

Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP)

November 22, 2010

Executive Minutes Fourth Meeting of the GAFSP Steering Committee November 3-4, 2010

Grand Westin Hotel
Washington, DC

Chair for these meetings of the GAFSP Steering Committee
Mr. Roger Ehrhardt
Canadian International Development Agency (retired)

Prepared by the GAFSP Coordination Unit
CHRISTOPHER L. DELGADO Nov. 21, 2010

SIGNED CLD

Christopher L. Delgado
Program Manager, GAFSP

Accepted for the Steering Committee
ROGER EHRHARDT Nov. 22, 2010

SIGNED RE

Roger Ehrhardt
Chair of GAFSP Steering Committee for
these meetings

Welcome, introduction of new members, and brief update on developments since the last SC meeting

1. The fourth meeting of the GAFSP Steering Committee (SC) was convened in Washington D.C., on November 3-4, 2010.
2. Participants to the meeting included members or alternates of the Steering Committee (see Annex 1 for a list of participants and Annex 2 for the list of current SC members and alternates as of November 3-4, 2010).
3. A brief update on developments since the last SC Meeting was given by the Chair, Mr. Roger Ehrhardt (recently retired as Director General, Multilateral Development Institutions, Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)). **The Chair confirmed and welcomed two new voting members (Australia and Yemen), as well as confirmed Ireland as a new donor that has chosen not to seek voting rights.** The Chair introduced members attending the SC meeting in person for the first time: the Australian representative Mr. Vincent Ashcroft; Mr. Raul Socrates Banzuela, representing the Asia Southern CSOs on behalf of Representative Dr. Sang Yaing Koma; and the Africa Southern CSOs representative, Mr. Ndiogou Fall. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was represented at the meeting by Mr. Per Pinstруп-Andersen, Chair of the TAC.

Presentation and adoption of the Agenda with any amendments offered

4. The meeting adopted the provisional agenda set forth in Annex 3.

Selection of a new Chair

5. The GAFSP Chair, Mr. Roger Ehrhardt, requested the voting members of the SC to elect one of the existing voting members to serve as Chair immediately after the conclusion of the present Steering Committee Meeting on November 4, given his recent retirement from the Canadian government.
6. **The meeting unanimously elected the United States to serve as Chair, effective at the end of the SC meeting on November 4, 2010.**

GAFSP Trust Fund financial overview

7. The Trustee presented the pledges made to the GAFSP as of September 30, 2010. Since the last meeting of the GAFSP SC in June 2010, Australia and Ireland pledged contributions to the GAFSP in the amount of AUD 50 million and EUR 0.5 million respectively. The total amount pledged by seven donors to the GAFSP is US\$ eq. 925.2 million, valued on the basis of exchange rates of April 22, 2010, the GAFSP official launch date. This amount includes pledges to both public and private sector windows.

8. The Trustee presented the status of contributions and receipts for the public sector window. It was explained that effective contributions represent conversion of donor pledges into commitments by way of countersigned contribution agreements/arrangements. Agreements/arrangements have been finalized with all seven donors (Australia, Canada, Gates Foundation, Ireland, Korea, Spain and United States). The Trustee has received US\$ eq. 367 million in total from these donors.
9. The cumulative funding allocations made by the GAFSP SC as of September 30, 2010 amounted to US\$ 232.4 million. Funds held in trust with no restrictions amounted to US\$ 365.3 million and funding decisions pending cash transfer amounted to US\$ 230.4 and amounts pending SC approval amounted to US\$ 4.9 million. Accordingly, the net funding availability in the GAFSP Trust Fund public sector window as of September 30, 2010 was US\$ 130.1 million.
10. The Trustee informed the meeting that approximately \$200-300 million are expected to be received from donors in 2011, with targeting by donors of most of this to the Public Sector Window. The US representative confirmed that appropriations for FY 2011 are at a late stage of finalization and that the request for GAFSP is part of that request. The range of the US contribution to GAFSP for FY 2011 is expected to be between US\$ 150 million and US\$ 250 million; a further request for GAFSP is expected to be made for FY 2012. Australia confirmed that AUD 25 million should be expected by latest June 30, 2011, and the Trustee confirmed that approximately \$27 million are expected from Korea by the end of 2011.

Decision on award structure for the present allocation

11. The meeting considered alternative options of the award structure. The meeting discussed the possibility of allocating resources currently available and then making conditional awards based on "receivables" (e.g. expected contributions based on pledged amounts). To maintain prudent financial management principles, **the SC decided to make only awards up to the currently available funds**, including: new financing for country proposals; an additional 5% of recipient amounts for agency execution in project preparation and supervision; any additional costs for TAC; and a budget for monitoring and evaluation of all projects funded to date.
12. The SC also agreed to **allocate the available resources in adequate amounts to a smaller number of countries, in order to have substantial impact** at the country level. In practice this was likely to be three countries at the present meeting.

