

# **Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP)**

---

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

March 3 – 4, 2015  
World Bank Group  
Washington, DC

GAFSP Steering Committee Chair  
Mr. Dan Peters  
Director of Development Results and Accountability, International Affairs  
U.S. Department of the Treasury

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

Accepted for the Steering Committee

DAN PETERS

---

Dan Peters

Chair, GAFSP Steering Committee

Accepted for the Private Sector Window  
Donor Committee

MARCEL BEUKEBOOM

---

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 Group in Washington, D.C. on March 3-4, 2015. This was the third time that the SC and the DC have met jointly, after the first joint meeting in September 2013, and a second in October 2014. Participants to the meeting included members or alternates of the SC and DC (see Annex 1 for a full list of participants).

2. The meeting's opening session commenced with a welcome and introductions of new members to the SC, DC and Coordination Unit (CU), and then adoption of the provisional agenda circulated on February 24, 2015. The meeting agenda was structured to focus on and facilitate comprehensive discussions around the Vision Paper for GAFSP circulated on February 22, 2015 that the US took the lead in drafting.

### **Day 1 - Session 2: Current Development Agenda and Financing**

3. At the opening of the first working session, video links with offices in Dhaka, Bangladesh and Kigali, Rwanda enabled beneficiary representatives from GAFSP-financed projects in those countries to address the Meeting, and share their personal stories of project experiences and impacts. Both male and female smallholder producers spoke compellingly about the skills gained, institutions built, and household level changes in agricultural productivity, linkages to markets, and income. The Chair thanked the representatives for their efforts to join and speak to the Committees, and members acknowledged the value of a reminder of the overall purpose and people who directly benefit from GAFSP. Short written summaries of the beneficiaries' testimonials were shared.

4. A presentation related to the first part of the GAFSP Vision Paper, on the broader development context, was made by Coordination Unit. The presentation highlighted recent progress on poverty reduction and food security, and reflected on what is required for the global food system between now and 2030 in order to end poverty and hunger (likely to be among the Sustainable Development Goals [SDGs] to be finalized later this year). Key takeaway messages from his presentation included:

- While there has been significant progress in reducing poverty and hunger globally, it has been uneven, with a significant lag in low income countries in which progress will need to accelerate to end global poverty and hunger by 2030.
- Most of the poor live in rural areas; some will migrate to cities by 2030, but most will not. Most of the income gains to end poverty will need to come from agricultural activities in rural areas.
- Driven by population growth, food demand is projected to increase the most in the poorest regions by 2030—by about 60 percent in Sub-Saharan African countries. Linking poor farmers to these markets, and raising their productivity to meet this higher demand, can help raise average incomes of the poor by the needed 60 percent to end poverty by 2030. Improving the climate-resilience of these productivity gains will be critical, as climate change is projected to have the greatest negative impacts where food demand is projected to be highest.
- Ending hunger likely requires a differentiated approach by country. Income gains and more targeted nutrition programs both matter, but the relative importance of each likely differs by the current conditions in each country.

- Ending poverty and hunger by 2030 will require substantially more resources. On-farm investments, by farmers themselves, by far make up the largest source of agricultural investments. Agricultural public investment in less developed countries has doubled since 2000. The share of agriculture in total public spending has moderately increased to 9 percent. This is lower than the 14 percent share that some of today's transforming Asian countries were spending on agriculture when they had similar shares of agriculture in GDP as today's least developed countries. Donor support has also increased, but momentum has slowed since 2011. ODA accounts for about 70 percent of all external financing in less developed countries.
- The amount of additional financing needed to end poverty and hunger will be dependent on the extent to which the financing provided: targets the poor; induces on-farm investments of the poor; improves the efficiency of broader public spending in the sector (including improvements to the broader policy environment); and induces broader private investment that more directly benefits the poor.

5. The ensuing discussion touched upon issues including: whether the priority was principally the sizable financing gap for agricultural and food systems investments, or a lack of clearly identified and ready-to-finance investments, or both; and the positioning of GAFSP in ongoing post-Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) discussions, especially with respect to other funds servicing the same constituents. The relevant features of GAFSP highlighted included: targeting of those countries in which progress needs to accelerate the most to meet the SDGs; focusing explicitly on agriculture— from which most income gains of the poor will likely be needed to achieve the SDGs; balancing both income gains and nutrition-sensitive investments; being strongly country-led; and demonstrating inclusive governance. Finally, the plenary concluded with points relating directly to GAFSP's vision and positioning: in linking with the SDGs and positioning GAFSP, meeting participants - as representatives of recipients, donors and development agencies - were urged to remain consistent in this messaging within these groups, especially as funding decisions are taken.

