whole will benefit from a sense of the priorities of individual members. Further, if the allocated amount by an individual iTAC member is less than the requested amount, then the member should make specific recommendations on which part of the proposal to finance and/or how much to finance to each part of the proposal (which could still include all parts of the proposal but with lower financing than requested for each part). In setting priorities and making recommendations, the iTAC member must consider:

- The prioritization of activities provided in the country proposals (these should be respected).
- If no or little prioritization is reflected in the proposal, then the iTAC member should consider the importance of activities relative to the overall program, and extent of activity alignment with the GAFSP framework document (if these are not clear then countries may need to be asked to prioritize before awards are finalized).

**4. Provide recommendations on which supervising entity to select**

If the country proposals include a preferred supervising entity, this preference should be respected. The proposal must adequately justify the preferred supervising entity. Ultimately the choice of supervising entity is a prerogative of the Steering Committee. If the iTAC member doubts the adequacy of the country-proposed supervising entity to provide adequate supervision and support of the activities and can make this case in writing, or if the country fails to specify a proposed specified entity, the iTAC member may propose a supervising entity. In such case, proposal of supervising entities should be based on the iTAC member's knowledge of the comparative advantage of the various possible GAFSP supervising entities relative to the activities contained in the proposal, considerations of safeguard policies, leveraging of Multi-lateral Development Bank resources, historical relations with the recipient country, and track record of providing high quality and context-experienced personnel to work with national authorities on the development and implementation of proposals.

If more than two supervising entities are proposed, then these need to be reviewed against the additional costs of multiple supervising entities (e.g. additional preparation and supervision costs) and be weighed against expected benefits. The Steering Committee would need to see strong justification for use of more than one supervising entity in order to approve this.

**Consolidation of iTAC member recommendations**

Individual iTAC members will provide the following to the Chair of the iTAC:

- The completed score sheet
- A paragraph summary on each of the four recommendations list above

The Chair of the iTAC will consolidate the individual assessments into one consolidated set of recommendations to be provided to the Steering Committee. The Chair of the iTAC will average the scores across all iTAC members and provide to the Steering Committee (via the GAFSP Coordination Unit) and the iTAC membership the following:

- A ranked list of countries/proposals based on scores
- Information on the dispersion of scores where significant without identifying individual members
- For each proposal, a one paragraph summary on each of the 4 recommendations

The summary will be submitted to the Steering Committee for review at the June 21 Steering Committee meeting. It will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting, and will be used for subsequent communication to countries on their proposals.

### **Timeframe**

The following timeframe is envisaged for the review process:

- June 14-17: members of iTAC are required to be available to screen proposals
- June 17 (COB): iTAC members submit recommendations (as above) to iTAC Chair
- June 18 (COB): iTAC Chair submits consolidated report to the GAFSP Coordination Unit
- June 21: iTAC Chair is available for presentation to Steering Committee
- June 21-30: possible limited follow-up may be required of iTAC members

## ANNEX 1: Proposal Rating Form

**Program Title:**

**Country:**

---

<b>Country need, policy, readiness</b>	=	<b>(100 points max)</b>
Country need	=	(25 points max)
Country policy	=	(25 points max)
Country readiness	=	(50 points max)
<b>Proposal readiness</b>	=	<b>(100 points max)</b>
<b>Total score</b>	=	<b>(200 points max)</b>

---

### Country Need (25 points, 12.5 for each section)

Need	Indicators <sup>3</sup>	Basis of Assessment by iTAC	
<u>Relative measure of need:</u> Poverty and hunger & levels of development assistance	First Millennium Development Goal, such as the prevalence of undernourishment (established using simple average of indicators at right that are available for country in question)	Proportion of people below \$1.25/day Poverty gap ratio % of poorest quintile in nat'l consumption Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age % of population below min dietary energy consumption	
	ODA for agriculture \$/rural population	Relative amounts of current aid	
<u>Absolute measure of need:</u> Level of poverty and hunger	Number of people undernourished (prevalence of undernourishment x population size) Number of poor people (poverty rate x population size)	Levels of poverty and hunger	

### Country Policy (25 points, 12.5 for each section)

Section of Part 1 country submission	Content of submission	Basis of Assessment by iTAC	
1.2 Key elements of the policy environment	Clarity/assurance on the policy environment (and on any proposed policy changes envisaged) to enhance	Potential impact of the policy environment on returns to the proposed investments.	