TAC review

13. Mr. Per Pinstруп-Andersen, Chair of the TAC, presented the TAC report to the GAFSP SC that was circulated to the SC by email on October 28, 2010. It was highlighted that the TAC is a body composed of 13 members from diverse backgrounds and independent of any of the Supervising Entities or governments included in the set of proposals. Mr. Per Pinstруп-Andersen gave a general overview of: (i) the process undertaken by the TAC to assess and evaluate the 20 country proposals for funding; (ii) the division of labor among the different TAC members and the role of the Chair; and (iii) the scoring process for the proposals. He also confirmed that the degree of consultations with relevant in-country stakeholders, including producer groups, other civil society

organizations, and the private sector, was considered as criteria in the assessment of the country proposals.

14. The Chair of TAC stressed that all members participated actively. **There was consensus on funding recommendations based on scoring for the top 6 proposals, but less consensus on how to spread limited resources across the six proposals.** Furthermore, **TAC was not able in the time available to come to a reasonable consensus on funding based on diverse scoring of the remaining 14 proposals.** The TAC Chair reported that this lack of firm consensus emerged largely from the absence of an opportunity for face-to-face dialogue amongst the TAC members to discuss concerns and uncertainties related to interpretation of the written TAC criteria and handling of inevitably subjective judgments on some items. These differences were reportedly such that they could not be easily resolved in a 2 hour audio conference or by round-robin email.
15. The Chair of the TAC requested that to improve the system for assessing the proposals, it is desirable for the TAC members to meet in person over 2-3 days to discuss their assessment and to allow for sufficient space to reach a consensus as a group, before submitting the TAC report to the SC. Extra time should also be provided to TAC members to thoroughly review all proposals, not just the ten each member reviewed in depth (and the rest quickly) for the current report.

Selection of recipients and resolution of need for more consensus in TAC rankings

16. The GAFSP SC allocated recipient-executed grants to three countries out of the top six for **a total of US\$97 million in recipient-executed grants**, based on the recommendations of the TAC that reviewed all proposals received. **The selected proposals were: Ethiopia (US\$51.5 million), Mongolia (US\$12.5 million) and Niger (US\$33 million).** It also was agreed to set aside an additional amount of up to 5% of these amounts for agency-executed assistance to countries in preparation and supervision of projects.
17. The SC instructed the CU to communicate in the award announcement letter to the successful governments **the importance of participation by relevant stakeholders in the preparation and implementation of projects**, and to post a summary of awards on the website.
18. **Ethiopia:** The proposal, assessed by TAC, was found to be based on a solid strategy and investment plan. Need is high. The government is placing high priority on agricultural development and it is allocating funds to support the agriculture strategy. Key drivers of GAFSP funding were: (i) the high priority, (ii) significant allocation of own funds, and (iii) compliance with CAADP guidelines. TAC judged that the solicited GAFSP funding would close the financing gap for the first phase of the Agricultural Growth Program. The proposed participatory approach to the provision of extension services and the strengthening of farmer associations was assessed to be a significant positive characteristic of the proposal. The Southern CSO representative (Africa) noted that there was limited involvement of CSOs and producer organizations in the development of the proposal .

Decision:

- Award amount: US\$ 51.5 million

- Supervising Entities: African Development Bank and the World Bank, with division of labor to be arrived at in discussion between the two entities and endorsed by the recipient.

19. **Mongolia:** the TAC judged that the proposal was sharply focused on improvement of the livestock sector, a sector of great importance to the country and its poor people. It is aimed at vulnerable areas, it includes a broad range of sensible interventions and it effectively scales up ongoing activities. The National Program for Food Security that runs until 2016 was assessed to be clearly formulated and comprehensive; the policy framework was assessed to give particular attention to nutrition and access to food. The transition to a market economy is improving the policy environment. Good stakeholder consultation and buy-in seem to exist. The M&E framework was assessed to be well developed with measurable quantitative indicators. The TAC found that the goals of component 3 (diversification and processing to enhance food security) addressed some very important food security and nutrition issues; however the proposed activities and the use of funds were not clearly defined.

Decision:

- Award amount: US\$12.5 million to fund a project to implement components 1 (linking farmers to market), 2 (raising livestock productivity and quality) and 4 (strengthening donor coordination) of the proposal
- Supervising Entity: World Bank

20. **Niger:** The country was judged to be in dire need of increased food production and improved household food security and nutrition. The strategy and investment plan are strong, the proposed policies seem fine and the proposal is well developed. The current government is demonstrating considerable leadership to develop an ambitious, thoughtful and comprehensive response to avert future famines and assure greater political and economic stability. A participatory approach is proposed by means of the strengthening of farmer associations. CAADP identified a number of technical issues to be dealt with, including land management approaches, sustainability, and potential negative aspects associated with large-scale dam-based irrigation. An M&E system would have to be developed. Pending the effective handling of these deficiencies, TAC recommends that component 1 (water harnessing infrastructure) be funded by \$33 million. The Southern CSO Representative (Africa) noted the importance of aligning the proposal with the CAADP process and reinforcing participation by a broader range of civil society organizations.

Decision:

- Award amount: US\$33 million to fund a project to implement component 1 (water harnessing infrastructure)
- Supervising Entity: African Development Bank

21. **Decisions on the other 17 proposals in the October 1 submissions were deferred pending further review and donor replenishment and contribution of GAFSP funding.** Thus, it was decided that the 17 proposals that were not funded are considered still active and will receive further assessment from TAC in the first quarter of 2011. It was decided that the SC would not seek further information from existing applicants, and will not consider new proposals or materials that were not already received by October 1, 2010 for this round of assessment.

