



BIFT Initial Proposal Template:

Please review the “BIFT Guidelines” prior to completing this Template. All sections, sub-sections, and questions provided below should be answered, and the total length of the completed Proposal should not exceed 25 pages (excluding annexes). Please fill in the Template with Times New Roman 12, single spacing. Submissions should be in English. Where relevant, include functional hyperlinks to additional supporting documentation and reference the relevant page numbers. Monetary values should be expressed in US\$ or US\$ equivalent, specifying the exchange rate used (including the date of the exchange rate), and rounded to the nearest ‘000. Instead of copying the same text into multiple sections of the Template, only write it once and refer to that text as needed.



I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Please provide a one-page summary of the proposal, including key information such as:

- Project Objectives and Rationale
- Contribution to Prioritized Themes
- Key Components/Activities to be Financed
- Final Beneficiaries and Expected Results
- BIFT Funds Requested & Leverage
- Other Key Information

II. SUMMARY DATA

a. Project name	
b. Project partners	
c. Total project cost	
d. Country location(s) of the project	
e. Brief description of the project	
f. Amount and nature of SE's contribution	
g. Projected date for a decision on the project by SE's Board of Directors (or other relevant internal authority) - No later than 06/30/2026	
h. Expected results of the project	
i. SE's expected role	
j. SE's categorization of the project for environmental and social safeguards purposes	
k. Contact details for SE's relevant Focal Point	
l. Total BIFT Funding Requested	Amount Requested: US\$
m. (If Additional Financing) Date of parent Project approval by the Supervising Entity	
n. Estimated project start and end date (mm/yy – mm/yy):	
<p>o. Supervising Entity</p> <p>Supervising Entities for Investments and Technical Assistance (Select one only)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> African Development Bank (AfDB)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Asian Development Bank (ADB)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> IDB Invest</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> International Finance Corporation</p>	

BIFT FUNDING REQUEST

USD	Total	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	% Grant Funding A/ Estimate	% Concessional Finance Estimate	Total Grant Funding and Concessional Finance B/ Estimate
Total requested from BIFT									

Note:

A/ Maximum 20% of total project size may be offered as Technical Assistance, Advisory Services, Incentives on a grant basis.

B/ Maximum of up to US\$15 million

C/ Last possible tenor date under the BIFT will be December 31, 2046

TOTAL PROJECT SIZE & LEVERAGE CALCULATION¹

Sources of Financing		Amount	Notes
BIFT concessional finance requested	(A1)		
BIFT grant finance requested	(A2)		
SE Contribution as finance (on its own account)	(B1)		
SE Contribution as grant finance	(B2)		
Private sector financing directly mobilized	(D)		
Additional Funds mobilized (please specify)	(E)		
Overall Non-GAFSP Mobilized Funds	(F) = (B1+D+E)		
Overall Project Mobilization Ratio	F/(A1+A2+B2)		The higher the ratio the higher the score given.
Non-GAFSP Mobilized Funds	(G) = (B1+D)		
Project Mobilization Ratio	G/(A1+A2+B2)		The higher the ratio the higher the score given.

¹ See BIFT Project Proposal Scoring Template for definitions and guidance on this table



[PROJECT NAME]

BIFT PROPOSAL

(not to exceed 25 pages total)

III. PROJECT DESIGN

(max. eight pages)

- A. Objectives:** Describe the rationale for the financial innovation(s) supported under the project, the financing gaps/needs facing BIFT target beneficiaries it is addressing, and its anticipated sustainable development impacts at both business and market levels in terms of mobilizing private capital and improving access to finance for BIFT target beneficiaries to invest in climate-smart technologies, practices, infrastructure, and capacities. Explain how the funding for this project provides additionality toward these objectives established for the BIFT pilot and monitored on the basis of the BIFT results framework.

- B. Prioritized Themes:** Describe how the project design has incorporated the three prioritized themes identified for the BIFT pilot: (i) creating and developing local and regional agri-finance markets; (ii) developing local and regional agri-food value chains for nutritious foods; (iii) inclusion of vulnerable groups, including women to further gender equality and youth.

- C. Geographic Focus:** Outline the local, country, regional, and/or global context in which the project will operate, including general socio-economic barriers BIFT target beneficiaries face. Specify if a country/ies facing Fragility, Conflict, or Violence are included in the scope of the project. If possible, provide information on target areas and regions that would be covered by the project within each country.

