

Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP)

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

March 28-30, 2017

Washington, DC

GAFSP Steering Committee Chair

Mr. John Hurley

United States Department of the Treasury

GAFSP Private Sector Window Donor Committee Chair

Mr. Jeroen Steeghs

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands

Accepted for the Steering Committee

JOHN HURLEY

SIGNED JH

John Hurley
Chair, GAFSP Steering Committee Chair

Accepted for the Private Sector Window Donor
Committee

JEROEN STEEGHS

SIGNED JS

Jeroen Steeghs
Chair, Private Sector Window Donor Committee

Day 1 - Tuesday, March 28, 2017

Session 1: Welcome, introduction of new participants, and adoption of agenda

1. A joint meeting of the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) Steering Committee (SC) and the GAFSP Private Sector Window Donor Committee (DC) was convened in Washington DC on March 28-30, 2017. This was the fifth time that the SC and the DC have met jointly, after the first joint meeting held in September 2013.
2. The meeting's opening session commenced with John Hurley, as Chair of the SC, welcoming new members to the SC and DC. The draft agenda circulated in advance of the meeting was reviewed and adopted.
3. Mahmoud Mohieldin, World Bank Senior Vice President for the 2030 Development Agenda, United Nations Relations, and Partnerships, welcomed the meeting participants. He highlighted that GAFSP stands out as an effective instrument to achieve the SDGs, a "core delivery vehicle", emphasizing its unique governance structure and robust partnership framework. Acknowledging that GAFSP was initiated as a response to the food price crisis in 2008, he stated that the Program continues to remain relevant in the present context, in particular to help pre-empt another repeat of this year's famine situation – providing both sizable investments as well as an effective partnership model to respond to emerging challenges that are promulgated by fast urbanization, demographic changes, and climate change – to name a few. He noted that projects funded by GAFSP are subject to rigorous scrutiny for cost effectiveness and usefulness in the field, and made a call to better publicize GAFSP's work. Mohieldin also emphasized the need to support programs like GAFSP that continue to serve a critical need, in order to achieve larger scale and better take into consideration the food and nutrition security needs of rapid urbanization while striking a balance between adequate rural and urban development, including a strong role for agriculture.
4. Sergio Pimenta, IFC Director of Global Industry, Manufacturing, Agribusiness and Services (MAS), added his welcome and highlighted that a measure of success of the blended financing approach of GAFSP's Private Sector Window is that it has served as an inspiration to IDA's Private Sector Window and continues to serve as a model for other sectors to generate greater impacts through blended finance.

Session 2: Program Update and Portfolio Review

5. Opening remarks were made by the GAFSP Program Manager, who thanked all partners for their support throughout the year and for pushing and challenging GAFSP to create a better, stronger partnership. She indicated that over \$1.25 billion in technically sound, sustainable support has been delivered across the entire value chain - through GAFSP's Public Sector Window, Private Sector Window, and most recently through the Missing Middle Initiative pilot. Furthermore, as reflected in the most recent Call for Proposals, supply has not been able to meet demand and good proposals are being turned away. The Program Manager noted that GAFSP is at a critical juncture, and encouraged those around the table to use the meeting to reflect on lessons learnt and consider how to further ensure that the Program will make the greatest impact on the 2030 Agenda.
6. A joint presentation covering both the Public and Private Sector Windows provided updates on the overall Program portfolio status.

7. The Coordination Unit (CU) provided an update on the **Public Sector Window**, sharing findings from the annual Portfolio Review, including overall portfolio performance, key milestones, project highlights, and challenges. For the Public Sector Window, the positive performance trend seen in last year's review was shown to have continued, as demonstrated in upwards movement in project ratings and in the disbursement figure of \$439.8 million as at end of 2016. Almost three-quarters of the projects reviewed were rated Satisfactory or Moderately Satisfactory, the share of which had increased steadily from 32% in FY15 to 63% in FY16 and then 73% for FY17. The efforts of GAFSP Supervising Entities (SEs) were acknowledged in contributing to improved performance through various follow-up action plans initiated following the last portfolio review. SE responses to the Portfolio Review presentation reaffirmed an intent to continue these efforts.
8. The CU reported that as the portfolio matures, a shift is being seen with more closures. One quarter of the projects had closed (or the GAFSP portions of their projects had closed, in the case of co-financed projects) by the end of CY2016. Through 2020, the remaining projects in the existing pool are scheduled to close, unless extensions are requested and granted.
9. SC members endorsed the continued proactive monitoring of the projects across performance categories. There was also broad acknowledgement of the fact that SEs have made an effort to increase attention to Category 4 projects, and an appreciation for the steps taken to address implementation issues. Noting that there were some instances of divergence between the SEs' self-ratings and the Portfolio Review (PR) ratings, it was acknowledged that historically the PR ratings tend to be stricter, and that there is no expectation that these should align exactly with SEs' self-ratings, given that there is likely to be variation in how SEs track and monitor their projects. Discussion recognized that each SE has long standing internal practices/processes, well aligned with their client needs. It was noted that the PR, as an independent review, was a valuable tool to track the health of the overall portfolio, and that the detailed write ups of the consultants could be made available to the SC on request.
10. **Action points:** (i) SEs are to submit a brief action plan to the CU for the two projects rated Unsatisfactory (category 4) immediately following the meeting's close, enabling the CU to carry out a six-monthly check-in on this subset of the portfolio. (ii) The CU will develop a "welcome package" for new GAFSP TTLs with orientation information on both Windows, relevant GAFSP guidelines and contacts, etc. (iii) Impact evaluation reports will be shared widely among stakeholders and posted on the GAFSP website.
11. The update on the **Private Sector Window** affirmed that it is a relatively new portfolio, that has been performing well, with 42 projects for \$226.4 million approved until end-2016, with a broad spectrum of equity and debt instruments. In terms of project performance ratings, at end 2016, 18 out of 33 active projects were developing as planned with some delays in the remainder. 24 out of 33 active projects have been partially or fully disbursed (including 8 committed risk sharing facilities), with most disbursements occurring according to schedule. During the period since the inception of the Private Sector Window (FY13-16), for every dollar that GAFSP has invested, it has attracted on average US\$5.6 from additional DFI and private investment (including US\$1.8 from IFC). The review outlined approved investment amounts by region, thematic area, and product. In terms of regional concentration, around 79% of the approved projects were based in Sub-Saharan Africa.

12. The Private Sector Window team shared that the GAFSP Private Sector Window portfolio has allowed IFC to invest in riskier countries and in projects which are often greenfield and which would not be possible without GAFSP support. Various challenges faced by many GAFSP projects included changing climatic conditions, lack of good infrastructure, availability of quality staff and access to affordable local currency financing, among others. The challenges faced by the Africa Juice and Malawi Mangoes projects should not deter investment officers from financing such projects but instead offer lessons in terms of how to better structure the investment and advisory services products to maximize smallholder development impact while de-risking the project. On the local currency pilot which is now closed, the conclusion reached was that while paying for the foreign currency swap was clearly a loss-making proposition for GAFSP from the start, there could be situations where the development impact could justify the use of such a highly concessional instrument. Key observations were that the portfolio is now growing at a faster rate (in both project number and dollar amounts); project supervision and portfolio monitoring are becoming more intensive, with risk management playing a more important role.
13. **Action points:** (i) Private Sector Window Secretariat to produce a combined AS and IS report moving forward. (ii) Private Sector Window leverage figures to be disaggregated by DFI/ public sources and private sources for future reports.