22. **The SC agreed to form a Working Group (WG) from the Steering Committee, TAC, and CU tasked to (i) provide TAC with further guidance on approaches for the assessment of the remaining 17 proposals without fundamentally changing the nature of the Call that they responded to, and to (ii) provide recommendations on lessons learned during any discussion of the first task that suggest the need for more fundamental changes in approaches to assessment, for the purpose of future calls.** The first task is to examine sources of inconsistency in scoring of the 17 as yet unfunded proposals, and clarification of how to assess these proposals in terms of the present criteria, but not a change in weights in scoring. The second task involves exploring whether the sources of inconsistency surfaced in the first task suggest the need for more fundamental changes going forward in TAC procedures and the criteria for proposal assessment. Given the urgency of the issue and small amount of time available to the Working Group (meeting one day), priority will be given to the first task, which nevertheless is expected to yield relevant insights for the second one. The Working Group will be chaired by the Chair of the SC and facilitated by the CU. The report of the Working Group should contain concrete recommendations to the SC on whether there is a need for a revised ToR for TAC with respect to new Calls, and the main lines of how the TAC ToR and Call for Proposals should be changed. The SC will need to be informed of the outcome of the first task, but its implementation is a matter for the independent TAC at a meeting in January. Anything related to the second task requires discussion and eventual approval by the full SC.
23. **The Working Group would be composed of a total of 9 members:** the Chair of TAC, one other TAC member, two representatives of donor countries (United States and Canada), two regional/country recipient representatives (Bangladesh and Senegal), one representative of the GAFSP Supervising Entities (FAO), one representative of the Civil Society Organizations (the Northern CSOs were subsequently asked by the Southern CSOs to represent CSOs as a whole on the WG), and one member of the GAFSP Coordination Unit (CU).
24. **The Working Group will meet on November 29, 2010.** The meeting will be arranged and hosted by the CU and chaired by the United States. The WG will share a draft report that must at a minimum cover the main points of task (i) in item 22 above with the SC by December 1, 2010. The SC will review the report and send comments by December 15, 2011. A final report approved by the SC will be sent to the TAC.
25. Following the November 29 meeting, the CU was asked to work with the TAC Chair to convene a **meeting of TAC in Washington, D.C. in person for further assessment of the existing 17 proposals from the October 1 Call that are not yet funded.** This meeting will in all likelihood be **January 26-28, 2011**, but in any event should occur no later than the end of February 2011.
26. **It was agreed that the GAFSP Coordination Unit would manage a contingent fund to be used to cover actual expenses for TAC to further review the proposals, including the costs of a January 2011 meeting of TAC in Washington, D.C.. The SC approved an initial allocation to the contingent fund in the amount of US\$ 100,000 towards the costs of this TAC workshop in January 2011. To expedite matters, the CU will approach the Trustee for this allocation immediately on approval of these minutes. The SC asked the CU to submit a detailed budget for the 2011 TAC meeting to the SC for approval by December 10, 2010. In view of the request of one SC member during the meeting to reduce the number of times the CU needs to come back to ask for funds to support agreed items, the CU will also provide at the same time an itemized**

budget to the SC for all anticipated TAC costs in calendar year 2011 including an anticipated review and physical meeting in Fall 2011. The Steering Committee can then either approve this larger budget or just the January workshop budget.

27. **The SC meeting agreed to meet in March/April 2011** to allocate further available funds to more existing proposals within the current group of 17 as yet to be funded ones.

Communication strategy towards October 1 Call participants

28. **It was agreed that communication of the SC decisions to the countries that submitted proposals would be the responsibility of the GAFSP Coordination Unit**, who would send to each of the awarded countries the following information by November 5: (i) the total amount allocated to the country, (ii) the approved Supervising Entity (ies), (iii) the TAC summary assessment for that specific country proposal, and (iv) and any additional information that was highlighted during the SC to be communicated to the recipient country in question.
29. **It was agreed that the Coordination Unit would communicate to the 17 countries that submitted proposals in the October 1 Call the following decisions taken by the SC: (i) that the 17 proposals are still considered active, and (ii) that the SC expects to receive further assessment from TAC and additional donor receipts by the end of first quarter 2011.**

Update on the Private Sector Window

30. **An update on the development of the Private Sector Window was given by a senior manager of IFC.** It was highlighted that during the last World Bank Annual Meetings on October 7-8, 2010, the US, Canada and IFC released a joint press statement announcing the first pledges to the private sector window: Canada (CAD 50 mil) and US (US\$ 25 million). IFC is expected to invest US\$ 25 million of its own capital to co-finance GAFSP funded projects. The Administrative Arrangement providing for CAD 2 million to the Advisory Component of the private sector window was signed with CIDA in October 2010. The Private Sector Window Charter and Agreement for Investments are being finalized with the US and Canada. Once the funds are contributed to the Private Sector Window, the facility will become operational and IFC will issue the first public call for proposals. GAFSP Private Sector Window funds will only be deployed in conjunction with IFC investments.
31. **On the governance structure, the donors will form a committee - Project Investment Committee (PIC) – that will make financing decisions for Private Sector Window funds.** IFC will prepare annual investment plans and seek endorsement by the SC. A Consultative Board will be created to provide advice to the PIC. It will consist of representatives of academia, Civil Society Organizations, private financial institutions and development agencies with experience in the agribusiness sector. The GAFSP SC is encouraged to nominate experts for the Consultative Board, and will provide final approval of its composition. Once launched, the Consultative Board for the private sector window will report at least once annually to the Steering Committee on the outcomes of its deliberations and any recommendations it may have about the private sector window.

