

Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP)

Executive Minutes Joint GAFSP Steering Committee/Private Sector Window Donor Committee Meeting

October 28-30, 2014
World Bank
Washington, DC

GAFSP Steering Committee Chair
Mr. Dan Peters
Senior Advisor, World Bank US Executive Director's Office

GAFSP Private Sector Window Donor Committee Chair
Mr. Marcel Beukeboom
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands

Accepted for the Steering Committee

DAN PETERS

SIGNED DP

Dan Peters

Chair, GAFSP Steering Committee

Accepted for the Private Sector Window
Donor Committee

MARCEL BEUKEBOOM

SIGNED MB

Marcel Beukeboom

Chair, Private Sector Window Donor
Committee

1. A joint meeting of the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) Steering Committee (SC) and the Private Sector Window Donor Committee (DC) was convened at the World Bank in Washington, D.C. on October 28-30, 2014. This was the second time that the SC and the DC have met jointly, after the first joint meeting in September 2013. Participants to the meeting included members or alternates of the SC and DC (see Annex 1 for a list of participants), as well as some invited experts. The meeting included a complete portfolio review, additional allocations for the public sector window, approval and endorsement of the Private Sector Window Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 Annual Plan, comprehensive discussion of programmatic issues (fundraising, external review, sustainable financing, governance, country guidelines, public – private coordination, and monitoring and evaluation), and next steps moving forward.

Session: Current State of Play (Public Sector Window)

2. The Coordination Unit (CU) presented progress made on the project portfolio of 31 projects in the past twelve months. This was accompanied by presentations from each of the Supervising Entities, who provided their perspectives. Significant progress has been made since the last meeting in September 2013, despite the fact that the program operates in IDA-only countries with poverty rates reaching almost 50 percent; of which ten are fragile and post-conflict states; and where countries have suffered from droughts, floods, and invasive pests during the past year and two countries have been devastated by Ebola.

3. Overall, as of September 30, 2014, 23 projects were effective with 22 projects disbursing a total of \$182 million or 30 percent of the total portfolio of projects under implementation. The CU classified investment projects under implementation (totaling 19) into three categories – satisfactory progress (six projects, 28 percent of total allocated), lagging progress (seven projects, 22 percent), and substantial delay (six projects, 18 percent). The CU noted that its definition of “satisfactory” exceeded that of the Supervising Entities, and that many of the projects defined as “lagging progress” were officially classified as “satisfactory” by their Supervising Entities. The Supervising Entities presented their plans for working intensively with clients, with CU support as needed, to focus on the middle group (“lagging progress”) so that they can be rated as “satisfactory progress” within the next six months. For projects that were rated as “substantial delays”, it was agreed that these delays were mainly caused by specific situations unique to each country/projects, and as such individualized plans to address the delays would be developed and executed in the next six months.

4. Supervising Entities raised a common obstacle for timely start-up: lack of counterpart government funding availability during a project’s *preparation* phase, particularly in the case of infrastructure projects. This lack of funding during preparation means that the government ends up spending the first year or more of project *implementation* in commissioning detailed engineering studies, feasibility studies, or bidding documents. If the government were to have access to grant funding shortly after the SC makes allocation decisions, these studies could be done in parallel with project preparation and speed up the overall implementation and impact of funds. Thus, the committee members endorsed the idea of reviewing a proposal for a possible preparation financing mechanism of up to \$1 million for each project. The SC requested that the CU, in conjunction with interested Supervising Entities, prepare a proposal to be reviewed by the SC. The proposal is to detail how such a mechanism would interact with the 5 percent administrative fee that Supervising Entities receive, what process/modalities need to be in place, and if or how the Country Guidelines would need to be revised to reflect such a preparation fund.

