

# Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP)

---

July 27, 2011

## Executive Minutes Fifth Meeting of the GAFSP Steering Committee June 7-8, 2011

Renaissance Hotel  
Washington, DC

GAFSP Steering Committee Chair  
Mr. Dan Peters  
US Treasury

Prepared by the GAFSP Coordination Unit  
CHRISTOPHER L. DELGADO July 7, 2011

**SIGNED CLD**

---

Christopher L. Delgado

Program Manager, GAFSP

Accepted for the Steering Committee  
DAN PETERS July 20, 2011

**SIGNED DP**

---

Dan Peters

Chair of GAFSP Steering Committee

## **DAY ONE: JUNE 7, 2011**

### **AGENDA 1: INTRODUCTION OF THE MEETING**

1. The fifth meeting of the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) Steering Committee (SC) was convened at the Renaissance Hotel in Washington, D.C., on June 7-8, 2011. Participants to the meeting included members or alternates of the SC (see Annex 1 for an Agenda, Annex 2 for a list of participants, and Annex 3 for the list of confirmed SC members and alternates as of June 30, 2011).
2. The Chair requested the observation of a minute of silence to remember Mr. Ndiogou Fall, who passed away on May 5, 2011. In his GAFSP role, Mr. Fall represented African civil society organizations on the GAFSP SC.
3. A brief update on developments since the last SC Meeting was given by the Chair of GAFSP, including reference to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting in January 2011, the two joint SC-TAC Working Group Meetings in December 2010 and April 2011, and the Development Impact Evaluation Initiative (DIME) workshop organized in Dakar in April 2011.

### **AGENDA 2: PRESENTATION AND ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED AGENDA**

4. The meeting adopted the provisional agenda circulated on June 1, 2011. Two additional topics were added to the agenda: (i) the role and composition of TAC and the length of term of current TAC members (to be discussed with item 13); and (ii) interactions of GAFSP with the Committee on Food Security (CFS), including the October CFS Meeting in Rome (discussed with item 12). The order of the topics under discussion was slightly modified during the meeting to allow for additional time for some sessions. The importance of agenda item 15 (on fundraising) was also highlighted, the outcome of which would determine the timing of the next SC meeting.

### **AGENDA 3: GAFSP TRUST FUND FINANCIAL OVERVIEW**

5. The Trustee presented the status of contributions and receipts for the public sector window. Since the last SC Meeting in November 2010, the Trustee has received additional cash receipts totaling AUD\$15 million from Australia and US\$99.8 million from the US, bringing the cumulative cash receipts amount to US\$521 million for the Public Sector Window. This amounts to 56 percent of the total pledged amount.
6. The cumulative funding decision made by the GAFSP SC up to May 2011 amounted to US\$ 345 million. This includes US\$ 321 million allocated to approved projects, US\$16 million committed to Supervising Entities to support preparation and implementation, and US\$8 million for administrative budgets by the Trustee, Coordination Unit and other relevant World Bank units. Accordingly, the net funding availability in the GAFSP Trust Fund public sector window as of June 7, 2011 was US\$ 176 million.
7. **An existing donor who wishes to make a public announcement at a later date announced an additional pledge of approximately US\$50 million.** Korea, then, informed the meeting of its willingness

to accelerate its contribution. It is expected that US\$ 24 million will be contributed by Korea, by September 2011 and the remaining US\$ 23 million in the next budget cycle.

#### **AGENDA 4: RESULTS OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) REVIEW BASED ON THE WORKING GROUP GUIDELINES TO TAC FROM DECEMBER 2010**

8. Two members of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) presented the TAC report that was circulated to the SC by e-mail on February 4, 2011. On the review process, it was highlighted that the SC's Working Group, as directed by the SC, provided further guidance to TAC to assess the 17 proposals prior to the TAC meeting of January 2011. The Working Group was tasked by the SC to improve the objectivity and specificity of the assessment criteria in order to reduce the dispersion of score among TAC members. Working Group recommendations were applied by the TAC in the review of the 17 unfunded proposals (from the October 2010 submissions). The original criteria, including the weights used, of the Call for Proposal were retained in the TAC assessment.

9. The TAC members reported the following observations based on the TAC review process experience: (i) it was critical to have a face-to-face meeting among TAC members to assess the proposals; (ii) the TAC is an advisory committee only and that the ultimate decisions reside with the SC; (iii) the TAC is very well-balanced in terms of geographical composition and technical competencies (mix of nutrition, economic and technical specialists) and each member reviewed all the proposals to arrive at an assessment; and (iv) there was significant value added from technical assistance provided for the preparation of the country submissions.

10. Based on their assessment, **TAC recommended funding for roughly half of the 17 proposals. Should funding not be available for all fundable proposals, TAC recommended that funding be prioritized to reflect the rank order recommended by TAC.** Some of the TAC recommendations for funding were conditional on the proposed Supervising Entity ensuring that specific attention is paid to elements that the TAC believes are crucial to ensure effective implementation and policy coordination. However, TAC did not recommend that the SC postpone proposal decisions until the changes have been documented, but rather that the changes should be monitored and verified by Supervising Entities and the SC, with support from the GAFSP Coordination Unit.

11. TAC also found that some proposals were not currently ready for funding. In some cases, the proposals do not appear to flow logically from country strategies and investment plans while in others, the request of funding may not match the objectives of GAFSP. In some cases, the costs of proposed activities seemed to be high and in some, the proposals seemed to duplicate what is already being implemented on the ground.

#### **AGENDA 5: SELECTION OF RECIPIENTS**

12. To maintain prudent financial management principles, the SC decided to allocate awards only up to the currently available funds deposited with the Trustee. This amounts to **US\$160 million available for allocation to country proposals.** This amount does not include an additional 5 percent of recipient amounts for supervising agency execution in project preparation and supervision and the additional costs associated with monitoring and evaluation and the administrative budget for FY12.

13. The TAC recommendations for the top four proposals amounted to \$172 million in recipient grants. To align with the available funding envelope of \$160 million, the SC agreed to an allocation that included a 7 percent reduction for all projects across the TAC recommended funding levels. Accordingly, the GAFSP SC allocated project grants to the four highest ranked countries for a total of US\$160 million in recipient-executed grants. **The selected proposals were: Cambodia (US\$ 39.1 million), Liberia (US\$ 46.5 million), Nepal (US\$ 46.5 million) and Tajikistan (US\$27.9 million).** It was also agreed to set aside an additional amount of up to 5 percent of these amounts for Supervising Entity-executed assistance to countries in preparation and supervision of projects.