### **Day 1 - Session 3: The Operational Model**

6. The first working session reviewed the Vision Paper and its recommendations focused on the GAFSP operational model, particularly its Public Sector Window. Discussion during the session focused on four specific recommendations for further refinement of the model, as highlighted in the draft Paper and presented below. Prior to presentation of those recommendations, the SC Chair noted that, through the drafting and consultation process, it was clear that many aspects of the operational model are working well and are highly valued. The SC/DC re-endorsed those distinctive aspects of the GAFSP model which have a comparative advantage and continue to be endorsed and praised (e.g., the inclusive governance model, its country led approach, its focus on countries with high levels of hunger and poverty, its competitive method for allocating financing, etc). The SC/DC nonetheless recognized that there is room for continued refinement and necessary adjustments.

7. The specific recommendations discussed<sup>1</sup> and agreements reached included:

---

<sup>1</sup> **Recommendation 4:** Integrate operational adjustments to improve coordination between the Public and Private Sector Windows on an operational level was discussed under Day 1 Session 5 Public Private Partnership. Decisions are reflected in the minutes under that section.

- **Recommendation 1:** Require that GAFSP proposals include an explanation and approximate quantification of if and how countries will leverage co-financing from other public sources (including the country's own budgetary resources). **Not agreed.** *SC/DC members agreed that it would be desirable, as a part of the GAFSP proposal process, for GAFSP client countries to provide information on complementary and additional sources of financing for their food security strategy generally and their GAFSP proposals specifically, to the degree that such information is not already required under the eligibility criteria and in order to underscore the ability of a country to reach out to others and look for synergies. Members, however, did not agree that the eligibility criteria should be revised or that any formal changes to the scoring formula should be made. **Agreed next steps:** Prior to the next Call for Proposals, the CU will review the guidelines for proposals to determine if the guidelines are sufficiently detailed in their request for financing information, as laid out above.*
- **Recommendation 2:** Require that countries that request a second grant from GAFSP demonstrate that government food security spending has remained flat or increased as a share of total expenditure as a proxy for demonstrating the country's continued commitment to improving food security. **Not agreed.** *Some members of the SC/DC noted that this indicator may not be the best proxy for a country's commitment – as countries with high levels of need often face urgent fiscal constraints. Some members of the SC/DC noted the need for further clarification on when countries should be able to apply for a second GAFSP grant. For countries that apply for a second grant, consider looking into previous GAFSP project performance as an additional review criterion to receive additional funds. **Agreed next steps:** Prior to the next Call for Proposals, the CU will prepare a short paper outlining recommendations for when a country should be eligible to request a second grant, and any additional review criteria (e.g. performance of first GAFSP financed project).*
- **Recommendation 3:** Adopt a balanced portfolio approach that would take thematic or geographic considerations into account in instances where proposals clearly meet the Technical Advisory Committee's (TAC) technical thresholds but there is no significant distinction in scores. **Not agreed.** *Views were mixed, although a majority of members who commented expressed concerns with taking thematic or geographic considerations into account. Some members expressed willingness to support a compromise in this area. **Agreed next steps:** None.*
- **Recommendation 5:** Request analysis from the Coordination Unit and Supervising Entities on opportunities and requirements for consideration of larger grant sizes, such as whether additional information should be included in proposals for TAC consideration and additional support for project preparation. **Agreed.** *The CU will undertake further analysis on the issue, working with the SEs, and building on the earlier Working Group 4 paper which also touched on this issue. **Agreed next steps:** The CU will prepare a short paper by July 1 examining the various factors for consideration in determining grant sizes and whether the SC/DC should more explicitly invite larger grant proposals in the next Call.*

8. The CU presented a summary on the M&E Framework that was adopted by the SC in 2011. The presentation underlined the principles that had been followed in the Framework – particularly that of an explicit reliance on Supervising Entities’ (SEs’) existing tools, formats and processes for M&E for tracking portfolio quality, progress and impact – and gave an overview of the Results Framework used to track, understand and measure progress and results at three tiers: portfolio inputs and quality; project progress and outputs; and program impact and outcomes. A concluding session on Lessons Learned paved the way for the following discussion, led by the US, and referencing the recommendations made in the Ambition and Results section of the Vision Paper.