- D. Project Description**
 - i. Key Components:** Describe the main components and subcomponents of the proposal. Specify activities under each component and subcomponent and explain the sequence and timeline of activities. Describe how the components represent innovations that build on already existing activities undertaken by co-financing platforms such as funds, facilities, programs, and bonds/notes, and include information on pipelines and partners where applicable. Describe public and private sector complementarities leveraged by the project to achieve its objectives (whether or not they are all funded by BIFT). In particular, describe linkages with ongoing or planned public sector investments or reforms supported by GAFSP SEs, including, if applicable, “Country-led” and “Producer



Organization-led” projects supported under the FIF’s Grant-based financing track, which would be prioritized. For each component, mention the BIFT contribution and amount of contribution from other co-financiers (i.e., leverage), as well as key results expected. For stand-alone concessional finance requests, any technical assistance, incentives, and/or advisory service activities financed outside the BIFT must be described, including scope, methodologies, and timeline. For stand-alone grant requests, the linkages to complementary sources of concessional finance for investments and leverage effect(s) generated with an existing co-financing platform must be described.

- ii. **Strategic Partnerships²:** Describe how the proposed project will work with specific strategic partners toward its objectives, and their potential for transformational impact and scale. Strategic partnerships should focus on public and private sector entities, regulators, standard setting bodies, and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) engaged in strengthening the financial ecosystem relevant to the project scope and objectives. Demonstrate alignment with national agriculture and food security strategies and plans, including National Pathways for Food System Transformation and Integrated National Financing Frameworks for the SDGs (if available) as well as commitments made under the Paris Climate Agreement. Demonstrate the level of engagement of governments, development partners, private sector, non-profit organization, and/or research institutions, as applicable, in the design and/or implementation of the proposed project.

E. Final Beneficiaries

Describe the target final beneficiaries. Confirm the definition of smallholder farmers, producer organizations, agribusiness MSMEs, and agribusiness start-ups, and any exceptions that will be applied to that definition. Describe their socio-economic status, to what extent they are not being served by existing structures, and specific barriers to access to finance. Discuss how target beneficiaries have been or will be consulted in the project design and its implementation. Describe any intermediary beneficiaries. Discuss intended sustainable business impact and behavior change of intermediaries in serving final beneficiaries.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

(max. five pages)

- A. **Institutional Arrangements:** Explain the SE’s Project Management structure. For each component and subcomponent, describe how they will be undertaken and by whom. Include the criteria used for selecting financial intermediary and/or other implementation partners and the role of these executing entities in designing and/or implementing the

² Strategic partnerships are those which demonstrate potential to be transformational or scale impact, contribute a material level of BIFT resources across the strategic partners, and are formed or near formation.

program. Include information on which key stakeholders, including governments and other public sector institutions, CSOs, and private sector entities, were consulted and have confirmed their participation in the project, which still require confirmation, and the process/timeline required to commit the funds. While strategic partnerships do not have to be fully finalized at the time of proposal submission, evidence of their level of maturity/readiness will be factored into the scoring.

- B. **Track Record of the SE and Other Partners:** Describe the track record of the SE in this area, the recent performance of the selected co-financing platform, and prior experience working with key implementing entities. Explain how the project incorporates lessons of experience. Explain how the project fits into the SEs strategy and the learning objectives for the SE.
- C. **Enhanced Blended Concessional Finance Principles:** Confirm that the SE applies the DFI Enhanced Blended Concessional Finance Principles and is actively engaged in the DFI Working Group on Blended Concessional Finance for Private Sector Projects. Summarize the SE's blended finance governance mechanisms, policies and procedures implemented in line with the DFI Enhanced Blended Concessional Finance Principles of the DFI Working Group, which will be applied to any investment activities utilizing BIFT funds, to ensure efficient and non-distortionary use of subsidy.
- C. **Sustainability:** Indicate what measures will be taken to assure the financial sustainability of the proposed project beyond BIFT funding. Is it anticipated that the impact of the project will continue beyond the implementation of the activities directly funded by BIFT? Are there opportunities to scale the program in a sustainable way to reach more final beneficiaries?
- D. **Theory of Change, Research, Learning and Knowledge Sharing:** Use the GAFSP Theory of Change included in the [2022 GAFSP M&E Plan](#) (Figure 1, page 7) to illustrate how the project will contribute to GAFSP general and BIFT specific objectives and how these activities will result in sustainable impact at both business and market levels. Explain how the SE will assess impact and collect insights from its project activities, compile lessons learned and disseminate knowledge products. Projects should include quantitative and qualitative methods to capture expected results at the level of target beneficiaries as a result of the BIFT financed project. Include, as needed, financial feasibility study/assessment of financing needs/gaps facing GAFSP target beneficiaries. Explain any research and rigorous impact evaluations activities to be undertaken, and how they would help to build the evidence base, improve the understanding of good practice, or test new approaches that support.
- E. **Monitoring and Evaluation:** Describe the SEs monitoring & evaluation framework to ensure that the funding is committed and used as intended. Provide an overview of how the SE will monitor project activities, risks, outcomes and impacts in line with the [GAFSP 2022 M&E Plan](#). Explain the annual cycle for collecting data and reporting on program results. Note how the SE will address any challenges in data collection. SEs will be expected to report progress on project activities and results twice a year.

