Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP)

July 1, 2010

Executive Minutes
Third Meeting of the GAFSP Steering Committee
June 21, 2010

World Bank, Washington DC,
USA

Chair of the GAFSP Steering Committee
Mr. Roger Ehrhardt
Director General, Multilateral Development Institutions,
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)

Prepared by the GAFSP Coordination Unit

CHRISTOPHER L. DELGADO July 1, 2010
_____date:_____
Christopher L. Delgado
Program Manager, GAFSP

Accepted for the Steering Committee

ROGER EHRHARDT July 1, 2010
_____date:_____
Roger Ehrhardt
Chair of GAFSP Steering Committee

Opening of the meeting

1. The third meeting of the GAFSP Steering Committee was convened at World Bank Headquarters in Washington, D.C., on June 21, 2010 at 10:00 am and ended at 6:30 pm.

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 confirmed Steering Committee members and alternates as of June 21, 2010).

3. A brief update on developments since the last Steering Committee Meeting was given by Mr. Christopher Delgado, Program Manager, GAFSP. He introduced the members attending the Steering Committee meeting in person for the first time : Mr. Mamadou Cissokho, representing the Southern CSO Representative Mr. Ndiogou Fall; the Africa region representative from Sierra Leone, Mr. Dunstan S.C. Spencer, and the Latin America and Caribbean region representative from Haiti , Mr. Jean Robert Chery. The interim Technical Advisory Committee (iTAC) was represented at the meeting by Mr. Steven Haggblade, at the express request of the chair of the iTAC, Mr. Per Pinstrup-Andersen, who was unavailable to attend. It was highlighted that the review of the proposals undertaken by the iTAC was professional, independent, and followed a transparent process. Mr. Delgado also reminded the Steering Committee that iTAC members, while nominated and appointed by the Steering Committee, were not paid by GAFSP or any of the Supervising Entities. Furthermore the Steering Committee would need to work over the summer with the Coordination Unit to establish a regular TAC to evaluate the next round of proposals in October.

Presentation and adoption of the agenda

4. The meeting adopted the provisional agenda circulated on June 18, 2010 (see Annex 3). The order of the topics under discussion was slightly modified to accommodate the late arrival from travel of the Trustee presenter of the financial report.

Results on iTAC selection and TOR

5. Mr. Steve Haggblade presented the iTAC Final Report to the GAFSP Steering Committee that had been previously circulated to the Steering Committee on June 18, 2010. It was explained that the iTAC is a body composed of 7 members from diverse backgrounds, but independent of any of the Supervising Entities or countries included in the set of proposals. The chair of the iTAC received 6 sets of ratings which were subsequently added to his own and summarized by him, without time available to meet with members to achieve a consensus. Mr. Haggblade gave a general overview of the process undertaken by the iTAC to assess and evaluate the 8 country proposals for funding following the terms of reference for the ITAC previously agreed by the Steering Committee. Lessons learned from the iTAC process include the desirability of having the proposals for one month before

the report is due, and the need to have a meeting after reviewers have done their assessments, to try to have consensus recommendations.

6. Mr. Haggblade presented table 1 on page 2 of the iTAC Recommendations, where the average scores and funding recommendation for each country proposal were summarized. The applications were evaluated according to the following criteria: (i) need; (ii) policy; (iii) readiness; and (iv) quality of the proposal, with the final rank of countries representing the total score from the four criteria. It was explained that the funding recommendations were the average amounts proposed by the seven iTAC members.

7. There are representatives from Bangladesh, Haiti, Mongolia, and Sierra Leone on the Steering Committee, and those countries had proposals before the Committee on June 21. One of the representatives in question requested clarification of the rules for their participation in discussion of proposals in this round. The Steering Committee, while acknowledging that recipient representatives represent regions as well as countries, agreed that the four recipient representatives in question could participate in the discussion of all proposals, but should not advocate for their country's proposal given that countries from which representatives were not represented on the Steering Committee would not have the opportunity to do so. For voting purposes, it was assumed that each representative from a country whose proposal was being discussed was supportive of that proposal, and would not seek to block the proposal of other countries included in the same window.