<sup>3</sup> The GAFSP Coordination Unit will provide a table of relevant numerical indicators along with proposals received on June 14.

	planned investment returns.		
	IFAD Rural Sector Performance Score	IFAD rural sector performance score (which range from 0 to 5) x 2	

If the IFAD rural sector performance scores do not exist for a particular country, full weighting is given to the policy section in the country proposal

## Country Readiness (50 points)

### Part 1. Summary of Overall Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and Associated Investment Plan (total points: 50; maximum score of 10 each section)

Note: For African countries, consider organization of country roundtable, signing of CAADP compact specifying long term strategic options for agricultural growth, poverty reduction, and priority investments, as well as modalities for development partnership and inclusive policy review and dialogue mechanisms, and post-compact CAADP Investment Plan ratified by a CAADP technical review meeting. For non-African countries, evaluate the quality of the strategic planning process that has led to the formulation of the investment programs entailed in the proposal package.

Section	Content	Basis of Assessment by iTAC	
1.1 Objectives and indicators	Clearly state the overall agriculture and food security strategy objectives and associated investment plan, with monitorable indicators.	Realism of the specific targets relative to past performance, potential, and capacity.	
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.	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 security will change from previous years. The trend in the share of public spending on agriculture and food security.	Costs of proposed activities, the past record of budget execution (capacity to utilize funds), realism on future capacity to utilize funds, and Government commitment to the sector as reflected in public spending shares on agriculture and food security.	
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.	Extent to which there are genuine financing gaps (estimates of total financing gaps and extent to which donor contributions have been committed).	
1.6 Process by which the	Clarity (and reasons) for the process used to develop the agriculture and	Degree of participation and consultation with local stakeholders	

strategy and investment plan was developed	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).	(smallholders and women farmers, farmer organizations, civil society, private sector, other grassroots groups, and parliament).	
--	---	---	--

## Proposal Readiness (100 points)

### Part 2. Specific Proposal for GAFSP financing (total points: 100; max score of 20 each section)

Note: For African countries, consider outcome of the Post-compact Technical Review Report from the country CAADP business meeting. For non-African countries, review the evidence of an independent and thorough peer review of the investment plan, such as the CAADP Post-Compact technical review report.

Section	Content	Basis of Assessment by iTAC	
2.1 Specific objectives, and targeted results (disaggregated by gender [targeted vulnerable groups], and number of targeted beneficiaries)	Clarity on the specific objectives, expected results including by gender, target beneficiaries of the specific proposal, and how it links with the overall sector strategy and investment plan. Clarify how the objectives will integrate gender equality, governance, and environmental sustainability (including climate change adaptation and mitigation if applicable). Specify the M&E framework to be used to assess progress on these objectives.	Assessed against the objectives of the GAFSP Framework Document (including its results framework), including the emphasis on women and smallholders. 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, duration of activities, and linkages with the overall sector strategy and investment plan, and the scope of the GAFSP framework document and their environmental sustainability. Reasons these activities were selected. Government ministries and other entities responsible for delivery. Expected sustainability of proposed activities following GAFSP financing. Modality of financing (investment projects, with or without TA, or other).	For Africa, consider the outcome of the post-compact review process regarding the consistency and coherence of the proposed investment activities. For non-Africa, 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 Amount of financing	Prioritized US\$ amount (by activity) requested from the GAFSP Trust	Assessed against the expected results, available Trust Fund resources, and	

requested	Fund, the basis for indicative cost estimates, 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).	confirmation that other local donor financing is not available (to ensure GAFSP funds are additional and not displacing other donor support). Assess cost estimates, likely 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).	
2.6 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.	
2.7 Consultation with local stakeholders and development partners	The process and extent of consultation with domestic stakeholders, and local development partners, especially smallholders and women farmers, farmer organizations and other vulnerable groups (e.g. pastoralists).	Assessed against degree of participation and consultation with local stakeholders (farmer organizations, civil society, private sector, other grassroots groups, and parliament). What was the nature of the outreach effort to stakeholders (particularly small producer organizations), what was the methodology of obtaining input from them, what evidence is there that this input was adopted.	
<b>TOTAL (maximum of 100 points)</b>			



