

# Executive Minutes Steering Committee Meeting

---

October 31, 2024

Virtual

## **GAFSP Steering Committee Co-Chair**

Mr. James Catto

Director, Office of International Development Policy, International Affairs, United States Department of the Treasury

## **GAFSP Private Sector Window Donor Committee Chair**

Mr. Radio Save

Commercial Agriculture and Sustainable Investment Lead | Global Food Security, Agriculture and Land, United Kingdom Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office

Accepted for the Steering  
Committee  
JAMES CATTO

Accepted for the Private Sector  
Window Donor Committee  
RADIO SAVE

**SIGNED JC**

---

JAMES CATTO

**SIGNED RS**

---

RADIO SAVE

## SESSION 1 – WELCOME, INTRODUCTION OF NEW GAFSP & WORLD BANK LEADERSHIP, AND ADOPTION OF AGENDA

1. A virtual meeting of the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) Steering Committee (SC) was held on October 31, 2024. The virtual meeting was preceded by a virtual pre-meeting of the SC, which took place on September 12, 2024. The Minutes of the virtual pre-meeting have been included in Annex I.
2. The virtual meeting was opened by the Co-Chair of the GAFSP Steering Committee, Mr. James Catto. In his opening remarks, Mr. Catto thanked the GAFSP Coordination Unit (CU) for organizing the meeting and shared with the participants the highlights of the High-Level Roundtable Dinner Event co-hosted by GAFSP and Brazil's G20 Presidency, which took place on October 24, 2024 and where GAFSP announced its commitment to the Global Alliance Against Hunger and Poverty launched under Brazil's G20 Presidency. The Co-Chair also welcomed a new member to the SC: Mr. Melvin Fernando Quiros Romero (Advisor to Executive Director EDS18[1]), the Regional Representative for the Latin America and Caribbean. In addition, the Co-Chair welcomed a new Observer to the SC: Mr. Kohji Matsumoto, representative of Japan's Ministry of Finance.
3. Ms. Shobha Shetty, the new Global Director for the World Bank's Agriculture and Food Global Practice, reflected on GAFSP's work across various regions where she had previously served as Practice Manager. She stated that with the recent completion of the restructuring of the Financial Intermediary Fund of the GAFSP hosted by the World Bank it is an opportune moment for the Program to take stock of the lessons learned over the past 15 years as part of the ongoing development of GAFSP's Vision 2030 strategic plan. She also highlighted the need for strengthening coordination across the different GAFSP windows and enhancing collaboration with other stakeholders. Ms. Shetty also referred to the Bank's strong commitment to addressing food insecurity through the newly launched Global Challenge Program (GCP), as well as the World Bank Group's commitment announced during the recent Annual Meeting of the World Bank Group and IMF to increase funding to agri-finance and agribusiness to \$9 billion annually by 2030.
4. Ms. Natasha Hayward, the newly appointed GAFSP Program Manager and Global Lead for Food and Nutrition Security at the World Bank, highlighted the wide recognition of GAFSP's work and its potential to deepen the Program's impacts moving forward in the global food security landscape. She highlighted the importance of the five-year Program Evaluation in guiding the next phase of the Program and the ongoing Vision 2030 strategic planning process.
5. Introductory remarks were delivered by the newly appointed Co-Chair of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for the Business Investment Financing Track (BIFT) Pilot, Ms. Sally Gitonga. The second Co-Chair of the TAC-BIFT will be announced to the Steering Committee in due course.
6. The Steering Committee formally endorsed the agenda set for the meeting.

## SESSION 2 – RESULTS OF THE 5 YEAR PROGRAM EVALUATION

7. The KPMG team preparing the 5 Year Program Evaluation presented key findings and recommendations of the Program Evaluation on the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, as well as governance and management of the GAFSP Program. The team also highlighted four key tradeoffs that GAFSP must define and balance, namely:
  - a. supporting high-quality and well-performing projects in low-income countries versus targeting areas with the highest food insecurity levels
  - b. responding to food crises versus supporting longer-term transformation of food systems
  - c. delivering Call for Proposal-specific results versus leveraging all GAFSP financing windows and tracks for large scale transformation
  - d. serving as a multistakeholder platform versus primarily a funding channel.