Session 3: CSO Update and Report back

14. The **CSO representatives from AFA and ROPPA** provided updates on their activities in 2016 in terms of results, knowledge management, challenges, and overall perspectives. They highlighted the CSO mandate in terms of mobilizing civil society actors in the community and promoting GAFSP. CSO partners also advocated for GAFSP to play a strengthened role going forward in engaging in policy dialogue and shaping resulting policy. With respect to the preceding year, it was shared that, *inter alia*, CSO partners have: promoted multi-stakeholder dialogue with their constituents to raise awareness about GAFSP; analyzed and participated in third-party evaluations of ongoing GAFSP projects; promoted improved inclusion at all stages leading to improved project design and implementation, through information missions and substantive local engagement; advocated on behalf of GAFSP at different platforms and conferences; and provided support for the MMI initiative. Discussion noted the value in CSO SC member review of and engagement in ongoing GAFSP projects, in particular with respect to local CSO engagement, with encouragement to carry this forward for other projects. The benefits of joint CU-CSO missions were raised, as was the possibility of joint review missions involving broader SC members. The key challenges faced by CSOs engaging in GAFSP processes have been related to delays in the release of funds and challenges in Public Sector Window and Private Sector Window complementarity.
15. The **CSO representative from ActionAid** highlighted that the value added of GAFSP is its ability to innovate in how it engages with smallholder farmers, farmer organizations and cooperatives. CSOs are working to provide checks and balances for ongoing projects by visiting, assessing and analyzing projects to ensure they meet the needs of farmers – and would like to link better with GAFSP’s SEs in this regard. The CSO representative emphasized that consultations take time and resources, including cultural interpretation, and also reminded the SC of the role that the OECD-based CSO plays in coordinating with the other regional CSO representatives. Recommendations were made on how to further improve the quality of CSO participation – for example by providing adequate time for translation and consultation; and with timely approval and commitment of CSO funds on an annual basis. In addition, a proposal was made for the SC to consider providing an approved annual

budget to support the OECD CSO's activities, as is the case currently for the two recipient country CSO partners.

16. In plenary, there was broad acknowledgment that GAFSP's partnership with CSOs is one of the strongest elements of the Program's governance structure, allowing for rich insights and grassroots perspectives to inform the work of GAFSP. The CSOs clarified how they organize to channel inputs to projects at different stages and how priority themes are pursued (e.g., climate responsiveness, women and youth). The CSOs noted the importance of missions to GAFSP-financed projects as a means to integrate a range of stakeholders in-country to encourage dialogue. Representatives also expressed their interest in learning more about how TAC takes into consideration the degree of CSO engagement in the proposal design stage, and in further exploring how CSOs could better contribute during the proposal-drafting stage.
17. **Decision point:** The SC agreed on the value of CSO representation from donor and recipient countries, and to give consideration to additional budget to support continued, dedicated engagement from the OECD/northern CSO representative.
18. **Action point:** By end May 2017, the CU will circulate for SC approval proposed budgets and work plans that ensure representation from three CSOs to the SC, including the OECD/northern CSO representative.

Session 4: Update from the Trustee

19. The Trustee made a presentation on the **financial status** of the GAFSP Trust Fund (Public Sector Window) which included updates on overall funding availability; contributions; investment income; and the most recent funding allocation decisions. It was shared that as of March 26, 2017, a total of US \$177.3 million was available to support new funding decisions.
20. In terms of **investment returns**, following the last SC/DC meeting, trust fund investments have been included in the Pool's longer-term investment model portfolios with the assets invested across high grade fixed income and money market instruments. The Trust Fund investment portfolio has earned approximately US\$ 14.9 million in investment income since inception. The portfolio returns during calendar year 2016 were about 1.15%, or approximately USD 5.1 million, driven primarily by investments in longer term tranches.
21. With respect to the **latest funding decisions**, the Trustee reminded the meeting that during 2016 and the first quarter of 2017, the SC approved the previous allocations to projects for Laos (US\$30M), Timor-Leste (US\$21M), and Bhutan (US\$8M). The SC also set aside US\$16M for the Missing Middle Initiative, based on approval at the January 2016 SC/DC meeting, and the following allocations under the initiative had been made: US\$ 13.2 million for project proposals related to Bangladesh (FAO), Mali (IFAD and WFP), Senegal (FAO), and Uganda (IFAD); US\$ 0.4 million for Monitoring and Evaluation, and US\$ 0.4 million (FAO) and US\$ 0.355 million (IFAD) for project fees. The SC also approved a budget of US\$ 0.3 million for impact evaluation of the project in Mongolia.

Session 5: Results of TAC review and discussion of Public Sector Window Proposals

22. TAC Chair Derek Byerlee presented the **Report of the Technical Advisory Committee** and Deputy Chair Diana McLean presented the TAC's recommendations and delineated the overall scoring and

ranking process, reminding the SC of the criteria for scoring based on country readiness (30%), proposal readiness (40%,) and country need (30%).

23. The TAC reported some **general observations** on the Fourth Call for Proposals, including that under this Call the TAC received the largest number of proposals to date (a total of 22 proposals), and that these were more variable in quality than previous rounds. 9 of the 22 proposals received were from prior GAFSP recipients; half of those were follow-on proposals. Over half of the total were submitted by fragile states and/or small states with limited capacity.
24. The TAC Chairs also noted that the proposals comprised a range of designs and priority themes, including some that targeted geographic areas with large poor and vulnerable populations; some that focused on sustainable natural resource management and climate change adaptation; and two that focused entirely on food safety and nutrition (home grown school feeding were elements in several proposals).
25. The TAC then presented its **recommendations for SC consideration** (including the overall score and rank), prior to fielding a broad range of clarification questions from the SC in terms of the nature and quality of the proposals; the criteria and scoring processes – and related challenges; the overall decision-making process; and how the TAC arrived at the recommended financing amounts for selected proposals, in those cases where the recommended grant amount was less than that requested.
26. Additional discussion points related to whether and how special consideration could be given to fragile and conflict states; whether there should be any adjustments to ensure a more level playing field between countries with strong program design and proposal writing capacities and those facing challenges; how countries may better address ‘value for money’ in their proposal submissions; whether the SC may consider in future a thematically-targeted Call for Proposals, focused on a key issue such as climate resilience or fragility; whether the SC should support a funding ‘pipeline’ of those well-scored proposals that could not be supported owing to limited resources currently available; and what steps should be taken in the event that a country were to reject the offer of a smaller grant amount than that requested. It was also reconfirmed to the SC that all countries would receive feedback provided by the TAC on their submitted proposals, to assist in improving the quality of future submissions. Further lessons for future Calls included the benefits of streamlining and sharpening the Country Guidelines (CGs) where possible, to increase accessibility and clarity; and adding in a standard budget template to supplement the existing guidance on narrative structure/format. Any changes made to the CGs in response to this meeting’s discussion would be shared with the SC for review and approval prior to any future Call.
27. The CU clarified that a total of US\$ 160 million was available for grant allocation under this Fourth Call, with additional resources held by the Trustee to account for the 5% fee to SEs, IE costs for about 30% of the portfolio, as well as Trustee fees and management and administration costs for the Program. Ahead of the Grant Allocation Session planned for the meeting’s second day, SEs were called on to consider whether they felt that their government partners may be willing to forego part of the requested funding amount in order to allow the pool of available funding to extend to a higher number of proposals. SEs were requested to report on their deliberations before Session 6 the following day.