## ANNEX 2: Call for Proposals

Washington D.C, May 20, 2010

Dear Colleagues:

### *Call for Proposals*

Following commitments by the G8 leaders at the L'Aquila Summit in July 2009 and reaffirmed by the G20 Summit in Pittsburgh in September 2009, a Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) Trust Fund has recently been established with funds provided by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Canada, the Republic of Korea, Spain and the United States as the initial donors. These resources will be used to help finance the scale-up of agriculture assistance to low income countries in a way that helps consolidate other forms of support received. In so doing, GAFSP will seek to make catalytic investments that raise agricultural productivity, improve rural incomes and strengthen food security. The general scope of the program is detailed in a Framework Document for the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (see enclosed *Framework Document for a Global Agriculture and Food Security Program*).

Current available resources in the GAFSP Trust Fund for 2010 are approximately \$350 million to be allocated to 7 to 10 proposals. More resources are likely to be available for 2011.

All IDA-only countries that are not in non-accrual status are eligible to submit proposals. As not all proposals can be financed with the limited resources available, selection will be based on an assessment of need, policy environment, and readiness (see enclosed *Country Guidelines for Public Sector Window Proposals*).

The Steering Committee will make financing allocations of the \$350 million in both June and October 2010. Proposals will need to be submitted by **June 14, 2010** to the GAFSP Coordination Unit via email at [GAFSPCoord@worldbank.org](mailto:GAFSPCoord@worldbank.org) to be considered for the June allocations, and by **October 1, 2010** to be considered for the October allocations.

The Steering Committee would like to inform eligible low income countries, through the country offices of the Multi-lateral Development Banks, of the program and invite submissions by eligible governments following the above mentioned guidelines.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact the GAFSP Coordination Unit ( [GAFSPCoord@worldbank.org](mailto:GAFSPCoord@worldbank.org) ).

We look forward to receiving country proposals for consideration by the GAFSP Steering Committee.

Sincerely,

Roger Ehrhardt  
Chair of the GAFSP Steering Committee

## ANNEX 3: Country Guidelines for Public Sector Window Proposals

### 1. Eligible Countries

1. 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 status<sup>4</sup>. This currently includes 60 countries:

<b>Africa</b> <i>(35 countries)</i>		<b>East Asia</b> <i>(9 countries)</i>	<b>ECA</b> <i>(4 countries)</i>	<b>Latin America</b> <i>(4 countries)</i>	<b>MENA</b> <i>(2 countries)</i>	<b>South Asia</b> <i>(6 countries)</i>
Angola	Lesotho	Cambodia	Kosovo	Guyana	Djibouti	Afghanistan
Benin	Liberia	Kiribati	Kyrgyz Rep.	Haiti	Yemen	Bangladesh
Burkina Faso	Madagascar	Laos PDR	Moldova	Honduras		Bhutan
Burundi	Malawi	Mongolia	Tajikistan	Nicaragua		Maldives
Cameroon	Mali	Samoa				Nepal
CAR	Mauritania	Solomon Islands				Sri Lanka
Chad	Mozambique	Timor-Leste				
Comoros	Niger	Tonga				
DRC	Nigeria	Vanuatu				
Congo, Rep.	Rwanda					
Cote d’Ivoire	Sao Tome & Pr					
Ethiopia	Senegal					
Eritrea	Sierra Leone					
Gambia	Tanzania					
Ghana	Togo					
Guinea	Uganda					
Guinea-Bissau	Zambia					
Kenya						

2. 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.

### 2. Country Selection Criteria

3. 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. Cross-country benchmarks (such as those referenced below) will be used for the relative assessment by the Technical Advisory Committee coupled with information provided in individual country proposal submissions. The Steering Committee will decide on the relative weighting given to measures of country need, policy, and readiness in the relative assessments.