8. On the issue of funding availability, the Steering Committee was informed that the total funding immediately available to be allocated through the public sector window totaled $252 million. The Steering Committee engaged in a discussion aimed at clarifying: (i) whether the Steering Committee was willing in principal to allocate the entire amount available on June 21 or only a portion of those funds; and (ii) whether the Steering Committee would support all the countries that submitted proposals under the June 14 window.

9. The Steering Committee agreed that funds could be allocated to countries whose proposals, as assessed by the iTAC, successfully met all the required standards of quality as laid out in the terms of reference for the iTAC. However the Committee would also need to weigh total funding availability, needs of other proposals, and the likelihood of having resources in hand for the October 1 window.

Proposed categorization of proposals

10. On the proposed categorization of proposals, it was decided that only two categories would be applied to proposals to operationalize the decisions of the Steering Committee with respect to June 14 public sector window: (i) "approved" and (ii) "sent back". To facilitate a common understanding of decisions, the categories were defined as follow:

11. An “approved proposal” will trigger an eventual financial transaction by the Trustee wherein Trust Fund resources will be allocated to the proposed projects or activities for which the Steering Committee has approved funding. The Trustee will set-aside the approved amount at this stage. The Trustee will commit the funds (i.e. create a liability) when the final project documents are approved by the Steering Committee. The transfer of funds intended for recipients will take place: (i) after the project appraisal stage; (ii) after the approval of the project by the relevant governing body of the Supervising Entities, if applicable; and (iii) based on the fund transfer request submitted by the Supervising Entity to the Trustee, and in accordance with the with the Transfer Agreement to be entered into between the Trustee and the Supervising Entities.

12. It was agreed that Supervising Entity executed project preparation, supervision costs, and administrative fees (collectively “Administrative Fees”)—in the aggregate not to exceed 5% of the recipient grant amount--would be additional to the grant approved for the country proposal. The selected Supervising Entity should submit to the Coordination Unit for Steering Committee approval on an absence of objection basis a budget for project preparation and supervision and any administrative fees to cover Supervising Entity overheads not to exceed in aggregate 5% of the recipient-executed grant. Following SC approval of the Administrative Fees and submission by the Supervising Entity to the Trustee of a Fund Transfer Request to receive such fees, the Trustee will transfer the full amount of the Administrative Fees to the Supervising Entity , in accordance with the Transfer Agreement between the Trustee and the Supervising Entities.

13. It was agreed that the Trustee in coordination with the Supervising Entities and the Coordination Unit would send an overview of the process flow for project proposals, up to and including funds transfers to the Supervising Entities to the Steering Committee.

14. It was agreed that for this first round of proposals, before final approval by the relevant governing body of the responsible Supervising Entity, all project proposals will be circulated to the Steering Committee for one week for approval on a no-objection basis; following approval the Trustee would commit funds to the Supervising Entity (ies) in question. This review period would give the Steering Committee the opportunity to verify that: (i) any concerns raised by the iTAC or the Steering Committee on a specific proposal during the first review have been addressed in the project design; and (ii) that the final project is in line with the proposal approved by the Steering Committee. It was agreed that this second review period would not be the proper occasion for the Steering Committee to introduce new elements into proposals that had not been previously reviewed or discussed by iTAC or the Steering Committee. This additional Steering Committee review and approval period may be repealed by the Steering Committee for the second or subsequent rounds of Calls for Proposals if it is felt that the process causes undue delays and/or donors are comfortable that Supervising Entities are consistently addressing iTAC concerns and are aligning project design with the approved proposal. Upon approval of the final project proposals by the Steering Committee, the Trustee will commit the final approved amount to the Supervising Entities.

15. In the course of project design, if the Supervising Entity and recipient country decide to make substantial changes to the project from the original approved proposal, these will be considered only under exceptional circumstances and will require communication of these changes and a justification thereof to the Steering Committee via the Coordination Unit, for Steering Committee approval. It was also highlighted that the amount allocated to the country for recipient-execution is an upper limit that cannot be changed.

