

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

---

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

January 25-28, 2016  
Kigali, Rwanda

GAFSP Steering Committee Chair  
Mr. Dan Peters  
United States Department of the Treasury

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

Accepted for the Steering Committee

DAN PETERS

**SIGNED DP**

---

Dan Peters

Chair, GAFSP Steering Committee

Accepted for the Private Sector Window  
Donor Committee

MARCEL BEUKEBOOM

**SIGNED MB**

---

Marcel Beukeboom

Chair, Private Sector Window Donor  
Committee

## Day 1

### **Day 1 - Session 1: Welcome, Introduction of New Participants, and Adoption of Agenda**

1. A joint meeting of the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) Steering Committee (SC) and the Private Sector Window Donor Committee (DC) was convened in Kigali, Rwanda on January 25-28, 2016. This was the fourth time that the SC and the DC have met jointly, after the first joint meeting in September 2013. Participants to the meeting included members or alternates of the SC and DC (see Annex 1 for a full list of participants).
2. This was the first meeting hosted in a recipient country, Rwanda, with the location intended to underscore the country-owned, country-led philosophy of GAFSP. Given the location, the meeting took on a different form with: the first day covering the current status of the portfolio; the second day involving full day field trips to different project sites located in Rwamagana, Karongi, Nyanza, and Muyanza; and the remaining third and fourth days covering strategic issues and steps forward. Appreciation was expressed by SC/DC members who noted the benefit of being able to visit the project sites and engage directly with project stakeholders during the meeting period.
3. The meeting's opening session commenced with a welcome and introductions of new members to the SC, DC and Coordination Unit (CU), as well as an acknowledgement of those unable to attend. The draft agenda circulated in advance of the meeting was broadly adopted and this was reconfirmed at the opening of Day Three.

### **Day 1 - Session 2: Portfolio Review**

4. The meeting's opening session focused on the jointly-presented GAFSP portfolio reviews. After an overview of the Program, including key design elements, the presentation focused on portfolio performance, key milestones, highlights, and challenges for both Public and Private Sector Windows. For the Public Sector Window, overall performance continues to be strong with notable improvements highlighted over the preceding year, however disbursement progress, at 95% of the planned amount, is still slightly below the planned level. Supervising Entity pro-activity and efforts have contributed to this improved project performance, as demonstrated with highlights from Tajikistan, Cambodia, Rwanda, and Malawi. For those projects rated as unsatisfactory, following updates on each project at the meeting, the responsible Supervising Entities (SE) confirmed that they would submit a brief plan outlining remedial actions following the meeting's close, and that the CU would carry out a six-monthly check-in on this subset of the portfolio.
5. The Private Sector Window Secretariat provided updates on both the investment and advisory portfolios with portfolio performance largely strong and most active projects

developing as planned. All projects in the portfolio are current in repayments, and there are no reported NPLs. Notwithstanding the positive performance, the portfolio of projects is young, and payment schedules are still within the “grace period”; where loan principal repayment is not yet required. The investment portfolio has focused mainly on loans and risk-sharing facilities in sub-Saharan Africa, and project highlights from Côte d’Ivoire, Bhutan, and Rwanda were presented. Challenges were seen in terms of the costliness of detailed supervision and monitoring of greenfield projects; changing climatic conditions; and the lack of good infrastructure, electricity and water. Going forward, investments will include increased project supervision and portfolio monitoring; and increased risk management and diversification. In terms of Advisory Services, future areas for attention included support to farmer organizations; risk-sharing facilities; a focus on large scale pipeline projects; and the potential new opportunities around reimbursable funding and grants.

6. In the discussion that followed, meeting members endorsed the pro-active monitoring of projects across performance categories to ensure good portfolio health, while also encouraging further reporting on development impacts in addition to the current focus on approvals and disbursements. They also encouraged the CU to distill and share lessons learnt from operations, capturing innovations in the GAFSP portfolio and addressing lessons in day to day portfolio management. A suggestion was made to consider complementing the annual desk review with visits to the field, including with those made by Civil Society Organizations (CSO). The Public and Private Sector Windows were reaffirmed as complementary, with members underlining that the two windows should add further value to one another. The complementarity and added-value of technical assistance (TA) components in the projects was also noted. The discussion covered the additionality of GAFSP projects, the leveraging of additional funds achieved through both Windows, and GAFSP’s risk appetite. A suggestion by the Chair that the CU draft a one-pager with summary and forward-looking actions from this session’s discussion was superseded by subsequent meeting discussions.
7. **Action point:** SEs with projects in the unsatisfactory category to submit a brief plan outlining remedial actions to the CU following the meeting’s close, by March 15, 2016, enabling the CU to carry out a six-monthly check-in on this subset of the portfolio.
8. The northern CSO representative (ActionAid) presented findings from case studies of GAFSP projects in Malawi, Togo, and Niger to a positive reception from the members, who welcomed this initiative. ActionAid had conducted a desk review, field visit, and interviews to study whether GAFSP Public Sector Window investments in these countries are: (i) successfully reaching small-scale food producers; (ii) inclusive of women; (iii) engaging civil society in meaningful consultation; and (iv) investing in climate resilient approaches. The study found many positives in the three selected projects, with interim results spanning

