



## **GAFSP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Terms of Reference**

January 30, 2012

### **Background<sup>1</sup>**

1. The Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) is a multilateral mechanism to assist in the implementation of pledges made at L'Aquila in July 2009, reaffirmed by the G20 Summit in Pittsburgh in September 2009. The focus of GAFSP is on the longer-term agenda to improve the income and food security of poor people in developing countries through more and better country-led public and private sector investment in raising agricultural productivity, linking farmers to markets, reducing risk and vulnerability, and improving non-farm rural livelihoods, and through technical assistance. GAFSP will complement ongoing efforts through other mechanisms to scale-up support to agriculture and food security. The objective of this new mechanism is to fill the financing gaps in country and region-led agriculture and food security strategies in a way that contributes meaningfully to the achievement of the MDG1 to cut hunger and poverty by half by 2015, and leverages other efforts to ensure verifiable results in this regard. It will do this by providing grants, loans, and equity investments in developing countries through a multilateral approach targeted simultaneously to the greatest needs and the best capacities to use such funding. The proposed GAFSP approach is to:

- provide a significant and unified source of additional development partner financing to developing countries that have demonstrated their commitment to a comprehensive approach for increasing agricultural growth and making lasting improvements in the food security of their populations;
- assist this approach through a country-led, aligned and harmonized multilateral and multisectoral response to country and regional requests for financing that helps ensure the successful impact of interventions, ensures coordination with other efforts at the country level, and follows a transparent and needs based process for gaining additional funding;
- include both a public and private sector financing window. The latter will provide long and short term loans, credit guarantees and equity to support private sector activities to improve agricultural development and food security.

2. The Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) Trust Fund was established in April 2010. The current donors are, in alphabetical order, Australia, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Canada, Ireland, Netherlands, the Republic of Korea, Spain and the United States. An external GAFSP Steering Committee has been set up to govern the fund. The GAFSP Steering Committee, composed of donor and recipient representatives as voting members, and representatives from the Fund Trustee, multi-lateral development banks, IFAD, FAO and WFP, the United Nations Secretary General's Special Representative on Food Security and Nutrition and CSOs as non-voting members, is the decision-making body of the GAFSP.

---

<sup>1</sup> Background material is drawn from the GAFSP Framework Document.

3. The role of the TAC is to provide due diligence on the quality of submitted agriculture and food security strategies and investment plans, and GAFSP proposals, and to submit to the Steering Committee funding recommendations for their consideration. In doing so the TAC must take full consideration of the Country Guidelines issued as part of the call for proposal (Attachment 3). The Steering Committee will make decisions on:

1. Which proposals to finance
2. How much to allocate to each proposal
3. What activities within the proposals to finance
4. Which Supervising Entity to appoint for each proposal.

### **Responsibility/Tasks of TAC Members**

4. Each TAC member will undertake the tasks that follow.

#### **Task 1: Provide recommendations on which proposals to finance based on assessment scores of country need, country readiness and proposal readiness**

5. Each TAC member will score each country submission using three criteria: Country Need, Country Readiness and Proposal Readiness (following the Proposal Rating in Attachment 2). In addition, each member will prepare a short written summary (one paragraph) on the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal and relate it to the numerical score. The proposal scores and written summaries will be submitted to the Chair of the TAC, who will share them with other members of TAC.

6. TAC members are expected to follow the deadlines communicated to them by the Chair of TAC. In its assessment, the Chair should draw upon advice from TAC members with working knowledge of specific countries. English is the operational language of GAFSP, thus submissions are expected in English. In exceptional cases, the Steering Committee may allow countries to submit supporting documents such as the full strategy and investment plan in other languages. This will be decided on a case by case basis. In making this decision the Steering Committee will consult with the Chair of TAC. To avoid the perception of conflict of interest, TAC members cannot provide a full technical assessment of their countries of origin, or of any country where they have actively assisted governments in preparing any part of the required documents for GAFSP submission.

#### **Task 2: Provide recommendations on how much to be allocated to each proposal**

7. The current available resources in the GAFSP Trust Fund for 2012 are approximately \$180 million to be allocated to roughly the 5 or 6 highest ranked proposals in May 2012. The TAC members are requested to recommend how much to allocate to each country to match available resources. In proposing funding amounts for each country proposal, TAC is not encouraged to reduce funding allocations per country with the sole intention to fund a large number of proposals. In making these recommendations, reviewers should consider:

- The relative and absolute measures of undernourished and poor people;
- The extent to which the proposed activities relate to the objectives and scope of GAFSP (see Section IV of the GAFSP Framework Document);
- The quality of the proposal (in line with the scores from assessment in Attachment 2);
- Whether the indicative costs associated with each component are appropriate to the activities proposed (based on the TAC member's own experience, if applicable);

- Whether a reduced level of funding would compromise the achievement of the stated proposal objectives;
- Whether other funds are available from alternative sources to finance the same type of investment.

**Task 3: Provide recommendations on which activities to finance (given that some members of TAC may not agree with the appropriateness of full funding).**

8. Respecting the priorities made by countries in their proposals, members of TAC should provide recommendations on which activities to finance within proposals. If the recommended amount by TAC members is lower than the requested amount, a clear justification should be provided on which components (and sub-components) of the proposal are to be financed, with their associated financing amount. In setting priorities and making recommendations, the TAC member must consider:

- The prioritization of activities provided in the country proposals (these must be respected).
- If no or little prioritization is reflected in the proposal, then the TAC members, in proposing which activities to finance, should: (i) consider the importance of activities relative to the overall program, (ii) the extent of the alignment of the activity with the GAFSP framework document, and (iii) give priority to investment with the highest likelihood of sustainability. If all components in the proposal are considered to have equal importance to the achievement of the proposal objectives, but they are all excessively costed resulting in the TAC not recommending full financing, then TAC could recommend reduced financing across all components on a pro-rata basis. Clear justification for the recommendations should be provided in the paragraph submissions from each member to the TAC Chair.