V. RESULTS FRAMEWORK

(max. two pages)

All applicants should follow the BIFT results framework template set forth in Annex 1. For every proposal, the applicant should include the following:

1. Ensure that all applicable Tier 1 indicators, Tier 2.1 outcome indicators (customized to each project), and Tier 2.2 output indicators (exactly as specified by GAFSP in Table 2) are included in the project results frameworks/logical frameworks; and
2. At least one of the three climate resilience indicators (Tier 2.2 output indicators 13, 14, and 15)

Please use the BIFT Results Framework template to list **total targets** and **annual targets** for mandatory and core indicators.

VI. KEY RISKS IDENTIFIED AND MITIGATION MEASURES

(max. four pages)

The Supervising Entity is responsible for ensuring that activities in this proposal are executed in accordance with the SE's fiduciary and safeguards policies and procedures.

- A. **Risks Identified:** Describe and assess, in line with SE's fiduciary and safeguards policies and procedures, country, sector, and project risks to achieving the overall project development objective(s) and associated activities.
- B. **Proposed Action Plan:** Reflecting the SE's fiduciary and safeguards policies, provide a plan to manage these risks. Describe the mitigation measures and project risk management mechanisms that will be employed.

VII. ANNEXES

The following annexes should be completed and submitted as part of the proposal

ANNEX 1: BIFT Results Framework

As defined in the GAFSP Governance Document, the objective of GAFSP is to improve the income and food security of poor people in developing countries through more and better public and private sector investment in the agriculture and rural sectors that is country-owned and led; by filling existing financing gaps in ongoing bilateral and multilateral assistance. The specific focus areas pursued by the GAFSP to achieve this objective encompass both (i) food system outcomes, including increased agricultural productivity, improved farm-to-market linkages, reduced risk and vulnerability, improved rural livelihoods and entrepreneurship, and improved institutions; and (ii) cross-cutting outcomes, including improved climate resilience, empowered women and girls, and improved nutrition. GAFSP will report progress towards its objectives and specific focus areas through (a) monitoring of corresponding Tier 2.2 output indicators within each outcome pillar (presented in Table 1), and (b) monitoring six reference outcome indicators that projects can customize to fit its specific context.

At project level, GAFSP *strongly encourages* all BIFT co-financing platforms to report on the relevant impact indicators to the extent possible by including them in the individual project results frameworks/logical frameworks:

- **Income** should include from all sources, including agriculture and non-agriculture sources. Agricultural income should be measured through a production-based approach (revenue minus costs), and home-produced food that is not sold but is consumed by the household is valued as income. These approaches are preferred over the use of consumption-expenditure surveys, which are more time consuming, more costly, and less practical.
- **Food security** should be measured by the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES).
- **Nutrition** should be measured by the Food Consumption Score (FCS) to track progress on improving dietary diversity of households or, for individuals, using the Minimum Dietary Diversity of Women/Young Children (MDD-W/C). Annex 1 (indicator reference sheet) further defines these Tier 1 indicators with detailed examples and methodological guidance for each indicator

The SE will prepare a table to report on Tier 2.2 output indicators as presented below in Table 1. As note, the Tier 2.1 outcome indicators can be customized by each project. The Tier 2.2 output indicators must be reported, verbatim by the SE.