8. The SC provided comments and questions on the draft evaluation, and the KPMG team provided some responses in the discussion. The SC commended the KPMG team for the breadth and quality of the evaluation, noting that the evaluation is much more detailed and focused relative to previous GAFSP evaluations, and serves as a key evidence base for the ongoing SC reflections on GAFSP and its Vision 2030. The SC also noted that the evaluation recognizes GAFSP taking steps in the right direction, such as through the PO-led track and newly launched BIFT, as well as efforts to strengthen the Program's role as a multistakeholder platform.

9. The key areas of discussion between the SC and KPMG included the following:

**a. Supporting FCV settings:** The SC values engagement in settings affected by Fragility, Conflict and Violence (FCV) and finds targeted calls in FCV valuable. The SC noted that weaker results in FCV settings relative to non-FCV settings are expected and should not be the basis for whether the Program continues to engage in FCV settings, but that the Program needs to continue to reflect on its risk tolerance for engaging in these settings. KPMG noted that the key issue is not weaker results, but rather a need to clearly define whether GAFSP targeting is focused on needs versus performance.

**b. Collaborating across windows and tracks:** The SC emphasized concern on the finding that collaboration between the Financial Intermediary Fund (FIF) for the GAFSP Public Sector Window and the Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) for the GAFSP Private Sector Window (PrSW) remains weak. KPMG clarified that while the distinct governance structures for FIF and the MDTF are a key constraint, there are opportunities to improve collaboration without governance changes, such as through operational guidelines. While the newly established BIFT could strengthen coordination, it cannot resolve all the governance issues emanating from the separate funding structure underpinning the two windows.

**c. Promoting innovations:** The SC echoed that it remains unclear how the current model is promoting innovations in the country-led track. The lack of a strong knowledge management component in the Program was also noted. Suggestions from the SC included: facilitating learning through an online repository of documents, incentivizing SE partnerships for innovation, and supporting across GAFSP financing windows and tracks targeted calls for innovation and experimental projects, such as for climate smart or digital agriculture.

**d. SC representation and composition:** The SC cautioned on the evaluation's framing of the issue on whether the regional representation model in GAFSP is adequate and representative of clients. Regional representatives emphasized that the Executive Director (ED) offices at the level of the World Bank represent the client countries, but did welcome more specific suggestions on how the regional representation model can be enhanced. KPMG noted that regional representatives could also serve a crucial Program visibility and resource mobilization function that goes beyond SC representation. KPMG also noted that regional representation in other FIFs lends itself better to visibility and resource mobilization. CSO representatives also urged the evaluation to include clear recommendations under governance on sustainable CSO funding and representation modalities and take into account the input provided by the CSOs in the context of the GAFSP Vision 2030 process (see Annex II). Finally, various SC members noted the consensus-based approach is a core strength of GAFSP. KPMG noted that other FIFs have included a failsafe option if the consensus-based approach proves to be an obstacle in a few exceptional cases.

**e. CU capacity:** The SC recognized the limited resources and capacity of the CU to deliver in the context of increasingly complex global challenges, a fragmented food security landscape, and a more elaborate Program with new and multiple windows and tracks.

**f. Benchmarking and evaluation timeframe:** The SC encouraged the KPMG team to better clarify the benchmarking approach, so that GAFSP performance is more clearly evaluated against relevant comparators, for example against performance of the regular non-GAFSP SE programs or against performance of other FIFs. There was also some discussion on the fact that the evaluation timeframe of 2018-2023 was a unique period requiring the Program to pivot and focus on crisis response, given the COVID-19 pandemic and invasion of Ukraine. The KPMG team noted, however, that most of the impacts in the evaluation are coming from earlier projects before 2018, as these projects are more likely to have closed.

10. There was an overarching discussion on what the right set of solutions and responses are to the findings and recommendations of the program evaluation. The SC should balance the trade-offs between lengthy restructuring and deeper reforms, and a narrower focus on operational improvements. On collaboration within the FIF and between the FIF and the PrSW, the key areas for improvement could include adjustments to calls for proposals, project design, and fostering in country collaborations. One suggestion to move forward on collaboration was to establish a working group and develop a framing paper.

11. The CU noted that the immediate next steps are to complete the evaluation and the SC response to the evaluation recommendations. The agreed next steps are as follows:

- a. Written comments from SC members- by November 15
- b. Revised evaluation shared with SC via CU (short and long versions to be prepared by KPMG team)- by November 29
- c. SC concurrence on final evaluation- by December 6
- d. Written comments from SC members on final recommendations- by December 6
- e. CU to complete draft SC response to evaluation recommendations- by December 20
- f. SC approval of final SC response to evaluation recommendations- in early January

### SESSION 3: GAFSP PORTFOLIO UPDATE

12. The GAFSP Coordination Unit (CU) and the PrSW Secretariat presented trends and analyses of the current portfolio of projects supported under GAFSP's Financial Intermediary Fund (FIF) and the MDTF respectively.