28. **Decision point:** (i) It was agreed that the SC would close the Fourth Call for Proposals and have no funding pipeline.
29. **Action point:** (i) For future Calls for Proposals, guidelines would be amended/updated to: indicate that each country may submit only one proposal per Call; request that countries delineate different scale versions of the proposals (i.e., upper and lower case financing scenarios and how these may affect the design or geographic scope); include a suggested/standard budget template.

Day 2 - Wednesday, March 29, 2017

Session 6: Discussion of Public Sector Window Proposals and Selection of Grant Awards

30. The SC undertook final discussion and decision on which country submissions would receive grant allocations in the Fourth Call for Proposals to the Public Sector Window. To support the decisions, the CU highlighted some points of principle including that countries had made their submissions, and the TAC had made its recommendations, with reference to the Country Guidelines previously endorsed at the 2016 Joint SC/DC meeting, which include the methodology and criteria used for scoring. At the 2016 Joint SC/DC meeting, the SC had also deliberated on second-time applicants and agreed that the Fourth Call would be open to all eligible countries. The Chair and members agreed that awards would be made within the framework set out by the current Country Guidelines, and that lessons learnt in this round would be used to inform adjustments to these for future Calls.
31. SC members considered possible reductions in the allocations for the top ranking proposals vis-à-vis the requested amounts. SC deliberations were informed by both TAC and SE understanding of how the projects might be affected, and focused on ensuring that results or viability of projects would not be adversely impacted by GAFSP funding lower than the proposed amounts.
32. **Decision points:** (i) The SC endorsed the final proposals to be financed, as follows:
- Rwanda US \$26.3 million;
 - Ethiopia US \$30 million;
 - Burkina Faso US \$24 million, including a US \$500,000 preparation grant;
 - Tanzania US \$20 million including a US \$498,580 preparation grant;
 - Myanmar US \$27 million;
 - Nepal US \$22.7 million including a US \$500,000 preparation grant; and
 - Haiti US \$10 million.
- (ii) The SC agreed to ensure language would be included in the award notification letters to the effect that robust CSO engagement is expected throughout the project cycle, including implementation.

Country	Region	Requested	Awarded	Supervising Entity	Current Recipient Country
1 Rwanda	Africa	26.3	26.3	WB, FAO	Yes
2 Ethiopia	Africa	55.3	30.0	WB, FAO	Yes
3 Burkina Faso	Africa	24.0	24.0	WB	Yes

4	Tanzania	Africa	41.3	20.0	AFDB	Yes
5	Myanmar	East Asia & Pacific	38.0	27.0	ADB, FAO	No
6	Nepal	South Asia	48.0	22.7	WB	Yes
7	Haiti	Latin America & the Caribbean	20.0	10.0	IADB	Yes

Session 7: Private Sector Window Update

33. The Acting Head of the Private Sector Window provided an update on the Window's activities, including both key achievements and challenges in the period since the last joint SC/DC meeting. It was noted that a high degree of turnover in key personnel had marked the year, including the departure of the Head of the Private Sector Window. Other key developments included the completion of the Formative Evaluation of the Private Sector Window, led by Dutch consultants Enclude BV; the launch of the IDA Private Sector Window; and the Donor Committee's approval of the Window's Annual Plan in June 2016 - with a notable delay in sharing this for Steering Committee endorsement, for which apologies were offered. However, it was reiterated that the Annual Plan - once approved by the Donor Committee - should be circulated by email to the SC for endorsement instead of waiting for the next SC meeting. A suggestion was also made that the Private Sector Window Annual Plan approval process should be on a regular June cycle going forward, for both DC and SC approval/endorsement.
34. Key issues raised by the Formative Evaluation included a need for greater clarity in how the IFC and the Window are calculating additionality; and how to ensure an adjusted approach to Advisory Services that truly captures client demand and a stronger link/integration with investment pipeline and business development. Additional discussion points in the plenary included: an explanation of reasons behind funding delays – much of which may be explained by GAFSP's investment profile in riskier markets and with more innovative deals which take time to structure; development of a pre-pipeline strategy for Advisory Services (AS) – which now includes co-location of AS and IS team members with IFC's MAS Industry Group; coordination and collaboration with the Public Sector Window – with examples of both successes and enduring challenges (e.g., in Bhutan); opportunities for CSO engagement – with the potential for a more regular exchange mechanism raised; and, the question of targeting producer cooperatives versus companies – with the Window's focus on preparing co-ops for more commercially-based management through AS.
35. **Decision points:** (i) The SC endorsed the Private Sector Window Annual Plan (FY17). (ii) The Private Sector Window Annual Plan approval process will be on a regular June cycle going forward, for both DC and SC approval/endorsement, with the latter being sought by email circulation.
36. **Action points:** (i) The Private Sector Window Secretariat agreed to add increased level of detail such as relevant financial or economic indicators to project notifications sent to SC/DC, within the bounds of confidentiality agreements. (ii) As part of a revamp of the broader GAFSP website, the Private Sector Window would update their content/design and make provision for a French translation of the Private Sector Window webpage. (iii) At the next DC meeting (planned for July 6 and 7, 2017),

the Private Sector Window Secretariat will provide an update on actions taken (or being taken) to address each of the recommendations made by Enclude in the Formative Evaluation report.

Session 8: Missing Middle Pilot Projects update

37. The CU provided an update on the Missing Middle Pilot Project Initiative. Since the SC's endorsement in January 2016 and allocation of US\$16 million from the GAFSP Public Sector Window, the CU has coordinated a competitive process with the strong support of the Missing Middle Advisory Committee (MMAC), which was responsible for the technical evaluation of the proposals. Grants were awarded to 5 pilot projects; this was announced at a dedicated launch event on the margins of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) Meeting at FAO in October 2016.
38. The 5 pilot MMI projects are: (i) Inclusion of Rural Youth in Poultry and Aqua-culture Value Chains in Mali (\$2.61m, IFAD); (ii) Strengthening Rural Women's Livelihoods for Sustainable Economic Development in East Senegal (\$2.48m, FAO); (iii) Increasing Access to Finance for Farmer Organizations in Bangladesh (\$2.48m, FAO); (iv) Quality Paddy for Higher Incomes in Mali (\$3.0m, WFP); and (v) Using E-Granary Innovative Mobile Platform to Deliver Economic Services to Farmers in East Africa - Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda (\$2.61m, IFAD), which is the first GAFSP regional project.
39. The MMI is planning a robust results-based management and learning system at both project (six-monthly reporting) as well as pilot-wide levels (with mid-term evaluation and completion evaluation planned). Continuous learning will also be built in, reflecting on what has worked well and what can improve. These results are to be shared and positive practices and lessons mainstreamed. This has already commenced, with lessons from the MMI preparation process well documented. The next steps are for SEs, in collaboration with recipient Producer Organizations, to finish working on the final pilot project designs, and submit them between April and June 2017. These will then be circulated to the SC for review and endorsement.
40. Discussion recognized the innovative nature of the MMI and reflected on how the pilot has been responsive to CSO inputs, both in its conceptual framework, as well as in how it has been administered. Civil society will continue to play an active role as implementation rolls out. Comments also underlined the value of plans to track and reflect on lessons learned, in particular to inform future decision-making on scaling-up/mainstreaming, including as related to the existing Program Windows. The SC's regional representative for Middle East and North Africa, who served as the Chair of the MMAC, highlighted the superior quality of proposals for MMI, most of which focused on the engagement of women and youth as a key element.