increased food availability, improved access to markets for smallholders, and more sustainable resource management practices, with good consultation and participation of female farmers. Additional findings indicated that: consultations could be improved in project design and implementation to better target national-level farmers' organizations, NGOs, and women as specific groups; and to focus more on the most vulnerable groups, including those without access to adequate productive resources. The review indicated that communities may also need further sensitization to women's empowerment. It was noted that projects with built-in flexibility are more successful, and that most GAFSP projects are seeing improvements in livelihoods for beneficiaries (as a consequence of increases in income, increased access to markets, and improved security) as well as making communities more climate-resilient.

9. **Action point:** ActionAid to make available final report and materials to the Steering Committee by March 2016. Findings to be shared further with GAFSP project teams for integration in the portfolio.

#### **Day 1 – Session 3: Rwanda GAFSP Projects**

10. To conclude the first day and to prepare participants for a day of field visits on Day 2, the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources of Rwanda presented on the GAFSP-financed Rwanda Land Husbandry, Water Harvesting, and Hillside Irrigation (LWH) project. Project team leaders from the concerned supervising entities, the World Bank and the International Finance Corporation, supplemented his remarks. LWH is the first project in Rwanda to have implemented hillside irrigation systems, to deal with the challenges associated with rain-fed agriculture and soil erosion through a farmer and community centered approach. GAFSP financing was key in leveraging additional co-financing to help bring the project to scale. The presentation provided background on project objectives, challenges, and current status, highlighting that intended project outcomes have either been met or exceeded. In addition, there were some unintended positive impacts of the project including that: (i) local firms have recently taken over the implementation of irrigation infrastructure works for the project from the international firms; and (ii) with the sharing of land terraces amongst genocide victims and perpetrators, the community institutions/self-help groups established through the project have been able to foster stronger social bonds, the results of which are impossible to quantify.
11. The ensuing discussion focused on topics such as: the role of south-south capacity building (e.g., with the Sustainable Land Management project in Ethiopia); the importance of land registration/titles being in place ahead of project implementation; and information that

exports have recently started, along with the establishment of partnerships with foreign investors/companies.

## **Day 2**

### **Day 2 – Field Visits**

12. All Representatives and Alternates were divided into four groups for one-day site visits. Each group started the day at a Ribbon Cutting ceremony for an Africa Improved Foods (AIF) food processing plant (funded by the Private Sector Window) and then traveled to one of the four LWH sites (Rwamagana, Karongi, Nyanza, or Muyanza site) to see LWH investments directly, and meet with beneficiaries and government officials.

## **Day 3**

### **Day 3 – Session 4: Update from the Coordination Unit and Trustee**

13. At the beginning of Day 3, the GAFSP Program Manager provided an overview of progress since the last Joint SC/DC meeting. The Program has now: approved its first 3-year budget; initiated regular consultations with regional representatives, CSOs, and SEs; further developed a web-based portal to make program-wide and project-specific data available in real time; continued annual portfolio reviews; established fundraising plans and targets; and begun to increase CU staffing to meet initial demands. Since the last meeting, in addition to continued portfolio management and overall program coordination, key initiatives have included revising the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system through a working group process and preparing the Missing Middle pilot initiative. In discussion, the SC underscored the importance of substantially strengthening the Communications team in the CU.
14. Session 4 continued with an update from the GAFSP Public Sector Window Trustee, who reminded the SC/DC members of the two-Window structure of GAFSP, with IBRD as the Trustee of the Public Sector Window and IFC as Trustee of the Private Sector Window. Owing to short term, high liquidity instruments, there has been modest investment revenue, and consideration is also being given to investing funds with a longer term horizon. The Trustee reported US\$79.7 million in funds as immediately available to support SC funding decisions, as well as an additional US\$50.70 million of pending new contributions that are not yet paid in and which follow a schedule of payments through 2017.