13. The PrSW Secretariat noted that as of June 30, 2024, GAFSP Private Sector Window (PrSW) has approved 93 investment projects in 29 countries for a total funding of US\$505.6 million. Additionally, 106 PrSW Advisory Services (AS) projects have been approved in 35 countries for a total funding amount of US\$54.4 million. The PrSW has a strong Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations (FCS) footprint: 26% of cumulative investment volume and 35% of cumulative project count. Since the inception of the GAFSP PrSW (FY13-24), for every dollar that GAFSP invested into a project, it attracted on average US\$6.3 from DFIs and private investment (including US\$1.9 from IFC). The PrSW Secretariat also highlighted to the SC the unique features, key innovations (e.g. local currency pilot, technology use in advisory projects), and important lessons learned so far from the management of the MDTF for the GAFSP PrSW, including delegated authority to IFC, expansion to IDA-Blend countries, and PrSW-PuSW collaboration challenges and opportunities in FCS contexts. The GAFSP Coordination Unit (CU) highlighted that disbursements under the GAFSP FIF have picked up in FY24 reflecting the improving portfolio performance, the Sixth Call projects disbursing after being effective, and the phase-out of COVID-19 effects. There are a growing number of projects that are smaller in size, and often delivered in association with the SE's own financing, but slower to prepare and disburse, which indicates a degree of trade-off between efficiency and co-financing. Specifically, while there is a time lag between SC approval of the final project design and the first disbursement, significantly more co-financing has been mobilized in the recent country-led projects. The CU has held regular meetings with GAFSP Supervising Entities (SEs) to agree on focused action plans aimed at improving the quality of the GAFSP portfolio.

14. Comments and guidance from the SC in response to the GAFSP Portfolio Update focused on GAFSP's role in enhancing food security in small island and coastal states, including through a blue economy approach, improving collaboration between the Public Sector Window and the PrSW using an integrated template for the regular portfolio update to the SC, integrating climate indicators in results reporting to reinforce GAFSP's commitment to climate financing, and incorporating more qualitative evidence into the GAFSP monitoring and evaluation system.

#### **SESSION 4: GAFSP FIF FINANCIAL STATUS**

15. The Trustee provided a financial status update of the FIF to the SC. As of September 30, 2024, cumulative funding received from Contributors to the GAFSP FIF amounted to \$2,293.5 million. Taking into account funding decisions already made by the SC and restricted funds, including the three-year budget cycle of FY26-FY28 for the administrative budget of the Trustee and the CU as well as the FY26 CSO Budget, net total funds available for SC decisions as of September 30, 2024 is \$116 million. The amount is expected to increase to \$120.5 million as of October 31, 2024 due to \$4.5 million of additional funds anticipated from Spain.

16. The Trustee also provided a status update on the operationalization of the GAFSP restructuring. Of the ten (10) Contributors to the GAFSP FIF, eight (8) have signed the Amended and Restated Contribution Agreements/Arrangement (CAs), and two (Australia, Spain) are in progress. The amended and restated CAs only become effective after signing by all the Contributors. Once effective, this will allow the SC to allocate funds within the GAFSP FIF to proposals submitted under the Business Investment Financing Track (BIFT). It will also allow the Trustee to advance the signing of the updated Financial Provisions Agreements with GAFSP's SEs.

#### **SESSION 5: NEXT STEPS IN VISION 2030 STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS**

17. The Coordination Unit presented the key Vision 2030 strategic planning milestones following the October 31st Steering Committee. They include the finalization of the 5 Year Program Evaluation, the formulation and adoption of the Vision 2030 strategic plan and resource mobilization plan, the preparation of a new Call for Proposals under the Producer Organization-led Track, and the organization of a GAFSP replenishment event towards the end of 2025. The Coordination Unit also highlighted that both the date and location of the next in-person Steering Committee meeting will be re-confirmed with SC Members using a brief survey to be shared with SC Members shortly after the October 31st Steering Committee Meeting. The current timing of the GAFSP In-Person Steering Committee in Washington DC (March 25-27, 2025) presents a conflict with the Nutrition for Growth (N4G) Summit, which will take place in Paris on March 27-28, 2025. Meanwhile, a number of SC Members have recently expressed a preference to organize the in-person SC Meeting in a GAFSP partner country (Dakar, Senegal). The Coordination Unit explained that the organization of an in-person SC Meeting in a GAFSP partner country would come at an additional cost. The Coordination Unit would thus request additional budget resources from the Steering Committee, if this option was confirmed in the survey.