**Task 4: Examine the appropriateness of proposed supervising entity for each proposal**

9. If the country proposals include a preferred supervising entity, this preference should be respected. The proposal must adequately justify the preferred supervising entity. If the TAC member doubts the adequacy of the country-proposed supervising entity and makes this case in writing, or when a country fails to specify a supervising entity, the TAC member through the Chair may propose a preferred supervising entity to the Steering Committee. In such a case, proposals of supervising entities should be based on the TAC member's knowledge of the comparative advantage of possible GAFSP supervising entities relative to the activities contained in the proposal; considerations of safeguard policies; leveraging of Multilateral Development Bank resources; historical relations with the recipient country; and track record of providing high quality and context-experienced personnel to work with national authorities on the development and implementation of proposals. The Steering Committee will confirm with the Government the appropriateness of the proposed Supervising Entity.

10. If more than two supervising entities for investment projects are proposed, then these need to be reviewed against the additional costs of having multiple supervising entities (e.g. additional preparation and supervision costs) and be weighed against expected benefits. The Steering Committee would need to see strong justification for the use of more than one supervising entity before approving the proposal.

**Task 5: Assistance in consolidation of TAC member recommendations**

11. Individual TAC members will provide the following to the Chair of the TAC:

- The completed scoring of each proposal; and

- A paragraph summary for each proposal specifying recommendations, and the associated justifications, on the four areas in which the Steering Committee will make decisions: (i) which proposals to finance (see para. 5 and 6); (ii) how much to allocate to each proposal (see para. 7); (iii) what activities within each proposal to finance (see para. 8); and (iv) which supervising entity to appoint for each proposal) (see para. 9 and 10).

12. TAC members are expected to meet in person (in Washington DC on May 2-4) to discuss and agree on a set of recommendations to be finalized in the Chair’s synthesis report.

**Responsibilities/Tasks of TAC Chair**

13. The TAC Chair, in addition to the tasks as a member of the TAC (listed above), will undertake the following tasks:

- Consolidate the individual assessments into one Chair’s synthesis report on recommendations to the Steering Committee. The Chair of the TAC will average the scores across all TAC members and provide to the Steering Committee (via the GAFSP Coordination Unit) and TAC members a report which includes the following: (i) a ranked list of countries/proposals based on scores; (ii) for each proposal, a one paragraph summary reflecting the four recommendations listed above; and (iii) information on the number of TAC members (without identifying individual members) that proposed financing for each proposal.
- Lead discussions at a face-to-face TAC workshop in Washington DC on May 2-4, 2012, to be organized by the GAFSP Coordination Unit, to discuss and agree on a set of recommendations to be finalized in the Chair’s synthesis report.
- Submit the Chair’s final synthesis report, through the GAFSP Coordination Unit, to the Steering Committee no later than May 14, 2012. Relevant parts of the report will be included in the minutes of the May 22-23 Steering Committee meeting and will be used for subsequent communication to countries on their proposals.
- Participate in the Steering Committee meeting (scheduled for May 22-23, 2012) to present the synthesis report and answer any questions on the TAC’s decisions.

**Deliverables/Timeframe**

14. The following timeframe is envisaged for the review process for the May 2012 submissions:

Date	Process
April 3, 2012	Complete package of country submission posted on the TAC password protected web-page to be accessible to the TAC Chair and TAC members for their review
April 3–22, 2012	TAC Chair and TAC members to conduct in-depth assessments for all proposals
April 22, 2012	Deadline for submission of in-depth assessment and scoring reports by TAC members to the Chair
April 27, 2012	Deadline for Chair to circulate among TAC members all their compiled scores and recommendations
May 2-4, 2012	TAC meeting to discuss and agree on a set of recommendations to be finalized in the Chair’s synthesis report
May 5 – May 13	Chair to finalize the report
May 14	Chair to submit final report, through the GAFSP Coordination Unit, to the Steering Committee copied to all TAC members
May 22-23, 2012	GAFSP Steering Committee (Chair to attend to present summary and answer any questions)

15. This Terms of Reference applies to the selected TAC members and TAC Chair to evaluate GAFSP proposals under the Second Call for Proposals launched on January 10, 2012.

### **Qualifications**

- Technical expertise with a high level of professional experience in some thematic area pertaining to agriculture and food security issues, and familiarity with the CAADP and CAADP-like processes.
- Cannot be current government officials of any country nor be current staff of any of the GAFSP Supervising Entities.
- Before joining TAC, prospective TAC members should disclose any active involvement they may have had prior to the contract or will have in assisting GAFSP eligible governments in developing national agriculture plans or GAFSP proposals. This information should be disclosed as soon as possible so that the Steering Committee can decide whether it constitutes a case of conflict of interest.

### **Reporting**

16. TAC members will directly report to the Chair of TAC, appointed by the Steering Committee and are responsible to the Steering Committee for their individual performance. For administrative matters, TAC members may consult the GAFSP Coordination Unit for assistance ([info@gafspfund.org](mailto:info@gafspfund.org)).

## ATTACHEMENT 1: Call for Proposals

Washington, D.C., January 10, 2012

### *Second Call for Proposals – GAFSP Public Sector Window*

This is the second GAFSP Call for Proposals from “IDA-only countries”<sup>2</sup> that are not in non-accrual status to submit proposals by March 31, 2012, consistent with the *Country Guidelines for the Public Sector Window* (version: January 10, 2012), available on the GAFSP “Call for Proposals” web page: <http://www.gafspfund.org/gafsp/content/call-proposals>.