Session 9: Monitoring & Evaluation Plan Update

41. The CU updated the SC on progress made on Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E), seeking endorsement of the updated GAFSP M&E Plan. Over 2015/2016, the M&E Working Group reviewed and updated GAFSP's M&E Framework with revisions to indicators at all 'tiers' and harmonized M&E functions across the two Windows to the extent possible. In April 2016, the SC approved these proposed revisions and the new indicators, and the M&E Plan has been updated to operationalize these revisions from 2017 onwards. The M&E presentation included three elements: (i) an overview of the M&E Plan, including revisions at each tier; (ii) Impact Evaluation (IE) - lessons learnt across the

portfolio (both Windows) including adjustments for the Public Sector Window; (iii) preliminary findings of the FIES target setting exercise for GAFSP.

42. **M&E Plan:** The CU described the various sections of the Plan and the adjustments made to each Window. Following SC endorsement, the CU will support operationalization of the new M&E Plan, in partnership with SEs, to implement the agreed changes and use the new indicators from June 30 2017 onwards. Partnership arrangements to support implementation of the new recommendations are being strengthened (with FAO FIES team, DIME, and others). It was confirmed that existing projects will not be required to retrofit their results frameworks to match the new indicators, but will continue to report in using the prior set of GAFSP core indicators, while the CU and Private Sector Window Secretariat will map this incoming data to be able to report out against the new indicators. It was also emphasized that GAFSP is pioneering rigorous impact assessment across the portfolio, including the Private Sector Window's business investments and this has been building capacity in the process. That said, the dearth of firms in the market that are capable of carrying out robust agri-business evaluations with the private sector and which assess development impact was noted.
43. **Impact Evaluation:** The session reaffirmed that current GAFSP IE practice requires that all projects undergo some form of impact assessment; one third of the Public Sector Window portfolio is expected to take up statistically rigorous or 'in-depth' IEs, principally through partnership with the World Bank's DIME group; and the remaining portfolio uses more 'rapid' approaches to impact assessment, with discretion and budget for methodology resting with the concerned government and SE partner. For the Private Sector Window, a total of 4-6 IEs are being conducted, along with 16 poverty assessments, accounting for about 30% of the portfolio, based on current financing.
44. For Public Sector Window IEs, a key update proposed in the updated M&E Plan and informed by program experience is that, following screening and approval of concepts, a project may contract a specialized organization *of their choosing* to carry out an in-depth IE. This may include universities, research organizations (e.g., IFPRI), DIME, regional technical organizations, etc.
45. **FIES:** With the SC having selected FIES as an indicator to track changes in household-level food insecurity under GAFSP, at the January 2016 SC/DC meeting it had been agreed that the CU would explore ex-ante what might be an appropriate target percentage change in a measure of FIES (one that captures severe food insecurity) to which GAFSP could be expected to contribute. At the present meeting, the CU presented the preliminary findings as well as the challenges related to this exercise. The CU noted that only two years' worth of data on FIES-based measures are presently available at a national level, using small sample sizes that cannot be further disaggregated. This means that there is limited experience and data against which to assess past annual changes, on the basis of which to derive an indication of any potential future changes under GAFSP. The CU described the elasticity-based methodology used to nonetheless derive an indicative change in the prevalence of food insecurity for GAFSP beneficiaries, in response to the percentage gain in income espoused in GAFSP's poverty-related target.
46. While there are significant caveats to the methodology, the preliminary analysis showed that a 10% income increase might reduce the prevalence of moderate or severe food insecurity by 5%, while the prevalence of severe food insecurity might decline by 8.4%. A 20 percent income gain (the GAFSP income gain target) would therefore imply a 17% reduction in the share of people experiencing severe food insecurity. Given the methodological limitations to the analysis, however, the CU outlined the difficulty of isolating the impact of income difference on food insecurity and the

inability, as yet, to validate national level results without household level estimates. As a result, a recommendation was made to the SC for additional analysis using micro-level data (at household level) and a further year's FIES data to provide a better-informed FIES target recommendation for GAFSP. In order to do this, GAFSP, through the Voices of the Hungry team at FAO as custodians of FIES, is in initial outreach to obtain a license from Gallup to access their World Poll data. The CU confirmed that funds are available within the planned M&E budget to cover this continued exercise as part of the operationalization of the updated M&E Plan, and that the CU would aim come back to the SC with updated recommendations on FIES targets by the end of CY 2017, data availability permitting.

47. In ensuing plenary discussion, the importance of aligning the GAFSP M&E framework with the SDG indicator framework was recognized. The CU addressed clarification questions on FIES including on fielding FIES at the project level and how gender may be recognized in the analysis effort. The CU noted that in the event that data availability is a challenge and an FIES target for GAFSP is not determined by the end of 2017, the SC may wish to re-assess in due course whether to simply track changes in FIES measures at the project/portfolio level without an associated Program target. CSO representatives made suggestions regarding language concerning climate variability and agriculture, requesting that 'climate resilient agriculture' be considered as a replacement for 'climate smart agriculture' in the M&E Plan. The CU noted the challenge in seeking language and terminology that conveyed clear shared meaning to all stakeholders, but committed to review and add language in the Plan that clarified GAFSP's usage, in response to CSO concerns.
48. **Decision point:** (i) The SC endorsed the updated M&E Plan for use.
49. **Action points:** (i) The CU will share the updated Theory of Change diagram with the SC by end June 2017, for the SC's information, prior to its inclusion in the M&E Plan document. ii) The CU will update language in the M&E Plan on climate-related terminology and application by end June 2017. (iii) The CU will report back to the SC by end of CY2017 on the FIES target setting exercise and the results of additional analysis agreed by the SC.

Day 3 - Thursday, March 30, 2017

Session 10: Program Evaluation

50. **GAFSP Program Evaluation:** As GAFSP approaches its 8th year, and as previously agreed by the SC/DC, a comprehensive programmatic evaluation will be commenced in 2017 to take stock of progress to date and inform the Program's future direction. The CU provided an overview of the draft Terms of Reference developed to guide this exercise.
51. The objective of the evaluation would be to: (i) assess the development effectiveness of the whole Program to date (including program relevance, efficiency, results and impact, and sustainability); (ii) assess the organizational/operational effectiveness of the whole Program to date (including program governance and management, administrative efficiency, application and selection, project-level implementation, M&E) ; and (iii) document lessons and experiences to help guide further refinements to GAFSP's operational model. It would be both backwards-looking, in that it would analyze and assess progress to date against stated objectives, as well as forward-looking, suggesting ways to enhance efficiency and effectiveness in the future and serving as an input to broader reflection among the SC and DC members about the needs and future direction of GAFSP. The CU

noted that the draft TOR includes a wide range of indicative questions for each category of assessment, and it is expected that the consultants would agree with stakeholders on a final, narrower set of questions under each thematic area. These would be reflected in the inception report, which would clearly delineate and guide the scope of the evaluation.