32. On the relationship between the public and the private sector window, it was highlighted that there is a **strong interest in aligning investments from the public and private window sector within the same country** to leverage the most impact with scarce resources.
33. The Southern CSO Representative (Africa) raised the importance of ensuring that the private sector window is accessible to smallholder farmers. He recommended proactive support for such farmers and that innovative financial mechanisms, including microcredit, should be eligible for support. Concerning the issue of reaching smallholder farmers that may not have the means to directly interact with the private sector window, it was explained that **smallholders will be best serviced by local financial intermediaries that may be supported by the private sector window. Local financial institutions (possibly including microcredit institutions) will be supported to ensure that small farmers and SMEs can access financial services directly while building a long-term relationship with such institutions.** It was recognized that small farmers are a very important element of the private sector window and that 50 percent of IFC agribusiness investment is already in IDA countries.
34. It was stated that **IFC's environmental and social safeguards policies apply** to all IFC projects and since GAFSP projects from the private sector window will co-invest with IFC projects, the same safeguards will apply **to all GAFSP projects, including ones funding financial intermediaries.**
35. On the issue of indicators, it was agreed that IFC will continue working on the development of specific development **indicators for GAFSP funded Private Sector Window projects, which will be disclosed to the public.**

Update on Transfer agreements by SEs:

36. **Regarding the status of the Transfer Agreements (TA), legal counsel to the Trustee, which is also legal counsel for the CU and a legal resource for the SC, clarified** that the Transfer Agreement template as approved by the SC has been successfully negotiated by Supervising Entities' lawyers, and most of the TAs have been signed and the rest are in the process of being signed. The legal counsel also pointed out that clarification has been sought by the Asian Development Bank (ADB) on paragraph 22 of the Transfer Agreement template, and it was agreed that paragraph 22 will be clarified. Provided that there are no substantive changes to the TA template, it was agreed that SC approval will not be required, and the same template should apply to all SEs. Once ADB's lawyers propose specific language for clarifying paragraph 22, the legal counsel will seek unanimous agreement of the donors' lawyers and the SEs' lawyers before such proposed clarification become part of the TA template. Only if agreed, all signed TAs will be amended to include the agreed clarification and any future TAs to be entered into will include such clarification.
37. **The SC reiterated to SEs that when the implementation of projects can be expedited without impacting the quality of the project, efforts should be made to ensure early disbursement as much as possible.** SE representatives present indicated their understanding of the importance of the issue and intention to follow up.

38. **The SC approved a request by IFAD to reimburse it for funds that it is prepared to advance so that project implementation in Togo can begin in November.** This early start will make it possible to take advantage of the current growing season.

Update on the GAFSP Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan

39. **The draft version of the GAFSP Monitoring and Evaluation plan** prepared by the GAFSP Coordination Unit was presented to the SC. This was applauded by the SC, but extensively discussed.
40. On the issue of **regular project level M&E**, it was clarified that GAFSP funded projects will follow existing Supervising Entity procedures as stated to the CU and reproduced in the GAFSP M & E plan. This includes the collection of baseline data, whose importance was particularly recognized for any future evaluation exercises. **In addition, it was agreed that Supervising Entities will need to ensure that baseline data is indeed collected no later than the end of the first year of project implementation.**
41. **On the issue of project level indicators, it was explained that the indicators are deliberately set at the output and intermediary outcome levels and have been selected in order to ensure that they can be aggregated** across different countries and projects.
42. On the issue of the alignment between progress reporting required in the Transfer Agreement and the M&E reporting requirements, **it was agreed that the Coordination Unit will align the M&E reporting schedule to the Transfer Agreement reporting schedule.**
43. It was agreed that **all GAFSP projects will undergo a rapid impact evaluation and that 10-30 percent of GAFSP-financed projects will undergo a more rigorous and much more costly in-depth impact evaluation.** Those projects to undergo a full-fledged impact evaluation will be strategically selected according to specific technical criteria to be approved by the SC.
44. On the issue of financing, it was decided that **all rapid impact evaluations will be financed as a cost item within the awarded GAFSP grant amount allocated to each country, with a benchmark allocation of \$50,000 to this purpose.**
45. **The Steering Committee will allocate additional agency-executed funds to the Coordination Unit for projects that have been selected to undertake in-depth impact evaluations. This amount may vary up to the equivalent of 2.5% of the amount allocated in recipient executed grants. An initial amount of US\$ 6 million has been approved by the SC to permit a good start to the CU-executed component of the GAFSP M&E Plan.** (This amount is about 1.87 % of the recipient-executed allocations to 8 countries already made). The CU will prepare a budget to use these funds to submit to the SC for approval. It was agreed that the SC will regularly evaluate whether the allocated budget can ensure an adequate coverage for the planned evaluations, and provide more funds as needed. The SC agreed that in contracting evaluations, the CU should make every effort to include local researchers.

