



**RESEARCH  
PROGRAM ON  
Agriculture for  
Nutrition  
and Health**

LED BY **IFPRI** 

**PERFORMANCE REPORT**

**2012**

**SUBMITTED TO THE CONSORTIUM**

**MAY 2013**

## **CGIAR RESEARCH PROGRAM ON AGRICULTURE FOR NUTRITION AND HEALTH (A4NH) PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT FOR 2012**

### **A. Key Messages (1 ½ page)**

Improving nutrition and health through agriculture is a new commitment of the CGIAR. To help meet this commitment, [A4NH](#) is initiating new partnerships across sectors with development implementers, development banks, private sector organizations, public-private partnerships and business schools while expanding its current partnerships with development implementers and research partners. The A4NH program is designed to innovate, expand, and integrate existing CGIAR efforts, such as biofortification, nutrition evaluations, food safety and zoonoses research and others. It works to enhance the nutritional benefits of food through improving availability, access and utilization of highly nutritious foods (Theme on enhancing nutrition in value chains) and micronutrient-enhanced staples (Theme on biofortification) with key agriculture, nutrition and health (ANH) research and development actors. It also seeks to mitigate the health risks associated with agriculture (Theme on agriculture-associated diseases). Beyond these agriculture for health strategies, A4NH also links closely with program implementers and policy makers in enhancing the performance of integrated, cross-sectoral efforts to improve nutrition and health outcomes (Theme on integrated ANH programs and policies).

A4NH works through three impact pathways 1) Value chains, 2) Integrated agriculture, nutrition and health (ANH) programs, and 3) Policies. Our value chain research brings a new emphasis on consumption and the challenges of quality, safety, price and supply of highly nutritious foods to infants, young children and pregnant women. Both the integrated ANH programs and policies pathways provide a new perspective on integrating agriculture and food systems with health care, gender empowerment, poverty support and other promoters of better nutrition and health. From 2010-2012, an expanded portfolio of nutrition evaluation research was assembled so that a stream of urgently needed evidence on what works to improve nutrition in integrated programs will be available in the next 3-5 years. In addition, in collaboration with the CRPs on Maize and Grain Legumes, A4NH is bringing together CIMMYT, ICRISAT, IFPRI, IITA and ILRI scientists, to [coordinate research planning](#) on aflatoxins, a crucial food safety and health issue that will be greatly expanded in the next few years.

In 2012, A4NH focused on coordinating and investing in a portfolio of ANH research. We will highlight two key achievements: one in biofortification and the second in the prevention and control of agriculture-associated diseases. Within its development phase (2009-13), [HarvestPlus](#) has become an internationally recognized brand in the provision of high-yielding micro-nutrient (vitamin A, iron and zinc) enhanced varieties of staple crops. Success requires combining: 1) the official release by national authorities or commercialization of top-yielding varieties with high-levels of micronutrients; 2) establishment of nutritional efficacy and bioavailability; and 3) ex-ante studies of acceptability and feasibility prior to scaling up efforts. In 2012, three biofortified crops in four countries met these criteria. One example is [high-iron pearl millet](#), which has been commercialized in Maharashtra State of India. Researchers and partners developed these varieties and tested them in [multi-location trials](#). Nutrition research measured the retention and bioavailability of the iron in pearl millet under typical processing, storage, and cooking practices. The bioavailability study in 2-3 year old Indian children showed significantly more iron absorption than from control varieties (7.4% vs. 4.5%). Initial results from a

nutritional efficacy trial completed in May 2012 are promising. An ex-ante varietal adoption study in Maharashtra provided detailed information to develop delivery plans. A consumer acceptance study indicated they would be willing to pay about 30% more for the high-iron variety. A high-iron pearl millet variety was commercialized by Nirmal Seeds, Ltd. and when officially released, high-iron varieties will also be sold by the Maharashtra State Seeds Corporation. Follow-up studies of 30,000 households who grew the biofortified pearl millet will be used to further refine delivery plans.