Table 1 GAFSP Outcome Pillars and Measurement Indicators

Outcome pillars	GAFSP Tier 2.1 outcome indicators (to be customized by each project)	GAFSP Tier 2.2 output indicators (to be used verbatim by project)
Across all five pillars	N/A	1. Number of people receiving direct benefits (person)
Increased agricultural productivity	Agricultural productivity, calculated as a measure of crop production weight (in kg or tons) per area of land under cultivation (in hectares).	2. Land area receiving improved production support (hectare)
		3. Smallholder producers/processors receiving productivity enhancement support (persons)
Improved farm-to-market linkages	Percentage of agricultural production sold on domestic and regional markets (%)	4. Roads constructed or rehabilitated (km)
		5. Number of processing, storage, and market facilities constructed and/or rehabilitated (facility)
		6. Farmers supported in accessing improved marketing opportunities (farmer)
Reduced risk and vulnerability	Number of farmers whose livelihood has become more resilient to shocks (farmer) ⁶	12. People receiving improved nutrition services and products (person)
		13. Farmers receiving inputs or services on climate resilient or sustainable agriculture practices (farmer)
		14. Land area where climate resilient or sustainable agriculture practices are implemented (hectare)
		15. Agribusiness companies/enterprises/POs adopting climate-resilient or sustainable agriculture interventions in their operations (organization)
Improved rural livelihoods and entrepreneurship	Direct employment provided or generated ⁷	7. Persons supported by the project in rural areas accessing financial services (person)
		8. Direct employment provided (full-time equivalent)
Improved institutions	Institutional capacity of supported organizations measured by capacity index (to be defined by the project) Policy products adopted with project's support related to agriculture, natural resource management, or food system resilience	9. Producer-based organizations supported (organization)
		10. Persons receiving capacity development support (person)
		11. Number of policy products completed with project support related to agriculture, natural resource management, and food/nutrition security (product)

Tier 2.2 Output Indicators

Table 2 lists Tier 2.2 output indicators that will be measured at project level consistently, which provides aggregable data to measure the whole program’s efforts and how GAFSP contributes to achieving higher level impacts. Progress reporting will take place on a bi-annual basis for the BIFT. Most of these indicators are relevant across all financing modalities. Table 2 indicates applicability to each financing modality, linkages to SDGs, and relevance to thematic areas of interest, such as climate resilience, gender equality and women’s empowerment, and improved nutrition. The 15 Tier 2.2 output indicators listed in Table 2 are defined in detail in the indicator reference sheet (Annex 1) included in the 2022 M&E Plan.

Table 2: Tier 2.2 Output Indicators for GAFSP Projects

	Tier 2.2 output indicator, <i>mandatory breakdowns</i> [†] (unit)	Type of fund	
		BIFT	PrSW
1	Number of people receiving direct benefits (person) Disaggregation: Of which, number of females		
2	Land area receiving improved production support (hectare) Disaggregation: Area provided with new/improved irrigation or drainage services (hectare)		
3	Number of smallholder producers/processors receiving productivity enhancement support (person) Disaggregation: Of which, female producers/processors		
5	Number of processing, storage, and market facilities constructed and/or rehabilitated (facility)		
6	Farmers that are supported in accessing improved marketing opportunities (farmer) Disaggregation: Of which, number of females		
7	Persons supported by project in rural areas accessing financial services (person) ^{†††} Disaggregation: Of which, number of females		
8	Direct employment provided (full-time equivalent) Disaggregation: Of which, number of jobs are provided to females		
9	Number of producer-based organizations supported (organization)		
10	Persons receiving capacity development support (person) Disaggregation: Of which, number of females		
12	[Nutrition] People receiving improved nutrition services and products (person) Disaggregation: Of which, number of females		
13	[Climate resilient indicator] Number of farmers receiving inputs or service on climate resilient or sustainable agriculture practices (farmer) ^{††} Disaggregation: Of which, female farmers Disaggregation: Of which, # of farmers adopting technologies or practices received		
14	[Climate resilient indicator] Land area where climate-smart agriculture practices are implemented (hectare) ^{††}		
15	[Climate resilient indicator] Agribusiness companies/enterprises/POs adopting climate resilient or sustainable agriculture interventions in their operations or in their supply chains (organization) ^{††}		