46. **The implementation arrangements, contracting, and supervision of rapid evaluations will be “decentralized”**, meaning that the country and Supervising Entity of the project will be responsible, funded through the recipient’s GAFSP proposal award. **The implementation arrangements, contracting, and supervision of in-depth and independent impact evaluations will be carried out through the GAFSP Coordination Unit**, using GAFSP funding provided by the SC for this purpose.
47. **The Coordination Unit will revise the M&E plan to incorporate feedback provided by the SC, including a discussion of additional indicators relating to participation issues, and will circulate an updated version of the document by December 3, 2010** for final approval by the SC. The CU agreed to explore geo-coding and geo-referencing of GAFSP investments for the purposes of enhancing impact and accountability, and will include a discussion of this item in the revised M & E plan to be submitted to the SC on Dec. 3. A budget will be submitted no later than December 10. (NB: the CU will acquire a new budget analyst Dec. 1). Progress on the M & E framework will be included as an agenda item at the next SC meeting.

Composition of the SC

48. **Concerning the size and the composition of the SC, the SC agreed to cap the voting membership of the SC at 16, following the model of the Climate Investment Funds** (i.e. a maximum of eight donor representatives and eight regional representatives from IDA countries selected through the Executive Directors of the World Bank representing IDA countries). In response to questions about the impact that a cap would have on the voice of existing donors and recruiting new donors, it was agreed that the **CU would draft a paper outlining options such as constituency arrangements, rotating chairs, etc. for the SC’s consideration**. The timing for this paper was not specified. Given that there are currently only 12 voting members and the multiple short deadlines facing the CU on other GAFSP items, the CU anticipates providing such a paper to the SC no later than mid-January. Once a specific option is agreed by the SC, the Governance Document will be amended to reflect the changes. The issue of the status of Regional Economic Organizations was also discussed, and decision on the admission of the African Union Commission to non-voting status membership of the SC was deferred until the SC can give fuller consideration to balance in representation across regions and the maximum size of the Steering Committee. The CU intends to explore options for such representation for the SC to consider in the above paper to be furnished in mid-January.

CSO Participation and access to information

49. **The South and North CSO representatives proposed two items for discussion, through a letter that was circulated on October 13, 2010** to the SC. The letter referred to: (i) concrete steps the GAFSP can take to ensure access to information and multi-stakeholder participation in proposal development, finalization and implementation; and (ii) the relationship between the reformed Committee on World Food Security (CFS) and the GAFSP.
50. The SC reiterated the importance of broad multi-stakeholder participation in GAFSP and **agreed to disclose on the GAFSP website the contact points of persons responsible for the awarded projects within one week** from the time of project approval by the SC.

51. IFAD provided an update on a grant that it is providing Agricoord to enable producer organizations in recipient countries to engage effectively in project design and implementation. **The SC agreed to request the CU to inform past and future GAFSP recipient governments that such funds are available, through a specific letter to that effect** separate from award letters, and also through the GAFSP website.
52. **The CU agreed to a request to place a notice on the website of the GAFSP that indicates the importance that the GAFSP SC places on the involvement of all relevant stakeholders** (including civil society, the private sector, and farmers' organizations) in the development, finalization, and implementation of proposals from the GAFSP.
53. It was also **agreed that the CSOs would prepare a discussion paper on the actual steps to ensure access to information and participation.** The CSOs will present the paper at the next SC meeting.
54. On the relation with the CFS, it was reported to the SC that the United Nations Secretary-General's representative and CSO representatives of the SC reported on GAFSP at the October 2010 CFS plenary meeting in Rome. Given the usefulness of such interaction, the SC wishes to explore the options to permit a regular flow of information between the CFS and the GAFSP. As a first step, **the SC agreed to explore having the Chair of the CFS address the next SC Meeting. The SC also requested the GAFSP Chair to explore with CFS ways that the GAFSP Chair or its representative can present on GAFSP activities at future meetings of the CFS.**

Next steps for the SC

55. **It was agreed that the next SC Meeting will be held in March or April 2011,** with the date to be set by the CU following consultation with the SC, subject to receipt of additional funding to support any new SC funding decisions likely to be made. A table of next steps is attached below.