18. The Co-Chair of the Steering Committee introduced Mr. Gabriel Ferrero, the Government of Spain's Ambassador at Large for Global Food Security, as the GAFSP Senior Strategy Advisor selected to guide and support the Steering Committee in the Vision 2030 Strategic Planning process. Ambassador Ferrero thanked the Steering Committee and the Coordination Unit for the trust provided and confirmed that he will undertake the assignment with GAFSP independently from his current role. He highlighted GAFSP's contributions to global food and nutrition security and underscored the Program's potential to catalyze public and private investments in the transformation of agriculture and food systems in the poorest and most vulnerable countries. Ambassador Ferrero said he looked forward to engaging all SC Members bilaterally and facilitating the Steering Committee's convergence toward an inspiring and impactful Vision 2030 Strategic Plan.

19. The GAFSP Program Manager, Natasha Hayward, thanked SC Members for their comments on the draft 5 Year Program Evaluation Report. She underlined that the SC's official response to the recommendations of the 5 Year Program Evaluation Report will provide important guidance for the different Vision 2030 strategic planning milestones presented by the Coordination Unit. The Co-Chair closed the meeting by thanking SC Members for their participation and highlighting the unique opportunity offered by the Vision 2030 strategic planning process to the SC to shape the future directions and narrative of GAFSP.

# Annex I: Minutes of the Virtual Pre- Meeting of the Steering Committee, September 12, 2024

## SESSION 1 - WELCOME, INTRODUCTION OF NEW PARTICIPANTS, ADOPTION OF AGENDA

1. The Co-Chair welcomed Steering Committee (SC) members to the virtual pre-meeting and introduced a number of new members to the SC, including: (i) Mr. Emmanuel Plingloh Muniyeh (Advisor to EDS14 Executive Director) who replaces Mr. Fisseha Kidane as EDS14's/Anglophone Africa's regional representative; (ii) Ms. Rebecca Smart (Deputy Director, Innovative Finance Team) and Mr. Adam Templer (Program Officer, Innovative Finance Team) who replace Mr. Amrane Boumghar and Ms. Vicky Leclair as Canada's representative and alternate respectively; (iii) Ms. Challiss McDonough (Senior Program Officer, Program Advocacy & Communications, Agricultural Development) who replaces Mr. Ammad Bahalim as the Alternate Representative for Gates Foundation during Mr. Bahalim's paternity leave; (iv) Ms. Shobha Shetty (Global Director, AGF Global Practice) and Ms. Marianne Grosclaude (Practice Manager, AGF Global Engagement Unit) who replace Mr. Martien Van Nieuwkoop and Mr. Julian Lampietti as the World Bank's representative and alternate respectively.

2. The Co-Chair noted that a number of SC Members excused themselves for the meeting, including the World Bank's Ms. Shobha Shetty, IFAD's Mr. Donal Brown and Ms. Enika Basu, and ADB's Mr. Shingo Kimura. The agenda of the meeting was subsequently endorsed by the SC.

## SESSION 2 - UPDATE ON VISION 2030 CONSULTATIONS

3. The Coordination Unit (CU) provided an update on the bilateral Vision 2030 consultations, which the CU undertook with each member of the SC following the May '24 SC meeting. The CU summarized the conclusions of the May '24 SC meeting, the consultation process that was followed by the CU since the most recent SC meeting, and the template used to facilitate the consultation with each SC Member based on the areas of agreement vs ongoing discussion identified during the May '24 SC Meeting. The CU also noted that SC members from the Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) shared written inputs during the consultation process. The inputs have been included in Annex II to the Minutes.

4. The update provided by the CU was structured around the feedback received from SC Members in relation to the areas of ongoing discussion, including GAFSP's (i) positioning in the global development finance architecture; (ii) resource mobilization strategy; (iii) geographic targeting; (iv) investment focus; and (v) call for proposals model.