The first Call for Proposals was launched in May 2010, with a first allocation round in June 2010, and a second allocation round in October 2010. Of those proposals submitted under the two rounds of the first Call, twelve low-income countries were awarded financing for a total of US\$481 million in recipient-executed funding. These resources are being used to help finance the scale-up of assistance to low-income countries in a way that strengthens their own strategic programs to raise agricultural productivity, improve rural incomes, and food security. The general scope of the program is detailed in the Framework Document for the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (available on the “About GAFSP” web page: <http://www.gafspfund.org/gafsp/content/global-agriculture-and-food-security-program>).

Available financing follows commitments made by leaders at the L’Aquila G8 Summit in July 2009, reaffirmed by the G20 Summit in Pittsburgh in September 2009, and since supplemented by new pledges. The Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) Trust Fund was established in April 2010. Donors to date, in alphabetical order, are Australia, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Canada, Ireland, the Republic of Korea, Spain, and the United States.

Currently available non-committed resources in the Public Sector Window of the GAFSP Trust Fund are approximately US\$180 million, likely to be allocated to roughly the 5 to 6 highest ranked proposals. The total amount is tentative and may increase depending on further donor commitments received between now and the time of allocation. There is no guarantee that all deserving proposals will be funded given the limited availability of funds.

Proposals submitted to GAFSP are reviewed by a confidential external Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) which reports to the GAFSP Steering Committee and are nominated solely by Steering Committee members representing donors, recipients, and civil society. TAC is fully independent of potential Supervising Entities of GAFSP projects, including the World Bank. TAC assesses proposals in line with the criteria laid out in the *Country Guidelines* (version: January 10, 2012), i.e. country need, country readiness, and the technical quality of the proposal. Its function is primarily to provide due diligence to the Steering Committee that proposals submitted conform to the published objectives and modalities of GAFSP.

The Steering Committee intends to make allocation decisions by the end of May 2012. Proposals must be submitted electronically by midnight March 31, 2012 (Washington, D.C. time) to the GAFSP Coordination Unit. Submissions can be made by email to [info@gafspfund.org](mailto:info@gafspfund.org), or by sending an electronic device such as a CD or a flash drive by courier to: GAFSP Coordination Unit, MSN MC5-510, The World Bank Group, 3301 Pennsy Drive, Landover, MD 20785 USA. Experience suggests that the

---

<sup>2</sup> Countries that are eligible to receive concessional funding through the World Bank from the International Development Association (IDA) but do not have access to lending from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD).

email option is the most reliable with respect to meeting time deadlines. All submitted documents should be in either Microsoft Word, Excel, or PDF format.

Submission documents must meet the conditions laid out in *Country Guidelines* (version: January 10, 2012). Please note that to ensure a level playing field, no exceptions will be made on deadlines or document formats. We strongly encourage countries to submit a few days earlier than the deadline in case of any technical problems in the submission process (and more than a few days in the case of courier submission of electronic media). Countries are responsible for ensuring that proposals are complete and in the due format specified in the *Country Guidelines* (version: January 10, 2012).

Countries that have submitted unsuccessful proposals to GAFSP in the past are strongly encouraged to apply again, although no special preference will be granted to these proposals, which will compete for available funds with new proposals. Also, please note that the selection criteria have been updated from the first Call for Proposals; countries are requested to review and revise previous proposals to follow the updated *Country Guidelines* (version: January 10, 2012).

The Steering Committee would like to invite submissions by eligible governments following the above mentioned guidelines. If you have any questions on administrative matters related to the submissions, please contact the GAFSP Coordination Unit ([info@gafspfund.org](mailto:info@gafspfund.org)). In fairness to all, the Coordination Unit cannot provide any insights on what is required for a successful proposal beyond what is posted on the website. Any clarification that becomes necessary over time to posted material will itself be posted as soon as possible on the website for the benefit of all.

We very much look forward to receiving country proposals for consideration by the GAFSP Steering Committee.

Sincerely,

Dan Peters  
Chair of the GAFSP Steering Committee

## ATTACHMENT 2: Proposal Rating Form

**Proposal Title:**

**Country:**

---

<b>Country Need</b>	=	<b>(30 points max)</b>
<b>Country Readiness</b>	=	<b>(30 points max)</b>
<b>Proposal Readiness</b>	=	<b>(40 points max)</b>
<b>Total score</b>	=	<b>(100 points max)</b>

---

### **Country Need (30 points max)**

The Country Need score for the received proposals will be provided in ranked order by the GAFSP Coordination Unit to TAC, following the agreed formulaic approach. Indicators to be used in the formulaic approach are those associated with the first Millennium Development Goal, specifically: (i) the proportion of people below the \$1 (PPP) per day poverty line; (ii) the poverty gap ratio; (iii) the percent of the poorest quintile in national consumption, (iv) the prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age, and (v) the percent of the population below the minimum dietary energy consumption.

### **Country Readiness (30 points max)**

Country readiness will be assessed from Part 1 of the country proposal. Each of the seven sub-components should be scored out of a maximum score 30/7. As per **Annex 1: Part 1** of the Country Guidelines, country readiness will be assessed through the evaluation of individual country proposals, which will also include an assessment of the policy environment. Completion of a Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) Post-Compact investment plan, with a subsequent CAADP technical review report and business meeting is a pre-requisite for African countries to apply for GAFSP financing. For non-African countries the completion of a comprehensive agricultural development strategy and investment plan that has undergone an independent technical review, covering similar technical aspects as the CAADP reviews will be used to assess country readiness. An independent and thorough peer review of the investment plan, comparable to that provided by a CAADP Post-Compact technical review report must be included with the non-African country submissions (see Annex 2 of the Country Guidelines). If the technical review highlights significant shortcomings, the Government should indicate how these have been or will be addressed.