16. The "sent back" category for this round comprises proposals that the Steering Committee is not prepared to approve at this time because they require further work to adequately meet the requirements of the Call for Proposals, or are judged lower priority for the purposes of GAFSP than available or likely alternatives, or insufficient funds are available, or some combination of these factors. Countries can resubmit proposals in later rounds and these resubmitted proposals will be considered by the TAC along with other proposals for the window in question. It was agreed that iTAC recommendations on this round will be passed on to the regular TAC.

17. It was agreed that communication of the Steering Committee decisions to the countries that submitted proposals would be the responsibility of the GAFSP Coordination Unit, who would send to each country the following information: (i) the total amount allocated to the country; (ii) the approved Supervising Entity (ies) if any; (iii) the iTAC summary assessment for that specific country proposal; and (iv) and any additional information that was highlighted during the Steering Committee to be communicated to the recipient country in question. The responsibility for communicating Steering Committee decisions to Supervising Entities is that of the Supervising Entity representatives on the Steering Committee, although the nature of those decisions in case of doubt is the version contained in the approved Steering Committee minutes.

Selection of recipients (first window allocation, June 14)

18. **Rwanda:** the proposal was assessed to be properly built on a strong agricultural sector investment plan that had been subject to good stakeholder consultation and peer review, and was aligned to the CAADP pillars and the GAFSP Framework Document. The iTAC recognized that the proposal provided for scaling-up of important activities in an enabling policy framework and indeed meets needs. However issues related to environmental implications of increased productivity were raised along with the need to encourage better inclusion of farmer organizations in the process.

    Decision:

    - The Steering Committee decided to award US$ 50 million to Rwanda.
    - The World Bank would be the recommended Supervising Entity for the project.
    - The Steering Committee would like to see a robust environmental assessment at the project appraisal stage.
    - The Steering Committee would like to see involvement of farmers' organizations in the specific projects that will use GAFSP funds.

19. **Bangladesh**: the proposal was well articulated and well integrated in the country's agricultural development and food security strategy and investment plan. It was recognized that the proposed activities will benefit a large number of low-income people while addressing important natural resource problems.

    Decision:

    - The Steering Committee decided to award US$ 50 million to Bangladesh.
    - It was decided that only those activities marked as high-priority (e.g.: ** = High Priority in the proposal) across all five categories, per table 4, page 19, of the proposal would be financed up to a maximum of US$ 50 million. However the Steering Committee also noted that the total amount requested to finance two-star priorities would be equal to US$ 54 million. The Steering Committee therefore requested the Government of Bangladesh to reallocate among two-star items to sum to the US$ 50 million available, while maintaining its own contribution of $17.5 million.
    - Bangladesh requested two Supervising Entities: FAO for technical assistance and the World Bank for investment activities. It was decided that FAO will be the Supervising Entity for the technical assistance component costing US$ 3.69 million (including a pro-rated share of the recipient program management component). The World Bank was designated as the Supervising Entity for $46.31 million allocated for the high priority items of Components 1 to 3 of the proposal.

20. **Sierra Leone:** the proposal was assessed to be fully aligned with country priorities and the CAADP Plan. It was recognized that the proposal has a sharp focus on smallholder farmers and includes productive safety nets and food security goals in the overall program.

    Decision:

    - The Steering Committee decided to allocate US$ 50 million to Sierra Leone, supporting all components in the GAFSP (2010-2014) Summary Table, page 18 of the Proposal to GAFSP.
    - IFAD was designated as the Supervising Entity for these funds. However it is the understanding of the Steering Committee that IFAD will work with FAO, as envisaged in the proposal, to deliver the technical assistance components of the work.
    - It was also decided that an environmental assessment should be undertaken in relation to the irrigation project; and that the country is strongly encouraged to actively engage farmer organizations.

21. **Togo:** The proposal was developed on the basis of a national investment program for agricultural development and food security. The progress made by Togo in the recent years was recognized as positive by the Steering Committee members. The proposal suggested the World Bank as the Supervising Entity. However, since the focus of part of the proposal was on scaling up a program in which IFAD was considerably involved, the Steering Committee suggested IFAD as an additional Supervising Entity.

    Decision:

    - The Steering Committee decided to allocate US$39 million to Togo.