The second important research success in 2012 was in the area of detection and prioritization of zoonotic and emerging diseases. Researchers developed a novel approach to identify countries where both poverty and three groups of zoonoses – endemic, outbreak or epidemic, and emerging – are concentrated. The [report](#) ranked the 13 most important zoonotic diseases linked to human morbidity and mortality and showed how zoonotic diseases pose a major obstacle in pathways out of poverty for the world’s poor livestock keepers. The research results will inform a new research program by DFID and other UK research granting agencies on research priorities for reducing disease transmission in emerging livestock systems that will bring the greatest benefits to the poor. Also in 2012, the zoonoses program, with partners in Kenya, completed a pathogen sequencing, bio-informatics and bio-repository system for detection of emerging [zoonoses](#). This platform allowed for screening of several Rift Valley fever (RVF) and other arbo-virus isolates using sequencing linked to bio-informatics processing and provision of viral sequences to molecular databases. Sequence information is then linked to information on outbreak early-warning and response systems used by the Kenyan government veterinary and public health services.

#### Financial Summary – 2012

2012 Financial Summary in (USD millions)	Planned expenditure (as per PIA budget)	Actual Expenditure	Variance from PIA budget (%)
Total Expenditure	58.8	60.9	3%
Window 1 / 2 (\$1 million from W1 and \$16.2 million from W2)	17.2	9.1	-47%
Window 3 / Bilateral	41.6	51.8	20%
Gender research expenditure (estimated)	N/A	5	N/A

Overall activity and total expenditure were higher (3%) than originally planned. The restricted grants expenditure was higher (20%) and Window 1 and 2 funding expenditure was lower (-47%). Window 1 and 2 funds represented only 15% of total expenditure. The average estimated expenditure in gender related research is \$5M based on the methodology in our gender strategy. In 2013, there will be a significant increase in expenditure of unspent and new funds as new staff members have been recruited and Center research teams and management systems are in place. Major increases in both income and expenditure from Window 2 are expected in 2013. We plan to increase expenditure, as foreseen in the proposal, on partnerships and capacity building, and research in biofortification, nutrition-sensitive value chains, aflatoxins, policy and gender.

## **B. Impact Pathway and Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs) (1/4 page)**

In 2012, we used impact pathways developed in the approved research proposal. In 2013, a more detailed [A4NH strategic results framework](#) and then evaluation plan will be developed. Within the overall CGIAR portfolio, we will clarify the linkages between A4NH and nutrition and health outcomes in other CRPs.

Given the range of research, there are a variety of baseline data and evaluative approaches used. Global estimates of malnutrition (stunting) and under-5 mortality in children from agriculture-associated diseases help to prioritize our target regions in Africa and South Asia. Within the regions, it is only possible to focus on a few countries. Bangladesh is our initial focus country; a large baseline study was conducted in 2012 and datasets are now being finalized and assessed. Within individual research Themes, baseline data and evaluation processes are at different stages. For biofortification, adoption plans for new varieties are well established and being monitored. For value chains, new baseline data will be assembled in collaboration with other CRPs and partners working on value chain arrangements, with the intention of identifying opportunities to enhance nutritional quality and food safety along strategic value chains. Baseline data collection for food safety in five livestock and fish value chains using integrated, participatory methods with the CRP on Livestock and Fish is on-going. For zoonoses risk, an innovative [prioritization study](#) provided initial prevalence estimates for zoonoses to guide further efforts. Recent reviews of the links between agriculture and nutrition highlight poor study design and weak evidence. In the [A4NH portfolio](#), rigorous theories of change and baseline data have been developed for all assessments of integrated ANH programs. Within the policies portfolio, new baseline information from two policy reviews is planned.

## **C. Progress along the Impact Pathway**

### **C.1 Narrative of major achievements, by Theme (1 ½ pages)**

There are four A4NH Themes contributing to three impact pathways. Theme 1: [Enhancing nutrition in value chains](#) and Theme 4: [Integrated ANH Programs and Policies](#) each links to a corresponding impact pathway, value chains and integrated ANH programs, respectively. Theme 2: [Biofortification](#) and Theme 3: [Agriculture-Associated Diseases](#) work through all three impact pathways, linking as appropriate with the other Themes. Research is most advanced for biofortification, agriculture-associated diseases and the integrated ANH programs and policies themes.