14. All countries who submitted proposals were notified through a letter to the Government on June 8, 2011 with the outcome. The four successful countries were notified of the award amount, approved Supervising Entity (-ies), and SC's recommendations for improvement through this letter. The other countries were notified of the outcome, the technical assessment of their submission, and encouraged to apply in the next Call for Proposals.

15. **Cambodia:** TAC assessed that the proposal was well developed and should be considered as a model for future proposals. It is based on a sound agricultural strategy document and strategic framework for food security and nutrition as well as a national nutrition strategy. A high economic growth rate during the last decade bodes well for the country's policy framework and capacity to implement projects. The external review of the Strategy for Agriculture and Water conducted by a donor was favorable. The M&E framework is developed and the risks for implementation are identified. The proposal should be further commended for its innovative and voluntary alignment with the CAADP process. However, a heavy donor dependence and weak commitment to agricultural development is reflected in the allocation of only 5 percent of the national budget for agriculture. The pathways of the proposed activities to impact on the food security and nutrition are not clear. The targeted areas are exposed to floods and droughts, but the proposal lacks activities to support disaster preparedness and mitigation of risks and vulnerability. While the proposal is well aligned with regional policies, no coordination mechanism is specified for improved intersectoral collaboration at the national level. TAC recommended and the SC concurs that in seeking ways to scale-down the total cost of the project consistent with available resources, the component for technical assistance and capacity development for the implementation of the rice policy (component C5.1) not be funded by GAFSP resources.

**Decision:**

- Award amount: US\$39.1 million
- Supervising Entity: The Asian Development Bank has been designated as the Supervising Entity as per the letter dated June 6, 2011 to the SC from the Cambodian government requesting this change. The original proposal had listed the World Bank as the Supervising Entity.

16. The Asian CSO representative to the SC also shared some observations from their mission to Nepal in April 2011 where they conducted consultations. This update will be shared with the Supervising Entity. Key observations included the following: (i) definition of farmers' organization and cooperatives in the proposal should be broadened to reflect on-going work by CSO and other farmers; groups, (ii) involvement of water user groups/associations and building their capacities for sustainable water management are important and should be ensured, (iii) a budget line is needed to directly support farmer organizations, especially community business organizations such as rice business, marketing, and storage, (iv) government should emphasize the role of farmer organizations, NGOs, and local

governments as partners in agricultural innovation, such as through representation in national implementation or project steering committees, (v) Asian CSO agrees with the TAC recommendation not to fund the technical assistance and capacity development for the implementation of the rice policy, and (vi) Asian CSO suggests the government to reinforce the expansion of SRI (System of Rice Intensification) to increase rice productivity.

17. **Liberia:** The TAC found that the country-owned national investment strategy and GAFSP proposal showed high commitment and prioritization of agricultural development for food security. There is sound policy alignment and the proposal supports both the CAADP objectives and the national priorities. The focus on capacity building, human resource development, research and extension and strengthening producer organizations is very appropriate for this post-conflict environment. The proposal includes a commendable focus on vulnerable groups including youth and women. The government allocates about 2.5 percent of the GNP (or approximately 9% of total government expenditures) to agricultural and rural development—a more than 150 percent expansion of spending on agriculture over the last five years. Government coordination has been addressed and will be strengthened by the proposed activities. Stakeholders, down to farmers themselves, have been actively engaged in the development of the policy framework and the national plan. The establishment of a Land Commission is most commendable and aims to develop and enact a land policy to strengthen access, use and tenure security to smallholders. Further emphasis should be given to: (i) drawing on NGOs and regional institutions for technical and capacity support; (ii) the potential in regional markets for commodities produced through this program; and (iii) how the private sector will be motivated to invest in the marketing activities. The TAC recommends that these elements receive greater elaboration with the Supervising Entity.

**Decision:**

- Award amount: US\$46.5 million
- Supervising Entity: African Development Bank

18. **Nepal:** The TAC found that the present agricultural strategies and policies highlight the importance of the process of transformation of agriculture to a competitive and commercial sector with a focus on poverty reduction and increased food security. The investment plan has been developed with broad-based consultation of agricultural stakeholders, NGOs and private sector entrepreneurs. The proposal explicitly focuses on the most remote and disadvantaged region of Nepal. The activities are prioritized emphasizing a strong gender dimension to address the “feminization of agriculture” as male members migrate to find remunerative work in relatively prosperous regions. The M&E framework is developed, risks factors are identified and risk mitigation measures are identified. The proposal also adopts an innovative, holistic approach, successfully aligning priorities with a number of ongoing and planned projects. The plan focuses primarily on food availability. It lacks adequate recognition of the issues of access and utilization of food for achieving food security and does not explicitly define pathways of impact from proposed activities to improved food security for the identified beneficiaries. Poor infrastructure and lack of security may constrain implementation of the project. The TAC recommends that the technology development component be scaled back, in order to give greater prominence to the food safety and nutrition interventions. Support could be sought from farmers’ organizations, NGOs, and local government to implement the project. The TAC recommends funding the proposal conditional upon verification of suggested changes and improvements by the Supervising Entity.

19. The Asian CSO representative to the SC also shared some observations from their mission to Nepal in May 2011 where they conducted consultations. This update will be shared with the Supervising Entity. They made the observation that CSOs had not actively participated during the preparation of the proposal. There was consensus that the proposed project is timely, needed, but partially addresses issues. Project areas are most food insecure. The issue of access, especially for the landless, *dalits*, and women who combine to form a significant proportion of the population, should be taken into account. Secondly, technology development should focus on local resources and build local capacity. Research should be coupled with extensive extension services. In the target areas, support services and technical capacity is needed. The need for participation of local NGOs should be emphasized. The project must have clear mechanism to increase farmers' prices, clear participation during the preparation stage of *dalits*, women and landless, and clear cut roles for local community organizations.

**Decision:**

- Award amount: US\$ 46.5 million
- Supervising Entities: The World Bank, and FAO (for TA activities).