### **Day 3 – Session 5: Monitoring and Evaluation**

15. It was noted that the March 2015 Joint SC/DC endorsed the creation of an M&E Working Group (WG) to explore revisions to the GAFSP M&E Plan and related Results Framework that were originally approved in 2011. After an overview of the approach and analyses undertaken to review and revise the M&E framework, the Chairs of the Working Group's three subgroups (referred to as SG1, SG2 and SG3) made additional presentations to the SC for endorsement.
16. The goal of SG1 was to consider the feasibility and propose options for the setting of ex-ante goals at the Program Level (Tier 1), while maintaining the country- and demand-driven nature of the program. Resulting recommendations for the updated GAFSP higher-level goals included: a proposed income gain target of 20% for 10 million poor people in rural households in countries furthest from achieving the SDGs (using data from impact evaluations); and a proposed crop yield gain target of 25% (based on project-level data) when productivity gains are an explicit objective of country programs. Attainment of these goals is predicated on an additional US\$1.5 billion in GAFSP financing – an amount agreed at the March 2015 Steering Committee, and noted at this meeting as ambitious in view of the current fundraising environment. Implicit in these goals is the need for a concerted effort to increase climate resilience and to offset any negative effects on agricultural productivity from climate change, to which the poorest countries are the most vulnerable.
17. GAFSP will measure progress towards food security by using the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) to track progress on food security of all Public Sector Window supported households and a sample of Private Sector Window supported households; and using the Food Consumption Score (FCS) to track progress on improving dietary diversity of households; or, at the individual level, using the minimum dietary diversity of women/young children (MDD-W/C), where these are explicit objectives in GAFSP projects. Targets for food security (as measured by the FIES) would be developed when more information on this relatively new measure becomes available, and this would be reviewed within a year. The presentation also highlighted the implications of the updated goals in terms of implementation and financing.
18. The goal for SG2 was to suggest a revised, streamlined set of proposed core project output indicators (Tier 2 level) for SC endorsement<sup>1</sup>. These indicators had been reduced from the 42 (Public Sector Window) and 35 (Private Sector Window) indicators to 14 “core” indicators, and were, to the degree possible, harmonized across the two GAFSP Windows. The revised indicators are also linked to the GAFSP pillars, the new SDGs, and key priority thematic areas, such as climate-smart agriculture (CSA), jobs, gender-responsive interventions, land access

---

<sup>1</sup> Available in the summary outcome document of the M&E WG and the detailed SG2 outcome document.

and land user rights, and nutrition. A question on whether these project level indicators adequately reflect climate-related outcomes in the GAFSP portfolio was raised. It was noted that, following SC endorsement, the next steps would include: the operationalization of core indicators, including finalizing definitions; and developing a strategy for adoption by projects, including consideration on how to treat existing projects, without burdening project teams.

19. The goal for SG3 was to develop an updated set of key performance indicators at the Tier 3 program management level to better measure program performance and to enhance portfolio and program/resource management. The group proposed a revised set of 25 key performance indicators (KPIs) across 10 dimensions<sup>2</sup>. It was noted that although most SG3 indicators have relatively clear existing definitions, a few new indicators remain to be defined during the operationalization phase, in addition to clear identification of where responsibility lies for attainment of each indicator.
  
20. Active discussion amongst Steering Committee members covered a range of areas including: the level of ambition of the ex-ante goal; the International Aid and Transparency Initiative as a potentially relevant framework for GAFSP to explore as it moves forward; the relationship between GAFSP's results and the program's overall strategic narrative; the effort to move towards commonality across the Public and Private Sector Windows in GAFSP indicators including on food and nutrition security; and the additional effort needed to finalize definitions and communicate updates. It was agreed that GAFSP can build on the updated indicators to reframe its own business case and acknowledged that an effort had been made to increase commonality in indicators across the Windows, while respecting the different natures of the two Windows. With a caution raised against burdening SE partners with unrealistic M&E requirements, the principle of utilizing SEs' own practices and procedures was reaffirmed as an important principle of GAFSP. The importance of climate sensitive and smart approaches to agriculture and an associated need to reflect them throughout the framework was agreed, along with potential linkages with countries' Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs). There was an acknowledgement of the challenges in related data collection and the need to track and review the ease of application and resulting 'meaningfulness' of GAFSP-gathered data. The recognition of food security as an important element of the program and the proposal to use the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES), as one of the SDG 2 indicators, was appreciated by members. It was agreed to revisit the feasibility of setting an associated target for FIES one year from the meeting.

---

<sup>2</sup> Available in the summary outcome document of the M&E WG and the detailed SG3 outcome document.

21. **Action points:** The Session Chair requested that SC/DC members indicate their general endorsement on the direction of the M&E recommendations. Following some refinements, the updated recommendations document would be circulated for virtual SC approval by mid-February 2016, in addition to a detailed matrix summarizing and responding to SC discussion and comments. The setting of a target for FIES for GAFSP would be revisited with the SC by February 2017.