- Activities to be financed are only component 1, 3, 4 and 5 of the proposal to GAFSP. The Steering Committee decided not to finance US$ 10 million that were requested for component 2 (livestock production) since there was insufficient information on this activity in the proposal. However the Steering Committee would encourage the Government to support livestock activities within the broader scope of the financed program.
- It was decided that the World Bank will be the Supervising Entity for the US$ 19 million to support the PASA program; while IFAD would be the Supervising Entity for the US$ 20 million to support the PADAT program.
- The Steering Committee also conveyed its desire that a robust environmental assessment be carried out during project appraisal and that it is desirous to see evidence during implementation of deeper engagement with farmer organizations.

22. **Haiti**: It was recognized that the proposal was based on a National Agricultural Investment Plan that could play an important role in the development of the country. However the main weakness was associated with the risk of failure given weak institutional and implementation capacity

    Decision:

    - The Steering Committee decided to allocate US$ 35.0 million to Haiti.
    - This grant will finance activity B.3.1. "Access to inputs and agricultural tools" as well as C.1. Agricultural Research, Extension and Training.
    - IDB and the World Bank were designated as Supervising Entities. No decision was made on the division of the funds between the World Bank and the IDB, nor on which Supervising Entity would be responsible for which activities. These decisions would need to be made through consultation among the Government of Haiti, IDB, and the World Bank.
    - The Steering Committee also conveyed its desire to see evidence during implementation of deeper engagement with smallholder farmers and farm organizations in rural areas.

23. The Steering Committee reviewed the proposals from **Mongolia, Tajikistan and Cambodia**. It was noted that fewer iTAC members recommended funding for these countries, stating that the proposals were not adequately developed. Even those in favor of funding recommended that only a few activities be funded. Despite recognition by the Steering Committee that there is significant need in these countries, the meeting was unable to approve funding for them on the basis of the submitted materials. The Committee agreed to send back the proposals to Mongolia, Tajikistan and Cambodia, along with the iTAC comments. Proposals from these countries can be resubmitted for consideration in the second or subsequent rounds. However, the Steering Committee made it clear that it cannot offer special treatment; resubmitted proposals will be evaluated on the basis of quality along with those proposals from other countries that submit proposals in that round.

Draft Transfer Agreement

24. On the Transfer Agreements between the Trustee and the Supervising Entities, the Trustee stated that discussions are ongoing between the Trustee and Supervising Entities. The Transfer Agreements are expected to be finalized in the coming weeks.

25. Concerning the approval of the final form of the Transfer Agreement by the Steering Committee, the Trustee affirmed that approval could be done virtually.

Update on the Private Sector Window

26. An overview of the latest progress on the Private Sector Window of the GAFSP was given by Mr. Oscar Chemerinski, Director the Agribusiness Department of IFC.

27. On the coordination between IFC and MDBs, there will be a public call for proposals for the private sector window in close coordination with other MDBs. The IFC will encourage other MDBs to submit their project proposals. It would be possible for IFC and other MDBs to co-fund selected projects where appropriate.

28. On the relationship between the public and the private sector window, it was highlighted that all things being equal, priority will be given to proposals in countries where the public sector window is already active and receiving support.

29. Regarding the sharing of confidential information from private sector clients, IFC would be able to share this only with the donors that contribute to the private sector window and are shareholders of the IFC. IFC's internal guidelines state that information about their private sector clients is confidential. According to IFC's disclosure policy, 30 days before the submission of the project to the Board, a Summary of Project Information, including an Environmental Social Review Summary of the project is released to the public through the IFC website. This information is first shared with IFC clients, and is only disclosed to the public after receiving written confirmation from the clients

30. It was stated that IFC's environmental and social safeguard 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.

31. It was decided to rename the "project approval committee" as the "project investment committee".

32. The meeting was informed that the cost recovery is being negotiated with contributing donors and will be part of the administrative agreement signed with contributing donors.

33. It was recognized that small farmers are a very important element of the private sector window. It was underlined that small farmers can be involved in many ways (e.g through intermediaries, advisory services, aggregators, etc.). The Call for Proposals will specifically try to focus on projects that support small scale farmers.

34. It was agreed that the draft would remain open for an additional two weeks following the Meeting for further comments and inputs.

