





3. Provide recommendations on which activities to finance (even that some members of iTAC may not agree with the appropriateness of full funding)

Members of iTAC should indicate their priorities for funding within proposals, in addition to the total amount recommended. Even if the recommended amount is equal to the amount requested, other members may not agree and the iTAC as a whole will benefit from a sense of the priorities of individual members. Further, if the allocated amount by an individual iTAC member is less than the requested amount, then the member should make specific recommendations on which part of the proposal to finance and/or how much to finance to each part of the proposal (which could still include all parts of the proposal but with lower financing than requested for each part). In setting priorities and making recommendations, the iTAC member must consider

- x The prioritization of activities provided in the country proposals (these should ye

- x A ranked list of countries/proposals based on scores
- x Information on the dispersion of scores where significant

## ANNEX 1: Proposal Rating Form

Program Title:

Country:

---

|                                 |   |                  |
|---------------------------------|---|------------------|
| Country need, policy, readiness | = | (100 points max) |
| Country need                    | = | (25 points max)  |
| Country policy                  | = | (25 points max)  |
| Country readiness               | = | (50 points max)  |
| <br>                            |   |                  |
| Proposal readiness              | = | (100 points max) |
| <br>                            |   |                  |
| Total score                     | = | (200 points max) |

---

### Country Need (25 points, 12.5 for each section)

| Need   | Indicators <sup>3</sup>  | Basis of Assessment by iTAC  |
|--|--|--|
| <u>Relative measure of need</u><br>Poverty and hunger & levels of development assistance | First Millennium Development Goal, such as the prevalence of undernourishment (established using simple average of indicators at right that are available for country in question) | Proportion of people below \$1.25/day<br>Poverty gap ratio<br>% of poorest quintile in nat'l consumption |

ODA for agriculture \$/rural population

|  |                                     |   |  |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|
|  | planned investment returns.         |   |  |
|  | IFAD Rural Sector Performance Score | IFAD rural sector performance score (which range from 0 to 5) x 2 |  |

If the IFAD rural sector performance scores do not exist for a particular country, full weighting is given to the policy section in the country proposal

## Country Readiness (50 points)

Part 1. Summary of Overall Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and Associated Investment Plan (total points: 50; maximum score of 10 each section)

Note: For African countries, consider organization of country roundtable, signing of CAADP compact specifying long term strategic options for agricultural growth, poverty reduction, and priority investments, as well as modalities for development partnership and inclusive policy review dialogue mechanisms, and post-compact CAADP Investment Plan ratified by a CAADP technical review meeting. For non-African countries, evaluate the quality of the strategic planning process that has led to the formulation of the investment programs entailed in the proposal package.

| Section   | Content  | Basis of Assessment by iTAC  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| 1.1 Objectives and indicators   | Clearly state the overall agriculture and food security strategy objectives and associated investment plan, with monitorable indicators.   | Realism of the specific targets relative to past performance, potential, and capacity.   |  |
| 1.3 Plan components to achieve the objectives                             | Key policy, institutional and other issues that constrain the achievement of the objectives (including environmental sustainability, capacity, and gender equality considerations), and how the proposed components address these constraints, and which government ministries/entities will be responsible for delivery.      | Clarity of the causal link to the proposed objectives, good practice approaches in proposed components, the extent to which environmental sustainability, governance, and gender equality issues have been addressed, and government coordination arrangements for delivery. |  |
| 1.4 Planned composition and level of spending to implement the components | Indicative costs of the components to achieve objectives, and how this compares with past public spending. Clarity on how (and why) the composition and level of public spending in agriculture and food security will change from previous years. The trend in the share of public spending on agriculture and food security. | Costs of proposed activities, the past record of budget execution (capacity to utilize funds), realism on future capacity to utilize funds, and Government commitment to the sector as reflected in public spending shares on agriculture and food security.                 |  |
| 1.5 Financing sources and gaps  | Source of financing for the investment plan by Government and development partners (who will finance what). Extent of the financing gap.   | Extent to which there are genuine  |  |

|  |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|--|
| strategy and investment plan was developed | food security strategy and investment plan, including depth of consultation with domestic stakeholders, especially smallholders and women farmers, farmer organizations, and vulnerable groups (youth indigenous groups etc | (smallholders and women farmers, farmer organizations, civil society, private sector, other grassroots groups, and parliament). |  |
|--|---|---|--|

## Proposal Readiness (100 points)

Part 2. Specific Proposal for GAFSP financing (total points: 100; max score of 20 each section)