### **Day 3 – Session 6: GAFSP Project Impact Evaluations (IEs)**

22. The Development Impact Evaluation (DIME) Group is performing rigorous Impact Evaluations for a number of GAFSP projects and made a presentation on their portfolio, with a focus on recent results from Bangladesh’s Integrated Agricultural Productivity Program (IAPP) and Rwanda’s LWH.
23. Ensuing discussion focused on issues of: scope of the research questions; the application of a gender lens; food security and nutrition measurement; and CSOs’ role in the IE process. The team clarified that gender is systematically included in their work and that if it is not mentioned in presentations, it is owing to the lack of statistically significant findings; that they are measuring dietary diversity, and are seeing changes in consumption patterns; and that CSO collaboration is sought where it has been relevant to the project or requested by government. Meeting participants also inquired whether GAFSP intends to maintain up to 30% of its portfolio with in-depth IEs, comparable to those led by DIME. The Session Chair confirmed that the intention is to do so, noting that the cost implications of a higher proportion may be prohibitive.
24. **Action point:** The DIME team to revert to the SC/DC with data in response to questions on changes in welfare and behavior, as well as data on food security and nutrition changes, in the month following the meeting.

### **Day 3 – Session 7: Missing Middle Pilot Projects Initiative**

25. Through a dedicated working group formed in September 2013, the Steering Committee has been developing a GAFSP pilot initiative targeted towards more effective GAFSP outreach to organized smallholder farmer groups, with investment in producer organizations (POs)/ agriculture-focused civil society organizations (ag-CSOs) and through effective partnerships with relevant value chain actors. A presentation was made on this “Missing Middle Pilot Projects Initiative” (MMI) noting the pilot’s intended objectives, related design features and modalities, and the proposed process and next steps.



26. Meeting participants applauded GAFSP for taking up this initiative and broadly endorsed a model which aims to reach and strengthen POs/ag-CSOs and grassroots smallholder farmer groups, utilizing SE partnerships to assure quality and build capacity, and which encourages innovation and risk taking, accompanied by learning from the initiative for the wider Program. The discussion focused on: the overall timeframe for launching the MMI - ensuring efficiency, but also allowing for adequate consultation and transparency in the process; the application of the broader GAFSP M&E Framework to the pilot, with strong encouragement to document and assess lessons; clarification as to whether a formal impact evaluation would be part of the learning effort; a suggestion to consider increasing the funding envelope from US\$12.0 million to allow ample resourcing to the initiative; and an exhortation to invert the suggested model from one where proposals start with SEs to one where CSOs and rural POs are enabled to originate project proposals, thereafter developing these in partnership with an identified SE. The CU clarified that: the MMI does not require any changes to the GAFSP legal framework; that submissions could be standalone or part of an existing operation; and that an independent review committee, with relevant experience, would need to be constituted to assess incoming proposals, as the 'regular' GAFSP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is not a standing body. It was mentioned that the pilot projects could include impact investors as actors in the value chain and that, while the pilot would be accompanied by an extensive learning effort, formal IEs were not considered cost-effective at this point. SC member CSOs were affirmed as playing an important facilitation role for the exercise, raising awareness through their networks, and also submitting basic concepts for MMI pilot projects, originated by POs/ag-CSOs, to the CU .
27. The Session Chair ended the Session with recommendations that the MMI Working Group rework language on the role of CSOs/ POs and SEs in terms of preparation and submission of proposals; consult further with members on the possible composition of the proposed review committee; and that members consider the overall funding envelope for the MMI, with all points to be finalized on Day 4.

### **Day 3 – Session 8: Private Sector Window**

28. The Session Chair indicated that the Private Sector Window needed approval from the DC to agree on the extension of the timeline of the Private Sector Window pilots for the local currency swaps, and SC endorsement of the Private Sector Window Annual Plan (AP). It was noted that the year for which the AP applies was already half over. DC members agreed on the extension, and conditionally approved the plan, provided that some additional time would be allotted for discussions on Day 4. A suggestion was made to change the practice whereby the AP is endorsed some months into its implementation. The Session Chair

clarified that in the past the AP has been endorsed virtually, but a decision had been taken to conduct joint meetings for Donor Committee Approval and Steering Committee endorsement of the AP at the 7th Annual Steering Committee meeting held September 4-6, 2013, as part of the joint meeting agenda of items to address. With the timing inconsistency, it was agreed that the previous practice of endorsing the AP virtually would be implemented moving forward.

29. The session continued into Day 4, and participants put forward views and posed questions on a wide variety of topics from cooperation between the two GAFSP Windows - in particular on increased joint communication efforts - to the more specific mechanisms of the Private Sector Window-led Country Diagnostics and the Challenge Grant Fund; risk appetite; M&E practices; and the role and impact of other entities in the work of the Private Sector Window. As an annex to the draft Annual Plan, a forward-looking proposal from the Netherlands on the next horizon for the Private Sector Window (so-called 2.0) was attached for members' review and discussion.
  