[†] Reporting on the indicator requires reporting all mandatory breakdowns for the indicator

^{††} Climate resilient or sustainable agriculture are practices and interventions defined as consistent with each Supervising Entity's climate definitions, including climate smart agriculture (as per the FAO definition) and agroecology (as per FAO's 10 elements)

^{†††} IFC will continue to report on the prior indicator "volume of agricultural production processed by post-harvest facilities established with GAFSP support, by food group (tons)"

SE Monitoring and Evaluation Responsibility

- During project preparation, the SE will prepare and appraise the project according to its own guidelines.
- Submitting six-monthly project progress updates as requested by the CU and ensuring that submitted M&E data on Tier 2.2 Output and Tier 3 Operational and Organizational Indicators (e.g. financial/disbursement indicators) are accurate and clearly presented.

- Ensuring that all *applicable* Tier 1 indicators, Tier 2.1 outcome indicators (customized to each project), and Tier 2.2 output indicators (exactly as specified by GAFSP in Table 2) are included in the project results frameworks/logical frameworks.
- Ensuring that an IE is carried out for the project using the project’s M&E resources. This can be an experimental or quasi-experimental IE (options 1 or 2 in Box 1) or more “rapid” evaluation/small sample size approach impact assessment (option 3 or small-n/mixed methods design).
- Completing the project completion report within six months of GAFSP grant closing. In the case where the GAFSP grant is co-financed with other SE-managed funds, and the GAFSP portion is closing more than a year earlier than the rest of the project, the SE is expected to submit a project closing report.

Box 1: Options for Rigorous Impact Evaluation Design

Option 1: Experimental design

Experimental design randomly selects the treatment and comparison groups from a potential population of participants such as individuals or communities, among others. On average, at the outset of an intervention, project, or program it can be assured that those who are exposed to the program (treatment) are no different than those who are not (control). Therefore, a statistically significant difference between the groups in the outcomes the program was planning to affect may be attributed to the program with confidence.

Cost: Cost can range widely, depending on the size and complexity of the program being studied, but they can reasonably be expected to be in the range of US\$500,000–1,000,000. The wide range in costs is driven by the context in which the intervention is undertaken, such as the scope of the intervention and the variability of household situations, the sample sizes of household surveys that determine precision of comparisons, and the unit costs of surveying rural households in a given country.

Option 2: Quasi-experimental design

Quasi-experimental (QE) design also tests causal hypotheses, but in contrast with a randomized experiment, the assignment conditions (treatment in relation to control) under QE is done by means of administrative selection or self-selection or both. QE design matches the preintervention characteristics (baseline) of the treatment and comparison group, and any difference in outcomes between the treatment and comparison groups is, therefore, said to be due to the program intervention. Methods of data analysis used in QE designs may be ex-post single difference or double difference, where the latter is also known as difference-in-difference, propensity score matching, regression discontinuity, and instrumental variables. In general, QE involves more assumptions to address counterfactual than randomization involves.

Cost: Costs may be similar to those for Option 1.

Option 3: Nonexperimental design (rapid assessment)

For nonexperimental designs, ex-post comparisons can be conducted between project groups and control groups. Multivariate regression analysis can be used here as one way of estimating the counterfactual, to statistically control some observable characteristics of the sample households of both groups.

Cost/timing: Costs will depend on study design features such as sample size and rounds of data collection. The costs will be considerably lower than Options 1 and 2. But for the investment size of GAFSP Country-led project, in general, the cost would be US\$100,000–250,000 for each assessment.

Sources: Bamberger (2009), Duflo and Kremer (2003), Sartorius (2013), Gertler et al. (2016).

ANNEX 2: Cost and Financing Plan

Include a detailed budget with budget notes, and the total amount of SE fees. Where possible, the budget should be linked to individual activities and expected results. Provide specific budget information for each country or region included in the proposal. An indicative fee cap of 5% of the BIFT project amount (i.e. the amount of funding provided from the BIFT) for SEs will support the cost of preparing project proposals and supervising projects. For Additional Funding (AF) the incremental cost of the new activity should be described, and details included in the Cost and Financial Plan. If you have programmatic or global elements, please explain how they will be budgeted and any implications that should be considered.