GAFSP Calendar and Next Steps

DATE	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE	PROJECT RELATED ACTIONS	RESPONSIBLE
November 3-4	Fourth GAFSP Steering Committee Meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocktaking of financial resources • Decision on Funding Proposals on second round • Monitoring and Evaluation Update • Administrative Issues • Adoption of Next Semester Calendar 	Coordination Unit and TAC prepares/Steering Committee decides		
November 5	Inform all countries that submitted proposals for funding under the October 1 Call for Proposal, Supervising Entities and Trustee of Steering Committee Funding Decisions.	Coordination Unit		
November 8			<i>Togo</i> Submission of Project Document to Steering Committee for one-week review	IFAD via CU/Steering Committee
November 10	Results of the October 1 Call for Proposals to be published on GAFSP web-site	Coordination Unit		
November 12 (Fri)	Circulate Fourth GAFSP Steering Committee Meeting Minutes to the Steering Committee. [Steering Committee comments to be received within 3 business days (Wednesday November 17). Final minutes circulated by the Coordination Unit to the Steering Committee. Chair approves or comments on Minutes within 2 business days]	Coordination Unit		
November 29	Working Group Meeting on the criteria for assessing the 17 proposals.	Working Group/Coordination Unit		
November 30	Signature of Transfer Agreements with all Supervising Entities which have current approved projects	Trustee/Supervising Entities		

DATE	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE	PROJECT RELATED ACTIONS	RESPONSIBLE
December 1	Working Group to circulate report on the criteria for assessing the 17 proposals to the Steering Committee. (2 week review period)	Working Group/Coordination Unit		
December 3	Revised M&E plan circulated for approval by Steering Committee; associated detailed budget may not be ready until Dec. 10 due to staffing changes in CU (2 week review period)	Coordination Unit/ Steering Committee		
December 6	TAC supplemental Budget circulated for approval by Steering Committee (5 day review period)			
December 13			<i>Rwanda</i> Submission of Project Document to Steering Committee for one-week review	World Bank via CU/Steering Committee
December 22	Coordination Unit to submit to TAC final Working Group report			
January 15	Decision on TAC Composition going forward	Steering Committee		
January 15	Submission of paper on options for SC composition	Coordination Unit		
January (or February)	3-day TAC meeting to further assess the 17 proposals	TAC/Coordination Unit		
February 21			<i>Togo</i> Submission of Project Document to Steering Committee for one-week review	World Bank via CU/Steering Committee
February 25			<i>Haiti</i> Submission of Project Document to Steering Committee for one-week review	IDB via CU/Steering Committee
March 1			<i>Sierra Leone</i>	IFAD via CU/

DATE	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE	PROJECT RELATED ACTIONS	RESPONSIBLE
			Submission of Project Document to Steering Committee for one-week review	Steering Committee
March 8			<i>Haiti</i> Submission of Project Document to Steering Committee for one-week review	World Bank via CU/Steering Committee
March-April	Fifth GAFSP Steering Committee Meeting			

Annexes to the Steering Committee Minutes

Annex 1 Participant List at the Fourth Steering Committee Meeting

Annex 2 Steering Committee Members as of November 2010

Annex 3 Agenda of the Fourth Steering Committee Meeting

Annex 1

List of Participants to the Fourth GAFSP Steering Committee Meeting

NAME (in alphabetical order)	ORGANIZATION
Abou-Sabaa, Aly	AfDB
Adbul Ghaffar, Jeehan	Middle East & North Africa Representative (Yemen)
Agee, Kerri	CSO
Anderson, Jock	GAFSP Coordination Unit
Ashcroft, Vincent	Australia, AusAid
Baasankhuu, Damba	Mongolia, World Bank ED's office
Badiane, Osumane	Africa Representative (Senegal)
Banzuela, Raul Socrates	Asia CSO Representative
Baselga Bayo, Pilar	Spain, Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Cooperation
Bora, Saswati	GAFSP Coordination Unit
Brooks, Karen Mcconnell	World Bank
Cackler, Mark	World Bank
Cannon, Julie	GAFSP Coordination Unit
Ceccacci, Iride	GAFSP Coordination Unit
Chery, Jean Marie Robert	Latin America & Caribbean Representative (Haiti)
Chiew, Robert	Finance Canada
Cooke, Sanjiva	World Bank
Crivelli, Pamela	Trustee
Dakolias, Maria	Legal counsel to the Trustee
Delgado, Christopher	GAFSP Program Manager
Diker-Yilmaz, Esra	IFC
Dhillon, Navtej	US Treasury
Ehrhardt, Roger	GAFSP Chair
Erickson, Jennifer	Canada ACIDI-CIDA
Fall, Ndiogou	Africa CSO Representative
Funch, Ellen	United Nations
Gimenez De Cordoba, Enrique	Spain, World Bank ED's Office
Gingerich, Chris	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

Gort, Michael	Canada, ACIDI-CIDA
Hoberg, Yurie Tanimichi	GAFSP Coordination Unit
Ingvoldstad, Chie	Trustee
Islam, Kazi M.	Asia Representative (Bangladesh)
Joo, Hoan Uk	Korea, World Bank ED's office
Kharas, Cyrus	US Treasury
Kifle, Henock	IFAD
Kim, Do Hyeong	Korea, World Bank ED's office
Kim, Yong Sang	Korea, Ministry of Agriculture
MacGillivray, Iain	Canada, ACIDI-CIDA
Malarin, Hector	IDB
McKeon, Nora	CSO
Moore, Chris	WFP
Morden, Cheryl	IFAD
Morris, Scott	US Treasury
Nabarro, David	United Nations
Pardo, Maria Lourdes	Legal counsel to the Trustee
Peters, Dan	US Treasury
Pinstrup-Andersen, Per	TAC Chair
Prakash, Vipul	IFC
Rodriguez, Leonardo	Spain, Ministry of Economy and Finance
Rothschild, Jonathan	Canada, World Bank ED's Office
Schoellhammer, Robert	ADB
Sumpsi, Jose Maria	FAO
Tan, Wen-Jun (Michelle)	Legal counsel to the Trustee
Townsend, Robert	GAFSP Coordination Unit
Truitt Nakata, Ginya	IDB
Tumurbaatar, Erdenejargal	Asia Representative (Mongolia)
Watkins, Neil	North CSO Representative (ActionAID)
White, Bruce	CSO