Updates on CSO Representation and CSOs FY11 Budget

35. Mr. Neil Watkins, Northern CSO Representative and Mr. Mamadou Cissokho--on behalf of Mr. Ndiogou Fall, Southern CSO Representative--presented the CSO FY11 budget. A more detailed proposal was circulated at the meeting that detailed the complete breakdown of the budget without increasing the total requested.

36. The CSO FY11 budget was approved by the Steering Committee in the additional amount of $140,000, which brings to the total amount of $170,000 ($30,000 was included in the approved Coordination Unit FY11 budget).

37. The Committee also approved the request of the CSOs to have additional "resource persons/advisers" present at the Steering Committee Meetings, with economy class travel for the resource persons and representatives funded by GAFSP. It was clarified by the CSO representatives at the meeting that the role of the resource persons in this respect is to advise/support the CSO representatives during the meeting with strategic guidance and input, documentation, translations, or administrative tasks.

38. IFAD also stated that they are working with farmers' organizations and is considering developing a proposal for even more effective participation of farmers' organizations at the national level.

Supervising Entities

39. On the participation of the Supervising Entities in Steering Committee meetings, it was recognized that all the Supervising Entities represented have behaved as good corporate citizens and have been key sources of technical expertise during Steering Committee discussions.

40. One Steering Committee member stated that Supervising Entities play a crucial role in the GAFSP process by assisting countries in preparing GAFSP proposal, and also that their expertise had added value in this meeting. However, currently the current seven Supervising Entities outnumber donors and recipient representatives on the Steering Committee taken separately. He asked if a smaller number of SC members would not be better in managing the Steering Committee meeting.

41. It was recognized by the Chair on the basis of discussion that the present large and diverse group of Supervising Entities participating at the Steering Committee meetings is of value and it would be difficult to have only one or two organizations represented and speak for the others at the table.

42. It was decided that the Steering Committee will maintain the current structure with all Supervising Entities participating in GAFSP Steering Committee Meetings through seats at the table. If at a later date the size of the Steering Committee is an issue, the Committee will revisit this issue to consider possible solutions, including limiting the number of Supervising Entity seats.

Next steps for the Steering Committee

43. A communication strategy for the GAFSP was discussed and the Steering Committee tasked the Program Manager of the Coordination Unit to inform separately by e-mail all countries that submitted proposals to the first window of the GASFP about the results of the allocations.

44. The desire to coordinate the messages to the media emerged very strongly. Therefore it was decided that a draft press release will be shared among Steering Committee members the following day for their review and comments.

45. SC members will communicate GAFSP progress to Korea so that it can be included in the G20 Communiqué.

46. The meeting discussed and broadly agreed on the next steps outlined in the following table:

DATE	TIME (EST)	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
June 21 (Mon)	10am – 5pm	Third GAFSP Steering Committee Meeting: • Selection of recipients (first allocation, June 14 window) • Supervising Entities Participation in Steering Committee Meeting • Approval of FY11 CSOs Budget	Coordination Unit and iTAC prepares/Steering Committee decides
June 22 (Tu)		Inform Recipients, Supervising Entities and Trustee of Steering Committee Funding Decisions (first window)	Coordination Unit
June 23 (Wed)	NB: this has been delayed to allow time for notification of proposers and to get Trustee and IFC clearances.	Circulate Third Second GAFSP Steering Committee Meeting Minutes [Steering Committee comments to be received within 3 business days. Final minutes circulated by the Coordination Unit to the Steering Committee one full business day after receipt of comments. Chair approves or comments on minutes within 2 business days.]	Coordination Unit
By June 25		Funding decisions to be published on GAFSP	Coordination Unit