Note: For African countries, consider outcome of the ~~Post~~compact Technical Review Report from the country CAADP business meeting. For ~~non~~African countries, review the evidence of an independent and thorough peer review of the investment plan, such as the CAADP ~~Post~~compact technical review report

| Section  | Content   | Basis of Assessment by iTAC   |  |
|--|---|---|--|
| 2.1 Specific objectives, and targeted results (disaggregated by gender [targeted vulnerable groups], and number of targeted beneficiaries) | Clarity on the specific objectives, expected results including by gender target beneficiaries of the specific proposal, and how it links with the overall sector strategy and investment plan. Clarify how the objectives will integrate gender equality, governance, and environmental sustainability (including climate change adaptation and mitigation if applicable). Specify the M&E framework to be used to assess progress on these objectives.                     | Assessed against the objectives of the GAFSP Framework Document (including its results framework), including the emphasis on women and smallholders. Proposals with a stronger results/M&E framework and an integration of gender equality and environmental sustainability will be given priority.   |  |
| 2.2 Activities to be financed  | Activities to be financed, duration of activities, and linkages with the overall sector strategy and investment plan, and the scope of the GAFSP framework document and their environmental sustainability. Reasons these activities were selected. Government ministries and other entities responsible for delivery. Expected sustainability of proposed activities following GAFSP financing. Modality of financing (investment projects, with or without TA, or other). | For Africa, consider the outcome of the postcompact review process regarding the consistency and coherence of the proposed investment activities. For non-Africa, assessed more explicitly against alignment to the GAFSP Framework Document (raising agricultural productivity, linking farmers to markets, reducing risk and vulnerability, improving nonfarm rural livelihoods, and technical assistance, institution building, and capacity development). In addition, assessed against linkage with the overall country strategy and investment plan for the <del>sec</del> likely environmental and financial sustainability, integration of gender equality, and strength of co-ordination arrangements among entities responsible for delivery. |  |
| 2.3 Amount of financing  | Prioritized US\$ amount (by activity) requested from the GAFSP Trust  | Assessed against the expected results, available Trust Fund resources, and  |  |

requested

Fund, the basis for indicative cost estimates, linkages with other cofinancing sources and its





## ANNEX 3: Country Guidelines for Public Sector Window Proposals

### 1. Eligible Countries

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

| Africa<br>(35 countries) |         | East Asia<br>(9 countries) | ECA<br>(4 countries) | Latin America<br>(4 countries) | MENA<br>(2 countries) | South Asia<br>(6 countries) |
|--------------------------|---------|----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Angola                   | Lesotho | Cambodia                   | Kosovo               | Guyana                         | Djibouti              | Afghanistan                 |
| Benin                    | Liberia | Kiribati                   | Kyrgyz Rep.          | Haiti                          | Yemen                 |                             |

Performance Scores, as a proxy for sectoral policies, will be used to assess differences in country policy environments. Supplementary policy information will be provided in the individual country proposals.

- x Country Readiness Much of the country readiness assessment will be through the individual country proposals. For African countries, completion of a Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) post-compact investment plan, with a subsequent CAADP technical review report will be used to reflect country readiness. For African countries the completion of a comprehensive agricultural development strategy and investment plan that has undergone a technical review, covering similar technical aspects as the CAADP reviews (reflected in the last column of the Annex 1 table on “Part 1: Summary of Overall Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and Associated Investment Plan”) will be used to assess readiness. It is expected that evidence of an independent and thorough peer review of the investment plan, comparable to that provided by a CAADP Post-compact technical review report, be included with the non-African country submissions. This will be required to ensure that the bar for readiness is not higher or lower for any geographic region. Supplementary information on the CAADP technical review process can be found at:  
<http://www.nepad-caadp.net/pdf/POST%20COMPACT%20GUIDELINE%20English.pdf>  
[http://www.nepad-caadp.net/pdf/POST%20COMPACT%20GUIDELINE%20\\_French.pdf](http://www.nepad-caadp.net/pdf/POST%20COMPACT%20GUIDELINE%20_French.pdf)

### 3. Outline of Public Window Proposals from Eligible Countries

4. Two part proposal Country proposals will have two parts (see Annex 1 for more details): Part 1 summarizes the country’s overall agriculture and food security strategy and associated investment plan. In the case of African countries that have prepared a CAADP-post-compact investment plan, with a subsequent CAADP technical review report, the first part will simply summarize the outcome of that process. Part 2 details the specific proposal for GAFSP financing. While the GAFSP process is not intended to provide an in-depth judgment on all aspects of a country’s entire agriculture and food security strategy and investment plan, it will provide sufficient assessment to assist the GAFSP Steering Committee to give priority to specific GAFSP proposals that are part of a clear, coherent, appropriately scaled, and inclusive strategy and investment plan.