20. **Tajikistan:** The TAC assessed that the proposal is clear and transparent and relatively cost effective at US\$ 400 per beneficiary household. The government recognizes that agriculture will have to yield water to other sectors and improved water use efficiency is critical. The intention is to move governance of water from the local political administration to water authorities. The investment plan is good but government commitment to its financing is low (US\$72 million of a total budget of US\$ 1.28 billion, or 5.6 percent for 2010-2015). However, the government is commendably allocating a large amount of funds to reduce indebtedness of cotton farmers (to the State as well as to cotton investors). The project is encouraged to develop a results framework with quantitative indicators of impact acceptable to the Supervising Entity. The TAC recommended full funding as proposed conditional on the Supervising Entity's assessment of the country's need for technical assistance to fund preparatory work for the introduction of a water basin management system. Support for the delineation of new roles and responsibilities and recommendations on how to move from the current to new institutional architecture may be needed. However, the amount requested should be reviewed by the Supervising Entity to justify its level.

**Decision:**

- Award amount: US\$ 39.1 million
- Supervising Entity: The World Bank

21. The SC discussed the possibility of forming a pipeline of pre-approved proposals among those who qualified for funding in this round of Call for Proposal, but for which funds were not currently available. After discussion, the SC concluded that this could create expectations that pre-qualified countries will be funded (in a context in which resources are limited). This would postpone the next Call for Proposal for a very long time and the SC reiterated the willingness to improve the selection criteria of the next Call for Proposals. **It was decided that all countries for which grants are not available in the first round should be invited to reapply to GAFSP and compete with new applicants under revised country guidelines (to be finalized) for the next Call for Proposal.**

**AGENDA 6: REPORT BACK TO THE WORKING GROUP ON THE NEXT CALL FOR PROPOSALS – PART 1**

22. A member of the GAFSP Coordination Unit (CU) briefed the SC on the outcomes of the GAFSP Working Group meetings and presented the Working Group recommendations. The Working Group met on December 15 and on April 13, 2011. The Working Group is composed of Dan Peters (United States), Ousmane Badiane (Africa Representative-Senegal), Iain C. MacGillivray (Canada), Kazi M. Aminul Islam (South Asia Representative-Bangladesh), Neil Watkins (Northern CSOs representative - ActionAid), Garry Smith (FAO), and Navtej Dhillon (United States). The Working Group meeting also included the Chair and a member of the TAC, and was supported by Robert Townsend (GAFSP Coordination Unit), Christopher Delgado (GAFSP Program Manager), and Iride Ceccacci (GAFSP Coordination Unit).

23. At the first meeting, the Working Group met to: (i) provide TAC further guidance for their review of the 17 proposals; and (ii) provide recommendations to the SC on how to improve the next GAFSP Call for Proposals including assessing the need for changing the relative weights of the criteria used to assess the country submissions. The main tasks of the second Working Group Meeting were: (i) to assess and provide recommendations on revisions to the Country Guidelines (on country need, policy, and readiness and on the specific GAFSP proposal readiness); and (ii) to assess and provide recommendations on the need for changing the selection criteria for future GAFSP proposals, particularly with respect to changes in the relative weights of the criteria.

24. Based on lessons from the TAC evaluation, the Working Group recommended the following for improving the country guidelines (further detail on the recommendations is provided in the Working Group report):

- (i) On country need, the Working Group noted the low dispersion of policy environment scores based on the IFAD Rural Policy Index and recommended using a formulaic approach based on the MDG1 relative measures of poverty and hunger (as was used in the assessment of the 17 country proposals).
- (ii) On country policy, the Working Group recommended to: (i) use TAC judgment to assess policy; and (ii) merge the country policy score with the country readiness score, rather than retaining the policy score as a separate stand-alone measure.
- (iii) On country readiness, the Working Group recommended to: (i) add an additional set of guidance questions (about 6) to the country guidelines (and TAC ToR) to more clearly reflect how country readiness will be assessed; (ii) provide more guidance to non-African countries on the elements of a CAADP-like review; (iii) provide information in the country guidelines on possible funding sources to undertake CAADP-type reviews given that GAFSP cannot finance them; (iv) ask countries to provide details on how they are addressing, or plan to address, shortcomings identified in the CAADP or CAADP-like reviews; and (v) ask countries with outdated investment plans to review their implementation progress and to update their plan prior to submitting their proposal to GAFSP.
- (iv) On proposal readiness, the Working Group recommended to: (i) request more detailed information on the institutional arrangements for implementation in the country guidelines in order to evaluate the country's implementation readiness; and (ii) incorporate the recommendations provided by TAC in their memo to the SC on February 4, 2011.

25. On the relative weights between Country Need, Country Readiness, and Country Proposal, the Working Group recommended that the SC reduce the weight of the Country Proposal, giving more

weight to Country Need and Readiness. The SC considered two options to give less weight to Country Proposal:

- (i) Directly changing the relative weights. Different options to directly change the relative weights were proposed by representatives from Canada, US, Africa, Asia and by TAC; or
- (ii) Changing the evaluation procedure to a two-step process.
  - The first step would (i) rank countries based on their total number of points scored for Need, Policy, and Readiness; and (ii) pre-qualify countries based on a minimum score, say of greater than 60, or 60 percent of the maximum possible points of 100.
  - The second step would evaluate the proposals for countries meeting the above minimum, and approve countries for funding based on the outcome of the proposal review.

26. The SC discussed the above Working Group recommendations with the final decision to be made on day two of the SC meeting (June 8)—See Agenda 13.

#### **AGENDA 7: UPDATE ON FY11/12 BUDGET, FY 11/12 SOUTH CSOs OUTREACH ACTIVITY AND IMPACT EVALUATION**

27. The CU updated the SC on the progress on impact evaluation (IE). In the November 2010 SC meeting, the M&E plan was discussed and it was agreed that all GAFSP projects will undergo a rapid IE and that up to approximately 30 percent of projects will undergo a more rigorous in-depth IE. The SC Chair proposed and the SC approved the Development Impact Evaluation Initiative (DIME) of the World Bank Group as the implementer of the in-depth IEs. A workshop was organized by DIME in Dakar in April 2011 and five GAFSP teams from Bangladesh, Haiti, Mongolia, Niger and Rwanda participated in this workshop to kick-off their IE initiative. The workshop objectives included sharing of international evidence and training on IE methods, and preparation of IE designs through project specific discussions facilitated by IE experts (from DIME and external researchers). Teams agreed on broad steps forward, a list of tentative additional evaluation questions beyond the mandatory evaluation questions related to the Program Development Objectives of each project and the GAFSP program level objectives on increasing income and food security, a preliminary sampling strategy, a tentative proposed methodology, and steps towards collecting a baseline data.