30. The Private Sector Window Secretariat provided information on how Country Diagnostics are conducted, highlighting that the intent is to identify relevant new opportunities for GAFSP investments linking farmers to value chains. In terms of the Private Sector Window's risk appetite, the DC is broadly receptive to the possibility that some projects may fail; it was underscored that GAFSP's concessional financing has allowed the Window to move forward projects that are riskier than those normally supported by IFC. It was also noted that initial conversations with IFAD had sharpened the Private Sector Window Secretariat's ability to understand where they can be more impactful, and going forward, they will look to work more closely together. Moving forward, the Private Sector Window Secretariat will continue to conduct annual portfolio reviews, with updates on project performance, including those with loans in 'non-performing' status. With respect to individual projects, the participants were reminded that the Private Sector Window has to comply with IFC disclosure policies, and that IFC Board documents are not publicly shared due to the sensitive financial information of companies. The Steering Committee requested that the Private Sector Window Secretariat provide more information about the Challenge Fund.

## **Day 4**

### **Day 4 – Session 9: Close of Day 3**

31. **Action points/Decisions regarding the Private Sector Window include:**

- ♦ The SC/DC agreed on the extension of the timeline of the pilots for local currency swaps until June 30, 2017.
- ♦ The DC approved, and the SC endorsed, the Annual Plan of the Private Sector Window for FY15/16.
- ♦ It was agreed that the Donor Committee meeting would be held annually in the spring (e.g., April-June) to approve the Private Sector Window Annual Plan. This is to ensure Donor Committee approval of the Annual plan before the start of the next fiscal year.
- ♦ Additional material to be shared with SC/DC members following this meeting, by June, 2016, including:
  - **Country Diagnostics**: A note on the Country Diagnostics, to include: (1) purpose of the Country Diagnostics; (2) TOR for the diagnostics; (3) criteria for country selection; (4) review of work by other agencies/institutions available for the country; (5) selection process for firm to conduct a Country Diagnostic; (6) description of the potential for any GAFSP SE to perform these diagnostics.
  - **Challenge Grant Fund (CGF)**: A note with more detail on the Challenge Grant Fund and Reimbursable Grants, to include: (1) general description; (2) management approval; (3) distinguishing the approach from IFC's usual AS.
  - **Performance Standards (PS) for Agribusiness Projects**: including how the PrSW applies the PS and disseminates lessons for wider application, and specifics on the interaction with PRAN, its compliance with IFC's performance standards, and how IFC is helping the company address the issue of food safety.
- ♦ The Private Sector Window Secretariat extended an open invitation to SC/DC members to form a Committee to prepare an Options Paper on including more SEs in the Window, with the Paper to be shared by September 2016. In the course of the next few months, interested volunteers should identify themselves to the Private Sector Window Chair for this purpose by the time of the next Private Sector Window Donor Committee meeting.
- ♦ It was agreed that the Private Sector Window would further explain the stated 1:7 leveraging ratio to interested SC/DC members at the next joint meeting.
- ♦ It was agreed that DC members would continue discussions on the Private Sector Window's next phase, building on the Netherlands '2.0' paper and also addressing the prospect of broadening participation to other SEs. Members were invited to comment on the paper, and it was agreed that this discussion would be concluded by the summer of 2016.

#### **Day 4 – Session 10: Decisions on Recommendations from Days 1 and 3**

32. The Session Chair invited SC/DC participants to consider the adoption of the M&E Working Group recommendations. Members agreed to:

- i. Broadly endorse the M&E Framework recommendations that update GAFSP's outcome, output and performance indicators;
- ii. Request that the M&E Working Group, supported by the CU, make revisions to the Summary Recommendations Note and prepare a matrix of comments from the SC and responses by February 12;
- iii. Upon receipt of the revised framework recommendations, review and approve the proposed updates within two weeks.

33. **Action Point:** The CU will circulate the updated Summary Recommendations Note and associated comments matrix to the SC for virtual approval.

34. The Session Chair invited participants to consider decision points on: (i) the allocation of funds for the Missing Middle Pilot Initiative; and (ii) the launch of the Missing Middle Pilot Request for Proposals. Specifically, members agreed to:
- i. Allocate US\$16 million of the available funds - amounting to US\$79.7 million (as of December 31, 2015) in the GAFSP Public Sector Window (GAFSP Trust Fund) - for pilot project awards and associated pilot costs; and,
  - ii. Endorse the revised MMI Guidelines paper (discussed in agenda item 7) and launch the Missing Middle Pilot Projects Initiative.

It was agreed that the MMI Guidelines would be approved including the specific edits below in ***italicized bold***:

MMI Guidelines: Para 11

- ♦ ***The Missing Middle pilot projects would originate with POs/ag CSOs and be jointly developed by the SEs and the POs/ag-CSOs.*** The pilot projects would be in line with the policies and procedures of the respective SEs. The pilots would reach and support the targeted smallholder farmers through this initiative. The POs/ag-CSOs would be directly involved in the conceptualization and design of the pilot projects so that the activities under the pilot projects are demand-driven and address the actual needs of smallholder farmers/smallholder farmer groups. The SEs planning to submit full pilot proposals to GAFSP would consult with relevant authorities in the GAFSP-eligible countries, and obtain their written 'no objections' prior to submission of the proposal documents to GAFSP.