### **Proposal Readiness (40 points)**

Proposal readiness will be assessed from Part 2 of the country proposal. Each of the sub-components should be scored out of a maximum score 40/7 (with an exception for sub-component 2.6 on the time frame of proposed support which should not be scored). As per **Annex 1: Part 2** of the Country Guidelines, the specific proposal for GAFSP financing will primarily be assessed against: (i) specific objectives and targeted results, (ii) activities to be financed, (iii) implementation arrangements, (iv) amount of financing requested, (v) time frame of proposed support (vi) risks and risk management, and (vii) consultation with local stakeholders and development partners.



**ATTACHEMENT 3: Country Guidelines for Public Sector Window Proposals**

**Global Agriculture and Food Security Program**

January 10, 2012

---

**COUNTRY GUIDELINES  
FOR PUBLIC SECTOR WINDOW PROPOSALS**

## 1. Focus of the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program

1. The focus of the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) is on the longer-term agenda to improve the income and food security of poor people in developing countries through more and better country-led public and private sector investment in raising agricultural productivity, linking farmers to markets, reducing risk and vulnerability, and improving non-farm rural livelihoods, and through technical assistance. The objective of this new mechanism is to fill the financing gaps in country and regional agriculture and food security strategies, thereby contributing to the achievement of the MDG1 to cut hunger and poverty by half by 2015<sup>3</sup>. GAFSP supports only country-led initiatives, giving priority to those with evidence of stakeholder participation from project design to implementation. For the scope of eligible activities see the GAFSP Framework Document:

<http://www.gafspfund.org/gafsp/sites/gafspfund.org/files/Documents/FrameworkDocument.pdf>

## 2. Eligible Countries

2. The call for proposals will be open to all members of the International Development Association (IDA) that are eligible to receive financing from IDA and not IBRD (“IDA-only countries”) and that are not in non-accrual status<sup>4</sup>. This currently includes 60 countries:

<b>Africa</b> <i>(35 countries)</i>		<b>East Asia and the Pacific</b> <i>(9 countries)</i>	<b>ECA</b> <i>(4 countries)</i>	<b>Latin America</b> <i>(4 countries)</i>	<b>MENA</b> <i>(2 countries)</i>	<b>South Asia</b> <i>(6 countries)</i>
Angola	Lesotho	Cambodia	Kosovo	Guyana	Djibouti	Afghanistan
Benin	Liberia	Kiribati	Kyrgyz Rep.	Haiti	Yemen	Bangladesh
Burkina Faso	Madagascar	Laos PDR	Moldova	Honduras		Bhutan
Burundi	Malawi	Mongolia	Tajikistan	Nicaragua		Maldives
Cameroon	Mali	Samoa				Nepal
CAR	Mauritania	Solomon Islands				Sri Lanka
Chad	Mozambique	Timor-Leste				
Comoros	Niger	Tonga				
DRC	Nigeria	Vanuatu				
Congo, Rep.	Rwanda					
Cote d’Ivoire	Sao Tome & Pr					
Ethiopia	Senegal					
Eritrea	Sierra Leone					
Gambia	Tanzania					
Ghana	Togo					
Guinea	Uganda					
Guinea-Bissau	Zambia					
Kenya						

3. If additional resources become available, and where there is a compelling case, the GAFSP Steering Committee may decide on an additional call for proposals from IDA blend countries, and non-members of IDA.

<sup>3</sup> Extract from the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program Framework Document.

<sup>4</sup> Nonaccrual status occurs when the oldest payment arrears are six months overdue. Once all arrears are cleared, all loans to, or guaranteed by, the country are generally restored to accrual status.

### 3. Country Selection Criteria

4. With limited resources available, not all country proposals can be financed. Priority will be given to IDA-only countries with greatest need, with a conducive policy environment, and to those who are more implementation ready. The Technical Advisory Committee will use cross-country benchmarks (such as those referenced below) and the information provided in individual country proposals to undertake a relative assessment of country submissions. Decisions on country allocations will be based on a relative weighting of 30:30:40 assigned to measures of country need, country readiness, and proposal readiness. These measures will include:

- **Country Need (Overall weight of 30):** Countries with greatest need will be given priority. In addition to their IDA-only status, other indicators to assess country need are those associated with the first Millennium Development Goal, specifically: (i) the proportion of people below the \$1 (PPP) per day poverty line; (ii) the poverty gap ratio; (iii) the percent of the poorest quintile in national consumption, (iv) the prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age, and (v) the percent of the population below the minimum dietary energy consumption.
- **Country Readiness (Overall weight of 30):** Much of the country readiness assessment will be through the evaluation of individual country proposals, which will also include an assessment of the policy environment. Completion of a Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) Post-Compact investment plan, with a subsequent CAADP technical review report and business meeting is a pre-requisite for African countries to apply for GAFSP financing. For non-African countries the completion of a comprehensive agricultural development strategy and investment plan that has undergone an independent technical review, covering similar technical aspects as the CAADP reviews will be used to assess country readiness<sup>5</sup>. An independent and thorough peer review of the investment plan, comparable to that provided by a CAADP Post-Compact technical review report, must be included with the non-African country submissions<sup>6</sup>. If the technical review highlights significant shortcomings, the Government should indicate how these have been or will be addressed. Supplementary information on the CAADP technical review process can be found at:  
<http://www.nepad-caadp.net/pdf/POST%20COMPACT%20GUIDELINE%20-%20English.pdf>  
[http://www.nepad-caadp.net/pdf/POST%20COMPACT%20GUIDELINE%20\\_French.pdf](http://www.nepad-caadp.net/pdf/POST%20COMPACT%20GUIDELINE%20_French.pdf)
- **Proposal Readiness (Overall weight of 40):** The specific proposal for GAFSP financing will primarily be assessed against: (i) specific objectives and targeted results, (ii) activities to be financed, (iii) implementation arrangements, (iv) amount of financing requested, (v) time frame of proposed support (vi) risks and risk management, and (vii) consultation with local stakeholders and development partners (detailed on pg 8-9).