9. Discussion focused on the need to arrive at realistic, simple and streamlined conclusions that preserve the current focus on the country-level bottom-up approach, respect the SEs’ M&E frameworks, and meet donor reporting requirements. Elements framing this discussion included: a reminder that although this presentation concerns only the Public Sector Window, the Working Group should also cover the Private Sector Window, also given the discussion between the two Windows for identification of potential common indicators; a suggestion to inform this discussion with the ongoing work on the SDGs and their emerging targets; and the consideration not only to narrow the set of GAFSP indicators, also to include new indicators that capture previously unaddressed dimensions like resilience, risk, and climate change.

10. Members **agreed** to establish a small working group composed of Supervising Entities and other interested members that will look at both public and private sector windows to make recommendations to the SC/DC with regard to:

- **Recommendation 1:** Establishing ambitious, realistic and measurable goals that capture GAFSP’s impact on target populations in recipient countries based on a given level of new donor contributions.

*Key notes: Some members of the Steering Committee noted the challenges in establishing ‘ex ante’ goals as GAFSP permits programming across a wide range of activities (in line with its country-led model), eschews earmarking, and delivers improvements in food security that depend on a range of factors, some of which may be beyond the control of a GAFSP project and some longer term in nature. It was also noted that it would be difficult to establish such goals without confirmation of the related future financing amount available, and noted that other instruments, such as IDA, do not set goals in this way. Other members, while acknowledging GAFSP’s country-led approach, stressed that GAFSP should be able to set over-arching goals (on income gains, for example) based on the experience of its existing portfolio, anticipated resource mobilization targets, and with an observation that these could be useful tools to aid fund-raising, by translating results into a compelling program narrative.*

- **Recommendation 2:** Narrowing the set of outcome indicators for the core activities supported by GAFSP (e.g., increase agricultural productivity, link farmers to markets, reduce risk and vulnerability, increase incomes, improve food security) and establishing targets for those indicators.

*Key notes: SC agreed that a narrowed set of outcome indicators was appropriate and feasible. Some members expressed concerns about setting annual targets for outcome indicators, where the relevant SE did not already do so in its own M&E practices.*

- **Recommendation 3:** Defining a set of operational performance indicators for GAFSP, including disbursement rates and percentage of projects rated “satisfactory” or better.

*Key notes: The SC as a whole agreed on the idea of operational performance indicators, as part of an improved performance monitoring framework, and agreed that the Working Group will determine which indicators should be monitored. Multiple participants noted that the SC needs to remember that, owing to their profile, GAFSP countries will (and should) have higher risk and failure rates. Agreed next steps: The CU will convene the Working Group with representatives from the Supervising Entities as well as interested members of the SC/DC. The Working Group aims to make recommendations to the SC/DC on the three proposals by July 1, subject to the ToR and timeline to be agreed by the group members. In addition, the Private Sector Window Secretariat outlined its plans for a meeting of interested donors and other partners at the conclusion of the SC/DC meeting, to review and discuss their plans for a Program Evaluation, in particular to ensure coordination with the planned Program Evaluation for the Public Sector Window.*

#### **Day 1 – Session 5: Public Private Partnership**

11. The final session of the day focused on specific aspects of the relationship between GAFSP’s financing for public and private sector-focused activities and were driven by a broader Committee concern to ensure appropriate coordination and synergy across the two windows. Specific issues discussed were: (i) the opportunity to open up access to private sector focused financing to other SEs, once additional funding becomes available – with acknowledgement that this was a new agenda item, added in the day’s opening session; (ii) an update and discussion on the direction and next steps planned for the Missing Middle initiative; and, (iii) an update and presentation by Laura Mecagni, Head of the Private Sector Window Secretariat at IFC, on specific examples of collaboration between public and private sector windows.