5. On countries that are affected by Ebola (Sierra Leone and Liberia), IFAD and AfDB were advised to modify the on-going projects as needed, providing updates to the SC as needed. AfDB presented a proposal to reallocate some funds from the Liberia project to be used in neighboring GAFSP eligible countries to spur seed production that could supply quality seeds to Liberia and accelerate the recovery of

Liberia's agricultural sector from the Ebola crisis. The SC asked AfDB to provide additional information on its proposal, noting that if funds were to be used in countries other than the original recipient, then the SC would need to provide prior approval.

6. The Trustee informed the meeting that approximately \$21.5 million is currently available for allocation, and that an additional \$132.5 million would become available from new contributions from the United States (\$122.5 million) and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF; \$10 million) by the end of the calendar year.

Session: Current State of Play (Private Sector Window)

7. The Private Sector Window Secretariat presented its portfolio of investments and Advisory Services activities for FY14 (running from July1, 2013 - June 30, 2014) and sought approval from the DC and endorsement from the SC for the activities and scope as described in the FY15 GAFSP Private Sector Window Annual Plan. The DC and SC committee members approved and endorsed the plan respectively. During the discussions, the Netherlands welcomed the introduction of country diagnostics to identify new activities, and expressed hope that this would lead to a larger and improved pipeline of projects. It also praised IFC for upcoming cooperation with IFAD, and requested IFC to undertake greater risk taking in investments, greater focus on nutrition, and greater encouragement for companies to submit proposals. The Netherlands also expressed their preference for a more policy- and strategy-based annual plan/report for following years.

8. As part of the FY 15 Annual Plan discussion and approval process the following decisions on four issues raised by the Private Sector Window Secretariat were taken by the committees as follows:

- Agree to extend tenor of GAFSP Private Sector Window funding up to December 31, 2026 to enable it to offer longer financing tenors of up to 10 years for projects originated in 2016.
- Agree to pilot supporting local currency loan equivalents as presented in the Annual Plan in up to two projects (for up to \$15 million equivalent), to be evaluated over a year. Guidelines will be developed and presented to the committee for consideration to pursue this beyond a pilot basis
- Maintain status quo on eligible countries for operation, i.e. eligible countries will remain as IDA-only countries in non-accrual status. A proposal to give IFC carte blanche to do more operations in IDA-blend countries was rejected. As indicated in the Private Sector Charter, only when there is a compelling case, investments may be made in IDA-blend countries, as approved by the donor committee on a case by case basis. Such approvals may be made in cases such as, but not limited to, companies that complement already existing GAFSP Public Sector Window funding, or for countries that have graduated to IDA-blend status while the Private Sector Window project has begun development.
- Proceed with dropping the creation of a separate Private Sector Window Advisory Committee as originally described in the Charter; and going forward to consider ways to increase private sector expertise and consideration utilizing existing committees within GAFSP. Several committee members also encouraged the Private Sector Window to strengthen its focus on the development impact of its investment. The conclusions followed discussions in two consecutive joint SC/DC meetings. The main logic behind this decision was that in operating as a single program, it is a step back to create new bodies that only serve one of the two windows, when there are alternatives that could serve both. It was also concluded that the joint SC/DC could benefit from more private sector expertise, beyond the expertise that farmer organizations bring in. A representative from a relevant, private sector group (like the World

Economic Forum's New Vision for Agriculture program) may be invited for part of the next SC/DC meeting at the discretion of the Chairs.

Session: Public Sector Window Allocation Issues

9. Given the imminent pledges from the United States and the BMGF, the meeting agreed to allocate monies to those projects which were recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for financing in the third call, but were not allocated funds due to a shortage in financing. It was specifically noted that the gap in technical quality between the awarded countries and un-awarded (but recommended for funding by the TAC) was minimal in this round of application. The projects were those from Benin, Bhutan, Kenya, Lao PDR, and Timor-Leste. The meeting agreed to fund all five countries at a total of \$107 million, specifically: Benin (\$24 million), Bhutan (\$8 million), Kenya (\$24 million), Lao PDR (\$30 million), and Timor-Leste (\$21 million). The award for each country involved a reduction from their requested amounts due to several factors such as countries having received funds from other sources since September 2013, or scaling down to target key areas. The remaining funds in the GAFSP account (approximately \$41 million), along with potential contributions in the next few months, may allow for a next Call for Proposals in early 2015. The issue of the timing for the next Call will be decided at the next SC/DC joint meeting in early 2015.