52. The CU also outlined the overall methodology of this evaluation, which would be commissioned by the SC and DC through the CU, and conducted by an independent consultancy firm through a combination of: a comprehensive desk review including portfolio analysis and review of relevant existing materials; structured interviews with key stakeholders; project site field visits and focus group discussions on a selective/random basis; comparative analyses of GAFSP Public Sector Window performance in different areas vis-à-vis similar FIFs/Programs; and a summary analysis of lessons learned. A proposed timeline as well as an indicative budget of up to US\$250,000 (all-inclusive) was put forth by the CU for SC deliberation.
53. SC member discussion raised that, in terms of the scope of the evaluation, it would be crucial to look at the Program as a whole, both the Public and the Private Sector Windows and, in particular, noted the recent formative evaluation of the Private Sector Window and the IEG evaluation of the rural non-farm economy in which its GAFSP was examined as a case study for partnership. It was underlined that significant time and effort was spent by the consultants in the formative evaluation of the Private Sector Window to understand the concept of blended finance at IFC and strongly recommended that the selected consultant for the Program Evaluation review and build upon the documents and information already made available as part of that exercise, especially in view of the tight timeline for completion. Members also proposed that the evaluation consider GAFSP's value proposition, overall relevance, and value-for-money, potentially benchmarking with other Financial Intermediary Funds. CSOs noted that it would be important to ensure that the evaluation process is inclusive and participatory. The SC urged the CU to compress the timeline further, to ensure that initial findings could become available within 2017 and the final report would be approved as early in 2018 as feasible, and to raise the budget to \$325k, to more realistically accommodate anticipated field visits.
54. **Action points:** The CU would re-circulate the draft TOR virtually with updates to reflect the discussion at the SC/DC meeting by April 3, 2017 for SC review, comments and endorsement. The final version of the evaluation should be available by end of March 2018.

Session 11: Strategic Vision for GAFSP

55. **Strategic Vision:** A brief video message from FAO DDG Daniel Gustafson was shared with the SC. It underlined the importance of the longstanding GAFSP-FAO partnership, noting FAO's TA project portfolio with GAFSP, the MMI, and collaboration on FIES and the Knowledge Forum, amongst other items. The message also emphasized that GAFSP is the only functioning multilateral initiative with farmers' organizations represented directly on its Steering Committee.
56. Australia presented a paper entitled 'A 2030-ready GAFSP' to the wider SC/DC that outlined a proposed strategic vision for the program, including potential adjustments to the delivery model, building on previous discussions convened by GAFSP's donors. Australia noted that GAFSP's substantial donor pledges for the Public Sector Window have largely been exhausted, but that the risks that agriculture faces globally are more pronounced than ever. In a competitive fundraising environment, Agenda 2030 reaffirms the need to mobilize financing from a variety of resources,

including from the private sector. GAFSP's competitive process is an important element of the Program's approach, including to demonstrate value for money. The paper proposes a country window approach, with collaboration between an expanded range of SEs and other implementers, and also explores the expansion of GAFSP to IDA-blend fragile countries. A key message in the paper is that GAFSP needs a planned and sustainable funding model to carry it through 2030, along with a sharper narrative, along with an associated call to consider what resources and structure would be needed to carry forward a 'new' GAFSP in the present complex global environment.

57. The SC members welcomed Australia's timely effort at this pivotal moment for the Program. The SC/DC were in agreement on committing to a recalibrated GAFSP in full support of the SDGs, as well as on enhancing communications and GAFSP's fundraising narrative as a priority – noting that a strategy for the Program's overall financial sustainability should soon be articulated. Members also agreed on the need for more detailed review and discussion of several issues proposed in the paper, including those relating to expanding country eligibility, in a context of limited funds, and the proposed Country Window, the implementation challenges of which would need to be fully considered.
58. An SC Working Group (WG), under Australia's leadership, was agreed as the best mechanism to take forward the thinking on GAFSP's strategic vision, with participation from across the SC/DC and with administrative support from the CU. The Chair proposed for Australia's consideration that the WG also consider lessons arising from the Fourth Call for Proposals as an element of the TOR, based on the concrete recommendations to be provided by the TAC. Member discussion noted that, while this work would be closely linked to the Program Evaluation for GAFSP, it would not wait for that process to be completed, with the goal being for the WG to present a strategic vision product with concrete recommendations for SC discussion and approval in the (northern hemisphere) fall of 2017.
59. **Action Points:** (i) A ToR for the Strategic Vision Working Group with concrete deliverables and a timeline would be circulated by Australia within 3 weeks of the SC/DC meeting, to be reviewed and endorsed by the SC.
60. AfDB made a presentation to the SC/DC on the possibility of **opening up the GAFSP Private Sector Window to other SEs**. The presentation gave the SC an overview of AfDB's Feed Africa approach to catalyzing private sector investment through various mechanisms including risk assessment; the use of private equity funds; blended financing; and support to Regional Economic Communities (REC) initiatives. The intervention positioned AfDB as a strategic partner of choice, with a deep understanding of Africa's vision for the future; a continent-wide presence and the ability to mobilize partners and additional resources. The proposal was made that additional MDBs joining in as GAFSP Private Sector Window SEs could broaden GAFSP's reach through the higher volume of eligible proposals. Increased cooperation amongst MDBs could be supported through a client-oriented, results-focused approach rather than competitive silos; further strengthening synergies between GAFSP's public and private sector interventions.
61. The GAFSP Private Sector Window Secretariat acknowledged that the issue of multiple SEs in the GAFSP Private Sector Window has been on the table for a number of years, resulting in a pilot project, with specific funding from Australia, that has explored joint IFC and ADB projects in Asia over the last year. Unfortunately, even with the best of intentions and efforts by both IFC and ADB, the pilot has not resulted in any new project for GAFSP and is effectively on hold. Although some

discussions have taken place between IFC and AfDB to create a Master Cooperation Agreement (MCA) between the two institutions, no material progress has yet been made in this area.

62. **Action Point:** The Private Sector Window would meet with AfDB separately, immediately following the closing of this meeting, to pursue additional discussion on this (please see Annex 4). Additionally, the WG on GAFSP's Strategic Vision would incorporate this issue into its TOR.

Session 12: Looking Forward

63. **Fundraising:** The GAFSP CU presented an overview of the interim fundraising strategy, which takes as its baseline the target of \$1.5 billion over 5 years presented in the 2015 US-prepared "Vision Paper" highlighting that the strategy positions the Program as a strong instrument to support delivery on the 2030 agenda; an associated plan is organized, in detail, by individual stakeholders. The CU noted that ultimately the strategy and associated fundraising target will depend on partners' ambitions for the Program and clarity on the role of the CU in the fundraising process; until recently the Chair had engaged donors separately from the CU. The interim fundraising strategy rests on three pillars: (i) increasing stakeholder engagement; (ii) raising program visibility, and (iii) promoting GAFSP as a tool to achieve the Global Goals with a clearly articulated vision and strategy. It aims to strengthen key strategic partnerships, working closely with the G7 and G20 processes and engaging the G77, while cultivating relationships with potential new donors and liaising with private sector actors and non-traditional donors. The CU expressed appreciation for Germany's leadership in the context of the G20 process, and noted the potential to leverage Canada's chairmanship of the G7 next year. The importance of aligning the strategic vision, communications, and fundraising for the overall Program was acknowledged. The GAFSP Private Sector Window, which has been involved in the preparation process, noted that it has adequate funding to support a pipeline of new investment projects through June 2018.
64. The SC broadly agreed with the goals of the interim strategy and the fundraising target, and appreciated the CU's investment in successfully building GAFSP's visibility, supported by materials such as the new draft Business Case. The SC noted that the key components of any fundraising effort should clearly identify and emphasize, with simple messaging, GAFSP's value proposition. It was acknowledged that GAFSP has much to offer, including its potential to serve as a tool of choice to achieve SDG2; its multi-stakeholder governance structure; its strong impact evaluation, transparency, and accountability; and stakeholder partnerships. The utility of promoting GAFSP through side events at larger platforms in a targeted and cost effective manner, including building on broader themes such as youth/employment/climate change where strategically useful, was acknowledged, with agreement on the need to prioritize, in view of limited resources. It was also suggested to consider the feasibility of working towards a large centerpiece event or conference for GAFSP, with engagement at the highest levels. The need for professional fundraising expertise was highlighted, in order to map different opportunities, identify specific targets and highlight possible influencers on the fundraising 'journey'. A proposal was made for the CU to bring on board senior staff with specific fundraising expertise, as well as to consider identifying a high level champion or "ambassador" for the Program.
65. **Action point:** The CU will identify and secure professional fundraising expertise to design and support delivery of the fundraising strategy and will report back to the SC on progress by July 2017.