### 4. Outline of Proposals from Eligible Countries and Available Financing

5. *Two part proposal:* Country proposals will have two parts (see Annex 1 for more details).

Part 1: *Summary of Overall Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and Associated Investment Plan.* All eligible countries that apply for GAFSP financing should summarize the country's overall

---

<sup>5</sup> Guidance on the elements of the technical review is provided in the second last column of the Annex 1 table on "Part 1: Summary of Overall Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and Associated Investment Plan".

<sup>6</sup> Guidance on the elements of the technical review for non-African Country Investment Plan consistent with the CAADP approach is provided in Annex 2.

agriculture and food security strategy and associated investment plan. African countries should have finalized a CAADP Post-Compact investment plan, with a subsequent CAADP technical review report, and summarize the outcome of that process, including steps being or to be undertaken to address issues raised in the technical review report. For non-African countries, an external CAADP-like review report undertaken by independent experts (see Annex 1, Part 1, column 3, and Annex 2) of the agriculture and food security strategy and associated investment plan must be provided as an integral part of the proposal. This should also include evidence of the consultation process.

Part 2: Specific Proposal for GAFSP Financing: Provide details on the specific proposal for GAFSP financing. The assessment of a GAFSP proposal is not intended to provide an in-depth judgment on all aspects of a country's entire agriculture and food security strategy and investment plan. It is, however, intended to provide the GAFSP Steering Committee with sufficient information to allow financing prioritization to country-led proposals. These should be part of a clear, coherent, appropriately scaled, and inclusive strategy and investment plan that will contribute to improving food security, including through enhancing smallholder production and incomes.

6. *Sections and content:* The sections and content guide for the GAFSP proposal is provided in Annex 1 (Part 1 and 2). All sections must be completed for the GAFSP Steering Committee to be able to make an informed decision on resource allocations.

7. *Financial support for preparation of proposals:* Resources from the GAFSP Trust Fund are not available from preparation of proposals, only for implementation. There are various sources of financing that could be used to assist preparation of country proposals, such as FAO-TCP (provided that the respective country agrees to use its allocation for this purpose <http://www.fao.org/tc/tcp/>); FAO Donor Trust Fund in support of country strategic planning and investment development (requests to be made through the FAO Country Representative); and the CAADP multi-donor trust fund, in the case of CAADP countries.

8. *Available resources:* Available resources in the GAFSP Trust Fund for 2012 are approximately \$180 million which will likely be allocated to 5 to 6 proposals among those submitted by eligible countries. More resources are likely to be available for 2012. In addition, in order to better guide Steering Committee decisions, it will be important to prioritize the investment financing requests as required by the document template (Annex 1), as perhaps only part of the request may be financed by the Trust Fund given the limited resources available.

9. *Disclosure policy:* Please note that following the disclosure policy of GAFSP, the proposal documentation submitted will be publicly disclosed. However, if the proposal documentation includes confidential or sensitive text or data that the Government does not want disclosed publicly, this should be highlighted in the submission.

10. *Language of proposal:* English is the operational language of GAFSP, thus submissions are expected in English. While the GAFSP proposals are always required to be in English, in exceptional cases, the Steering Committee may allow countries to submit supporting documents such as the full strategy and investment plan in other languages. This will be decided on a case by case basis.

## 5. Proposal submission

11. *Submission from Ministry of Finance:* Finance Ministries of eligible countries should submit GAFSP proposals to the GAFSP Coordination Unit ([info@gafspfund.org](mailto:info@gafspfund.org)). Every proposal should be co-signed by: (i) the Minister of Finance who also will submit the GAFSP application package, (ii) at least one of the relevant technical ministries (e.g. agriculture, rural development, social welfare, environment/natural resource management etc.), and (iii) it should be endorsed by the in-country sector working group for agriculture and food security or equivalent that includes donor partners, as reflected by the signature of the Chair of the group (the endorsement should be contingent upon the assessment of whether GAFSP funding builds up and complements existing programs and will not displace or duplicate other sources of financing).

12. *Form and deadline of submission:* The preferred form of submission is via e-mail to [info@gafspfund.org](mailto:info@gafspfund.org), or alternatively, electronic device such as a CD or a flash drive may be submitted by courier to the GAFSP Coordination Unit, MSN MC5-510, The World Bank Group, 3301 Pennsy Drive, Landover, MD 20785 USA. Submission documents must be in Microsoft Word, Excel or PDF. Submissions must be received by: March 31, 2012 midnight (Washington, D.C. time). No exceptions will be made on the deadline or document formats. We encourage countries to submit a few days earlier in case of any technical problems in the submission process.

13. *Submission documents:* The following documents are required to be included in the submission to the GAFSP Coordination Unit.

For African countries	For Non-African countries
<p><u>Specific GAFSP request</u>            Part 1: Summary of the Country's Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and CAADP Post-Compact Investment Plan            Part 2: Country Proposal for GAFSP Financing</p>	<p><u>Specific GAFSP request</u>            Part 1: Summary of the Country's Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and Investment Plan            Part 2: Country Proposal for GAFSP Financing</p>
<p><u>Attachments:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agriculture and Food Security Strategy</li> <li>2. Signed CAADP Compact</li> <li>3. CAADP Post-Compact Agricultural Sector Investment Plan (this must also include evidence of the consultation process underpinning the Plan development)</li> <li>4. CAADP Post-Compact Technical Review Report of the Investment Plan</li> <li>5. Documented evidence that a CAADP Business Meeting has taken place following the Technical Review.</li> </ol>	<p><u>Attachments:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agriculture and Food Security Strategy</li> <li>2. Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan</li> <li>3. An independent and thorough peer review report of the investment plan, such as the CAADP Post-Compact technical review report (this must also include evidence of the consultation process underpinning the Plan development). When the strategy and investment plan are not recent, countries should review implementation progress and update their plan for inclusion in and prior to submitting their proposal to GAFSP.</li> </ol>