Session: Moving Forward

10. Four topics were presented and discussed during the "Moving Forward" session: (i) an overview of fundraising efforts (presented by the SC Chair), (ii) a presentation on sustainable financing models (BMGF), (iii) an external review of GAFSP (Meridian Institute), and (iv) coordination of the two GAFSP windows (Canada and the Netherlands with comments from the CU and Private Sector Window Secretariat). Summaries for each topic are listed below. To move these discussions forward, it was agreed that two papers will be prepared prior to the next meeting planned for early 2015. The first paper will be a vision paper ("Future of GAFSP"). This will be prepared by a SC/DC working group to be formed composed of volunteers from the SC/DC representing the various constituent groups. The US agreed to chair this group. The paper will articulate a strong case for additional financing support for GAFSP including its role in the post-2015 food security development architecture; clear, multi-year fundraising goals across both windows; and a proposed operating model and staffing that would be necessary to support such a renewed fundraising effort. It would also include future policy orientations under both windows given new developments and insights into the area of food security. The second paper will address the issue of coordination between the two windows. This paper will be drafted by the Private Sector Window Secretariat with input from the CU and GAFSP Supervising Entities. The paper will include specific and actionable recommendations for GAFSP to achieve greater levels of synergy and impact between the two windows reflecting, as needed, new initiatives coming out of the "Missing Middle" working group.

11. **Fundraising efforts:** The Chair summarized fundraising efforts to date noting significant receipts to date (totaling \$1.1 billion for the Public Sector Window and \$0.3 billion for the Private Sector Window). However, reflecting the current flat aid budget environment, new contributions have slowed and fundraising requires strategic positioning and a clear articulation to make the case for support especially given that the public sector window has allocated over 90 percent of the pledged funds. The Chair noted that while US contribution cannot exceed a third of commitments, it firmly believes in the GAFSP proposition and is providing catalytic support through the matching pledge efforts announced in October 2012.

12. **Sustainable financing model:** Following on the SC Chair's summary of fundraising efforts, BMGF emphasized the sense of urgency and presented a possible model that it believes would put GAFSP on a more sustainable financing pathway comparable to other global programs such as the Global

Partnership for Education (GPE), Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation (GAVI), the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria (Global Fund), and the Global Environmental Facility (GEF). It was pointed out that these programs share a common approach, i.e. a professional donor and resource mobilization strategy; solid case for support and defined needs with outcome targets; predictability in financing, strong leadership, and dedicated staff capacity to support these efforts. BMGF's presentation included three specific recommendations:

- **Consider establishing a normalized financing period.** This could begin with an initial 2 or 3 year trial period that begins in 2015. It could then be repeated, or stopped at the end of the first cycle, based on a review. This would allow current donors to see how a new system could work before committing to repeated replenishment cycles
- **Develop a strong case for support and a clearly defined, multi-year (2 or 3 year) fundraising goal.** This exercise would include linking this financial goal to the achievement of clear targets and outcomes that would be achieved with those additional resources. These could include nutrition, gender and sustainability targets that link the Public and Private Sector windows.
- **Consider creating a senior replenishment director position responsible for meeting funding goals along with 1-2 support staff for the position.** The replenishment director should report to the CU director of the GAFSP. As part of the terms of reference, the senior replenishment director would play several roles related to positioning the fund and engaging with current and future donors.

13. The SC engaged in a lively discussion based on the above BMGF presentation. The focus of the discussion was on the renewed awareness of the urgency for fundraising, and the need to define a clear strategy moving forward. These issues will be addressed in the vision paper to be developed by the donors immediately following this meeting.