### SESSION 3 – Q&A SESSION WITH SC MEMBERS

5. The Co-Chair invited each constituency to (i) elevate any other critical points that may have been missed in the Update; and/or (ii) provide any additional feedback or guidance to the CU as it develops the Vision 2030 concept in the forthcoming months. The key feedback received from SC Members with respect to the areas of ongoing discussion included the following:

**a. Positioning in the global development finance architecture:** GAFSP should re-position itself from an instrument that was originally set up to close financing gaps related to SDG 1 & SDG 2 at scale towards an instrument that catalyzes additional public and private investment through innovative co-financing modalities and partnerships at country- and regional- levels that can help defragment the landscape of global food and nutrition security initiatives. In this context, GAFSP should seek to build stronger linkages with other multilateral financing and partnership platforms focused on addressing global challenges, in particular those related to climate, nature protection, and

**b. Resource mobilization strategy:** SC Members are called upon to support the CU in elevating the Vision 2030 strategic planning process within the framework of the Global Alliance against Hunger and Poverty launched by Brazil's G20 Presidency and at the level of different global and regional events in which SC Members participate in 2025, including the African Union's CAADP Post-Malabo Agenda. Both existing and new Contributors should be engaged in the Vision 2030 strategic planning process to mobilize a critical mass of resources to support the implementation of the strategic plan. The resource mobilization plan accompanying the Vision 2030 strategic plan should consider how GAFSP's different funding windows and tracks would be deployed under different budget/resource mobilization scenarios.

**c. Geographic targeting:** GAFSP should maintain its focus on IDA-only countries, while prioritizing the inclusion of new, underserved countries into the Program, in particular countries affected by fragility, conflict, and violence.

**d. Investment focus:** GAFSP should channel funds towards investments and capacity building efforts in low-income countries that address drivers of fragility by accelerating the transformation of agriculture and food systems towards increased sustainability and resilience in the long-term. These efforts should be closely coordinated with ongoing food crisis prevention and response efforts, including by building stronger linkages with early warning platforms.

**e. Call for proposal model:** GAFSP should ensure that synergies and linkages between different GAFSP financing windows and tracks are built into the design of future calls for proposal, starting with the next Call for Proposals under the Producer Organization-led Track.

**SESSION 4 - UPDATE FROM GAFSP TRUSTEE ON AMENDED AND REVISED CONTRIBUTION AGREEMENT**

6. The Trustee provided the SC with an update on the signing of the Amended and Restated Contribution Agreement. As of September 12, 2024, seven (7) out of the ten (10) Contributors to the GAFSP Financial Intermediary Fund (FIF) have signed the Amended and Restated Contribution Agreement. For three (3) Contributors (Norway, Spain, Australia) the signing of the Agreement is in progress. All ten (10) Contributors will need to sign the Amended and Restated Contribution Agreement before it is effective. Once effective, the Amended and Restated Contribution Agreement will allow the SC to allocate funds within the GAFSP FIF to proposals submitted under the Business Investment Financing Track (BIFT). It will also allow the Trustee to advance the signing of the updated Financial Provisions Agreements with GAFSP's SEs.

**SESSION 5 - CLOSING REMARKS BY STEERING COMMITTEE CO-CHAIR**

7. The Co-Chair thanked SC members for their participation in the virtual pre-meeting and the constructive feedback provided for the Vision 2030 strategic planning process.





# Annex II:

## Input from CSO Members to Vision 2030 Consultations

GAFSP SC CSOs would like to underline the following points as an initial contribution to the strategic reflection towards a Vision 2030 Strategy.

### **GAFSP objective – support to productive capacity versus food system transformation**

GAFSP has proved effective in supporting medium to long term development while simultaneously adapting to a challenging environment of multiple, recurrent crises at the country level on top of the COVID-19 pandemic and the global food price precipitated by the war in Ukraine.

In order to maximize the synergies with other Agencies and Programs and leverage scarce grant resources, it is paramount for GAFSP to continue to focus on the most vulnerable countries and adopt a long-term development focus, complementing the work of the humanitarian Agencies providing first immediate support, and building on those efforts to restore the capacities of the countries to fulfil food security needs and resilience of their population in the long term.

To break the cycle of recurrent crises GAFSP should address the challenges that countries face to build productive capacity, create markets for their farmers, and build resilience against climate change. While GAFSP is not in a position to lead food system transformation, it can support the establishment of appropriate infrastructure and actors to facilitate the transformation needed.