## Annex 1

### Sections and Content Guide for the GAFSP Request

<b>Part 1 Summary of Overall Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and Associated Investment Plan</b> [about 5-7 pages]		How this will be assessed by the GAFSP Steering Committee:  Overall assessment of the extent of alignment of the summary with the actual country Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and associated Investment Plan, including the outcome of the CAADP or CAADP-like review and the subsequent responses to the review findings.	
Section	Content		Aspects of each component to be reviewed:
1.1 Objectives and indicators	Clearly state the overall agriculture and food security strategy objectives and associated investment plan, with monitorable indicators.	<p>For African countries: Review CAADP Post-compact Technical Review Report</p> <p>For non-African countries: Review of an independent and thorough external peer review report of the investment plan, such as the CAADP Post-Compact technical review report.</p> <p>This includes review of<sup>7</sup>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Likelihood for the investment programs to realize growth and poverty reduction</li> <li>2. Technical realism (alignment of resources with results) and adequacy of institutional arrangements to implement</li> <li>3. An inclusive review and consultation process</li> <li>4. Consistency of country budgetary and development</li> </ol>	Realism of the specific targets relative to past performance, potential, and capacity to implement, including the current and planned level and composition of human resources.
1.2 Key elements of the policy environment	Clarity/assurance on the policy environment, including in relation to regional trade, (and on any proposed policy changes envisaged) to enhance planned investment returns.		Potential impact of the policy environment, including in relation to regional trade on returns to the overall investment plan.
1.3 Plan components to achieve the objectives	Key policy, institutional and other issues that constrain the achievement of the objectives (including environmental sustainability, capacity, and gender equality considerations), and how the proposed components address these constraints, and which government ministries/entities will be responsible for delivery.		Clarity of the causal link to the proposed objectives, good practice approaches in proposed components, the extent to which environmental sustainability, governance, and gender equality issues have been addressed, and government co-ordination arrangements for delivery.
1.4 Planned composition and level of spending to implement the components	Indicative cost of the components to achieve objectives, and how this compares with past public spending. Clarity on how (and why) the composition and level of public spending in agriculture and food security will change from previous years. The trend in the share of public spending		Costs of proposed activities, the past record of budget execution (capacity to utilize funds), realism on future capacity to utilize funds, Government commitment to the sector as reflected in public spending shares on agriculture and food security.

<sup>7</sup> See Annex 2 for Guidelines for Review of non-African Country Investment Plan Consistent with the CAADP approach.

	on agriculture and food security.		
1.5 Financing sources and gaps	Source of financing for the investment plan by Government and development partners (who will finance what). Extent of the financing gap.	assistance commitments with the country investment plan	Extent to which there are genuine financing gaps (estimates of total financing gaps and extent to which donor contributions have been committed).
1.6 Process by which the strategy and investment plan were developed	Clarity (and reasons) for the process used to develop the agriculture and food security strategy and investment plan, including depth of consultation with domestic stakeholders, especially smallholders and women farmers, farmer organizations, and vulnerable groups (youth indigenous groups etc). When the strategy and investment plan are not recent, countries should review implementation progress and update their plan for inclusion in and prior to submitting their proposal to the GAFSP.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Adequacy of institutional arrangements for effective and efficient delivery, including M&amp;E</li> <li>6. Coherence and or consistency between policies, implementation arrangements and delivery mechanisms, and investments areas, priorities or program objectives</li> <li>7. Appropriateness and feasibility of the indicators for impact and system for capacity improvement and accountability</li> <li>8. Extent and quality of dialogue, (peer) review and mutual accountability system</li> </ol>	Quality of participation and consultation with local stakeholders (smallholders and women farmers, farmer organizations, civil society, private sector, other grassroots groups, and parliament). Whether the proposal presents clear and verifiable evidence of participation by key self-selected civil/stakeholder groups, including farmer groups, the private sector and other civil society organizations, in the preparation of the strategy and investment plan and a mechanism to facilitate such participation in the execution of the proposed activities. [See Annex 3 for list of verifiable criteria upon which this will be assessed by the Technical Advisory Committee]. Whether the strategy and investment plan presents clear and verifiable evidence that it is country-owned and country-led and that the country is fully committed to its implementation. Extent to which implementation lessons have been reflected in the investment plan.
1.7 Implementation arrangements and capacity to implement	Clearly state the institutional arrangements and inter-ministerial co-ordination, reflecting actual or planned capacity to implement (including identifying channels of accountability, capacity gaps and proposed remedies, the role of other stakeholders, including civil society groups, farmer organizations and private sector).		Whether the roles of the state, the private sector and civil society in the implementation of the proposed activities are clearly articulated. Compare the country capacity and institutional arrangements with the proposed investment plan, assessing its likelihood of being implemented. Assess the extent to which the institutional arrangements are designed to incorporate the outcomes of inclusive consultations with relevant stakeholders. [See Annex 3 for list of verifiable criteria upon which this will be assessed by the Technical Advisory Committee].