12. FAO made a brief presentation on key elements of the paper “Food Security, Nutrition, and Sustainable Agriculture at Centre Stage on the Road to the Addis Ababa Conference” jointly prepared by FAO, IFAD, and WFP ahead of the meetings on Financing for Development (FfD) to be held in Ethiopia in July, 2015. The paper posits the centrality of food security, nutrition and sustainable agriculture to the post-2015 development agenda. In addition to recognizing the evolving aid architecture and development finance landscape and the increased range of relevant fund flows, including domestic and private financing, the paper calls attention to a need for public finance and policy frameworks to be used better to support and facilitate sustainable investments by private actors and communities. In the context of private financing and investments, however, it is critical to recognize the importance of smallholder farmers and improving their investment capacity as part of the private sector agenda.

13. The Private Sector Window Secretariat at IFC made a presentation that showcased existing examples of collaboration between Private and Public Sector partners and investments, that underlined the potential for joint working in appropriate contexts, and also illustrated the time and efforts needed to forge those partnerships: the Rwanda Nutrition project, working with 11 cooperatives which receive complementary financing through the Public Sector Window Land Husbandry, Water Harvesting, and

Hillside Irrigation (LWH) project; and the Cameroon Agriculture Investment and Market Development project -- a joint IDA/IFC initiative supported by IDA, IFC and the GAFSP Private Sector Window.

14. The Coordination Unit gave a brief update on the Missing Middle initiative. The agreement reached in principle with the Missing Middle Working Group was a three-pronged approach: i) to work with those SEs that have recently approved GAFSP projects that are now in the design phase (e.g., Lao PDR, IFAD/ WFP) to see if there are opportunities to incorporate Missing Middle criteria; ii) to develop dedicated pilot project(s) in consultation with the Working Group (WG) – for which defining criteria, related success factors/indicators, and a proposed timeline and process steps would be agreed in April; and iii) to explore options to modify existing selection criteria in the Country Guidelines for the next GAFSP Call for Proposals, drawing upon suggestions made in the Enclude report, and any lessons from the emerging pilots. By mid-May, the WG would report back to the SC to update on the status of all three prongs.

- **Recommendation 1:** Permit other Supervising Entities to participate in GAFSP’s private sector window. *Agreed.* Members expressed willingness to have other SEs serve as implementers of the GAFSP private sector window **when** new financing was available for commitment to the private sector window. One member asked about the potential for establishing a small pilot for other SEs if new money was made available this calendar year. A second member indicated a willingness to discuss the allocation of some of its existing funds in the Private Sector Window. *Agreed next steps:* ADB, AfDB, IFC, relevant members of the DC and SC as well as IFC and WB trustee representatives should hold a conference call by March 15 to explore the potential for the pilot described above.
- **Recommendation 2:** Establish a timeline for launching a pilot of the Missing Middle initiative. *Agreed.* Several members underscored the need to move ahead with pilots based on the extensive work done in this area over the last nine months. The Coordination Unit agreed to develop firm timelines for final development and launching of Missing Middle pilot(s), subject to the SC’s approval and factoring in the need to both incorporate civil society contributions and consultation on the resulting draft, which require translation. *Agreed next steps:* The CU will prepare a short paper by May 1 covering (i) success factors for pilot project(s) of the Missing Middle Initiative, (ii) a timeline for developing and launching new pilot project(s) and (iii) resources required for the pilot project(s), to be commented by the Missing Middle WG and subsequently to be approved by the SC.
- **Recommendation 3:** Develop a mechanism for capturing opportunities for further public-private partnerships that involve GAFSP, such as the examples presented by the Private Sector Window (Rwanda and Cameroon). *Not decided.* The importance of encouraging greater dialogue at the country level in order to identify more organic opportunities to create these types of cooperation was recognized as well as the need to learn from examples shared of successful cooperation. The meeting was reminded of the paper prepared jointly by the Netherlands and Canada and shared at the October 2014 SC/DC, addressing operational opportunities for enhanced coordination between Public and Private Sector Windows. The SC Chair suggested that the SEs could review the Public Sector Window projects to identify opportunities for cooperation and Private Sector

*Window financing and submit those, as applicable, to the Private Sector Window Secretariat for further consideration. The SC Chair suggested that the SC/DC could set a projection for the number of opportunities to be identified by the SEs over the next 12 months.*

## **Day 2 – Session 6: Review of decisions from Day 1**

15. The second day opened with a review of the first day's discussions, with the Chairs sharing a jointly prepared summary of agreements and recommendations for the members' review and discussion. Key points raised have been reflected in the Recommendations for Day One incorporated into these Minutes. Additional points included the need for the CU to deploy technical assistance (TA) and troubleshooting expertise in those instances of poor performance, which were taken up under Session 8 Staffing and Resourcing.