Annex 2

GAFSP Steering Committee (as of November 2010)

Chair			
Canada	Mr. Roger Ehrhardt	Chair of the Steering Committee	
Country	Agency	Function	Representative
Donors (One Vote Per Country of Foundation)			
Australia	AusAID	Representative Alternate	Mr. Vincent Ashcroft Mr. Alopi Latukefu
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	Representative Alternate	Mr. Prabhu Pingali Mr. Christopher Gingerich
Canada	CIDA	Representative Alternate	Ms. Diane Jacovella Mr. Iain C. MacGillivray
Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	Representative Alternate	Mr. Seung Soo Eun Mr. Kangho Lee
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	U.S. Treasury	Representative Alternate	Ms. Marisa Lago Mr. Scott Morris
Recipients (one Vote per Representative)			
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 North Africa	Representative	Ms. Jeehan Abdul Ghaffar
Donor Representatives in Non-Voting Status			
Ireland		Representative	TBD
Recipient Representatives in Non-Voting Status Pending Participation of More Donors			
Moldova	Europe and Central Asia	Non-Voting Recipient Representative	Ms. Maya Sandu
Trustee and Coordination Unit (non-voting)			
World Bank	GAFSP Coordination Unit	Program Manager	Mr. Christopher Delgado
	Trustee		Ms. Pamela Crivelli
Representative of U.N. Secretary General (non-voting)			
United Nations	High Level Task Force on the Global Food Crisis	Representative	Mr. David Nabarro
Supervising Entities For Investment and Technical Assistance (non-voting)			
World Bank	IBRD	Representative (Public Sector Window) Alternate	Mr. Juergen Voegele Mr. Mark Cackler
	IFC	Representative (Private Sector Window)	Mr. Oscar Chemerinski
IFAD	IFAD	Representative Alternate	Mr. Henock Kifle Mr. Willem Bettink

AfDB	AfDB	Representative Alternate	Mr. Aly Abou-Sabaa Mr. Chiji Ojukwu
ADB	ADB	Representative Alternate	Mr. Katsuji Matsunami Mr. Robert Shoellhammer
IDB	IDB	Representative Alternate	Mr. Hector Malarin Ms. Ginya Truitt Nakata
Supervising Entities for Technical Assistance			
FAO	FAO	Representative Alternate	Mr. JoseMaria Sumpsi Mr. Charles Riemenschneider
WFP	WFP	Representative Alternate	Mr. Chris Moore Mr. Allan Jury
Civil Society Organizations			
North	Northern CSOs	Representative	Mr. Neil Watkins (Action Aid, USA)
South	Southern CSOs (Africa)	Representative	Mr. Ndiogou Fall (ROPPA, Senegal)
South	Southern CSOs (Asia)	Representative	Dr. Sang Yaing Koma (Farmer and Nature Net, Cambodia)

Annex 3

Agenda of the Fourth GAFSP Steering Committee

Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) AGENDA Fourth Steering Committee Meeting November 3-4, 2010 Venue: Westin Grand Hotel, 2350 M Street, NW Washington Ballroom (Conference Level) 9:00am- 6.00pm	
DAY 1	
9:30 am to 10:30 am	<p><i>[Breakfast will be served from 9:00 am in the Washington Ballroom Foyer, Conference Level]</i></p> <p>1. Welcome, introduction of new members, brief update on developments since last SC meeting Mr. Roger Ehrhardt, <i>Chair</i> Mr. Christopher Delgado, <i>CU Program Manager</i></p> <p><u>Documentation</u>: GAFSP Steering Committee June 2010 Meeting Minutes <u>Requested Action</u>: Confirmation of Australia and Yemen as voting members</p>
	<p>2. Presentation and adoption of the proposed agenda with any amendments offered Mr. Roger Ehrhardt, <i>Chair</i></p> <p><u>Documentation</u>: Proposed Agenda <u>Requested Action</u>: Amendment and adoption of agenda</p>
	<p>3. Selection of a new Chair Mr. Roger Ehrhardt, <i>Chair</i></p> <p><u>Requested Action</u>: Appointment of new SC Chair effective Nov. 5, 2010</p>