- **Country Need:** Countries with greatest need will be given priority. In addition to their IDA-only status, other indicators to assess country need include those associated with the first Millennium Development Goal, such as the prevalence of undernourishment, as well as relative levels of current official development assistance for agriculture.
- **Country Policy Environment:** Countries with a policy environment more conducive to generating higher investment returns will be given priority. For example, IFAD’s Rural Sector

<sup>4</sup> 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.

Performance Scores, as a proxy for sectoral policies, will be used to assess differences in country policy environments. Supplementary policy information will be provided in the individual country proposals.

- **Country Readiness:** Much of the country readiness assessment will be through the individual country proposals. For African countries, completion of a Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) post-compact investment plan, with a subsequent CAADP technical review report will be used to reflect country readiness. For non-African countries the completion of a comprehensive agricultural development strategy and investment plan that has undergone a technical review, covering similar technical aspects as the CAADP reviews (reflected in the last column of the Annex 1 table on “Part 1: Summary of Overall Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and Associated Investment Plan”) will be used to assess readiness. It is expected that evidence of an independent and thorough peer review of the investment plan, comparable to that provided by a CAADP Post-Compact technical review report, be included with the non-African country submissions. This will be required to ensure that the bar for readiness is not higher or lower for any geographic region. 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](http://www.nepad-caadp.net/pdf/POST%20COMPACT%20GUIDELINE%20_French.pdf)

### 3. Outline of Public Window Proposals from Eligible Countries

4. *Two part proposal:* Country proposals will have two parts (see Annex 1 for more details). Part 1: summarizes the country’s overall agriculture and food security strategy and associated investment plan. In the case of African countries that have prepared a CAADP post-compact investment plan, with a subsequent CAADP technical review report, the first part will simply summarize the outcome of that process. Part 2: details the specific proposal for GAFSP financing. While the GAFSP process 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 will provide sufficient assessment to assist the GAFSP Steering Committee to give priority to specific GAFSP proposals that are part of a clear, coherent, appropriately scaled, and inclusive strategy and investment plan.
5. *Sections and content:* The sections and content guide for the GAFSP proposals 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 allocation.
6. *Available resources:* Available resources in the GAFSP Trust Fund for 2010 are approximately \$350 million which will likely be allocated to 7 to 10 proposals among those submitted by eligible countries. More resources are likely to be available for 2011. In addition, in order to better guide Steering Committee decisions, please prioritize the investment financing requests as required by the document template (Annex 1), as perhaps only part of the request may be financed by the Trust Fund given the limited resources available.
7. *Disclosure policy:* Please note that following the disclosure policy of GAFSP, the proposal documentation submitted 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 may be highlighted in the submission.

8. *Language of proposal:* English is the operational language of GAFSP, thus submissions are expected in English. In exceptional cases, the Steering Committee may allow countries to submit documents in other languages, to be decided on a case by case basis.

### **Proposal submission**

9. *Submission from Ministry of Finance:* Finance Ministries of eligible countries should submit GAFSP proposals to the GAFSP Coordination Unit (GAFSPCoord@worldbank.org). Every proposal should be signed by the Minister of Finance as well as at least one of the relevant technical ministries (e.g. agriculture, rural development, social welfare, environment/natural resource management etc.) and endorsed by 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.

10. *Form of submission:* The preferred form of submission is via e-mail to [GAFSPCoord@worldbank.org](mailto:GAFSPCoord@worldbank.org) , or alternatively by courier to the GAFSP Coordination Unit, Mailstop: MC5-510 World Bank, 1818 H Street, Washington D.C. 20433 USA.

11. *Submission documents:* The following documents will need to be included in the submission to the GAFSP Co-ordination Unit.