66. With fundraising a continued priority for GAFSP, membership and rotation of donor voting rights on the SC have been questions raised in the CU's outreach efforts. Clarity on the status of new donors as potential voting members on the SC would facilitate fundraising for GAFSP among potential new donors. The CU outlined options for the **allocation of voting donor membership and rotation of the GAFSP SC**, for consideration by the SC. The CU reminded the SC that, at present, all 8 voting donor seats on the SC are filled.
67. The current Steering Committee consists of a total of 16 voting members: an equal number of Public Sector Window donor country representatives (maximum 8) and regional 'recipient country' representatives (also maximum 8). Donors on the SC that currently have voting rights are: Australia, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Canada, Germany, the Republic of Korea, Spain, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The non-voting members on the SC include a representative from: each of GAFSP's Supervising Entities; one OECD- and two recipient region-based CSOs; the Trustee; the United Nations Secretary General's Special Representative on Food Security and Nutrition; each donor which is not a voting member (currently Ireland, which is the only non-voting Public Sector Window donor representative on the SC, and Japan and the Netherlands, which are donors only to the Private Sector Window).
68. Options for clarifications and revisions to SC membership have been discussed by the SC on several occasions, including at the November 2010 SC meeting where the SC agreed to cap voting membership at 16 (8 donor representatives and 8 regional representatives); the June 2011 SC meeting where a paper on options for constituency arrangements for SC consideration was discussed; and the October 2014 SC meeting where the number, selection, and rotation of regional representatives was agreed upon and when options were presented for the allocation of voting rights to donors in the event that a 9th donor would contribute to the Public Sector Window, but no decision was taken. At this March 2017 meeting, several options for consideration for the allocation of donor voting rights were presented, with the assumption that under each of the options, donors that either do not qualify for or lose their voting seat will retain a non-voting seat on the SC:
- Option 1, where voting seats would go to 8 donors with the largest cumulative contributions based on committed amounts.
 - Option 2, where voting seats would go to 8 donors with the largest cumulative contributions within the last 3-year period and a contribution would be necessary to retain a voting seat.
 - Option 3, where voting seats would go to 4 donors with the largest cumulative contributions as well as 4 donors with the most recent contributions, not including those with largest cumulative contributions.
 - Option 4, where the cap on the size of total voting members of SC would be lifted and additional donors would contribute an agreed cumulative minimum (indicatively \$50 million) to receive a voting seat.
 - Option 5, where the allocation of voting donor seats would be determined using a formula to consider historical commitment as well as cumulative contribution (e.g. voting priority index = $1/3$ (months/years from first commitment to present) + $2/3$ (cumulative committed contribution amount to present)).

69. In addition, a 2 year SC membership term was proposed for SC consideration. The SC Composition therefore would be reviewed and adjusted every 2 years or in the event of a new donor joining - whichever occurs earlier. SC members discussed the various options and related incentive structures, and also considered whether the fundraising strategy necessitated clarity on this in the near future.
70. **Action Points:** It was agreed that the CU would consult offline with SC members to arrive at a single option to be proposed to the SC by April 18, 2017. In the final approval process, which would be conducted virtually, the CU would seek an *affirmative response* from SC members on the proposed governance option.

Sessions 13 and 14: Selection of the next Steering Committee and Donor Committee Chairs; Summary and Closure

71. The outgoing SC Chair, the United States, announced that Germany will be taking up the Chair of the Steering Committee at the conclusion of this meeting. It was also confirmed by the outgoing DC Chair, the Netherlands, that the UK will assume the Chair for the Donor Committee going forward. Both incoming chairs were confirmed by those present. Members agreed to plan for the next joint SC/DC meeting in the fall of 2017 (i.e., October or November 2017). **The new Chairs of the SC and DC**, on behalf of all members, thanked the outgoing Chairs for their considerable contribution and leadership to the Program over the past years.
72. The Program Manager thanked the CU and Private Sector Window teams, as well as numerous other contributors, for their hard work in preparing for the meeting.

Annex 1: List of Meeting Participants (alphabetical order)

NAME	ORGANIZATION/COUNTRY
Abdul Ghaffar, Jeehan	Middle East North Africa Regional Representative / World Bank
Acheampong, Yasmine	Coordination Unit
Adoum, Djime	Africa Regional Representative / CILSS
Ahmed, AKM Mahfuzuddin	ADB
Ahuja, Preeti	World Bank
Bagna, Djibo	ROPPA
Bahalim, Ammad	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
Banzuela, Raul Socrates	AFA
Barbosa, Heleno	IADB
Brizzi, Adolfo	IFAD
Byerlee, Derek	TAC
Carsalade, Flavio	IFC
Cebotari, Alex (VC)	World Bank
Chen, Yanni	IFC
Chisholm, Georgina	IFC
Chow, Jennifer	United States
Clarke, Marie	ActionAid USA
Collines, Michael	IADB
Darjee, Lyam	AFA
Deuja, Jagat	AFA
Diaz Palacios, Jaime	Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Representative / World Bank
Dolan, Paul	Coordination Unit
Dominguez-Pabon, Rafael	Spain
Dumon, Jeremie	IFC
Dyer, Nichola	World Bank
Ehui, Mamou Kouyate	Africa Regional Representative / World Bank
Feldman, Lucas	WFP
Ferrero, Gabriel	United Nations
Fronic, Tea	Coordination Unit
Gerstenmier, Adam	AGRA
Guerra, Alberta	ActionAid USA
Habibullah, Nilofer	Coordination Unit
Haggerty, Luke (VC)	IFC
Hayward, Natasha	Coordination Unit
Htenas, Aira	Coordination Unit
Hurley, John	United States
Imashov, Chorobek	Europe and Central Asia Regional Representative / World Bank

NAME	ORGANIZATION/COUNTRY
Issamiddinova, Dilnara	World Bank
Johm, Ken	AfDB
Jung, Fritz	Germany
Kaddeche, Tania	IFC
Kadji, Christophe	Canada
Kalibata, Agnes	Africa Regional Representative/ AGRA
Kar, Anuja	Coordination Unit
Khouri, Nadim	Coordination Unit
Kooijman, Vincent	Royal Netherlands Embassy
Krebber, Iris	United Kingdom
Lanza, Jorge Fuentes	World Bank
Lestari, Dian	Asia Regional Representative / World Bank
List, Geneva	IADB
Louiszoon, Sandra	Netherlands
Lozansky, Tania (VC)	IFC
Lynn, Fiona	Australia
Makhulo, Anne Marie	AGRA
Mascaretti, Alberta	FAO
McGrenra, Deirdre	IFAD
McLean, Diana	TAC
Mohieldin, Mahmoud	World Bank
Moscatelli , Fabrizio	United States
Mostafa, Iftikhar	Coordination Unit
Naradate, Kazuki (Mr.)	Japan/World Bank
Nerayo, Lewan Afework	World Bank
Ngirente, Edouard	Africa Regional Representative / World Bank
Ogoh, Teresa	IFC
Ojukwu, Chiji	AfDB
Ouedraogo, Ousseini	ROPPA
Parent, Kimberly	Coordination Unit
Pimenta, Sergio (VC)	IFC
Pokharel, Champak	Asia Regional Representative
Price, Elizabeth	IFC
Rastogi, Tanuja	WFP
Roberts, Brad	IFC
Salman , Diana	Coordination Unit
Shah, Niraj	IFC
Sharan, Vimlendra	FAO North America
Shimano, Toshiyuji (Mr.)	Japan/World Bank
Sierra-Escalante, Kruskaia	IFC
Sta. Maria, Iris	World Bank