14. **GAFSP external review:** The Meridian Institute presented an external review of GAFSP, focused on the Public Sector Window. The Private Sector Window received less attention because it started operationally roughly two years behind the Public Sector Window. It was clarified that this is not an independent evaluation of GAFSP but a synthesis of where the program is assessed against the criteria of efficacy, relevance, and efficiency using publicly available information and inputs from the CU and the Private Sector Window Secretariat.

15. **Coordination of the two GAFSP windows:** Canada and the Netherlands presented some ideas on how coordination at the operational level between both windows could be strengthened, i.e. by participation in each other's activities at the country level. The CU and the Private Sector Window presented efforts that have been undertaken since the last SC/DC meeting to enhance coordination at the central and country levels. Discussions centered around learning from good examples such as in Rwanda (between the two GAFSP windows) and Cameroon (for Private Sector Window and IDA, not the GAFSP Public Sector Window), and also in determining whether there is a sequential element to enhanced coordination at the country level, i.e. well-coordinated Public and Private Sector Window investments are only likely to occur after Public Sector Window investments are several years into implementation. It was also reaffirmed that the objective of pursuing coordination is because of the premise that coordinated public and private investments in agriculture will yield higher returns for farmers, and coordination for its own sake is not the goal.

Session: Public Sector Window Revised Country Guidelines

16. The CU presented revised Country Guidelines reflecting comments from the Working Group 4 of the GAFSP Continuous Improvement Process (Public Sector Window Improvement), the Technical

Advisory Committee (memo of August 2013), discussions with Supervising Entities, and discussions with officials from the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP). The meeting approved the presented draft Country Guidelines, which included key revisions including:

- Making Country Guidelines available approximately two months before the next Call
- Retaining the 30 percent weight for “country need” (50:50 weights for poverty: hunger)
- Retaining both country and proposal readiness – but with more emphasis on government commitment and implementation capacity
- Including in the proposal readiness new categories on justification of approach, post-project sustainability, and plan for detailed preparatory activities (such as feasibility studies for infrastructure)
- Adding a new requirement of joint submission to SC for appraisal stage no objection approval (when the project involves investment and Technical Assistance managed by separate Supervising Entities)
- Inclusion of more details in award letters to countries on steps required for GAFSP Supervising Entity appraisal

Session: Governance Issues

17. The CU made a presentation based on issues discussed in Working Group 2 of the GAFSP Continuous Improvement Process, notably the composition of the Steering Committee and allocation of voting rights. The founding documents of GAFSP only specify that there shall be equal voting rights between donors and recipients, and that the selection of recipient representatives should be based on a self-selection basis through the Executive Directors of the World Bank (Framework Document paragraphs 75 and 76). It does not offer any details on how to allocate voting rights within constituent groups, such as donors or recipient representatives. In November 2010, the SC determined that the number of voting members would be capped at 16, following the model of the Climate Investment Fund. At present there are 14 voting members: seven donors and seven recipient representatives. It is likely that another donor will join in the next few months (which would need to be matched with a recipient representative), bringing the count of voting members to 16. There is no clarity on what kinds of arrangements should prevail for voting right allocations when a ninth donor joins.

18. Following internal discussions, the recipient representatives agreed on specific steps forward. The recipient representatives highlighted that the term “recipient representative” is misleading, since they do not only represent the actual recipient representatives, but rather they represent any potential recipients in a given region. Thus, they have requested the program to formally change the term to “regional representative” to better reflect their actual mandates. Also, in order to maintain continuity in knowledge as representatives change, a formal system of alternates was proposed (as is the norm for donors and Supervising Entities). According to the self-selection principle, the following was agreed by the recipient representatives (henceforth called regional representatives). The exact names of the representatives and alternates will be communicated to the SC by December 31, 2014.