Budget Categories	Amount (do not round)				# of Farmers Reached	Countries*
	Investment Activities	Advisory/ Technical Assistance Activities/ Incentives	Total BIFT Funding Requested	Expected mobilized funds		
Component or AF 1						
Component or AF 2						
Component or AF 3						
Component or AF 4						
Support activities, Research, M&E						
SE Fee**			Preparation:			
			Management:			
Total						
<p><i>* if funding is allocated to more than one country per component please fill out the "Country Allocation Table" below.</i></p> <p><i>** for SE fees, input the amount under the total column.</i></p>						

Please fill out the "Country allocation table" below if funding is expected to be allocated to multiple countries per component.

Country Allocation Table	Total Amount (do not round)
Country 1	
Country 2	
Country 3 (etc.)	
Total	

VIII. ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT 1: Definitions and Guidance

For reference only

BASIC INFORMATION

- **Geographic Focus:** Indicate the country or countries where the project(s) will be active. For multi-country proposals, please provide a list of countries where BIFT funded activities might be implemented, and a breakdown of financing allocation for each country. BIFT can finance programs or projects in countries and territories that are eligible to receive funding from the International Development Association (IDA), including through trust funds administered by the World Bank. The geographic scope of the BIFT pilot is limited to IDA Only countries. In addition, the BIFT will prioritize IDA Only countries affected by Fragility, Conflict, and Violence. For a reference of country/territory groups, please see Attachment 6.
- **BIFT Project Implementation Period:** The maximum period for implementing projects approved under the BIFT pilot and committing all BIFT funds to final beneficiaries is 5 years.
- **Proposals which include Additional Financing:** Additional Financing needs to be treated as a new and separate allocations from the project being topped up. Accordingly, all proposals which include Top-Ups should ensure that there is no overlap or double counting between existing results frameworks and new Top-ups.
- **Definition of Additional Financing:** AFs are defined as extensions of the same activities in the same countries with new beneficiaries. SEs can use top-up funding for active projects to reinforce existing activities which would require little to no structural changes. These would be projects that have high burn rates or have depleted the majority of their funding and would merit a top-up due to demonstratable performance and impact. *Note: any other activities, projects, or programs outside of the AF definition should be considered as a regular funding request.*

PROJECT FINANCING DATA

- **Total Cost of Project:** This is defined as the total cost for activities, inclusive of all funding sources, BIFT included. If there are multiple sources of funding and all funds are focused on the same objectives that are fully aligned with BIFT's objectives, they may all be included here. If BIFT funding is associated with a broader program/project where only certain components are focused on the same objectives as BIFT, then only the costs for those components should be included here.
- **Grants:** Grants are transfers made in cash, goods or services for which no repayment is required.
- **Concessional Finance:** Concessional financing is financing below market rates (or with maturity, grace period, security or rank offered on soft terms without being priced according to the market). Investment and performance grants are included in concessional financing.



- **Private sector investment operations of the DFIs:** This refers to the non-sovereign operations of the DFIs
- **SE Fee:** SE Fee means the amount of Trust Fund resources allocated to the SE as a fee to cover the SE's costs in respect of services performed by the SE in connection with the preparation of a Proposal and/or managing the SE Trust Fund/Account and a GAFSP Activity for which an Allocation is made. Preparation costs may include, but not be limited to staff time, studies, stakeholder consultations, consulting services etc. mobilized to develop the final Proposal. Management costs include all costs linked to the supervision, periodic and completion reporting of the final approved Proposal.
- **Technical Assistance:** Technical assistance is the transfer of skills and/or knowledge for developmental purposes. Technical assistance can be provided before and/or after investment support is delivered under a BIFT project.
- **Advisory Services:** Advisory Services ("AS") are non-lending activities that help external clients or audiences advance a development objective. AS can support design or implementation of better policies, strengthen institutions, build capacity, inform development strategies or operations, and contribute to the global development agenda. AS outputs include analytical reports, policy notes, hands-on advice, and knowledge-sharing workshops or training programs.
- **Incentives:** Incentives concern capital depleting instruments that guarantee payments contingent on performance (e.g. performance-based incentives) and/or in exchange for upfront investment in new financial solutions or markets (e.g. buy-down of capital cost, interest rates, or cross-currency swap rates)
- **Performance-Based Incentives** An agreement is considered to be "performance-based" when (1) it is as clear and specific as possible about the expected results and how they will be measured, and (2) it strengthens incentives for good performance by defining penalties or benefits that are tied to the achievement of the expected results.
- **Eligible Investment Platforms for BIFT Funding:** Eligible platforms include Funds, Facilities, Programs, and Bonds/Notes (as opposed to one-off transactions) with the objective of providing finance and access to finance to the BIFT target beneficiaries.
- **Beneficiaries of BIFT funding:** The following groups are considered the target groups for which BIFT funding support is available including: Smallholder Farmers; Agribusiness MSMEs; Producer Organizations; and Agribusiness Start-Ups. Each SE will include specific definitions of the target groups as part of the proposal description.
- **IDA Only Countries:** Eligibility for IDA support depends first and foremost on a country's relative poverty, defined as GNI per capita below an established threshold and updated annually (\$1,315 in the fiscal year 2024). As defined as borrowing countries by the current list published by the International Development Association.
- **Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations Countries (FCV Countries):** Countries with high levels of institutional and social fragility, identified based on indicators that measure the quality of policy and institutions, and manifestations of fragility. Countries affected by violent conflict, identified based