**28. The SC asked the Coordination Unit to prepare a brief update on the implementation of the impact evaluation framework for the five countries that participated in the DIME workshop.**

29. A representative from the World Bank's legal team updated the SC on the explanatory note prepared and circulated in advance of the meeting to lay out the roles and responsibilities of the SC, Trustee, Supervising Entities and Coordination Unit in interacting with DIME and sought their comments on this note by June 17, 2011. The lawyer also reported that the GAFSP governance document will be updated to reflect the Bank's new role in GAFSP, i.e., the role of DIME, which is a World Bank unit.

30. The SC agreed that the first annual report of GAFSP could be an excellent opportunity to put together the prospective results and impact of GAFSP projects and also communicate the catalytic impact of GAFSP projects in some countries (e.g. IFAD's experience in Togo; AfDB's experience in Niger). The SC asked the Coordination Unit to highlight such stories and also the proposed results and impacts

of GAFSP projects during the preparation of the annual report. The Coordination Unit will circulate the first draft of the annual report to the SC by July 31, 2011.

31. The FY11 and FY12 Administrative Costs for GAFSP were presented for consideration and approval by the SC. This included budgets by the Trustee and Coordination Unit.

32. The Trustee's revised estimates of its costs during FY11 amounted to US\$ 520,500. Both financial management and accounting costs were lower than projected due to limited financial activities, while legal costs were higher (negotiation on Transfer Agreements with Supervising Entities required more staff time than expected). Investment management fees are calculated based on a flat-fee of 3.5 basis points (0.035%) against the average annual balance of the portfolio. As the projected average portfolio size was revised to US\$ 356 million from US\$ 200 million for FY11, the fee increased by US\$ 55,000. The proposed FY12 Trustee budget is US\$ 293,000 and reflects the following components: (i) financial management and relationship management; (ii) investment management; (iii) accounting and reporting; (iv) legal services, and (v) non-core central unit costs.

33. Considering that there is minimal financial activity (e.g. disbursements) in the GAFSP Trust Fund to date, the Trustee believes that it is not cost effective to perform an external audit for FY11. Therefore, the Trustee proposed to arrange the first external audit for the GAFSP Trust Fund as of June 30, 2012; such audit would cover all financial activities since inception of the Trust Fund. Since the GAFSP Trust Fund is included in the Bank's Single Audit exercise, the Trustee will share the FY11 Single Audit report with the SC members, which includes the combined statement of contributions, fund balances, and other consolidated financial information for all trust funds. This proposal was accepted by the SC.

34. The Coordination Unit's revised budget costs during FY11 amount to US\$ 804,181. This includes costs associated with: (i) development of the GAFSP website; (ii) development of various technical documents as requested by the SC; (iii) drafting of TORs and legal documents; (iv) organization of SC, TAC and Working Group meetings; and (v) travel to Washington of non-DC based Recipient Representatives for the SC meetings. The shortfall in expenses in FY11 relative to budgeted staff costs is due to delays in recruiting, pending clarification of needs. A Communications Assistant was recruited as of May 2011. A more senior position mainly focused on results reporting has been advertised; a short list has been prepared and interviews will proceed in the coming weeks.

35. The proposed Coordination Unit budget for FY12 is US\$ 1,110,500 and includes the following expenses: (i) staff costs; (ii) facilitation of meetings; (iii) legal services; (iv) travel by the GAFSP Coordination Unit; (v) travel costs for participation in SC meetings of non-DC based recipient representatives; and (vi) outreach and communications activities.

**36. The Coordination Unit agreed to provide the SC with a roster of CU members and their roles in supporting GAFSP activities.**

37. The two Southern CSOs representatives, from Africa and Asia, presented their proposed FY12 budget which amount to US\$ 85,800 and US\$ 85,000 respectively, and include costs associated with: (i) travel to SC Meetings; (ii) attendance in producers' meetings; (iii) country support missions, and (iv) administration and communications. The CSOs representative from Africa discussed awareness building and outreach activities in FY11, which included production of three reports, participation in meetings

with producer organizations, and country missions. He also reported on some cases where challenges included: (i) limited CSO participation in the GAFSP process of proposal development at the country level despite some proposals highlighting CSO involvement and (ii) the need for greater transparency and information sharing in the GAFSP process at country level. The CSOs representative from Asia highlighted some of the activities undertaken in FY11 and lessons learnt to date: (i) participation of CSOs in the project cycle has been very well appreciated; and (ii) it is important to strengthen the capacity of farmers' organization to work together at the country level. The Asian CSOs representative also reported that complete progress and trip reports on their missions in the past 6 months will be prepared and shared with the Supervising Entities, governments, and CSOs. They will also be uploaded on the Asian Farmers' Association for Sustainable Rural Development (AFA) and GAFSP websites. Furthermore, they are working on disseminating knowledge for the purpose of raising funds (for example, preparing brochures similar to the one prepared by ActionAid).

**38. The SC approved the proposed FY12 budgets presented by the Trustee, Coordination Unit and the Southern CSOs. For the Trustee and the Southern CSO budgets, the proposed budgets were approved. For the Coordination Unit budget, some corrections were pointed out to the submitted proposal and the approved amount for FY12 is US\$ 1,110,500.**

#### **AGENDA 8: WRAP-UP & CLOSURE OF THE FIRST DAY OF THE MEETING**

#### **DAY TWO: JUNE 8, 2011**

#### **AGENDA 9: UPDATE ON THE PRIVATE SECTOR WINDOW**

39. A representative from International Finance Corporation (IFC) presented an update on the private sector window. **Canada has signed a CAD\$ 48 million agreement with IFC for a contribution to the private sector window that will finance long and short term loans and credit guarantees and equity capital in agribusiness firms. An additional CAD\$ 2 million has been contributed by Canada for financing of advisory services.**

40. The United States also reported that it is pursuing its contribution of US\$ 25 million to the private sector window that could be available in the next few months. This is additional to its 2011 US\$100 million contribution to the public sector window.