- **Africa (GAFSP eligible countries: 32):** Given the largest number of GAFSP eligible countries, Africa will have three regional representatives in total (and one alternate): (i) one representative from one of the World Bank’s Executive Directors’ Offices that covers African countries that are eligible for GAFSP,¹ (ii) one recognized food security expert of Anglophone African countries, and (iii) one recognized food security expert of Francophone African countries. The alternate African

¹ As of December 2014, EDS13 (Francophone Africa) and EDS14 (Anglophone Africa)

regional representative will be from the other World Bank Executive Directors' Office as the official described in (i) above.

- **Asia (South Asia and East Asia and the Pacific; GAFSP eligible countries: 16):** Asian countries will have two regional representatives: (i) representative from one of the World Bank's Executive Directors' Offices that covers Asian countries that are eligible for GAFSP,² and (ii) a recognized food security expert of Asian countries.
- **Latin America and the Caribbean (GAFSP eligible countries: 4):** One representative and one alternate, at least one from the World Bank's Executive Directors' Offices that covers Latin America and the Caribbean countries that are eligible for GAFSP.³ Composition to be determined by the region.
- **Eastern Europe and Central Asia (GAFSP eligible countries: 3):** One representative and one alternate, at least one from the World Bank's Executive Directors' Offices that covers Eastern Europe and Central Asian countries that are eligible for GAFSP.⁴ Composition to be determined by the region.
- **Middle East and North Africa (GAFSP eligible countries: 2):** One representative and one alternate, at least one from the World Bank's Executive Directors' Offices that covers Middle East and North African countries that are eligible for GAFSP.⁵ Composition to be determined by the region.

19. On donor representation, the CU on behalf of Working Group 2 presented a suggested way forward including establishing a lower-bound threshold of contributions to be considered for voting right allocations, and three possible options for allocating voting rights if and when there are more than eight donors to GAFSP. It was clarified that only contributions to the Public Sector Window will be considered for allocation of voting rights of the SC since the Private Sector Window has its own governance body, the Private Sector Window Donor Committee. Donors were asked to report back with their decisions (on exact amount to be used for the lower-bound threshold, and on method for allocating voting rights) by December 31, 2014. The SC Chair agreed to initiate discussions among donors.

20. It was clarified that, in reality, actual votes have seldom been called for in past SC meetings and decisions are almost always made by consensus by all (voting and non-voting members). Some donors asked for special recognition as founding donors, as well as ways to allow donors to participate if they will be asked to give their voting rights up. Other SC members noted the importance of establishing rules that would incentivize new donors to contribute to GAFSP. These points will be considered in the donor discussions that will determine their representation.

Session: Missing Middle

21. Three presentations were made in relation to the topic of better addressing the "missing middle": (i) a "missing middle" options report by the consulting firm, Enclude Solutions, (ii) CSO perspectives on

² As of December 2014, EDS06 (Afghanistan), EDS09 (Cambodia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Vanuatu), EDS11 (Maldives), EDS12 (Bangladesh, Bhutan), and EDS16 (Lao PDR, Myanmar, Nepal, Tonga)

³ As of December 2014, EDS07 (Guyana), EDS15 (Haiti), and EDS18 (Honduras and Nicaragua)

⁴ As of December 2014, EDS10 (Kosovo), and EDS24 (Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan)

⁵ As of December 2014, EDS11 (Yemen) and EDS13 (Djibouti)

the Enclude report, and (iii) a proposal to increase the number of Supervising Entities for the Private Sector Window by the Asian Development Bank (ADB). Enclude was contracted by the SC to respond to concerns raised at first instance by CSO representatives prior to the September 2013 SC/DC meeting that a portion of smallholder farmers, and farmer organizations were not being reached by the GAFSP Private Sector Window.

22. The Enclude report recommended four options for GAFSP to better reach smallholder farmers:

Option 1) Tweak the **Public Sector Window** to focus more on public private partnerships or offering grants to producer organizations and other organizations that will directly support farmers in accessing market linkages, technology, and financial services.

Option 2) Expand the **Private Sector Window** to provide grant financing for investments of producer organizations that go further than the current budget for Advisory Services (this could involve expanding the Private Sector Window Supervising Entities to other institutions such as the Asian Development Bank).