DATE	TIME (EST)	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
		Temporary web-site	
July 6 – 13		Virtual approval of form of the Transfer Agreements with Supervising Entities	Trustee/Supervising Entities
July 14 onwards		Signature of Transfer Agreements with Supervising Entities	Trustee/Supervising Entities
July 14 onwards		Commence Project Appraisal where SE agreements signed	Supervising Entities/Recipients
July 30		Coordination Unit progress report on GAFSP to World Bank Board	Coordination Unit
By Sept 1		Permanent GAFSP Website has been launched	Coordination Unit
Sept 2 - 15		Virtual Approval of TAC Composition, TOR and budget (CU Note: Members other than SEs have since been requested to submit nominees to CU by July 16)	Steering Committee nominates, Coordination Unit prepares/Steering Committee decides
October 2		Circulation of Funding Proposals received by October 1 deadline for first round to TAC and Steering Committee for review	Coordination Unit
October 2 – 22 (approx)		Review of Funding Proposals (second window)	TAC
November	2 day meeting in November to allow adequate review by both TAC and S/C	Fourth GAFSP Steering Committee Meeting: • Stocktaking of likely financial resources • Decision on Funding Proposals on second round • Adoption of Next Trimester Calendar	Coordination Unit/Steering Committee
November		Inform Recipients, Supervising Entities and Trustee of Steering Committee Funding Decisions (second window of first Call)	Coordination Unit

Wrap-up & Closure of the Meeting

47. It was decided that the next meeting would be a physical meeting in Washington, D.C., with virtual connections, at the end of October. It was suggested that this would be a two-day meeting.

Attachments

Annex 1: List of Participants

Annex 2: GAFSP Steering Committee as of April 21, 2010

Annex 3: Draft agenda (circulated on April 20, 2010)

Annex 1: List of Participants

Name	Title	Organization
Badiane, Ousmane (via audio)	Representative	Senegal
Behal, Rajesh	Investment Officer	IFC
Bohannon, Sean	Consultant	Office of Outreach and Partnerships
Bora, Saswati	GAFSP Coordination Unit	World Bank
Ceccacci, Iride	GAFSP Coordination Unit	World Bank
Chemerinski, Oscar	Director, Agr.	IFC
Crisologo, Priscilla		IADB
Crivelli, Pamela	Lead Financial Officer	World Bank
Dakolias, Maria	Lead Counsel	World Bank
Damba, Baasankhuu	WB Advisor to Executive Director	Mongolia
Delgado, Chris	Adviser	World Bank
Ehrhardt, Roger	Director General	CIDA
Ingvoldstad, Chie	Trustee	World Bank
Islam, Kazi MD. Aminul	WB Alternate Executive Director-	Bangladesh
MacGillivray, Iain C.	Principal Advisor, Agr.	CIDA
Moore, Christopher	Director of Hunger Solutions Strategy	World Food Programme
Morden, Cheryl	Director North American Liaison Office	IFAD
Morris, Scott	Dep Asst Sec	U.S. Treasury Department
Nabarro, David	Representative	UN Secretary General's Office
Pardo, Maria Lourdes	Legal	World Bank
Peters, Dan	Director	U.S. Treasury Department

Prakash, Vipul	Senior Manager	IFC
Riemenschneider, Charles		FAO
Sabaa , Aly-Sabou (via audio)	Representative	AfDB
Schoellhammer, Robert	Deputy Resident Director	Asian Development Bank
Spencer, Dunstan	Representative	Sierra Leone
Sumpsi, Jose Maria (via audio)	Representative	FAO
Tan, Wen-Jun	Legal	World Bank
Townsend, Robert	GAFSP Coordination Unit	World Bank
Truitt-Nakata, Ginya	Operations Senior Specialist	Office of Outreach and Partnerships
Voegele, Juergen	Director, Ag.	World Bank
Watkins, Neil	Policy Director	ActionAid
Yndriago, Ramon	GAFSP Administrative Client Support	World Bank
Zwaans, Pauline	GAFSP Coordination Unit	World Bank
Haggblade, Steven	Professor	Michigan State University
Ferrero, Gabriel	Deputy DG(?)	Spain MFA
Dhillon, Navetj	US Advisor	US Treasury
McKenna, Tjada	Senior Advisor	USAID
Lee, Kangho	Director	Ministry of Strategy & Finance, Korea
Gingerich, Chris	Senior Program officer	Gates Foundation
Kifle, Henock	Chief Development Specialist	IFAD
Cackler, Mark	Manager, ARD	World Bank

Lee, Jun Beom	Deputy Director	Ministry of Strategy & Finance, Korea
Bae, Sangdoo	Director	Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Fishery, Forestry
Robert, Chery J. M.	Advisor to Minister	Haiti
Cissokho, Cheikh	Roppee/PAFFD	Senegal
Tyler, Natsuki K.	ADB/NARO	ADB
Rodriguez, Leonardo		Spain