## **Day 2 – Session 7: Sustainability in the Post-2015 Agenda, Fundraising, and Lifecycle**

16. This session focused on the positioning and vision of GAFSP as a sustainable financing instrument in the wider context of agriculture and sustainable development, and attainment of the SDGs. Initial contributions from members focused on the complex inter-relationship between the ongoing FfD discussions in the run up to the Third International Conference on FfD in Addis Ababa in July 2015, and the SDGs to be adopted at the UN General Assembly in September 2015. Discussion is on-going as to what mechanisms would be used to finance attainment of the SDGs with varying recognition of different instruments including IFAD, GAFSP and a proposed smallholder fund, in addition to the related potential for 'competition' in a reduced ODA environment between different vertical funds. It was discussed that the GAFSP should be more visible and present in global processes and discussions related to FfD and the Post-2015 Development Agenda/SDGs.

17. The Vision Paper presentation highlighted GAFSP's convincing potential to deliver on SDG 2 namely on ending hunger, achieving food security and improved nutrition and promoting sustainable agriculture – as well as other SDGs – given its alignment with national country plans; transparent competitive process; focus on the poorest; and emerging results on incomes, nutrition, productivity and climate change. The Vision Paper proposes a lifecycle to the year 2030, aligned with the SDGs, and allowing sufficient time for impacts to be realized, yet with attendant urgency. A proposal was made that, in order to make this a serious global effort, resources are needed, and that more predictability and certainty of funding would be beneficial to both financiers, recipients and the program delivery without it becoming a formal, rigid mechanism. The proposal laid out in the Vision Paper was three five-year cycles of fund-raising, including a first five-year cycle with a goal of \$1.5 billion.

18. Other discussion points included the need to avoid a proliferation of financing instruments for agriculture and food security and do a better job in articulating and advocating for GAFSP as a successful bottom-up instrument. The potential for enhanced communications was raised, including strategic engagement and communications both to those institutions and agencies on the global stage (G7, G8, G20, UN, etc) and to broader civil society, donor country tax-payers, etc. It was agreed that a calendar building up towards pledges in the fall and visibility opportunities for GAFSP would be drawn.

- **Recommendation 1:** Establishing regular funding cycles until 2030. *Agreed. Members agreed on the value of establishing a regular and predictable funding cycle in alignment with the SDGs,*

*to the benefit of both financiers and recipients. Several members underscored a need to consider the funding needs of both windows. Members discussed the feasibility of three-year versus five-year funding cycles, set against respective donor budget and planning cycles. It was generally agreed that three years may be too short. There was broad commitment to embark collectively on a design process that would learn the lessons and challenges of more fixed replenishment cycles, avoid competition with other replenishment timelines (e.g. IDA) and without building in disincentives to donors who wish to contribute outside the funding cycle. The Steering Committee agreed that the structure should be flexible. **Suggested next steps:** The US will reflect these recommendations in the revised Vision Paper.*

- **Recommendation 2:** Creating funding targets. **Agreed.** \$1.5 billion was agreed in principle as an appropriate funding target for the first five-year cycle and for the Program as a whole. The importance of establishing greater communications and outreach and an articulated fundraising strategy was acknowledged. While it was recognized that ‘perfect’ evidence was unrealistic, participants agreed on the utility of a convincing results framework, narrative and related communications. They also noted the attendant implications for the CU, recognizing the significant ‘machinery’ behind fundraising and replenishment at other multilateral mechanisms.
- **Recommendation 3:** Setting up programmatic evaluation. **Agreed.** The SC/DC were reminded that for the Public Sector Window the first phase of the programmatic evaluation was completed and shared at the October SC/DC meeting; that review assessed the Program in terms of efficacy, relevance, and efficiency using publicly available information and inputs from the CU and the Private Sector Window Secretariat, and reported fairly positively on operational strength, performance metrics, and increasing demand from countries and private sector entities. For the second phase, an important factor is data availability, and, with a significant number of projects closing in 2016, it is proposed to start the evaluation only in late 2016 or early 2017.