Option 3) Develop a **new GAFSP window** where GAFSP funds would be awarded directly to producer organizations and/or local financial institutions through Supervising Entities.

Option 4) Develop a **new GAFSP window** where GAFSP funds would be awarded to volume buyers to ensure access to market for smallholder farmers.

23. After lengthy discussion, including smallholder perspectives provided by a CSO representative, the SC agreed that it was not prepared to decide on one option. The Chairs, however, noted that there was an emerging consensus around option 1 (tweaking the Public Sector Window), as well as noting that the options are not mutually exclusive, i.e. more than one option can be pursued. As next steps, the Chairs requested that the joint SC/DC Working Group on the “missing middle” develop a concrete proposal for a pilot under option 1 to be presented at the next Steering Committee meeting. Several SC members noted that they would not be prepared to endorse a final option for implementation until other issues, particularly those to be outlined in the “Future of GAFSP” paper, were addressed.

24. ADB presented a proposal to become an additional Supervising Entity under the Private Sector Window. ADB proposed that by adding it as a Private Sector Window supervising entity, the advantages could include accelerating the deployment of funds, better leveraging the ADB agribusiness portfolio, increasing the number of projects in Asian countries in the Private Sector Window portfolio (currently only 12 percent and 14 percent of the pipeline), and also attracting new donors from the Asia Pacific region. AfDB expressed support for ADB’s proposal, and indicated that they would also be interested in becoming a Supervising Entity for the Private Sector Window. The CSOs also endorsed the concept of increasing ownership and diversity in the Private Sector Window. The SC Chair pointed out that there are some practical obstacles to expanding Supervising Entities for the Private Sector Window such as the existing common agreement of the Private Sector Window Charter and individual Administration Agreements. However, he indicated that the two Chairs (of the SC and DC) will hold discussions with interested donors, Supervising Entities and others after the meeting to continue discussions.

Session: Monitoring and Evaluation

25. The CU and the Private Sector Window Secretariat presented their strategy to improve joint program-wide results reporting including a systematic cross-walk of their respective indicators that was carried out. First, it was clarified that to date, the Public Sector Window has prorated results according to the GAFSP share of total financing, while the Private Sector Window has used a different approach that tracks incremental results achieved by a project. The Private Sector Window’s approach does however include additional private sector financing in the project size in addition to IFC’s and GAFSP’s

contributions. This is one of the factors that have caused joint results reporting to be difficult. Thus, to jointly report on results going forward, the Public Sector Window will begin to present un-prorated results, when appropriate.

26. The cross-walk showed that at the impact level (beneficiaries, income, and food security), it is possible to aggregate across windows except for the food security indicator. The Public Sector Window intends to revise the existing food security indicator⁶ to better reflect nutrition outcomes, e.g. dietary diversity scores. The Private Sector Window has yet to define a food security indicator. Thus, the two windows will coordinate to ensure the adoption of the same indicator for both windows. It was noted that the impact level results will only be made available at end of project through impact evaluations, or in some rare cases, at mid-term reviews.

27. Moving forward over the next few months, both windows will work together to harmonize indicators that will enable joint reporting of more results to the extent possible within the context that the two windows fund very different sets of activities. For example, 13 public projects undertake irrigation, while only 2 private projects do; and 8 private projects provide financial products to farmers while only 1 public project does. Harmonization will involve figuring out exact methodologies for harmonizing existing similar (but not equal) indicators, incorporating some indicators in the Private Sector Window into the Public Sector Window, when appropriate (IFC has indicated that the reverse cannot be considered due to the great difficulty of introducing non-standardized indicators into project results frameworks).

28. The meeting emphasized the importance of robust results-based management in GAFSP's success, and requested an update of this work at the next SC/DC meeting. Certain donors also offered help to the CU and the Private Sector Window Secretariat in this work as they have relevant expertise.