41. IFC was requested to follow current practice and submit to the CU a progress update document that would include progress against previously agreed actions, for inclusion into the meeting document binder.

42. The private sector window will launch its first call for proposals at the end of June 2011 and this will be posted on the GAFSP and IFC websites. IFC's communication department is working on a strategy for reaching out to IDA countries especially in Africa and where the GAFSP public sector window is already active. This Call for Proposal will run for 30 days and has been discussed with the Project Investment Committee (PIC) and, as per Canada's suggestion, will be discussed further with other development and international financial institutions. IFC sees high potential for demand for the GAFSP private sector window, which will co-invest financial resources with IFC. The Call for Proposals will be

open in all IDA countries and IFC will attempt to prioritize its investments in those countries where the Public Sector Window has on-going operations.

43. A number of SC members stressed the importance of improving coherence between the Private Sector Window and the Public Sector Window. On linkages of the private sector window with the public sector window, IFC outlined a two-step approach. In the first call for proposal, IFC will review the proposals submitted. Priority will be given to projects in countries where the Public Sector Window is operational. If this does not work out, the second round will focus on integrating lessons learned from the first round and on reinforcing coherence between the two windows. IFC also indicated that it will coordinate with the SC when reviewing the proposals to see what synergies can be achieved.

44. **IFC has agreed to prepare a document highlighting ways to achieve synergy between the public and private sector windows, as well as addressing governance issues. IFC will work on this document with the other Supervising Entities such as ADB, AfDB, IFAD as well as the UN High Level Task Force (HLTF) and Coordination Unit.** Given the urgency for achieving synergies and for fundraising purposes, this document is expected to be prepared within a month.

#### **AGENDA 10: COMPOSITION OF SC**

45. At the Fourth GAFSP SC Meeting on November 3-4 2010, the CU was requested by the SC to draft a paper outlining constituency arrangement options for the SC's consideration, following the decision of the SC to cap the voting membership of the SC at 16.

46. The CU presented a paper that provided a set of constituency arrangement issues and options, highlighting pros and cons of each. It was clarified that the paper was for discussion only and that once the SC agrees on a specific option, the Governance Document will be amended as needed to reflect the changes in accordance with its amendment procedures. The CU reiterated the importance of active participation by all GAFSP stakeholders; and that any current SC member that is presently participating will always be welcome to observe all GAFSP meetings and to participate via constituencies seated at the table.

47. **The SC agreed to review the paper drafted by the Coordination Unit on the constituency arrangement issues and options and get back to the Chair and CU with any comments and suggestions. [NB: The CU suggested that this be done by no later than September 15, 2011]**

48. In the discussion that followed, it was mentioned that the issue of representation of new contributors on the SC should be carefully handled since it might disincentivize new donors from joining GAFSP if their voting status is not guaranteed. It was also mentioned that some new donors and possible Supervising Entities have unofficially expressed their willingness to join GAFSP. **Furthermore, in the context of determining the size of pledge or effective contribution to GAFSP to hold a seat on the SC, clarification was sought on whether the total sum of donors' contribution (including both private and public sector windows) should be considered, or the respective amount for the public sector window only. This issue was not decided at the meeting.**

#### **AGENDA 11: UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS OR PROJECTS AWARDED IN CY2010**

49. A member of the Coordination Unit updated the SC on the progress to date in the implementation of the GAFSP approved operations. Project teams, through the Coordination Unit, will provide updates to the SC every 6 months either virtually or at SC meetings if there is one at an opportune time. Currently the Rwanda operation is ready for disbursements. The Togo operation is in an advanced stage of implementation; IFAD has not yet requested disbursements because the project is still using the pre-disbursement financing provided by Government of Togo. The operation in Sierra Leone is expected to start disbursements by September. The operations in Bangladesh and Haiti should be ready for disbursement by the end of CY2011.

50. The SC reiterated that it is important to accelerate disbursements keeping in mind that supervising entities have their own policies and safeguards that have to be adhered to. **The SC asked Supervising Entities to jointly draft a recommendation paper on how to shorten preparation and disbursement times. The Chair and Coordination Unit will work together to contact Supervising Entities in moving this process forward.**

#### **AGENDA 12: CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS PARTICIPATION AND CSOs ACCESS TO INFORMATION**

51. At the Fourth GAFSP SC Meeting on November 3-4 2010, CSOs were requested to prepare a discussion paper for the SC's consideration on ensuring CSOs participation in the GAFSP. The paper drafted by the CSOs titled "Civil Society Proposal to enhance Participation in the GAFSP" was presented by the CSOs representative and discussed at the SC meeting. The objective of the proposal was to ensure a full participation (and not only "consultation") of CSOs from design to implementation of GAFSP projects. It was explained that both the proposal and the scorecard (annex 3 of the Country Guidelines) were the result of extensive consultations within the CSOs community.

52. Four concrete proposals were drafted by the CSOs to enhance participation in the GAFSP: (i) adopt agreed standards, indicators and means of verifying participation that can guide TAC in evaluating GAFSP proposals and country investment plans (a CSO proposal included as annex 3 of the Country Guidelines); (ii) put in place a consolidated, institutional framework for project steering, implementation and monitoring in which producers' organizations and CSOs participate from the outset; (iii) ensure that the necessary resources are made available to enable meaningful producer organizations and CSOs participation. It was noted that the IFAD AgriCord Grant can help to ensure producers' organizations have the means and technical support to play their role in the GAFSP process; and (iv) that the Coordination Unit and Supervising Entities promote participation in ways appropriate to their roles.

53. It was reiterated that the documentation requested from countries verifying CSO participation (Annex 3 of the Country Guidelines) represents a sample-list of documents that could be useful to prove meaningful stakeholder participation. Countries may decide on the exact documents to submit, i.e. any of the documents on the sample-list, and/or a detailed description of the participation process. However, given that submitted materials will be used by the TAC as parts of its assessment on stakeholder participation, it was clarified that it would be in the country's advantage to submit a set of documents that fully describes the participation process.