MMI Guidelines: Para 14

- ♦ ***A 5-member sub-committee, comprised of SE, regional, and donor representatives as well as an independent, external individual with relevant experience, would be formed by the SC to assess the Missing Middle pilot project proposals submitted by the SEs.*** The sub-committee is expected to make recommendations to the SC on the pilot project

proposals in summer of 2016, on the basis of which subsequently the SC will make the final decision and award funds to pilot projects.

35. **Action Point:** CU to proceed with the Missing Middle Pilot Projects Initiative launch and proposal process, with an allocation of US\$16 million to this Initiative from the GAFSP Public Sector Window.

#### Day 4 – Session 11: Future of GAFSP

36. A video message from David Nabarro, the United Nations Special Representative on Food Security and Nutrition, was shared with the meeting. The message highlighted the importance of GAFSP as a vehicle through which to achieve the Global Goals on poverty and food security. GAFSP's track record as a "learning organization" was noted, along with its responsibility to share lessons learnt at the programmatic level (regarding, *inter alia*, inclusive and accountable governance, innovation, etc.), and at the project level (for example, on the interface between the safeguarding of food systems and climate, resilience, and viable livelihoods). It was also noted that GAFSP had the potential to stimulate investments that blend development and climate financing at the country level, through key partnerships such as with the Green Climate Fund. This was followed by a presentation by the Asian Farmers' Association (AFA) highlighting their activities during the previous year, in support of the GAFSP portfolio, aimed at ensuring effective empowerment of farmers in project implementation through advocacy, representation in key fora and project level review and outreach.
37. Following these presentations, all Committee members then participated in small group discussions to consider key questions relating to the future positioning of GAFSP. The resulting presentations to the plenary session focused on the **strengths** of GAFSP, as a country-owned and country-led multi-stakeholder mechanism with a robust, inclusive, and accountable governance structure. It was underlined that GAFSP has served to implement the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) on the African continent and to provide both grants and blended finance. Additional strengths outlined were its dual Public and Private Sector Windows; the fact that it is demand-driven and well-integrated in national policies; its efficiency and low transaction costs; its effectiveness in terms of targeted support to smallholder farmers; the institutional changes that it has inspired at the SE level; and the fact that it captures the whole agriculture and food production value chain.
38. Key steps to **enhance GAFSP's relevance** for its stakeholders and to support implementation towards the SDGs were also discussed. These included effective operationalization and learning from the Missing Middle Pilot Projects Initiative; ensuring continued coherence of

GAFSP with national strategies and policies; implementing a participatory results monitoring process, including documenting and showing results; enabling the participation of other SEs in Private Sector Window operations; promoting better alignment of Public Private Partnerships (PPP); ensuring a Call for Proposals to sustain GAFSP's momentum in 2016; contributing to the global and local discourse on agriculture, food security and nutrition; and enhancing ownership of GAFSP among all SC members, including the SEs, which are critical partners for implementation.

39. Suggestions were also made for **improving GAFSP's communication efforts**, such as: updating the website; creating a renewed narrative for GAFSP that links it to the prevailing global agenda and challenges; creating and broadly disseminating briefs and talking points on the program; engaging political champions and/or a dedicated spokesperson for global engagement; and increasing utilization of social media.
40. The discussion concluded with the **key priorities for the program over the next few years**, including its alignment to delivery of the SDGs, as a key tool in the Financing for Development arena. It was noted that GAFSP is well-suited to demonstrate impact and learning through its emerging results, especially given that the updated M&E framework explicitly links to the SDGs. Although SC members deliberated on the need to push beyond business as usual, it was also cautioned that the tradeoffs between scale and innovation need to be considered. It was recognized that program advocacy needs to happen at a higher level, including SC members, and higher level officials in their organizations or agencies to lend a voice to fundraising efforts. It was mentioned that the World Economic Forum (WEF) could be considered as an additional private sector voice, next to those of the representatives of small-holder farmer groups, and this possibility would be pursued by the Donor Committee Co-Chair.
41. **Action points:** In consultation with the SC, the CU to prepare a 'messaging document' that distils inputs from this session's small group discussions into a tool for advocacy, by summer 2016. DC Co-Chair to pursue potential for additional private sector representation going forward by summer 2016.

#### **Day 4 – Session 12 & 13: Call Readiness and AOB**

42. A presentation was made on the revised Country Guidelines, which include the revisions agreed and made since the third Call for Proposals in March 2013. Additional updates were put forth for the SC to endorse, including: the inclusion of a project preparation grant fund (which a recipient country may request in its proposal, to be used after the proposal is accepted to further prepare the project), detailed in Annex 5 to the Guidelines; additional requirements for submission from countries that have already received a grant (in terms of

implementation performance, project impact, and additionality of previous GAFSP awards); and the composition of the need score indicators (with reference to the near-final list of SDG indicators).