As an example, if GAFSP were to make a decision to support the transition to sustainable agriculture by fostering the use of locally produced ecological inputs and diversification of crops, it would go far to helping farmer autonomy, adaptation to climate change, and reduce GHGs emissions. By no longer funding the use of chemical inputs, which trap farmers in a system that fosters dependency on external assistance and a vulnerability to external shocks, the GAFSP can have a constitutive impact on the broader food system.

### **Support to POs organizations in the GAFSP continuum and connection among GAFSP financing tracks**

Many POs seek to support to develop horizontally, with local and territorial markets being more remunerative, and thus they don't place the same primacy on engaging with or better benefiting from value chains. These local and territorial markets are very often informal, and don't have adequate financial, policy and infrastructure support. If the GAFSP's objective is to support POs just so they may enter and benefit from the value chain, we risk leaving out a portion of the POs in the broader landscape.

Adopting a food system transformation approach requires supporting farmers to increase yields and diversify, and access territorial markets. Corporate-controlled supply chains are just one approach within a textured landscape of food distribution systems. From public markets and street vendors to cooperatives, urban agriculture to online direct sales, food hubs to community kitchens; territorial market channels are contributing to feeding as much as 70% of the world's population every day. They are based around small-scale producers, processors and vendors, rooted in territories and communities, and play multiple roles within them<sup>1</sup>.

### **Support to agroecology**

Industrial agriculture is responsible for almost 1/3 of global GHGs emissions, while the agricultural sector is heavily impacted by climate change, with increasing loss of livelihoods and farming opportunities for millions of rural people and consequent rise in hunger and food insecurity. Agroecology applies ecological principles to farming, enhancing natural cycles instead of a reliance on pesticides and fertilizers.

In addition to contributing to mitigation and adaptation through building resilience in a changing climate condition, agroecology supports rights to resources, decision-making, and a more equitable food system.

A growing number of agencies, research institutions, governments, and donors are adopting policies and developing tools to scale up and scale out agroecology. Yet, agroecology is severely hampered by the quantity and quality of financing available for its development. The organizations, food producers and proponents that are advancing agroecology around the world have little access to public or philanthropic financing or other institutional support. Most finance for agriculture is allocated to conventional agriculture that, while having achieved productivity gains in some places, has been highly uneven and come at great expense to the environment, equity and sustainability. With its POs led track, GAFSP can champion a shift in funding from conventional agriculture towards agroecology.

### **GAFSP inclusive governance**

The partnership with CSOs is central to GAFSP and a unique value added. GAFSP's partnerships with civil society and Producer Organizations gives GAFSP credibility in the broader food and agriculture community.

Civil society support, or lack thereof, has been the determining factor for program success. Having CSOs on board, is key to ensuring the Program effectively delivers for farmers, with initiatives tailored to and sensitized by the needs of GAFSP's target beneficiaries.

By including CSOs in its governing body, and providing the support needed to substantiate this partnership, GAFSP has instantiated a commitment to ensuring civil society stays at the helm of program design and delivery. Unfortunately, the current governance structure framing engagement with CSOs doesn't allow for them to play the role intended.

Classifying CSOs as service providers and limiting the collaboration to those that are able to compete in a call for proposal is at tension with civil society ways of working internally and externally and precludes many organizations with the precise expertise the GAFSP needs to improve its efficacy and impact.

To carry out the work required as representatives/facilitators, they should be given the resources needed to, at the very least, be able to run consultations with farmers to ensure all relevant processes are sensitized and adequately tailored.

While the FIF sets clear parameters on who can receive direct WB funding, other TFs and FIFs within the WB have managed to allow for exceptions to fund civil society directly. Among others, this includes the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), Global Financing Facility (GFF) and the Global Partnership for Social Accountability (GPSA). For example, the Global Partnership for Education has set up a separate fund, Education Out Loud, for the sole purpose of supporting civil society engagement and activities, which is distributed via Oxfam Denmark, a CSO selected by a competitive process. In direct contrast to the stated GAFSP policy, they allow CSOs to be on the Board and receive grant funding.