Annex 2: GAFSP Steering Committee as of June 21, 2010

Country	Agency	Function	Person and coordinates
Donors (One Vote Per Country or Foundation)			
Spain	Ministry of Economy and Finance	Representative	Mr. Jose Manuel Campa Fernandez Secretary of State of Economy Ministry of Economy and Finance Calle Alcala, 9 Madrid 28071
Spain	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation	Alternate	Mr. Juan Lopez-Doriga DG of Development Policy Planning and Evaluation Secretary of State of Development Cooperation Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation Beatriz de Bobadilla, 18 28040 Madrid
Canada	CIDA	Representative	Ms. Diane Jacovella VP, Multilateral Global Programs CIDA Ottawa Canada
Canada	CIDA	Alternate	Mr. Roger Ehrhardt DG, Multilateral Development Institutions CIDA Ottawa Canada
United States	U.S. Treasury	Representative	Ms. Marisa Lago Asst. Secretary for Markets and International Development Washington, D.C. USA
United States	U.S. Treasury	Alternate	Mr. Scott Morris Deputy Asst. Secretary International Development and Debt Policy Washington, D.C. USA

Country	Agency	Function	Person and coordinates
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation		Representative	Mr. Prabhu Pingali
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation		Alternate	Mr. Christopher Gingerich
Republic of Korea		Representative	Mr. Seung Soo Eun
Republic of Korea		Alternate	Mr. Kangoo Lee
Recipients (One Vote per Country)			
Senegal	Africa	Representative	Mr. Ousmane Badiane
Sierra Leone	Africa	Representative	Dr. Dunstan S.C. Spencer Senior Partner Enterprise Development Services Ltd PMB 108 5 Sir Samuel Lewis Road Freetown Sierra Leone
Bangladesh	South Asia	Representative	Mr. Kazi M. Aminul Islam Advisor to the Executive Director
Mongolia	East Asia andPacific	Representative	Ms. Erdenejargal Tumurbaatar Director, External Cooperation Division, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Light Industries, Mongolia
Haiti	Latin America and Caribbean	Representative	Mr. Jean Robert Chery
Recipient Representatives in Non-Voting Status Pending Participation of More Donors			
Yemen	Middle East and North Africa	Non-Voting Recipient Representative	Ms. Jeehan Abdul Ghaffar Advisor to the Executive Director

Country	Agency	Function	Person and coordinates
Moldova	Europe/Central Asia	Non-Voting Recipient Representative Alternate:	Mr. Victor BODIU State Minister Between April and July 1, 2010: Mr David Kuijper From July 1st: Ms. Maya Sandu Dutch constituency office
Trustee (non-voting)			
World Bank	GAFSP Coordination Unit	Head	Mr. Christopher Delgado Program Manager, GAFSP
World Bank	Financial and Administrative issues	Advisor	Ms. Pamela Crivelli Trustee
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/IDA	Representative	Mr. Juergen Voegele Director, ARD
World Bank	IFC	Representative of Private Sector Window	Mr. Oscar Chemerinski Director Agribusiness Department (IFC).
IFAD	IFAD	Representative: Alternate:	Mr. Henock Kifle Chief Development Strategist Mr. Willem Bettink Programme and Change Officer, Programme Management Department
AfDB	AfDB	Representative: Alternate:	Mr. Aly Abou-Sabaa Director, Agriculture & Agro-Industry Department Mr. Chiji Ojukwu Manager, Agriculture 1 Division (North and East Africa)

Country	Agency	Function	Person and coordinates
ADB	ADB	Representative:	Mr. Katsuji Matsunami Advisor/Practice Leader (Agriculture, Rural Development & Food Security) Regional and Sustainable Development Department
ADB	ADB	Alternate:	Mr. Robert Schoellhammer Deputy Resident Director North American Representative Office Suite 325, 815 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, DC
IDB	IDB	Representative:	Hector Malarin Chief, Environment, Rural Development & Disaster Risk Division
IDB	IDB	Alternate	Ginya A. Truitt Nakata Operations Senior Specialist Office of Outreach and Partnerships (ORP) 1300 New York Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20577 USA Tel. 1-202-623-2003
Supervising Entities for Technical Assistance (non-voting)			
FAO	FAO	Representative: Alternate:	Mr. JoseMaria Sumpsi Mr. Charles Riemenschneider
WFP	WFP	Representative: Alternate:	Mr. Chris Moore Director, Hunger Solutions Strategy (WFP) Mr. Allan Jury Director, WFP Liaison Office to the U.S., Washington, D.C.
Civil Society Organizations (non-voting)			