**54. It was decided that the CSOs will revise the scorecard to integrate the inputs and advice from the SC members. It was decided that relevant information contained in the paper will be captured in the scorecard and that only the scorecard will be annexed to the Country Guidelines. The CU will circulate the CSOs draft scorecard to SC members for their comments and virtual approval.**

55. On the relations between the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) and GAFSP, the CSOs highlighted the need for ensuring a useful interaction between the two bodies. **The chair will follow-up on the possibility of representing GAFSP at the October 2011 CFS plenary meeting in Rome with the CSOs representatives and the UN Secretary General's Special Representative on Food Security and Nutrition. It was decided that the Chair of CFS will be invited to attend the next GAFSP SC Meeting.**

#### **AGENDA 13: REPORT BACK TO THE WORKING GROUP ON THE NEXT CALL FOR PROPOSALS – PART 2**

56. The SC continued the discussion on the Working Group recommendations on the next Call for Proposals and arrived at the following **decisions**:

- (i) On the criteria for assessment: **the SC adopted the Working Group recommendations** (as reflected in the Working Group report) on county need, policy, readiness, and proposal readiness, including **merging the country policy score with the country readiness score** (rather than retaining it as a stand-alone measure).
- (ii) On the method for re-weighting Country Need, Country Readiness, and Country Proposal: the SC **directly changed the relative weights of Country Need, Country Readiness and Country Proposal** (rather than use the two-step approach discussed).
- (iii) On the relative weights, **use a weighting of 30-30-40 for country need – country readiness (inclusive of policy) - proposal readiness.**
- (iv) On the content of the **Country Guidelines for the public sector window**, it was decided to circulate **the document to allow for additional input and review from SC members by June 21. The decision on whether the weights should be explicitly reflected in the Country Guidelines will also be taken by SC members in the context of the review of the Country Guidelines. Concerning the scorecard on participation (Annex 3 of the Guidelines), it was decided that the CSOs will review the scorecard and integrate feedback from the SC. Concerning the list of financing Sources (Annex 4 of the Guidelines), it was decided that the list will be compiled by the CU with inputs from Supervising Entities. The CU will incorporate suggested changes by July 6 and re-circulate the Country Guidelines to the SC for approval on 5-days no-objection basis (by July 13).**
- (v) On the TAC ToRs, it was decided that the Working Group will revise the ToRs at a later stage to reflect any change to the Country Guidelines once they are approved by the SC. It was decided that decisions on the (i) length of term of TAC; and (ii) composition of TAC and on whether to disclose TAC membership and TAC ToRs on the GAFSP website will also be taken by the SC members. Timing will depend on funding outlook and will be decided at a later date.

#### **AGENDA 14: NEXT CALL FOR PROPOSALS**

57. **The SC decided that the next Call for Proposals could be launched in fourth quarter of 2011, depending on the availability of additional financial resources.** In the meantime, the SC agreed to take stock and continue to do advocacy on behalf of GAFSP. The SC again emphasized the important linkages with the private sector and the need to highlight the important impact of GAFSP on the ground.

#### **AGENDA 15: NEXT STEPS FOR THE SC, FUNDRAISING**

58. **The SC will continue fundraising for GAFSP. The SC also agreed to endorse GAFSP in the G20 process so as to include it in the G20 Declaration.** It needs to be emphasized that the GAFSP is a result of the G20 process and needs to be endorsed and supported by the G20 when agriculture ministers meet on June 23, 2011. It was decided that the Chair will follow up with SC members on issues related to possible areas of improvement of GAFSP to enhance its effectiveness.

Annex 1: Agenda



**AGENDA**

**Fifth Steering Committee Meeting June 7-8, 2011**  
**Venue: Renaissance Washington D.C. Dupont Circle Hotel**  
**1143 New Hampshire Ave. N.W. Washington, D.C.**  
**City Center Ballroom on the Conference Level**  
**DAY 1**

*[Breakfast will be served from 8:30 am outside of the City Center Ballroom]*

9:00 am to 9:45 am	<p><b>1. Welcome, introduction of new members, brief update on developments since last SC meeting, housekeeping notes</b> Mr. Dan Peters, <i>Chair</i> Mr. Christopher Delgado, <i>Coordination Unit Program Manager</i></p> <p><u>Documentation:</u> GAFSP Steering Committee Nov. 3-4 Meeting Minutes (Binder Tab 1)</p>
	<p><b>2. Presentation and adoption of the proposed agenda with any amendments offered</b> Mr. Dan Peters, <i>Chair</i></p> <p><u>Documentation:</u> Proposed Agenda (Binder Tab 1) <u>Requested Action:</u> Amendment and adoption of agenda</p>
	<p><b>3. GAFSP Trust Fund financial overview</b> Ms. Pamela Crivelli, <i>Trustee</i></p> <p><u>Documentation:</u> GAFSP Trust Fund Financial Overview (Binder Tab 2)</p>
9:45 am to 12:30 pm (15 minute coffee break to	<p><b>4. Results of Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) review based on Working Group guidelines to TAC from Dec. 2010</b> Messrs. Howard Elliott and Steve Haggblade, <i>TAC members</i></p> <p><u>Documentation:</u> Working Group guidelines (Dec. 2010), TAC Final Report of February 4, 2011 (Binder Tab 3)</p>