**Part 2 Specific proposal for GAFSP financing** [about 10-15 pages]

Section	Content	How this will be assessed by the GAFSP Steering Committee
<p>2.1 Specific objectives, and targeted results (disaggregated by gender [targeted vulnerable groups], and number of targeted beneficiaries)</p>	<p>Clarity on the specific objectives and expected results of the proposal and how it links with the overall sector strategy and investment plan. Clarity on how the objectives will integrate gender equality, governance, and environmental sustainability (including climate change adaptation and mitigation if applicable). Specify the M&amp;E framework to be used to assess progress on these objectives. Be explicit on the number and type of targeted beneficiaries, including their disaggregation by gender.</p>	<p>Assessed against the objectives of the GAFSP Framework Document and its results framework, including the emphasis on women, and smallholder farmers (<a href="http://www.gafspfund.org/gafsp/content/monitoring-and-evaluation">http://www.gafspfund.org/gafsp/content/monitoring-and-evaluation</a>). Proposals with a stronger results/M&amp;E framework and an integration of gender equality and environmental sustainability will be given priority.</p>
<p>2.2 Activities to be financed</p>	<p>Activities to be financed. Clarity on the causal link between the proposed activities and objectives, including explaining the expected pathways that will lead to a reduction of poverty and hunger and improved nutrition. Explicit linkages with the overall sector strategy and investment plan, and the scope of the GAFSP framework document (and for Africa, the links with the four technical pillars of CAADP), and their environmental sustainability. Reasons why these activities were selected. Government ministries, and other stakeholders responsible for delivery. Clear rationale for public versus private financing, providing specific reasons to justify public financing and the mechanism to ensure long-run sustainability. Modality of financing (Investment projects, with or without TA, or other).</p>	<p>Assessed against the causal link between the proposed activities and objectives, including the expected pathways that will lead to a reduction of poverty and hunger, and improved nutrition. Specifically whether the proposal provides a clear causal pathway from the proposed activities to improved food security and nutrition of low-income population groups. Whether the proposed activities are identified as high-priority activities in the country's agricultural development strategy and investment plan.</p> <p>For Africa, assessed against alignment with the four technical pillars of CAADP, which overlap with the scope of the GAFSP framework document, and in particular to the country investment plan. For non-African countries, assessed more explicitly against alignment to the GAFSP Framework Document (raising agricultural productivity, linking farmers to markets, reducing risk and vulnerability, improving non-farm rural livelihoods, and technical assistance, institution building, and capacity development). In addition, assessed against linkage with the overall country strategy and investment plan for the sector, likely environmental and financial sustainability, integration of gender equality, and strength of co-ordination arrangements among entities responsible for delivery.</p>
<p>2.3. Implementation arrangements</p>	<p>Clearly state the institutional arrangements and inter-ministerial co-ordination identifying the role of other stakeholders in implementation (including civil society groups, farmer organizations and private sector).</p>	<p>Assess whether the structure of the institutional arrangements has sufficient capacity and appropriate composition to implement the proposed activities. [See Annex 3 for list of verifiable criteria upon which this will be assessed by the Technical Advisory Committee]. Determine whether the proposal presents clear and verifiable evidence that the capacity required to implement the proposed activities is in place, to ensure that the proposed financing is used in an effective and efficient manner.</p>



2.4 Amount of financing requested	Prioritize/rank activities with the US\$ amount being requested from the GAFSP Trust Fund, and the basis for indicative cost estimates. Detail linkages with other cofinancing sources and its comparable size relative to the cost of the country's overall investment plan (prioritization will be important to guide allocation if Trust Fund resources are not available to finance the total request). Provide a summarized cost table (including all relevant financing sources).	Assessed against: (i) alignment with the agriculture and food security investment plan, (ii) the expected results, (iii) available Trust Fund resources, (iv) confirmation that funds are additional and not displacing other donor or potential private sector financing, and (v) interdependence and complementarity with other programs in the investment plan. Assessment of cost estimates (at a broad programmatic level, to avoid duplication of effort in subsequent and more detailed design and appraisal by selected supervising entities (MDBs, and IFAD)).
2.5 Preferred supervising entity and Government team	Preferred supervising entity (African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank, or IFAD) with associated reasons. In addition, countries may select entities other than the above, to assist in design and implementation, but they will need to be agreed to by the preferred supervising entity. List of full time Government members of the team that will prepare and finalize the project along with the supervising entity. The list should include their current roles.	Stronger consideration will be given to country preferences, together with an additional assessment against comparative advantage of supervising entities, considerations of safeguard policies (e.g. environment and governance), leveraging of MDB resources, and historical relations with the recipient country. Evidence of a pre-identified government team can reduce delays in engagement by the supervising entity.
2.6 Time frame of proposed support	Expected duration of the proposed activities.	Assessed against the expected life of the GAFSP Trust Fund (currently to end 2019) and the country's agriculture and food security strategy.
2.7 Risks and risk management	Major risks that may affect the achievement of the specific objectives, and implementation of each component (activity), including environmental risks, and mitigation measures in place.	Assessed against the significance of the risks and the mitigation measures in place.
2.8 Consultation with local stakeholders and development partners	The process and the extent of consultation with domestic stakeholders, and local development partners, especially smallholders and women farmers, farmer organizations and other vulnerable groups (e.g. pastoralists). Document the extent to which the consultation added value to the project design.	Assessed against the quality of participation and consultation with local stakeholders (farmer organizations, civil society, private sector, other grassroots groups, and parliament). What was the nature of the outreach effort to stakeholders (particularly small producer organizations), what was the process of obtaining input from them? Whether the proposal presents clear and verifiable evidence of participation by key stakeholder groups including farmer groups, the private sector and other civil society organizations, in the preparation of the proposal and a mechanism to facilitate such participation in the execution of the proposed activities. [See Annex 3 for list of verifiable criteria upon which this will be assessed by the Technical Advisory Committee].