Country	Agency	Function	Person and coordinates
North		Representative:	Mr. Neil Watkins, Northern CSO Representative
South		Representative: Alternate:	Mr. Ndiogou Fall

Annex 3: Agenda

Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) ***Proposed Agenda*** **Third Steering Committee Meeting June 21, 2010** World Bank Main Complex Room MC13-121 10 AM- 5 PM Chair: Mr. Roger Ehrhardt	
10:00 am to 10:30 am	*[Breakfast will be served from 9.30 am.]* **1. Welcome and brief update on developments since last Steering Committee Meeting** Christopher Delgado, *Program Manager, GAFSP* Documentation: GAFSP Steering Committee Meeting Minutes of May 14 **2. Presentation and adoption of the proposed agenda with any amendments offered** Mr. Roger Ehrhardt, *Chair* Documentation: Proposed Agenda <u>Requested Action</u>: Amendment and adoption of agenda
	3. GAFSP Trust Fund financial overview Ms. Pamela Crivelli, *Trustee* Documentation: GAFSP Trust Fund Financial Overview **4. Results on iTAC selection and TOR** Mr. Steve Haggblade, *Member of iTAC Sub-Committee* Documentation: iTAC TOR and Final Report on iTAC Selection

10:30 am to 12:30 pm	**5. Selection of recipients (first window allocation, June 14)** Mr. Roger Ehrhardt Documentation: Funding Recommendations from the iTAC <u>Requested Actions</u>: Decisions needed from the Steering Committee on a) Country proposals to be financed; b) How much funding to be allocated per proposal; c) Activities to be financed under each proposal; d) Supervising Entity to be selected.

12:30 pm to 1:00 pm	**Lunch Break (lunch provided outside the meeting room)**
1:00 pm to 2:45 pm	**6. Selection of recipients (first window allocation, June 14) - Continued** Mr. Roger Ehrhardt Documentation: Funding Recommendations from the iTAC <u>Requested Actions</u>: Decisions needed from the Steering Committee on a) Country proposals to be financed; b) How much funding to be allocated per proposal; c) Activities to be financed under each proposal; d) Supervising Entity to be selected. **7. Draft Transfer Agreement** Ms. Pamela Crivelli and Ms. Maria Dakolias, *Lead Counsel*
2:45 pm to 3:00 pm	**Coffee Break**
3:00 pm to 4:30 pm	**8. Update on the Private Sector Window** Mr. Oscar Chemerinski, *Director, Agribusiness Department, IFC* Documentation: Working Draft of IFC Private Sector Window **9. Representation of Supervising Entities on the SC** Christopher Delgado Documentation: GAFSP Governance Document and GAFSP Steering Committee Meeting Minutes of May 14 <u>Requested Action</u>: Whether each Supervising Entity will maintain individual seats on the SC

	10. Updates on CSO Representation and CSOs FY11 Budget Mr. Neil Watkins, *Northern CSO Representative* Mr. Mamadou Cissokho on behalf of Mr. Ndiogou Fall, *Southern CSO Representative* Documentation: Northern: Communication of Selection Process from Vanessa Dick to Chris Delgado; Actual Selection Information (CVs); CSOs FY11 Budget Requested Action: Approval of FY11 CSO Budget
4:30 pm to 5:00 pm	**11. Coordination Unit understanding of Steering Committee guidance on responses to applicants and next steps for the Steering Committee** Christopher Delgado Summary of responses to applicants Second Call for Proposal Regular TAC Documentation: updated three-month timetable Requested action: endorsement of 3 month timetable **12. Wrap-up & Closure of the Meeting** Mr. Roger Ehrhardt