<p>be decided by Chair)</p>	<p><b>5. Selection of recipients</b> Mr. Dan Peters, <i>Chair</i></p> <p><u>Documentation:</u> TAC Final Report of February 4, 2011 (Binder Tab 3) <u>Requested Actions:</u> Decisions on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Countries to be financed</li> <li>b) Amount and activity to be awarded for each proposal</li> <li>c) Supervising entity to be selected</li> <li>d) Communication strategy for [successful countries, TAC recommended but unsuccessful countries, unsuccessful countries]</li> </ul>
<p>12:30 pm to 1:30 pm</p>	<p><b>Lunch Break</b> <b>(lunch will be served in the hotel’s M Brasserie on the ground floor)</b></p>
<p>1:30 pm to 5:30 pm (15 minute coffee break to be decided by Chair)</p>	<p><b>6. Report back from Working Group on the next Call for Proposals – Part 1</b> Mr. Dan Peters, <i>Chair of the Steering Committee and the Working Group</i> Mr. Ousmane Badiane, <i>Africa (Senegal) via audio and Skype video connection</i></p> <p><u>Documentation:</u> “Recommendations on improving the next Call for Proposals”, Revised Country Guidelines, Decision Table (Binder Tab 4) <u>Requested Actions:</u> Decision to be taken on the second day. Necessary decisions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Whether to adopt the Working Group Recommendation on Country, Need, Policy and Readiness</li> <li>b) Endorse the revised Country Guidelines</li> <li>c) On exact weights of country need, policy, and readiness</li> <li>d) Whether the weights should be explicitly reflected in the Country Guidelines</li> <li><b>e) Whether to disclose TAC membership and TAC TOR on website</b></li> </ul> <p><b>7. Update on FY11/12 budget, FY11/12 South CSO outreach activity and Impact Evaluation</b></p> <p><b>Budget:</b> Ms. Pamela Crivelli, <i>Trustee</i>, Ms. Marie-Claude Haxaire, <i>Coordination Unit</i>, Mr. Mamadou Cissokho, <i>Acting Africa CSO representative</i>, Mr. Soc Banzuela, <i>Alternate Asia CSO representative</i> <b>DIME:</b> Ms. Maria Dakolias, <i>Trustee’s lawyer</i>, Mr. Karl William Bach, <i>Office of Ethics and Business Conduct (TBD)</i>, Ms. Jane Kirby-Zaki, <i>Global partnership and Trust Fund Policy (TBD)</i>, Ms. Yurie Tanimichi Hoberg, <i>Coordination Unit</i></p> <p><u>Documentation:</u> FY12 Administrative Budget report (for Trustee and Coordination Unit), South CSO FY11 progress reports, FY12 South CSO budget requests, DIME Explanatory Note, DIME Dakar workshop participants list (Binder Tab 5)</p>

	<p><u>Requested Action:</u> Adoption of FY12 budgets and DIME Explanatory Note</p>
<p>5:30 pm to 6:00 pm</p>	<p><b>8. Wrap-up &amp; Closure of the first day of the meeting</b> Mr. Dan Peters, <i>Chair</i></p>

 <p><b>AGENDA</b>  <b>Fifth Steering Committee Meeting June 7-8, 2011</b>  <b>Venue: Renaissance Washington DC Dupont Circle Hotel</b>  <b>1143 New Hampshire Ave. N.W. Washington, D.C.</b>  <b>City Center Ballroom on the Conference Level</b>  <b>DAY 2</b></p> <p><i>[Breakfast will be served from 8:30 am outside the City Center Ballroom]</i></p>	
<p>9:00am to 10:30 am</p>	<p><b>9. Update on the Private Sector Window</b> Mr. Vipul Prakash, <i>IFC</i></p>

	<p><b>10. Composition of Steering Committee</b>  Mr. Christopher Delgado, <i>Coordination Unit Program Manager</i></p> <p><u>Documentation:</u> Paper on constituency arrangement options for the GAFSP Steering Committee, Governance document (Binder Tab 6)  <u>Requested Action:</u> Select a preferred option and length of term</p>
10:30 am to 10:45 am	<b>Coffee Break</b>
10:45 am to 12:30 pm	<p><b>11. Update on implementation progress of projects awarded in CY2010</b>  Ms. Yurie Tanimichi Hoberg, <i>Coordination Unit</i></p> <p><u>Documentation:</u> Project progress table, progress reports from SEs (Binder Tab 7)  <u>Requested Action:</u> Confirmation of results, provide comments on any needed actions to be taken</p> <p><b>12. Civil Society participation and CSO access to information</b>  Mr. Neil Watkins, <i>Northern CSO Representative</i>  Mr. Mamadou Cissokho, <i>Acting South CSO(Africa)representative</i>  Mr. Soc Banzuela, <i>Alternate Southern CSO (Asia) representative</i></p> <p><u>Documentation:</u> CSO proposals to Enhance Participation in GAFSP (Binder Tab 8)  <u>Requested Actions:</u> Adoption of proposals in paper</p>
12:30 pm to 1:30 pm	<b>Lunch Break</b> <b>(lunch will be served in the hotel’s M Brasserie on the ground floor)</b>
1:30 pm to 4:00 pm	<p><b>13. Report back from Working Group on the next Call for Proposals – Part 2</b>  Mr. Dan Peters, <i>Chair of the Steering Committee and Working Group</i>  Mr. Ousmane Badiane, <i>Africa (Senegal) via audio and Skype video connection</i></p> <p><u>Documentation:</u> “Recommendations on improving the next Call for Proposals”, Revised Country Guidelines, Decision Table (Binder Tab 4)  <u>Requested Actions:</u> Decisions on</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Whether to adopt the Working Group Recommendation on Country, Need, Policy and Readiness</li> <li>b) Endorse the revised Country Guidelines</li> <li>c) On exact weights of country need, policy, and readiness</li> <li>d) Whether the weights should be explicitly reflected in the Country Guidelines</li> <li>e) Whether to disclose TAC membership and TAC TOR on website</li> </ol>

	<p><b>14. Next Call for Proposals</b> Mr. Dan Peters, <i>Chair</i></p> <p><u>Requested Actions:</u> Decisions on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Decision on date of the next Call for Proposals for the public sector window</li> <li>b) Decision on eligibility for the next Call for Proposals (Countries, Regional Economic Communities, others?)</li> </ul>
	<p><b>15. Next steps for the Steering Committee, Fundraising</b> Mr. Dan Peters, <i>Chair</i> Mr. Christopher Delgado, <i>Coordination Unit Program Manager</i></p> <p><u>Documentation:</u> Updated 6 month timetable (Binder Tab 1) <u>Requested action:</u> Endorsement of 6 month timetable</p>
<p>4:00 pm 4:30 pm</p>	<p><b>16. AOB, Wrap-up, &amp; Closure of the Meeting</b> Mr. Dan Peters, <i>Chair</i></p>

**Annex 2: List of Participants**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Abdul Ghaffar, Jeehan	Middle East/North Africa
Antikainen, Kaisa	GAFSP Coordination Unit
Bach, Karl	Office of Ethics & Business Conduct
Badiane, Ousmane (via audio)	Africa
Banzuela, Raul Socrates	Southern CSOs (Asia)
Behal, Rajesh	IFC
Bettink, Willem	IFAD
Bishop, Veronique	Trustee
Bora, Saswati	GAFSP Coordination Unit
Cackler, Mark	World Bank
Cannon, Julie	GAFSP Coordination Unit
Cass, Louisa	AusAID
Ceccacci, Iride	GAFSP Coordination Unit