For GFF, GPSA and GFF, finding a solution was the result of buy-in from a wider range of constituencies than appears to be the case for GAFSP. This buy-in drove donor allocation for CSOs for GFF, the creation of the EOL fund for GPE and the launch of GPSA's CIVIC-the Civil Society and Social Innovation Alliance, a dedicated new finance and support facility for civil society organizations (CSOs) and other social economy actors, which aims to supercharge and mature the WBG's engagement with civil society. In fact, these TF efforts to work more closely with civil society are in line with a broader, yet unrealized directive from within the World Bank. As part of its Evolution Roadmap endorsed by the Development Committee in October 2023, the WBG has committed to "deepen its partnership with civil society, especially at the country and regional levels, to make the evolution process more effective." And the WBG has expanded and deepened its engagement with CSOs over the past 40 years, in recognition of the valuable voices, perspectives, and knowledge they bring to inform policy and project design and implementation. Nonetheless, this engagement remains highly variable throughout the project cycle, highly dependent on the right enabling environment, and too often falters due to lack of political prioritization, time, funding, and capacity. There is then a need to recommit ensuring all World Bank funding vehicles are sensitized to CSO needs, so as to take advantage of the central role they play in enhancing impact.

At this point, the options then available to GAFSP remain: setting up a parallel donor-led fund for civil society organizations, availing itself of the GPSA led CIVIC, or selecting a designated civil society organization via competitive process who is eligible to receive direct funding and has the capacity to distribute that funding to other civil society members of the GAFSP Steering Committee. Addressing this challenge isn't a matter of getting any one CSO funded, it is about ensuring that the GAFSP is fit for purpose and can work with all types of stakeholders regardless of organizational structure or distinction.

### **Co-financing with climate funds**

The development finance landscape is very fragmented, while donors continue to shrink their ODA, along with other kinds of financial assistance and investment. Additionally, recent overlapping crises require a more holistic and intertwined response. Co-financing could be a helpful way of improving outcomes for different types of funding with convergent objectives. Although 90% of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) mention agriculture as a priority, and food systems account for one-third of global greenhouse gas emissions, only 3% of climate finance goes to food systems.

Thus, the agriculture sector is still undervalued within climate finance, even as farmers organizations have pressed the salience of agriculture in achieving mitigation and adaptation targets. We need to enhance finance to fund resilient and equitable farming that protects the planet and delivers healthy and nutritious food to people's plates. GAFSP should engage more in those spaces, with the respective SEs, to design programmes and interventions that maximize the scarce available financing and create synergies with other Funds and Programs.



# Annex III: List of Participants

## 3.1. Virtual Pre-Meeting of the Steering Committee, September 12, 2024

	Last Name	First Name	Country/Organization
Co-Chair			
1	Catto	James	Director, International Development Policy, US Treasury, GAFSP Chair
Donors			
2	Lynn	Fiona	Australia
3	Smart	Rebecca	Canada
4	Templer	Adam	Canada
5	Bruentrup-Seidemann	Sabine	Germany
6	Busma	Jens	Germany
7	Fernandez Sanchez	Monica	Spain
8	Yanez Minondo	Blanca	Spain
9	Sandgrove	Christabel	United Kingdom
10	Singer	Jason	United States
Regional Representatives			
11	Tenkouano	Abdou	Africa
12	Khuong	Ha	Asia
13	Huerzeler	Benedikt	ECA
Donor Representatives in Non-Voting Status			
14	Kawazoe	Yuri	Japan
15	Chiyojima	Ryohei	Japan
16	Janszen	Agnes	Netherlands

## Annex III - GAFSP Steering Committee Meeting

Supervising Entities (SEs)			
17	Boahen	Philip	AfDB
18	Manssouri	Mohamed	FAO
19	Veillerette	Benoist	FAO
20	XU	Jianjun	IADB
21	Grosclaude	Marianne	WB
22	Simmons	Sarah	WB
23	Polidori	Giulia	WFP
24	Toe	Chris	WFP
Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)			
25	Kandell	Arianna	ActionAid USA
26	Rostaing Akoha	Sessi	ROPPA
GAFSP Coordination Unit, WB			
27	Dizon	Felipe	Interim GAFSP Program Manager
28	Van der Celen	Philip	GAFSP Deputy Program Manager
29	Adubofuor	Agartha	Coordination Unit
30	Calixto	Silvana	Coordination Unit
31	Christiansen	Andrea	Coordination Unit
32	Fitzgerald	Nora	Coordination Unit
33	Guerra	Alberta	Coordination Unit
34	Magarotto	Cecilia	Coordination Unit
35	Mecagni	Laura	Coordination Unit
36	Sakhuja	Davinder	Coordination Unit
37	Usman	Muhammed	Coordination Unit
38	Yang	Shijie	Coordination Unit
39	Zelege	Alemayehu	Coordination Unit