NAME	ORGANIZATION/COUNTRY
Steeghs, Jeroen	Netherlands
Strychacz, Nicholas	United States
Tabitha, Gillan	United Kingdom
Thant, Kyi Zar	IFC
Thapa, Dipti	Coordination Unit
Tolvaisaite, Lina	IFC
Trinidad, Rosalie Quong	Coordination Unit
Watkins, Neil	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
Yeom, Kyung-yun	Republic of Korea/World Bank
Zapatero, Maria Abad	Spain

Annex 2: Meeting agenda



AGENDA **Joint Steering Committee and Donor Committee Meeting** **March 28th – 30th, 2017**

Washington DC

Tuesday, March 28, 2017 (DAY 1)

Venue: Room C8-150, 1225 Connecticut Ave NW, Washington, DC 20036

8.30am to 9am	Coffee served outside the meeting room
9.00am to 9.30am	<p>1. Welcome, introduction of new participants, and adoption of agenda <i>Mr. John Hurley, Steering Committee Chair</i> <i>Mr. Jeroen Steeghs, Donor Committee Chair</i></p> <p>Welcome by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Mr. Mahmoud Mohieldin, World Bank Senior Vice President for the 2030 Development Agenda, United Nations Relations, and Partnerships- Sergio Pimenta, Director of Global Industry, Manufacturing, Agribusiness and Services, IFC <p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Meeting Agenda
9.30am – 11am	<p>2. Program Update and Portfolio Review</p> <p><u>Presentation:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Opening remarks (Nichola Dyer)b. Portfolio Status Updates for the Public Sector Window and Private Sector Window (Natasha Hayward and Niraj Shah)

	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public Sector Window Portfolio Review Report - Private Sector Window Investment Project Portfolio Analysis - Private Sector Window Investment Project Portfolio Report - Private Sector Window AS Project Portfolio Analysis - Private Sector Window AS Project Portfolio Report
11am – 11.20am	Coffee Break
11.20am to 12:30pm	<p>3. CSO Update and Report back</p> <p><u>Presentations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CSOs Year in Review <p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CSO Reports
12.30pm to 1.30pm	Lunch
1.30pm to 2pm	<p>4. Update from the Trustee</p> <p><u>Presentations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Financial Status of the Fund (Mr. Alexandru Cebotari) <p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GAFSP Financial Report
2pm to 6pm (including coffee break)	<p>5. Results of TAC review and discussion of Public Sector Window Proposals</p> <p><u>Presentations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. TAC presentation (Mr. Derek Byerlee, TAC Chair) <p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TAC Report - Country Proposals

Wednesday, March 29, 2017 (DAY 2)

Venue: Room C8-150, 1225 Connecticut Ave NW, Washington, DC 20036

8.30am to 9am	Coffee served outside the meeting room
9am to 9.30am	Session 5 Continued - Results of TAC review and discussion of Public Sector Window Proposals
9:30am to 10.30am	6. Discussion of Public Sector Window Proposals and Selection of Grant Awards <u>Documentation:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- TAC Report- Country proposals <u>Decision points:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Proposals to be financedb. Amount and activity to be awarded for each proposalc. Supervising Entity to be selected
10.30am to 11am	Coffee Break
11am to 1pm	7. Private Sector Window Update <u>Presentations:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Private Sector Window Annual Plan and Status Update (Niraj Shah)b. Formative Evaluation report – Private Sector Windowc. Local currency solutions pilotd. Africa Juice/Malawi Mangoes <u>Documentation:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Private Sector Window Annual Plan (June 2016 – June 2017)- Formative Evaluation Report – Private Sector Window <u>Decision points:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Endorsement of Private Sector Window Annual Plan
1pm to 2pm	Lunch
2pm to 3.30pm	8. Missing Middle Pilot Projects update <u>Presentations:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Missing Middle Pilot Projects Update (Iftikhar Mostafa)

3.30pm to 4pm	Coffee break
4pm to 5.30pm	<p>9. Monitoring & Evaluation Plan Update</p> <p><u>Presentations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Overview of GAFSP M&E plan (Natasha Hayward) b. Impact Evaluation – brief update c. FIES target setting exercise <p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - M&E Plan - FIES Target Setting Exploration Paper - Impact Evaluation Brief <p><u>Decision points:</u></p> <p>Endorsement of M&E Plan</p>
5.30pm to 8.00pm	<p>Reception</p> <p>Venue : C8-150 meeting room foyer</p>

Thursday, March 30, 2017 (DAY 3)

Venue: Room C8-150, 1225 Connecticut Ave NW, Washington, DC 20036

8.30am to 9am	Coffee served outside of meeting room
9am-9:30am	Session 9 Continued - Monitoring & Evaluation Plan Update
9:30am to 10am	10. GAFSP Program Evaluation <u>Presentations:</u> a. GAFSP Programmatic Evaluation <u>Documentation:</u> - Draft ToR: GAFSP Program Evaluation <u>Decision points:</u> a. Timeline for SC endorsement of ToR
10am to 11am	11. Strategic Vision for GAFSP <u>Presentations:</u> a. Strategic Vision for GAFSP b. Expansion of Private Sector Window Supervising Entities <u>Documentation:</u> - A 2030-ready GAFSP - African Development Bank: SEs for the Private Sector Window <u>Decision points:</u> TBD
11am to 11.30am	Coffee break
11.30am to 12.30pm	Strategic Vision for GAFSP (continued)
12.30pm to 1.30pm	Lunch
1.30pm to 3.30pm	12. Looking Forward <u>Presentations:</u> a. Fundraising – Overview b. Governance – Steering Committee membership options

	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interim Fundraising Strategy - Sustainable Financing for GAFSP – Oct 2014 (BMGF) - Governance Options Note - Communications Plan <p><u>Decision Points:</u> TBD</p>
3.30pm to 4.00pm	Coffee break
4.00pm to 4.30pm	13. Selection of the next Steering Committee and Donor Committee Chairs
4.30pm to 5pm	<p>14. Any other business, summary of decisions and closure</p> <p><u>Decision Points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Venue and timing of next meeting

Annex 3: Summary table – Joint SC/DC Meeting, March 2017: Action and Decision Points