on a threshold number of conflict-related deaths relative to the population. As published annually by the World Bank Group.

- Nutritious Food:** In alignment with the definition of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and with the Committee on World Food Security Voluntary Guidelines, the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN) defines a “nutritious” food as a food that, in the context where it is consumed and for the individual who consumes it, provides beneficial nutrients (e.g., vitamins, major and trace minerals, unrefined complex carbohydrates, protein, unsaturated fats, essential amino acids, essential fatty acids, and dietary fibre) and minimises potentially harmful elements. GAIN groups “nutritious foods” into the following four broad types:

Type	Description	Examples of food groups (non-exhaustive list)
High inherent nutritional value	Naturally contains micronutrients, dietary fibre, unrefined complex carbohydrates, high quality protein and/or essential fats in significant quantities. No major potentially harmful elements ^c when consumed in recommended quantities by a given group.	Fruits and vegetables; whole grains; legumes; nuts and seeds; unsweetened dairy products; eggs; fish; minimally processed meat
Enhanced nutritional value	Foods with some inherent nutritional value that are made more nutritious through the addition of nutrients (i.e. fortification) in significant quantities or changes to the processing procedures. No major potentially harmful elements ^c when consumed in recommended quantities by a given group.	Fortified staple grains/flours; mitigating loss of germ and dietary fibre in grain products
Some inherent nutritional value	Foods with some inherent nutritional value for which potentially harmful elements ^c have been minimized when consumed in recommended quantities by a given group.	Low sugar dairy products; low sodium processed meat; low sugar fortified biscuits
Source of added nutrients	Condiments or supplements which enhance the nutritional value of foods or diets to which they are added.	Iodized salt; fortified cooking oils; micronutrient powders; protein- or lipid-based supplements

^a GAIN will not work on breast milk substitutes, highly sugar-sweetened beverages of no nutritional value (e.g., soda), alcoholic beverages, tobacco, sweeteners, hydrogenated oils, and ultra-processed meat/poultry/fish/dairy products (10).
^b A series of definitions, standards, and criteria related to terms used in this table are available in the annex.
^c Some exceptions related to quantities of fats may apply, such as for malnourished people and groups with higher nutritional needs.

- Financial Intermediary:** A private sector entity that acts as the intermediary between parties in a financial transaction, such as a bank, credit union, investment fund, a village savings and loan group, or other institutions that provides financial services to private investors, agri-food producers, producer organizations, micro, small, or medium-sized enterprises, or agribusiness start-ups.
- Private Sector Entity:** A legal entity that is (i) carrying out (or established for) business purposes and (ii) financially and managerially autonomous from national or local governments.