## **Day 2 – Session 8: Staffing and Resourcing**

19. Discussion under this session was based on the relevant section of the Vision Paper. SC/DC members were reminded that when GAFSP was established the CU was meant to be a light administrative unit, and that for a fund of this size the fact that the overhead costs account for less than 1 percent is uncommon. As the program has matured, however, it has witnessed an increase in the size of the project portfolio to be monitored and the number of donors to report to, together with additional demands made of the CU beyond its earlier envisaged tasks; there is a need to clarify these demands and scale the staffing and resources of the CU accordingly. In the course of these meetings, additional requests have been extended to the CU to exert even more effort on communications and M&E, as well as to deploy TA and troubleshooting expertise in instances of poor project performance (Day 2 – Session 6). An increase in CU staffing becomes imperative under these circumstances. The Vision Paper recommended at least 12 full-time staff members equivalent spread across four clusters: Operations, Policy/ Strategy, M&E, and Communications/ Advocacy/ Outreach.

20. The World Bank thanked SC/DC members for entrusting the WB with the organization of GAFSP, and proceeded to clarify that even with external demand and additional funds, increasing CU staff currently required trade-offs and is not always possible. The World Bank is committed to GAFSP, it was announced that the CU currently has 12 staff members – some of whom are part-time, and that staffing decisions to reinforce the M&E CU capacity are being undertaken. In addition, the recruitment of

a full-time GAFSP Program Manager, in addition to the already-hired Deputy Program Manager, had been concluded.

**Recommendation:** The US and CU will draft a Staffing Plan and ToRs taking into account different streams of work that the SC/ DC would like the CU to assume based on the four priority clusters (Operations, Policy/ Strategy, M&E, and Communications/ Advocacy/ Outreach) laid out in the Vision Paper.

## **Day 2 – Session 9: Review of Decisions from Day 2**

21. The Chair reflected the agreements reached in Session 7, as captured in the Recommendations above, but additionally proposed that the US will take the lead in drafting a proposed timeline and strategy that will look forward to an anticipated replenishment/pledging event in the fall of 2015, potentially around World Food Day. The paper will include steps and deliverables required on key agendas of interest, including Ambition/Results (M&E); Public and Private Sector Window coordination and co-operation (including Missing Middle and PPPs); and CU staffing and resourcing. The Chair also proposed that the issue of private sector expertise on the Technical Advisory Committee be resolved by the next Call for Proposals.

22. The Project Preparation Funds paper, as provided in the meeting’s materials folder, will be shared with the SC for approval on a no-objection basis in the coming few weeks.

23. Other business:

- i. A suggestion was made by the outgoing GAFSP Program Manager to explore the possibility of including in the CSOs agreement a provision for translation costs of GAFSP documents (discussed under Session 8).
- ii. The CU updated the SC members on the strong level of support expressed by recipient countries for GAFSP and indicated that these countries would like to see it as a model for delivering the SDGs in the Post-2015 Development Agenda. A number of letters by Ministers of Finance and Foreign Affairs have been signed by respective Governments expressing full support for GAFSP and urging the donor community to replenish the GAFSP. The team is exploring opportunities to have countries highlight their leadership and experience in this year’s key global development and financing processes (FfD and Post-2015).
- iii. Next SC/ DC meeting: It was proposed that the SC/DC will meet again in the Fall of 2015. The CU agreed to explore options and costs for hosting the next meeting overseas.
- iv. Selection of chairmanship of the SC/DC. The Chairs of the SC and DC will retain their positions until the next SC/ DC meeting, and proposed that they then rotate out sequentially, so that there is not a complete turnover at one time. Members were encouraged to give consideration to chairmanship in the future.