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

6. Available resources Available resources in the GAFSP Trust Fund for 2010 are approximately \$350 million which will likely be allocated to 7 to 10 proposals among those submitted by eligible countries. More resources are likely to be available for 2011. In addition, in order to better guide Steering Committee decisions, please prioritize the investment financing requests as required by the document template (Annex 1), as perhaps only part of the request may be financed by the Trust Fund given the limited resources available.

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

8. Language of proposal English is the operational language of GAFSP, thus submissions are expected in English. In exceptional cases, the Steering Committee may allow countries to submit documents in other languages, to be decided on a case by case basis.

#### Proposal submission

9. Submission from Ministry of Finance Finance Ministries of eligible countries should submit GAFSP proposals to the GAFSP Coordination Unit (GAFSPCoord@worldbank.org). Every proposal should be signed by the Minister of Finance as well as at least one of the relevant technical ministries (e.g agriculture, rural development, social welfare, environment/natural resource management etc.) and

## Annex 1

### Sections and Content Guide for the GAFSP Request

| Part 1 Summary of Overall Agriculture and Food Security Strategy and Associated Investment Plan [about 75 pages] |  |   |                         |
|--|--|---|-------------------------|
| Section  | Content  | How this will be assessed by the GAFSP Steering Committee |                         |
|  |  |   | Aspects to be reviewed: |
| 1.1 Objectives and indicators  | Clearly state the overall agriculture and food security strategy objectives and associated investment plan, with monitorable indicators. |   |                         |

For African countries:  
Review CAADP Post  
compact Technical Review

| Part 2 Specific proposal for GAFSP financing [about 105 pages]  |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| Section   | Content   | How this will be assessed by the GAFSP Steering Committee   |
| 2.1 Specific objectives and targeted results (disaggregated by gender [targeted vulnerable groups], and number of targeted beneficiaries) | Clarity on the specific objectives, expected results including by gender, target beneficiaries of the specific proposal, and how it links with the overall sector strategy and investment plan. Clarify how the objectives will integrate gender equality, governance and environmental sustainability (including climate change adaptation and mitigation if applicable). Specify the M&E framework to be used to assess progress on these objectives.   | Assessed against the objectives of the GAFSP Framework Document (including its results framework), including the emphasis on women and smallholders. Proposals with a stronger results/M&E framework and an integration of gender equality and environmental sustainability will be given priority.   |
| 2.2 Activities to be financed   | Activities to be financed, and linkage with the overall sector strategy and investment plan, and the scope of the GAFSP framework document (and for Africa, the links with the four technical pillars of CAADP), and the environmental sustainability. Reasons these activities were selected. Government ministries, and other entities responsible for delivery. Expected sustainability of proposed activities following GAFSP financing. Modality of financing (Investment projects, with or without TA, or other). | For Africa, assessed against alignment to the four technical pillars of CAADP, which all overlap with the scope of the GAFSP framework document. For non-Africa, assessed more explicitly against alignment to the GAFSP Framework Document (raising agricultural productivity, linking farmers to markets, reducing risk and vulnerability, improving non-farm rural livelihoods, and technical assistance, institution building, and capacity development). In addition, assessed against linkage with the overall country strategy and investment plan for the sector, likely environmental and financial sustainability, integration of gender equality, and strength of coordination arrangements among entities responsible for delivery. |
| 2.3 Amount of financing requested   | Prioritized US\$ amount (by activity) requested from the GAFSP Trust Fund, the basis for indicative cost estimates, linkages with other cofinancing sources and its comparable size relative to the cost of the country's overall investment plan (prioritization will be important to guide allocation if Trust Fund resources are not available to finance the total request).  | Assessed against the expected results, available Trust Fund resources, and confirmation that other local donor financing is not available (to ensure GAFSP funds are additional and not displacing other donor support). Assess cost estimates, likely at a broad programmatic level, to avoid duplication of effort in subsequent and more detailed design and appraisal by selected supervising entities (MDBs, and IFAD).  |
| 2.4 Preferred supervising entity  | Preferred supervising entity (African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank, or IFAD) with associated reasons. Countries may select entities other than the above to assist in design and implementation, but they will need to be agreed to by the supervising entity.   | Stronger consideration will be given to country preferences, together with an additional assessment against comparative advantage of supervising entities, considerations of safeguard policies (e.g. environment and governance), leveraging of MDB resources, and historical relations with the recipient country.  |
| 2.5 Time frame of proposed support  | Expected duration of the proposed activities.   | Assessed against the expected life of the GAFSP Trust Fund (currently to end 2019) and the country's agriculture and food security strategy.  |