43. A presentation was also made on the outcomes of a study on “The Opportunities and Requirements for Consideration of Larger Grant Sizes”, which the SC/DC meeting of March 2015 requested the CU to conduct. The CU examined various factors for consideration to determine whether the Steering Committee should more explicitly invite larger grant proposals in the next Call. The recommendations to the SC included: keeping average GAFSP grant sizes above US\$30 million to keep overall SE fees at, or below, 5% (in the absence of substantially larger financing amounts available to allocate to country proposals at each Call for Proposals); considering adjusting the indicative number of proposals to be financed in the Call for Proposals to allow for larger proposals, reviewed against the current country and proposal readiness criteria (*if substantially larger financing amounts become available*); in making any larger grants, considering the proposal readiness scores provided by the GAFSP TAC, and allocating relatively larger amounts to more ready proposals.
44. It was agreed that an updated Country Guidelines and Grant Size note would be circulated for virtual endorsement following this discussion. The Steering Committee suggested further adjustments to the updated Country Guidelines, including: (i) a brief paragraph upfront describing the overall program, its two Windows; (ii) checking with the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) Planning and Coordinating Agency (NPCA) to ensure alignment with CAADP's updates since the Malabo Declaration and updating the language, as needed; (iii) increasing clarity on the role of investment and technical assistance (TA) SEs upfront in the guidelines (including respective roles in the preparation of the proposals, clarification on the circumstances under which TA can be selected, and need for joint detailed preparation and appraisal by the two SEs); and (iv) including considerations for safeguards and risk management, although with acknowledgment that this is typically addressed through SEs' own policies. It was also suggested that countries indicate in Part I of proposals submitted to GAFSP how they are aligning with the SDGs. The SC urged leaving adequate time for proposal preparation in GAFSP's next Call for Proposals, keeping also in mind the language barriers for some applicants. It was also suggested that the budget allocated to TA not be determined when proposals are submitted to the SC, rather during joint detailed formulation and appraisal. Finally, it was noted that CSOs and bilateral donor offices may be able to provide assistance in proposal preparation and project design.
45. **Action point:** CU to circulate updated Country Guidelines and Grant Size Note for virtual SC approval.

46. The meeting's closing discussion focused on fundraising, following an update from the CU on the current availability of funds for the program, as reported by the Trustee<sup>3</sup>. It was agreed that fundraising efforts should be coordinated for the program as a whole, spanning both Windows, in order to further enhance global food security efforts. There was broad agreement that the program should aim to launch a Call for Proposals in June 2016, to ensure continued awareness of the Program, with a target amount set at US\$150 million. There was discussion on the advisability of setting such a threshold amount, and on sharing the available amount and indicative number of awards to be made, in order to manage expectations and help mitigate against the risks of countries investing time and resources in preparing proposals with limited likelihood of being awarded funds.
47. The CU agreed to confirm the latest donor contributions to date, and circulate the most recent funding availability table to the SC. It was reiterated that the funding allocation for the Missing Middle Pilot Projects Initiative would be increased to US\$16 million, acknowledging the fact that an additional US\$4 million would add further flexibility and ease costs on SEs, while keeping in mind the tradeoffs between funding for the Missing Middle Initiative and allowing for a next full Call for Proposals. It was suggested to synchronize timing between the Call for Proposals for the Public Sector Window and the Missing Middle Initiative proposals, while ensuring adequate time for consultations with all constituencies and completion of proposal preparation. It was noted that discussions on broadening the Private Sector Window to other SEs would be ongoing following the SC/DC meeting.
48. **Action points:** The CU would circulate an updated table on funds availability to the SC, alongside the meeting's Minutes. The Program would aim to launch a Call for Proposals in June 2016, with a target amount set at US\$150 million. The Program would continue to pursue opportunities for outreach jointly for both Windows, including a potential high visibility event at the World Bank Spring Meetings to support fundraising efforts. The CU would also prepare a calendar of priority events/opportunities, along with a detailed strategic Communications Plan. A GAFSP Knowledge Forum would also be held by early 2017. Discussions on broadening Private Sector Window participation to other SEs would be continued and finalized in the summer of 2016.

#### **Day 4 - Session 14: Closing remarks by representative of Government of Rwanda and Chairs**

49. The Minister of Agriculture and Animal Resources of Rwanda, Ms. Gerardine Mukeshimana, joined for the closing of the SC/DC meeting and expressed her pleasure in her country's hosting of the joint GAFSP SC/DC meeting in Rwanda. She highlighted GAFSP's crucial role in providing a catalytic financial contribution to the basket of funds used for the LWH project,

---

<sup>3</sup> At the time of the January SC meeting, there was US\$79.7 million available to support SC funding decisions, as well as an additional US\$50.70 million of new contributions that are not yet available.



and that the emerging results on multiple fronts - production, finance, health, nutrition – spoke to the success of the project. She noted that the project was comprehensive and executed in a timely manner, and had provided an opportunity to pilot a number of critical components for the government, including smart agriculture techniques, soil erosion control, and activities to increase productivity (resulting in significantly raised yields). There remain some priority areas to be addressed – including micro finance, financial literacy, and engaging youth in agriculture - through a number of activities along the value chain and the Minister expressed the hope that Rwanda could benefit from additional GAFSP financing, noting that the opportunity to engage both the private and the public sector is a key advantage of GAFSP.