GAFSP Private Sector Window Secretariat – IFC			
41	Abboud	Maddison	IFC
42	Chaudhary	Bheeshm	IFC
GAFSP Trustee /Legal			
43	Pardo	Maria Lourdes	Legal
44	Lanza	Jorge	Trustee
45	Pillay	Karen	Trustee
46	Srinivasan	Vijayalakshmi	Trustee

### 3.2. Virtual Meeting of the Steering Committee, October 31, 2024

	Last Name	First Name	Country/Organization
Co-Chair			
1	Catto	James	GAFSP Co-Chair and Director, International Development Policy, US Treasury, GAFSP Chair
Donors			
2	Lynn	Fiona	Australia
3	Watkins	Neil	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF)
4	Smart	Rebecca	Canada
5	Templer	Adam	Canada
6	Brix	Jan	Germany
7	Bruentrup-Seidemann	Sabine	Germany
8	Busma	Jens	Germany
9	Nyman	Jessica	Norway
10	Fernandez Sanchez	Monica	Spain
11	Ferrero	Gabriel	Spain
12	Yanez Minondo	Blanca	Spain
13	Save	Radio	United Kingdom

## Annex III - GAFSP Steering Committee Meeting

14	Sandgrove	Christabel	United Kingdom
15	Shaps	Caz	United Kingdom
16	Singer	Jason	United States
Regional Representatives			
17	Tenkouano	Abdou	Africa
18	Khuong	Ha	Asia
19	Pokharel	Champak	Asia
20	Huerzeler	Benedikt	ECA
21	Romero	Melvin	LAC
22	Nawaf Abdul Malik Abdul Ghaffar	Jeehan	MENA
Observers in Non-Voting Status			
23	Matsumoto	Kohji	Japan
24	Janszen	Agnes	Netherlands
Supervising Entities (SEs)			
25	Manalo	Charmaine	ADB
26	Kimura	Shingo	ADB
27	Boahen	Philip	AfDB
28	Labella	Patrizia	FAO
29	Manssouri	Mohamed	FAO
30	Veillerette	Benoist	FAO
31	Basu	Enika	IFAD
32	Mancini	Marc	IFAD
33	Grosclaude	Marianne	WB
34	Shetty	Shobha	WB
35	Simons	Sarah	WB
36	Williams	Melissa	WB
37	Polidori	Giulia	WFP



## Annex III - GAFSP Steering Committee Meeting

Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)			
38	Hertzler	Doug	ActionAid USA
39	Kandell	Arianna	ActionAid USA
40	Penunia	Esther	AFA
41	Rostaing Akoha	Sessi	ROPPA
GAFSP Coordination Unit, WB			
42	Hayward	Natasha	GAFSP Program Manager
43	Van der Celen	Philip	GAFSP Deputy Program Manager
44	Adubofuor	Agartha	Coordination Unit
45	Alamzai	Amanullah	Coordination Unit
46	Canli	Funda	Coordination Unit
47	Calixto	Silvana	Coordination Unit
48	Chirag-Zade	Rufiz	Coordination Unit
49	Dizon	Felipe	Coordination Unit
50	Guerra	Alberta	Coordination Unit
51	Haidary	Mariam	Coordination Unit
52	Ho	Ginny	Coordination Unit
53	Magarotto	Cecilia	Coordination Unit
54	Mpambara	Aimee	Coordination Unit
55	Murphy-Mcgreevey	Clare	Coordination Unit
56	Mecagni	Laura	Coordination Unit
57	Sakhuja	Davinder	Coordination Unit
58	Usman	Muhammed	Coordination Unit
59	Yang	Shijie	Coordination Unit
60	Zelege	Alemayehu	Coordination Unit
61	Gitonga	Sally	BIFT TAC

GAFSP Private Sector Window Secretariat – IFC			
62	Abboud	Maddison	IFC
63	Berman	Daphna	IFC
64	Chaudhary	Bheeshm	IFC
65	Farenholtz	Philipp	IFC
66	Maiztegui	Josefina	IFC
67	Neelamraju	Kalyan	IFC
68	Park	Joon Young	IFC
69	Rast	Karoline	IFC
70	Shah	Niraj	IFC
GAFSP Trustee /Legal			
71	Pardo	Maria Lourdes	Legal
72	Achi	Laurent	Trustee
73	Lanza	Jorge	Trustee
74	Pillay	Karen	Trustee
75	Srinivasan	Vijayalakshmi	Trustee
External Attendees			
76	Engen	Lars	KPMG
77	Hurten	Marte	KPMG