Session	Action Point	Deadline	Responsibility	Decision Point
Day 1				
Session 2: Program Update and Portfolio Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. SEs to submit a brief action plan to the CU for projects rated Unsatisfactory (Category 4) ii. The CU to develop a “welcome package” for new GAFSP project leaders (with orientation information on both Windows, relevant guidelines and contacts, etc.) iii. Impact evaluation reports to be shared among stakeholders and posted on the GAFSP website. iv. Private Sector Window Secretariat to produce a combined AS and IS report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Following SC/DC Meeting close ii. Ahead of next Knowledge Forum iii. As IE reports become available iv. Effective immediately 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Supervising Entities ii. Coordination Unit iii. Coordination Unit iv. Private Sector Window 	
Session 3: CSO Update and Report back	CU to circulate for SC approval, CSO proposed budgets and work plans	End of May 2107	Coordination Unit	SC agreed on the value of CSO representation from donor and recipient countries, and to give consideration to additional budget to support continued, dedicated engagement from the OECD/northern CSO representative
Session 5: Results of TAC Review and Discussion of Public Sector Window Proposals	<p>For future Calls for Proposals, guidelines to be amended/updated to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. each country may submit only one proposal per Call ii. countries delineate different scale versions of the proposals (i.e., upper and lower case financing scenarios and how 	Ahead of next GAFSP Call for Proposals	Coordination Unit	SC would close the Fourth Call for Proposals and have no funding pipeline

Session	Action Point	Deadline	Responsibility	Decision Point
	<p>these may affect the design or geographic scope)</p> <p>iii. proposals include a suggested/standard budget template</p>			
Day 2				
Session 6: Discussion of Public Sector Window Proposals and Selection of Grant Awards			Coordination Unit	<p>i. The SC endorsed the final proposals to be financed, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rwanda: US \$26.3 million; ▪ Ethiopia: US \$30 million; ▪ Burkina Faso: US \$24 million (including a US \$500,000 preparation grant) ▪ Tanzania: US \$20 million (including a US \$498,580 preparation grant) ▪ Myanmar: US \$27 million; ▪ Nepal: US \$22.7 million (including a US \$500,000 preparation grant) ▪ Haiti: US \$10 million <p>ii. The SC agreed to ensure language would be included in the award notification letters to the effect that robust CSO engagement is expected throughout the project cycle, including implementation</p>
Session 7: Private Sector Window Update	<p>i. The Private Sector Window Secretariat to increase level of detail (such as relevant financial or economic indicators) in project notifications sent to SC/DC, within the bounds of confidentiality agreements</p>	<p>i. Effective immediately</p> <p>ii. December 2017</p>	<p>iv. The Private Sector Window Secretariat</p> <p>v. The Private Sector Window Secretariat</p>	<p>i. The SC endorsed the Private Sector Window Annual Plan (FY17).</p> <p>ii. It was agreed that the Private Sector Window Annual Plan approval process would be on a regular June cycle going forward, for both DC and SC approval</p>

Session	Action Point	Deadline	Responsibility	Decision Point
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. The Private Sector Window to update website content/design and make provision for a French translation of the Private Sector Window webpage. iii. The Private Sector Window Secretariat to provide an update on actions taken (or being taken) to address recommendations made in the Formative Evaluation report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Next DC meeting (July 2017) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> vi. The Private Sector Window Secretariat 	and endorsement, with the latter being sought virtually, via email.
Session 9: Monitoring & Evaluation Plan Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The CU to share the updated Theory of Change diagram with the SC, for the SC's information, prior to its inclusion in the M&E Plan document ii. The CU to update language in the M&E Plan on climate-related terminology and application iii. The CU to report back to the SC on the FIES target-setting exercise and the results of additional analysis agreed by the SC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. end June 2017 ii. end June 2017 iii. December 2017 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Coordination Unit ii. Coordination Unit iii. Coordination Unit 	The SC endorsed the updated M&E Plan for use.
Day 3				
Session 10: Program Evaluation	The CU will re-circulate the draft TOR virtually, with updates to reflect the discussion at the SC/DC meeting for SC review, comments, and endorsement.	April 2017; Final version of the evaluation to available by end of March 2018	Coordination Unit	
Session 11: Strategic Vision for GAFSP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. A ToR for the Strategic Vision Working Group with concrete deliverables and a timeline to be circulated by Australia, for review and endorsement by the SC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Within 3 weeks of the SC/DC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Australia 	

Session	Action Point	Deadline	Responsibility	Decision Point
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. The Private Sector Window to meet with AfDB, to pursue further discussion on the topic of the Private Sector Window comprising of multiple SEs. Additionally, the WG on GAFSP's Strategic Vision would incorporate this issue into its TOR. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> meeting (i.e. April 2017) ii. Meeting: following close of SC/DC meeting; TOR inclusion: April 2017 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Private Sector Window Secretariat 	
Session 12: Looking Forward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The CU to identify and secure professional fundraising expertise to design and support delivery of the fundraising strategy and report back to the SC on progress. ii. The CU to consult offline with SC members to arrive at a single option to be proposed to the SC. In the final approval process, which would be conducted virtually, the CU would seek an affirmative response from SC members on the proposed governance option. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. July 2017 ii. April 2017; Final approval to be conducted virtually 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Coordination Unit ii. Coordination Unit 	
Session 13: Selection of Next Steering Committee and Donor Committee Chairs; Summary and Closure				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Germany confirmed as new Steering Committee Chair ii. UK confirmed as new Donor Committee Chair

Annex 4: Summary of AfDB/IFC Private Sector Window Secretariat follow up discussion

Following the discussions at the GAFSP Steering Committee meeting from March 28-30, 2017, representatives of the African Development Bank (AfDB) (Dr. Chiji Okukwu, Director, and Mr. Ken Johm, Lead Agricultural Specialist, Agriculture and Agro-Industry Department) met with the GAFSP Private Sector Window (Mr. Niraj H. Shah, Acting Head) on Fri, Mar 31, 2017.

Mr. Shah explained the details of past successful collaborations of IFC/GAFSP with Asian Development Bank (ADB) in the case of Mountain Hazelnuts, Bhutan, with Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) in the case of Roya Renovation, Nicaragua and with Investment Fund for Developing Countries (IFU), Denmark in the case of Insta Products, Kenya. In each of these instances, it required a significant amount of work and cooperation/ collaboration on the side of both DFIs together with the GAFSP PrSW. He further explained the unsuccessful attempts between the IFC/GAFSP and ADB teams to identify projects to utilize the additional US\$6 mn earmarked for this purpose by Australia over the past year. Mr. Shah also explained the concept of a Master Cooperation Agreement (MCA) which would work in similar ways to a syndicated loan, and while being faster, would require AfDB to depend significantly on the IFC led appraisal process. However, AfDB applies similar instruments as the IFC.

AfDB reiterated their strong investment pipeline of 9 projects for US\$500 million which would benefit from GAFSP support. Mr. Ojukwu explained that the recent restructuring of the AfDB Private Sector Department (PSD) had led to the PSD Agriculture business being combined with the larger AfDB Agriculture Department, and the plan was to grow this business starting with the hiring of a senior leadership team and investment staff focused on private sector agribusiness operations, while in the interim, existing PSD agribusiness staff will continue to support the business. He also commended the Advisory Services model of IFC and said that a similar model was being conceived within AfDB.

In the interest of time and the spirit of cooperation shown in the recently concluded SC meeting, and while the Steering Committee Working Group on the Future Vision of GAFSP considers a potential expansion of the GAFSP PrSW SE to include other DFIs including the AfDB, both sides agreed to put forward one potential pipeline proposal each to explore in detail for potential co-funding by IFC and AfDB, supported by the GAFSP PrSW. This would allow both institutions to understand each other's approval and credit processes and peculiarities, as has been the case with the abovementioned co-funded projects supported by GAFSP. A funding requirement of US\$10-15 million (spread across IFC, AfDB and GAFSP) was considered as the ideal size.

The representatives will reach out to their business development teams (GAFSP PrSW with IFC teams, and AfDB with the PSD team) on the ground in Africa to come up with suitable projects that would fit the above size and GAFSP eligibility criteria to take forward.