ATTACHMENT 2: BIFT Proposal Scoring Template

(SEE SEPARATE DOCUMENT)

ATTACHMENT 3: BIFT Principles

The key principles that will guide the use of BIFT contributions by SEs for programs/projects draw on the **October 2017 Report by the Development Finance Institutions (DFI) Working Group on Blended Concessional Finance for Private Sector Projects**³, which presents an approach to the effective use of blended concessional finance for private sector projects. These principles, which aim to maximize development impact, are as follows:

1. **Additionality and Rationale for Blended Concessional Finance:** Contribution that is beyond what is available, otherwise absent from the market, based clearly on the economic rationale for using concessional finance.
2. **Crowding-in and Minimum Concessional Finance:** Contribute to catalyzing market development and mobilization of private sector resources, with concessional finance not greater than necessary to make the project happen.
3. **Commercial Sustainability:** Impact achieved by each operation should aim to be sustainable and also contribute towards commercial viability in the sector over time.
4. **Reinforcing Markets:** Addresses market failures effectively and efficiently minimizes the risk of market distortion or crowding out private finance.
5. **Promoting High Standards:** Promote adherence to high standards, including in areas of governance, environmental impact, integrity, transparency, and disclosure.

³ Please refer to: http://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/30635fde-1c38-42af-97b9-2304e962fc85/DFI+Blended+Concessional+Finance+for+Private+Sector+Operations_Summary+R....pdf?MOD=AJPERES

ATTACHMENT 4: IDA-only Countries/Territories Eligible for BIFT funding

BIFT funding is available to support projects in IDA-Only countries, of which there are 60. The table below lists, as of October 1st, 2024, the 75 IDA-eligible countries, of which 60 IDA-only; and **15 blend countries (in red)**. FCV countries (designated by the WB) are noted and are countries in particular need and will be scored higher on the BIFT Proposal Template (in blue).

AFRICA		EAST ASIA	SOUTH ASIA	LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN
Benin	Malawi	Cambodia ¹	Afghanistan ⁵	Belize ^{2&3}
Burkina Faso ⁵	Mali ⁵	Fiji ^{2&3}	Bangladesh ⁴	Dominica ^{2&3}
Burundi ⁶	Mauritania ⁴	Kiribati ^{3 6}	Bhutan ³	Grenada ^{2&3}
Cameroon ^{2&4 5}	Mozambique ⁵	Lao People's Democratic Republic ⁴	Maldives ³	Guyana ³
Cabo Verde ^{2&3}	Niger ⁵	Marshall Islands ^{3 6}	Nepal	Haiti ⁴⁵
Central African Republic ⁵	Nigeria ^{2&4 5}	Micronesia, Federated States of ^{3 6}	Pakistan ^{2&4}	Honduras ⁴
Chad ⁶	Rwanda	Myanmar ^{4 5}	Sri Lanka ⁴	Nicaragua ⁴
Comoros ^{3 6}	Sao Tome and Principe ^{3 6}	Papua New Guinea ^{2&4 6}		St. Lucia ^{2&3}
Congo, Democratic Republic of ⁵	Senegal ⁴	Samoa ³		St. Vincent ^{2&3}
Congo, Republic of ^{2&4 6}	Sierra Leone	Solomon Islands ^{3 6}	EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA	MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA
Cote d'Ivoire ⁴	Somalia ⁵	Timor-Leste ^{2&3}	Kosovo ^{4 6}	Djibouti ³
Eritrea ^{1 6}	South Sudan ⁵	Tonga ³	Kyrgyz Republic	Syrian Arab Republic ^{1 5}
Ethiopia ⁵	Sudan ⁵	Tuvalu ^{3 6}	Tajikistan	Yemen, Republic of ⁵
Gambia, The	Tanzania	Vanuatu ³	Uzbekistan ^{2&4}	
Ghana ⁴	Togo			
Guinea	Uganda			
Guinea-Bissau ⁶	Zambia			
Kenya ^{2&4}	Zimbabwe ^{1&2 6}			
Lesotho ⁴				
Liberia				
Madagascar				

¹ Inactive country; no active IDA financing due to protracted non-accrual status.

² Blend countries: IDA-eligible but also creditworthy for some IBRD borrowing.

³ Borrowing on small economy terms, when applicable.

⁴ Borrowing on blend credit terms. Ineligible for BIFT funding.

⁵ WB List of Conflict-affected situation countries.

⁶ WB list of Institutional and Social Fragility countries.



ATTACHMENT 5 – Proposal Preparation Team

List the names, titles, organizations, and emails of the core members of the Proposal preparation team (including private consultants and Supervising Entity staff, if any, who directly contributed to completing the Proposal Template). Do not include individuals who participated in wider consultation meetings or workshops held as part of the preparation of the Proposal.

Name	Title	Organization	Email

(Add lines as needed)