## Annex 2

### Guidelines for Review of non-African Country Investment Plans Consistent with the CAADP approach

Areas of Review	Content of Review of Country Investment Plans
Likelihood for the investment programs to realize growth and poverty reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it aligned with the growth and poverty reduction targets in the country strategy?</li> <li>• Is it aligned with the internationally-agreed Millennium Development Goal of halving extreme poverty and hunger by 2015?</li> </ul>
Technical realism (alignment of resources with results) and adequacy of institutional arrangements to implement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does it establish evidenced-based feasibility, efficacy and sustainability of the proposed programs?</li> <li>• Has the financial and economic merit been articulated by applying specific analytical tools such as cost-benefit analysis, risk assessment and beneficiary analysis?</li> </ul>
An inclusive review and consultation process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does it demonstrate commitment to gender integration and inclusiveness of vulnerable populations?</li> <li>• Does the plan present clear and verifiable evidence of participation by key stakeholder groups, (including farmer groups, the private sector and other civil society organizations), in the preparation of the strategy and investment plan and a mechanism to facilitate such participation in the execution of the proposed activities?</li> <li>• Does it present a plan for engagement with the private sector and NGOs?</li> </ul>
Consistency of country budgetary and development assistance commitments with the country investment plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the investment plan present a feasible financing plan with respect to both resources from the country (from public and private sources) and resources from the international donor community?</li> <li>• Has the phasing of individual programs within the plan been presented based on priorities and donor funding scenarios and a clear indication of any interdependence among projects?</li> <li>• Has a financing “gap” been put forward on which donors are expected to make programming commitments?</li> </ul>
Adequacy of institutional arrangements for effective and efficient delivery, including M&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does it sufficiently describe inter-agency and inter-sectoral coordination (agricultural and non-agricultural sectors, such as health/nutrition, natural resource management)?</li> </ul>
Coherence and or consistency between policies, implementation arrangements and delivery mechanisms, and investments areas, priorities or program objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are outstanding policy issues required to achieve the desired change clearly presented?</li> <li>• Does it demonstrate the means and capacity for effective implementation given the level of resources from the country and donor community?</li> <li>• Does it establish, for each investment area, clear delivery mechanisms and institutional arrangements (who does what, when) taking into consideration country policies, and program objectives?</li> </ul>
Appropriateness and feasibility of the indicators for impact and system for capacity improvement and accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Defines anticipated results and presents targets and standards by which performance will be assessed during Plan implementation</li> <li>• Presents a data collection and analysis system/plan to effectively monitor and report progress against the planned targets.</li> </ul>
Extent and quality of dialogue, (peer) review and mutual accountability system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who is responsible for implementation and what is the accountability system for results, including peer review arrangements?</li> </ul>

## Annex 3

### Quality of Participation Guidelines

These guidelines will be used by the Technical Advisory Committee to assess the extent to which the country investment plans (section 1.6 and 1.7 of Annex 1) and GAFSP proposals (section 2.3 and 2.8 of Annex 1) were developed in a participatory manner. These guidelines are intended to be used by governments and supervising entities to finalize and implement GAFSP supported projects and ensure regular, sustained, inclusive, and meaningful participation of relevant actors.

Key Elements and Indicators	Means of Verification
<p><b>1. Participation is inclusive/representative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Key actors are identified and representatives of each sector are allowed to self-select who will represent them in the participatory processes.</li> <li>- All interests/sectors connected with food security are invited to participate (e.g. women, smallholder producers, CSOs, private sector, public sector institutions, technical experts, donors, and others).</li> <li>- Particular attention has been paid to ensure the voice and participation of small scale producers.</li> <li>- Participation opportunities also include stakeholders from outside the capital.</li> </ul>	<p>Description in proposal and/or documents such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Description of selection criteria and details about how actors were selected to be included in the country proposal.</li> <li>- Lists of participants in key meetings.</li> <li>- Invitations and meeting announcements.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Participation is well planned and more than a one-off activity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is an agreed process for scheduling and organizing participation. The decision making process, roles and responsibilities of actors are clearly defined ahead of opportunities for participation; and announcements of opportunities for participation are communicated widely in advance to ensure broad participation.</li> <li>- Self-selected representatives of key stakeholders (including civil society groups, farmer organizations and private sector) participate in the institutional/inter-ministerial co-ordination arrangements with clearly identified roles in implementation. Representatives of key producers' organization and CSOs should be invited to be members of these committees from the outset and should designate their own representatives.</li> <li>- Consultations and opportunities for participation are provided regularly throughout development of the agriculture and food security strategy, the investment plan and the GASFP proposal.</li> <li>- There are specific plans and platforms to ensure participatory processes during implementation.</li> </ul>	<p>Description in proposal and/or documents such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Documents outlining agreed process endorsed by key actors, defining roles and stating who is responsible.</li> <li>- CAADP Post-Compact Review for African Countries, independent technical review report for non-African countries.</li> <li>- Evidence that the government is addressing the recommendations concerning stakeholder involvement from the CAADP Post-Compact review (for African countries) and from the independent technical reviews (for non-African countries [see Annex 2] )</li> <li>- Invitations and meeting announcement.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Participation is meaningful and transparent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participation opportunities employ methodologies to ensure equal voice of men and women, and of smallholder farmers.</li> <li>- Dissenting voices are accepted and recorded.</li> <li>- Minutes of meetings are recorded, provided to the participants and disseminated broadly.</li> <li>- Support is provided to enable broad participation of key stakeholders in consultation, implementation and for capacity building.</li> </ul>	<p>Description in proposal and/or documents such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TOR, methodology, and agenda endorsed by stakeholders.</li> <li>- (CAADP Post-Compact Review for African Countries).</li> <li>- Meeting reports and distribution lists.</li> <li>- Description and/or documentation outlining in-kind, financial or donor</li> </ul>

	resources available to support consultation implementation and for capacity building.
<b>4. Participation impacts project design and implementation</b>	Description in proposal and/or documents such as:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is evidence of meaningful participation by key actors in the planning and implementation of the agriculture and food security strategy, the investment plan and the GASFP proposal.</li> <li>- There is evidence that the agriculture and food security strategy, the investment plan and the GASFP proposal are responsive to gender concerns.</li> <li>- There is evidence that input received from all actors involved in participatory processes was reflected in the investment plan and in the GASFP proposal.</li> <li>- There is ownership/broad political support for the agriculture and food security strategy, for the investment plan and for the GASFP proposal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Documentation from independent, self-selected civil society/stakeholders that provides an analysis and evaluation of the design and impact of the consultation process organized by the government.</li> </ul>