Name	Organization
Chery, Jean Marie Robert	Latin America/Caribbean
Chiew, Robert	Finance Canada
Cho, In-Kang	Rep. of Korea (WB ED's office)
Cissokho, Mamadou	Southern CSOs (Africa)
Dakolias, Maria	Legal
Delgado, Chris	GAFSP Coordination Unit
Dhillon, Navtej	US Treasury
Douglas, Fionna	World Bank
Erickson, Jennifer	CIDA
Feeney, Catherine	WFP
Ferrero, Gabriel	HLTF on Global Food Crisis
Fries, Lorin	OxFam America
Gimenez, Enrique	Spain (WB ED's Office)

Name	Organization
Gingerich, Chris	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
Haxaire, Marie-Claude	GAFSP Coordination Unit
Hou, Xiao	GAFSP Coordination Unit
Ingvoldstad, Chie	Trustee
Islam, Kazi M. Aminul	South Asia
Jesurun-Clements, Nancy	IDB
Joo, Hoan Uk	Rep. of Korea (WB ED's office)
Keita, Dougou	AfDB
Lasbennes, Florence	HLTF on Global Food Crisis
Lehmann, Paul	AusAID
MacGillivray, Iain	CIDA
Morden, Cheryl	IFAD
Muñoz, Eric	OxFam America

Name	Organization
Nabarro, David	UN SG's Special Rep.
Pardo, Maria Lourdes	Legal
Parent, Kimberly	GAFSP Coordination Unit
Penn, Kristin	USAID
Penunia, Esther	Southern CSOs (Asia)
Peters, Dan	Chair
Prakash, Vipul	IFC
Riemenschneider, Charles	FAO
Romeu, Jorge	Embassy of Spain
Santa Maria, Iris	Trustee
Schoellhammer, Robert	ADB
Shipmaker, Chad	WFP
Spencer, Dunstan	Africa

Name	Organization
Tan, Wen-Jun (Michelle)	Legal
Tanimichi-Hoberg, Yurie	GAFSP Coordination Unit
Townsend, Robert	GAFSP Coordination Unit
Truitt Nakata, Ginya	IDB
Tumurbaatar, Erka	East Asia/Pacific
Tyler, Natsuki Kimura	ADB
Wallerstedt, Kirsten	US Treasury
Watkins, Neil	Northern CSOs

**Annex 3: Current member of the GAFSP Steering Committee (as of June 2011)**

<b>Chair</b>			
United States (Organization)		Chair of the Steering Committee	
<b>Country</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Function</b>	<b>Representative</b>
<b>I. Voting Members</b>			
<b>(1) Donors (One Vote Per Country or Foundation)</b>			
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	Representative	Mr. Prabhu Pingali
		Alternate	Mr. Christopher Gingerich
Canada	CIDA	Representative	Ms. Diane Jacovella
		Alternate	Mr. Iain C. MacGillivray
Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	Representative	Mr. Seung Soo Eun
		Alternate	Mr. Kim Seong-Wook
Spain	Ministry of Economy and Finance	Representative	Mr. Jose Manuel Campa Fernandez
	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation	Alternate	Mr. Juan Lopez-Doriga
United States	US Treasury	Representative	Ms. Marisa Lago
		Alternate	Mr. Scott Morris
Australia	AusAID	Representative	Mr. Paul Lehmann
		Alternate	Mr. Bob Quiggin
<b>(2) Recipients (One Vote Per Representative)</b>			
Senegal	Africa	Representative	Mr. Ousmane Badiane
Sierra Leone	Africa	Representative	Mr. Dunstan S.C. Spencer
Bangladesh	South Asia	Representative	Mr. Kazi M. Aminul Islam
Mongolia	East Asia and Pacific	Representative	Ms. Erdenejargal Tumurbaatar
Haiti	Latin America and Caribbean	Representative	Mr. Jean Robert Chery

Yemen	Middle East and North Africa	Non-Voting Recipient Representative	Ms. Jeehan Abdul Ghaffar
<b>II. Non-Voting Members</b>			
<b>(1) Donor Representatives in Non-Voting States</b>			
Ireland		Representative	TBD
<b>(2) Recipient Representatives in Non-Voting Status Pending Participation of More Donors</b>			
Moldova	Europe and Central Asia	Non-Voting Recipient Representative	Ms. Maya Sandu
<b>(3) GAFSP Administrative Units (Non-Voting)</b>			
World Bank	GAFSP Coordination Unit	Program Manager	Mr. Christopher Delgado
	Financial and Administrative Issues		Ms. Pamela Crivelli
<b>(4) Representative of U.N. Secretary General (Non-Voting)</b>			
United Nations	High Level Task Force on the Global Food Crisis	Representative	Mr. David Nabarro
<b>(5) Supervising Entities for Investment and Technical Assistance (Non-Voting)</b>			
World Bank	IBRD	Representative (Public Sector Window)	Mr. Juergen Voegele
	IFC	Representative (Private Sector Window)	Mr. Oscar Chemerinski
IFAD	IFAD	Representative	Mr. Henock Kifle
		Alternate	Mr. Willem Bettink
AfDB	AfDB	Representative	Mr. Abrirahman Beileh
		Alternate	Mr. Dougou Keita
ADB	ADB	Representative	Dr. Lourdes S. Adriano
		Alternate	Mr. Samuel Tumiwa
IDB	IDB	Representative	Mr. Hector Malarin
		Alternate	Ms. Ginya Truitt Nakata
<b>(6) Supervising Entities for Technical Assistance</b>			
FAO	FAO	Representative	TBD

		Alternate	Mr. Charles Riemenschneider
WFP	WFP	Representative	Mr. Chris Moore
		Alternate	Mr. Allan Jury
(7) Civil Society Organizations			
North	Northern CSOs	Representative	Mr. Neil Watkins (Action Aid)
South	Southern CSOs (Africa)	Representative	TBD
South	Southern CSOs (Asia)	Representative	Dr. Sang Naing Koma (Farmer and Nature Net, Cambodia)