Session: Catch-all

29. It was decided that the SC/DC will meet again in early 2015 in Washington. The next SC/DC meeting will have a more strategic focus and will come up with recommendations for a 'narrative' for the program as a whole, ideas for branding the program, assessment of GAFSP's place vis-a-vis other organizations and programs (such as through a Strength, Weakness, Opportunity, and Threat analysis (SWOT)) and other ideas to prepare GAFSP for the years ahead. The basis of the meeting will be two papers that will be prepared in advance of the meeting. The first paper will be on the "Future of GAFSP". The US has offered to lead this effort together with other volunteers from the SC/DC. This paper will articulate the shared vision of GAFSP and reflect information needs that are most pertinent for building a strong case for additional financial support for GAFSP. The second paper will be on "Public Sector – Private Sector Coordination" to be prepared by the Private Sector Secretariat in consultation with CU. This paper will address specific and actionable recommendations to achieve greater levels of synergy and impact between the two windows, including lessons learned from good practices (such as Rwanda and Cameroon), and with country-led activities by donors, SEs and others.

30. Both papers will be circulated prior to the next SC/DC meeting and form the basis of the discussions of that meeting.

31. **Selection of Chairs:** Current SC and CD Chairs will retain their positions through the next SC/DC meeting to help shepherd ongoing activities. Both Chairs welcomed discussion with other voting committee members interested in taking on the role of chair.

⁶ Dietary energy consumption.

Annex 1: List of participants

NAME	COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION
Ahmed, Mahfuz	ADB
Atheeq, LK	South Asia Regional Representative
Badiane, Ousmane	Africa Regional Representative
Banzuela , Raul Socrates	South CSO
Beukeboom, Marcel	Netherlands
Bor, Simon	United Kingdom
Brill, Marie	North CSO
Cackler, Mark	World Bank
Campbell, Katie	North CSO
Cebotari, Alex	World Bank
Chen, Gianni	Private Sector Window Secretariat
Chery, Jean Robert	LAC Regional Representative
Delforce, Julie	Australia
Ding, Shannon	United States
Dominguez Pabon, Rafael	Spain
Eckberg, Barbara	Coordination Unit
Edmundson, Helen	United Kingdom
Evers, Guy	FAO
Ezcurra, Aitor	IFC
Ghaffar, Jeehan	MENA Regional Representative
Goita, Mamadou	South CSO
Hayward, Natasha	World Bank
Hegwood , David	United States
Htenas, Aira	Coordination Unit
Hurley, John	United States
Irigoyen, Jose Luis	IDB
Kato, Yuri	Japan
Keita, Dougou	AfDB
Klein, Alzbeta	IFC
Latortue , Alexia	United States
Leclerc, Caroline	Canada
Lemoine, Martin	ADB
LePoole, Peter	Netherlands
Lozman, Josh	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
McClafferty, Bonnie	GAIN

McIntire, John	IFAD
NAME	COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION
Mealey, Tim	Meridian
Mecagni, Laura	Private Sector Window Secretariat
Mostafa, Iftikhar	Coordination Unit
Nangia, Varun	Coordination Unit
Ngirente, Edouard	Africa Regional Representative
Ojukwu, Chiji	AfDB
Palmer, Caitriona	Private Sector Window Secretariat
Parent, Kimberly	Coordination Unit
Peters, Dan	United States
Pouliot-Cotnoir, Isabelle	Canada
Trinidad, Rosalie	Coordination Unit
Roberts, Brad	Private Sector Window Secretariat
Sethi, Geeta	Coordination Unit
Shah, Niraj	Private Sector Window Secretariat
Smart, Rebecca	Canada
Tanimichi Hoberg, Yurie	Coordination Unit
Townsend, Robert	Coordination Unit
Truitt Nakata, Ginya	IDB
Tyler, Natsuki	ADB
Van Manen, Bert	Enclude Solutions
Van Niewkoop, Martien	World Bank
Wang, Linda	Private Sector Window Secretariat
Watkins, Neil	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation