

1. The second GAFSP Knowledge Forum was held on June 10-11, 2015 at the IFAD Headquarters in Rome. About 40 project team leaders and representatives (list of participants are provided in) from seven Supervising Entities (SEs)¹ participated at the Knowledge Forum, which was organized by the GAFSP Coordination Unit (CU) in cooperation with IFAD. A group picture of the Forum participants is provided in .
2. The objectives of the Knowledge Forum were to: (i) exchange on GAFSP projects for improving efficiency of delivery and increasing impact on beneficiaries; (ii) contribute to current processes underway to strengthen the overall GAFSP monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework and related project systems; and (iii) capture and highlight emerging results from GAFSP- and donor-led projects for clients and donors.
3. The agenda of the Knowledge Forum is provided in . The discussions at the Knowledge Forum focused on GAFSP specific elements of projects, beyond regular operations of the respective SEs. The project team leaders and representatives were asked to think critically about GAFSP on monitoring and evaluation, performance indicators, public-private partnerships including what strengths and challenges team leaders have experienced, and what changes could be made to increase the impact, speed, or strength of the Program moving forward. The discussions resulted in several concrete follow-up actions.
4. During the introductory session of the Knowledge Forum, the importance of project design and the need to secure quality at entry was emphasized so as to ensure better implementation of GAFSP projects. Better feasibility studies, including project site selection, and discussions on building trust with partners were amongst suggestions to improve

Proposed Actions

- x Report to the GAFSP M&E Working Group on the suggestions and comments made at the 2015 Knowledge Forum including []:
 - o Focus on how to report back Tier II indicators to donors.
 - o Research core indicators of SEs and focus on streamlining GAFSP indicators so that they are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound, including if possible, with respect to outcome.
 - o Research logical frameworks that are currently followed by AfDB, ADB and IFAD.
 - o Re-define all GAFSP indicators in terms of input, activities, outputs and outcomes.
 - o Revert to SE team leaders on validating the revised indicators
- x Develop one-page template for SE team leaders to prepare human impact stories. []

10. Closer linkages between the two GAFSP windows are actively being sought. IFC country managers (OE) u } Isoire and Kenya shared their experiences of projects that demonstrate public-private partnerships. The project team leaders were requested to flag possible investment opportunities for the Private Sector Window, which the Public Sector Window could leverage.

11. There was also a robust discussion on how to overcome challenges for public-private engagement. The average size of GAFSP Private Sector Window projects is relatively small in comparison to the GAFSP Public Sector Window projects. Participants expressed a need for the Private Sector Window to understand what the GAFSP Public Sector Window does, and vice versa. It was explained that it is challenging for IFC to step into a project that has been approved and is under implementation. SE representatives and team leaders reported that there is some

12. In general, when there are two Supervising Entities (SEs) for investments in GAFSP projects, the two components operate relatively independently. However, when there are investment and technical assistance (TA) components, the projects are expected to run in an integrated manner, which experience is demonstrating not always to be the case. It was noted that GAFSP projects with multiple SEs, especially one for investment and the other one for TA, require more coordination between them in terms of timing and sequencing TA and investment activities.
13. In GAFSP projects that have two SEs (one SE undertaking investment and other one TA), the key challenge is lack of clarity on the interdependency and interactions of investment and TA activities. Despite the fact that governments ultimately are the decision makers, they are not adequately informed about the roles and responsibilities of the two SEs undertaking investment and TA activities in the GAFSP projects. Clarity is needed at the design phase on whether the investment and TA components in projects would be implemented in an integrated manner or separately. Given the nature of the two components, implementation of investment is likely to take longer than TA activities.
14. The Forum recommended that one future role of the CU would be to inform and clarify GAFSP partners (SEs and government) on investment and TA activities and their coordination. It is important that governments take timely decisions and from the start of the project make it clear about what are investments and TA activities and which SEs would be undertaking those. Instead of having two separate proposals for the same project as is the current practice (one investment and the other one TA), it would be helpful to have only one proposal and one design for each project that would include investment and TA activities. It is very important to articulate the clear roles of SEs in the project proposal that is to be submitted to the GAFSP Steering Committee. This would provide greater integration between investment and TA activities. All partners should be clear about the above two components and the level of engagement between SEs from the start.

Project Restr

Proposed Actions

- x Organize a meeting or teleconference of relevant SEs after each project proposal has been approved by the Steering Committee (SC). The purpose of this meeting/teleconference would be

17. CU demonstrated the GAFSP Portal (online platform) in the test environment to the Forum participants. Project team leaders expressed interest in the Portal and looked forward to its formal launch.

Proposed Action

- x Share comments provided by project leaders with the World Bank Trustee FIF team. []

18. The CU conducted a brief survey at the end of each day during the Knowledge Forum to collect feedback from the participants.

Raza Farrukh	Water Resources Specialist	Cambodia/STPD
Piseth Long	Senior Project Officer	Cambodia/EFAD
Mahfuzuddin Ahmed	Advisor/Practice Leader	Steering Committee
Lewis Bangwe	Task Team Leader	
Mouldi Tarhouni	Chief Irrigation Officer	Mali
Samba Bocary Tounkara	Chief Fisheries Expert	Benin
Sheikh Javed Ahmed	Chief Water Resource Engineer	Kenya
Anna Lisa Noack	Investment Centre	Bangladesh
Enkhjargal Tumur Ochir	Officer Strategic Planning/Policy	Mongolia/Rome
Guy Evers	Deputy Dir. Investment Centre	Steering Committee
Jennifer Braun	Investment Centre	Bangladesh
Marc Moens	Sr. Livestock Officer	
Mariatou Njie	Sr. Operations Officer	The Gambia
Pamela Pozarny	Rural Sociologist	Ethiopia/Rome
Robert Allport	Rep. Programme Implementation	Kenya
Takayuki Hagiwara	Sr. Nat. Resources Mgt. Officer	Mongolia
John McIntire	Associate Vice President	
Willem Bettink	Sr. Program Manager	
Cassandra Colbert	Resident Rep. Abidjan	} š [/ Å }] Œ

| 41
42

Anita Bhatia
Raffaele Boldracchi

Director/CDPDR

|



Oval Room, IFAD Headquarters, Via Paolo di Dono, 44, Rome

DAY 2: Thursday, June 11

9.00 am	Welcome and Recap of Day 1 Proceedings ² CU
9.15 am ² 10.45pm	SESSION 5: Public-Private Partnerships for Smallholder Farmers - Chair : Laura Mecagni, IFC : Experiences of GAFSP projectsdemonstrating public -private partnerships ²

Session 5: Public-Private Partnerships for Smallholder farmers (% of the respondents)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Not Applicable	Dissatisfied	Total Respondents
Relevance of presentations	27.3	59.1	9.1	4.5	0	100
Usefulness of lessons learnt in applying to GAFSP-specific activities	22.7	59.1	13.6	4.5	0	100
Clarification provided on key issues related to GAFSP	13.6	68.2	9.1	4.5	4.5	100
Overall rating	22.7	59.1	13.6	4.5	0	100

Session 6: GAFSP Operational Issues (% of the respondents)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	No Response	Total Respondents
Relevance of presentations	45.5	40.9	0.0	13.6	100
Usefulness of lessons learnt in applying to GAFSP-specific activities	40.9	45.5	0.0	13.6	100
Clarification provided on key issues related to GAFSP	27.3	54.5	4.5	13.6	100
Overall rating	40.9	45.5	0.0	13.6	100

Session 7: The Value of GAFSP: Pathway from project to country (% of the respondents)

Session 8: Moving Forward (% of the respondents)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	No response	Total Respondents
Clarification provided on key issues related to GAFSP	31.8	36.4	4.5	27.3	100.0
Clarity on the next steps	31.8	27.3	13.6	27.3	100.0
Overall rating	31.8	36.4	4.5	27.3	100.0

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	No response	Total Respondents
Opportunities for exchanging knowledge	31.8	45.5	0.0	22.7	100.0
Overall experience of the GAFSP knowledge Forum	40.9	36.4	0.0	22.7	100.0