24. The meeting concluded with thanks from the Chairs.

## Annex 1: List of participants

<b>Name</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Agency</b>
Mr. Dan Peters	United States	US Treasury
Mr. Marcel Beukeboom	Netherlands	Netherlands Ministry for Foreign Affairs
<b><i>Donors</i></b>		
Mr. Matt Williams	Australia	DFAT
Dr. Julie Delforce	Australia	DFAT
Mr. Adam Patterson	Australia	DFAT
Mr. Josh Lozman		Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
Mr. Neil Watkins		Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
Ms. Isabelle Pouliot-Cotnoir	Canada	Finance Canada
Ms. Rebecca Smart	Canada	DFATD
Ms. Teresa Ramos Gorostiza	Spain	Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness
Ms. Helen Edmundson	United Kingdom	DfID
Ms. Diana Dalton	United Kingdom	DfID
Ms. Alexia Latortue	United States	US Treasury
Ms. Shannon Ding	United States	US Treasury
Ms. Jennifer Chow	United States	US Treasury
Ms. Birgit Gerhardus	Germany	Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
Mr. Ralf Schroeder	Germany	German ED's office
<b><i>Recipients</i></b>		
Mr. Rionald Silaban	Asia	Executive Director (Brunei Darussalam, Fiji, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Singapore, Thailand, Tonga, Vietnam) World Bank
Dr. Adisorn Promthep	Asia	Minister of Agriculture Office of Agriculture Embassy of Thailand, Washington DC

Mr. Herfan Brilianto	Asia	Minister of Agriculture and Head of Office of Agricultural Affairs, Southeast Asia Group (Indonesia)
Ms. Chanyanis Utiskul	Asia	Officer of Agriculture and Assistant the the Minister of Agriculture, The Royal Thai Embassy
Mr. Edward Jackson	Latin America/Caribbean	Senior Advisor ED's office for Central America
Mr. Mariano Jimenez	Latin America/Caribbean	Government of Honduras
Mr. Chorobek Imashov	Europe/Central Asia	Advisor Office of the Executive Director (Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Poland, Serbia, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)
Mr. Reto Robert Gruninger	Europe/Central Asia	Advisor Office of the Executive Director (Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Poland, Serbia, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)
Mr. Edouard Ngirente	Africa	Advisor Office of the Executive Director (Botswana, Burundi, Eritrea, et al)
Ms. Mamou Kouyate Ehui	Africa	Advisor Office of the Executive Director (Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, et al)
Ms. Jeehan Abdul Ghaffar	Middle East North Africa	Senior Advisor Office of the Executive Director (Bahrain, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Yemen)
<b><i>Donor Representatives in Non-Voting Status</i></b>		

Ms. Yuri Kato	Japan	ED's office
Mr. Peter LePoole	Netherlands	Netherlands Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Mr. Mark van der Velden	Netherlands	
<b>Administrative Units (non-voting)</b>		
Ms. Geeta Sethi		World Bank
Ms. Laura O. Mecagni		IFC
Mr. Darius Stagnu		World Bank
Ms. Iris Jacqueline Sta. Maria		World Bank
Kinam Oh		World Bank
<b>Supervising Entities For Investment and Technical Assistance (non-voting)</b>		
Mr. Juergen Voegele		World Bank
Mr. Mark Cackler		World Bank
Mr. Willem Bettink		IFAD
Mr. Dougou Keita		AfDB
Mr. AKM Mahfuzuddin Ahmed		ADB
Mr. Pedro Martel		IDB
Mr. Ginya A. Truitt Nakata		IDB
<b>Supervising Entities for Technical Assistance</b>		
Mr. Guy Evers		FAO
Mr. Jon Brause		WFP
Ms. Tanuja Rastogi		WFP
<b>Civil Society Organizations</b>		
Ms. Marie Brill	Northern CSOs	ActionAid
Ms. Elisabeth Getachew	Northern CSOs	ActionAid
Mr. Djibo Bagna	Southern CSOs (Africa)	Roppa
Mr. Mamadou Goita	Southern CSOs (Africa)	Roppa
Mr. Raul Socrates Banzuela	Southern CSOs (Asia)	AFA
<b>Coordination Unit</b>		
Robert Townsend		World Bank
Kimberly Parent		World Bank

Aira Htenas		World Bank
Iftikhar Mostafa		World Bank
Varun Nangia		World Bank
Barbara Eckberg		World Bank
Rosalie Q. Trinidad		World Bank
Natasha Hayward		World Bank
Pauline Zwaans		World Bank
Yuvan Beejadhur		World Bank
Nadim Khouri		World Bank
Niraj Shah		IFC
Brad Roberts		IFC
Heather Anne Miller		IFC
Yanni Chen		IFC
Caitriona Palmer		IFC
Jeremie Dumon		IFC
Sergio Pimenta		IFC
Urkaly Isaev		IFC
Pamposh Rasdan		IFC
Anton Von Ruten		IFC
Chris Richards		IFC
Flavio Carsalade		IFC