50. The meeting concluded with thanks from the Chairs to all participants, organizers and hosts of the joint GAFSP SC/DC meeting.

Annex 1: List of participants

<b>Name</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Agency</b>
Mr. Dan Peters	United States	US Treasury
Mr. Marcel Beukeboom	Netherlands	Netherlands Ministry for Foreign Affairs
<b><i>Donors</i></b>		
Ms. Gita Kamath	Australia	DFAT
Ms. Julie Delforce	Australia	DFAT
Mr. Neil Watkins		Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
Ms. Hien Tran		Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
Ms. Rebecca Smart	Canada	DFATD
Mr. Fritz Jung	Germany	Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)
Mr. Chang-seok Kim	Republic of Korea	Export-Import Bank of Korea (KEXIM)
Ms. Iris Krebber	United Kingdom	DfID
Ms. Tabitha Gillan	United Kingdom	DfID
Mr. Nicholas Strychacz	United States	US Treasury
<b><i>Recipients</i></b>		
Mr. Ousmane Badiane	Africa	
Ms. Agnes Kalibata	Africa	
Mr. Edouard Ngirente	Africa	Office of the Executive Director (Botswana, Burundi, Eritrea, et al)
Ms. Mamou Kouyate Ehui	Africa	Office of the Executive Director (Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, et al)
Mr. Herfan Brilianto	Asia	Office of the Executive Director (Brunei Darussalam, Fiji, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Singapore,

		Thailand, Tonga, Vietnam) World Bank
Mr. Champak Poharel	Asia	
Mr. Jaime Diaz Palacios	Latin America/Caribbean	Office of the Executive Director (Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Spain, Venezuela)
Ms. Jeehan Abdul Ghaffar	Middle East North Africa	Office of the Executive Director (Bahrain, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Yemen)
<b><i>Donor Representatives in Non-Voting Status</i></b>		
Mr. Peter LePoole	Netherlands	Netherlands Ministry for Foreign Affairs
<b><i>Administrative Units (non-voting)</i></b>		
Ms. Nichola Dyer		World Bank
Ms. Laura O. Mecagni		IFC
Mr. Alex Cebotari		World Bank
<b><i>Representative of U.N. Secretary General (non-voting)</i></b>		
Mr. Gabriel Ferrero		Office of the Special Representative of the UN Secretary General for Food and Nutrition Security
<b><i>Supervising Entities For Investment and Technical Assistance (non-voting)</i></b>		
Mr. AKM Mahfuzuddin Ahmed		ADB
Mr. Dougou Keita		AfDB
Mr. Adolfo Brizzi		IFAD
Ms. Preeti Ahuja		World Bank
<b><i>Supervising Entities for Technical Assistance</i></b>		
Mr. Guy Evers		FAO
Ms. Alberta Mascaretti		FAO
Ms. Brenda Barton		WFP

Mr. Jean-Pierre DeMargerie		WFP
Mr. Jesse Wood		WFP
<b>Civil Society Organizations</b>		
Ms. Marie Clarke	Northern CSOs	ActionAid
Mr. Buba Khan	Northern CSOs	ActionAid International
Mr. Djibo Bagna	Southern CSOs (Africa)	Roppa
Mr. Ousseini Ouedraogo	Southern CSOs (Africa)	Roppa
Mr. Raul Socrates Banzuela	Southern CSOs (Asia)	AFA
<b>Coordination Unit</b>		
Ms. Natasha Hayward		World Bank
Ms. Aira Htenas		World Bank
Mr. Iftikhar Mostafa		World Bank
Ms. Kimberly Parent		World Bank
Ms. Dipti Thapa		World Bank
Ms. Rosalie Q. Trinidad		World Bank
<b>Secretariat</b>		
Ms. Yanni Chen		IFC
Mr. Alan Johnson		IFC
Mr. Juan Francisco Ron		IFC
Ms. Lina Tolvaisaite		IFC
<b>Observers</b>		
Mr. Pieter Dorst		Embassy of Netherlands
Mr. Adam Gerstenmier		AGRA
Mr. Boaz Keizire		AGRA
Ms. Esperance Mukarugwiza		World Bank
Mr. Valens Mwumvaneza		World Bank
Mr. Prosper Ndayiragije		AIF
Ms. Caro Pleysier		Embassy of Netherlands
Mr. Detlev Puetz		IEG