	<p>4. GAFSP Trust Fund financial overview Ms. Pamela Crivelli, <i>Trustee</i></p> <p><u>Documentation:</u> GAFSP Trust Fund Financial Overview</p>
<p>10:30 am to 12:30 pm (15 minute coffee break to be decided by Chair)</p>	<p>5. Decision on award structure for the present allocation Mr. Christopher Delgado, CU</p> <p><u>Documentation:</u> CU note on possible categories of award <u>Requested Actions:</u> Decisions on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Number and size of awards to make (roughly) b) Possibility of conditional awards based on expected contributions in 2011 1Q <hr/> <p>6. Results of TAC review Mr. Per Pinstруп-Andersen, <i>TAC Chair</i></p> <p><u>Documentation:</u> TAC Final Report</p>
<p>12:30 pm to 1:30 pm</p>	<p>Lunch Break (lunch will be served in the hotel’s Promenade Level)</p>
<p>1:30 pm to 5:30 pm (15 minute coffee break to be decided by Chair)</p>	<p>6. Results of TAC review (continued as necessary) Mr. Per Pinstруп-Andersen, <i>TAC Chair</i></p> <p><u>Documentation:</u> TAC Final Report</p>

	<p>7. Selection of recipients Mr. Roger Ehrhardt, <i>Chair</i></p> <p><u>Documentation:</u> TAC Final Report <u>Requested Actions:</u> Decisions on</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Categorization of proposals [approval, conditional approval, send back] b) How much funding to be allocated per approved and conditionally approved proposals c) Activities to be financed under each proposal d) Supervising entity to be selected
<p>5:30 pm to 6:00 pm</p>	<p>8. Communication strategy towards October 1 Call participants Mr. Christopher Delgado, <i>CU Program Manager</i></p> <p><u>Requested Actions:</u> Decisions on</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Summary of responses to applicants b) Handling unfunded but technically sound proposals c) Joint press releases <p>9. Wrap-up & Closure of the first day of the meeting Mr. Roger Ehrhardt, <i>Chair</i></p>
<p>DAY 2</p>	<p>Fourth Steering Committee Meeting November 3-4, 2010 Venue: Westin Grand Hotel, 2350 M Street, NW Washington Ballroom (Conference Level) 8:30am- 4:30pm</p>
<p>9:00am to 10:30 pm</p>	<p><i>[Breakfast will be served from 8:30 am in the Washington Ballroom Foyer, Conference Level]</i></p> <p>10. Update on the Private Sector Window Mr. Vipul Prakash, Sr. Manager, IFC Mr. Rajesh Behal, IFC</p> <p><u>Documentation:</u> Private Sector Window Update to the SC (IFC); GAFSP PSW Press Release (IFC); GAFSP Private Sector Oct 18 (IFC)</p>

	<p>11. Update of progress on Transfer Agreements with Supervising Entities and by Supervising Entities on countries that received awards in June 1010</p> <p>Ms. Pamela Crivelli, Trustee Ms. Maria Dakolias, Trustee’s lawyer Ms. Yurie Tanimichi Hoberg, CU and Supervising Entity Members of the SC</p> <p><u>Documentation</u>: Estimated project milestones by CU based on information supplied by SEs.</p>
10:30 am to 10:45 pm	Coffee Break
10:45 am to 12:30 pm	<p>12. Update on the GAFSP Monitoring and Evaluation Plan</p> <p>Ms. Yurie Tanimichi Hoberg, <i>CU</i> Mr. Jock Anderson, consultant Mr. Sanjiva Cooke, CU</p> <p><u>Documentation</u>: Draft GAFSP M&E Plan <u>Requested Action</u>: Guidance on the GAFSP M&E Plan</p>
	<p>13. Composition of Steering Committee</p> <p>Mr. Christopher Delgado, <i>CU Program Manager</i></p> <p><u>Requested Action</u>: Decisions on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Confirmation of size of SC b) Request for African Union representation on the SC
12:30 pm to 1:30 pm	Lunch Break (lunch will be served in the hotel’s Promenade Level)
1:30 pm to 4:00 pm	<p>14. Civil Society participation and CSO access to information</p> <p>Mr. Neil Watkins, <i>Northern CSO Representative</i> Mr. Ndiogou Fall, <i>Southern CSO (Africa) Representative</i> Mr. Raul Socrates Banzuela, on behalf of Mr. Sang Yaing Koma, <i>Southern CSO (Asia) Representative</i></p> <p><u>Documentation</u>: Oct. 13 letter from Messrs. Neil Watkins and Ndiogou Fall</p>

	<p>15. Linkage between GAFSP and the CFS Mr. Neil Watkins, <i>Northern CSO Representative</i> Mr. Ndiogou Fall, <i>Southern CSO (Africa) Representative</i></p> <p><u>Documentation</u>: Oct. 13 letter from Messrs. Neil Watkins and Ndiogou Fall <u>Requested Action</u>: SC comments on letter of Oct. 13 and guidance to SEs on follow-up</p> <hr/> <p>16. Decision on the 2011 Call for Proposals Mr. Roger Ehrhardt, <i>Chair</i></p> <p><u>Requested Actions</u>: Decisions on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Decision on date of the 2011 Call for Proposals for the public sector window b) Decision on eligibility for the 2011 Call for Proposals (Countries, Regional Economic Communities, others?) <p>17. Next steps for the Steering Committee Mr. Christopher Delgado, <i>CU Program Manager</i></p> <p><u>Documentation</u>: Updated 3 month timetable <u>Requested action</u>: Endorsement of 3 month timetable</p>
4:00 pm 4:30 pm	<p>18. AOB, Wrap-up, & Closure of the Meeting Mr. Roger Ehrhardt, <i>Chair</i></p>