<b>For African countries</b>	<b>For Non-African countries</b>
<u>Specific GAFSP request</u> Part 1: Summary of the Country’s Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and CAADP Post-Compact Investment Plan Part2: Country Proposal for GAFSP Financing	<u>Specific GAFSP request</u> Part 1: Summary of the Country’s Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and Investment Plan Part 2: Country Proposal for GAFSP Financing
<u>Attachments:</u> 1. Agriculture and Food Security Strategy 2. Signed CAADP Compact 3. CAADP Post-Compact Agricultural Sector Investment Plan 4. CAADP Post-Compact Technical Review Report of the Investment Plan	<u>Attachments:</u> 1. Agriculture and Food Security Strategy 2. Agricultural and Food Security Investment Plan 3. Evidence of an independent and thorough peer review of the investment plan, such as the CAADP Post-Compact technical review report.

## Annex 1

### Sections and Content Guide for the GAFSP Request

<b>Part 1 Summary of Overall Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and Associated Investment Plan</b> [about 5-7 pages]			
Section	Content	How this will be assessed by the GAFSP Steering Committee	
			Aspects to be reviewed:
1.1 Objectives and indicators	Clearly state the overall agriculture and food security strategy objectives and associated investment plan, with monitorable indicators.	<p>For African countries: Review CAADP Post-compact Technical Review Report</p> <p>For non-African countries: Review of evidence of an independent and thorough peer review of the investment plan, such as the CAADP Post-Compact technical review report.</p>	Realism of the specific targets relative to past performance, potential, and capacity to implement.
1.2 Key elements of the policy environment	Clarity/assurance on the policy environment (and on any proposed policy changes envisaged) to enhance planned investment returns.		Potential impact of the policy environment on returns to the proposed investments
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.		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 security will change from previous years. The trend in the share of public spending on agriculture and food security.		Costs of proposed activities, the past record of budget execution (capacity to utilize funds), realism on future capacity to utilize funds, and Government commitment to the sector as reflected in public spending shares on agriculture and food security.
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.		Extent to which there are genuine financing gaps (estimates of total financing gaps and extent to which donor contributions have been committed).
1.6 Process by which the strategy and investment plan was 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).		Degree of participation and consultation with local stakeholders (smallholders and women farmers, farmer organizations, civil society, private sector, other grassroots groups, and parliament).

<b>Part 2 Specific proposal for GAFSP financing</b> [about 10-15 pages]		
Section	Content	How this will be assessed by the GAFSP Steering Committee
2.1 Specific objectives, and targeted results (disaggregated by gender [targeted vulnerable groups], and number of targeted beneficiaries)	Clarity on the specific objectives, expected results including by gender, target beneficiaries of the specific proposal, and how it links with the overall sector strategy and investment plan. Clarify how the objectives will integrate gender equality, governance, and environmental sustainability (including climate change adaptation and mitigation if applicable). Specify the M&E framework to be used to assess progress on these objectives.	Assessed against the objectives of the GAFSP Framework Document (including its results framework), including the emphasis on women and smallholders. 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, and 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 these activities were selected. Government ministries, and other entities responsible for delivery. Expected sustainability of proposed activities following GAFSP financing. Modality of financing (Investment projects, with or without TA, or other).	For Africa, assessed against alignment to the four technical pillars of CAADP, which all overlap with the scope of the GAFSP framework document. For non-Africa, 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 Amount of financing requested	Prioritized US\$ amount (by activity) requested from the GAFSP Trust Fund, the basis for indicative cost estimates, 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).	Assessed against the expected results, available Trust Fund resources, and confirmation that other local donor financing is not available (to ensure GAFSP funds are additional and not displacing other donor support). Assess cost estimates, likely 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).
2.4 Preferred supervising entity	Preferred supervising entity (African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Banks, the World Bank, or IFAD) with associated reasons. Countries may select entities other than the above to assist in design and implementation, but they will need to be agreed to by the supervising entity.	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 MDB resources, and historical relations with the recipient country.
2.5 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.

2.6 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.
2.7 Consultation with local stakeholders and development partners	The process and extent of consultation with domestic stakeholders, and local development partners, especially smallholders and women farmers, farmer organizations and other vulnerable groups (e.g. pastoralists).	Assessed against degree of participation and consultation with local stakeholders (farmer organizations, civil society, private sector, other grassroots groups, and parliament). What was the nature of the outreach effort to stakeholders (particularly small producer organizations), what was the methodology of obtaining input from them, what evidence is there that this input was adopted.