### **Theme 1: Enhancing nutrition in value chains (Linked to the value chain impact pathway)**

Research on nutrition-sensitive value chains for improving diet quality is new. It extends CGIAR research on input supply, farm productivity and local post-farm processing and marketing to place greater emphasis on consumer demand and behavior, particularly for poor people. Diet quality, particularly for infants and young children, will require highly nutritious foods (e.g. animal source foods (ASF) and fruits and vegetables) and/or biofortified/fortified staples. [Partnerships](#) are critical. A4NH research builds on and complements value chain research in other CRPs and by development partners. It also links to the food industry (processing, manufacturing, and marketing) through public-private partnerships, business schools and other intermediaries. In 2012, we recruited a research leader, established a cross-Center working group, and initiated several new partnerships with public and private partners. In 2012, value chain assessment research was conducted for some traditional and ASF value chains (see Annex 1). By 2015, we seek to expand the portfolio and establish more systematic and rigorous assessment approaches across the range of food value chains with greatest potential to improve diet quality of the poor. Past evidence shows that gender is a critical factor; if ignored, worse nutrition and health outcomes often result (Section D).

## **Theme 2: Biofortification (Linked to the value chain, programs, and policies impact pathways)**

Biofortification research is well established with a [clearly described impact pathway](#). In 2013, the HarvestPlus team will finish its second, five-year development phase, which includes the development and release of high micronutrient varieties of staple crops, rigorous evaluation of their nutritional efficacy and ex-ante studies of market feasibility and plans for scaling up. Across all research lines, detailed management plans are developed and tracked with implementing partners. Plans are being developed for delivery at scale in eight target countries by 2018.

In 2012, nine new biofortified varieties were released (or commercialized) in three countries (three maize varieties in Zambia; five bean varieties in Rwanda; one pearl millet variety in India); nutritional efficacy studies were completed for vitamin A and iron crops; impact research laid the foundation for delivery in new countries; and farmers' feedback has been gathered in countries where delivery is underway. Globally, submissions to Codex Alimentarius on defining biofortification should enable harmonized regulation. Biofortified crops were delivered to about 200,000 farmers in 2012 (30,000 farmers in India received high-iron pearl millet; 140,000 farmers in Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of Congo received high-iron beans; and 20,000 farmers in Uganda received orange-fleshed sweet potato and high-iron beans). In 2012, germplasm multiplication was scaled up for widespread delivery of vitamin A cassava and vitamin A maize in 2013. Breeding programs have a detailed development pipeline for new varieties.

## **Theme 3: Agriculture-Associated Diseases (Linked to the value chain, programs, and policies impact pathways)**

Research in Theme 3 progresses through three stages: disease prioritization, understanding of disease dynamics and designing and evaluating risk-mitigation. Progress was made across all research stages. Within disease prioritization, as previously mentioned, a zoonotic disease prioritization [technical report](#) provided a new method for estimating disease prevalence and linking these to livestock and poverty data. Theme 3 has selected two prototype diseases – RVF and cysticercosis. Progress in 2012 included impact prioritization of human RVF using a [Disability Adjusted Life Year](#) (DALY) approach and an arbo-virus [discovery platform](#), which provides new information to support on-going decision support to the Kenyan public health and veterinary departments. Furthermore, improved [field diagnostics](#) and new characterization of [cysticercosis risk](#) contribute to progress in improving the management of this disease. A portfolio of food safety assessments in ASF value chains with the CRP on Livestock and Fish was launched in 2012. Guidelines, tools, hazards, and risks in value chains will be made available in 2013 to improve understanding of food-borne disease dynamics. Key issues for food safety in informal, short value chains, including the role of gender and testing social innovations, were synthesized in a [special journal issue](#). An important [policy forum](#) was held in Vietnam bringing together researchers and decision makers from the pig sectors of India, East Africa, Asia and Australia on how public health innovations can best be implemented to mitigate risk. Pig value chains are of particular interest for both food safety and potential for emerging viral diseases from bats. Finally, A4NH and the CRPs on Maize and Grain Legumes plan to expand research on aflatoxin health and market risks and their mitigation. In 2012, a meeting of [CGIAR aflatoxin research](#) leaders was held to coordinate research efforts and identify research gaps. This process will add value in the application of new aflatoxin risk-reducing technologies such as aflasafe™ (led by IITA and partners) and grain storage bags (CIMMYT and partners) with diagnostics tools by ICRISAT, ILRI and others.

#### **Theme 4: Integrated ANH Programs and Policies (Linked to the program and policy pathways)**

This theme has two mutually reinforcing sub-themes. One supports and evaluates integrated program implementation. The second provides evidence to support policy and investment decisions. The [evaluation portfolio](#) of integrated programs covers a range of interventions to improve nutrition outcomes from nutrition-specific, like [Alive and Thrive](#) and Preventing Malnutrition in Children under Two ([PM2A](#)), through nutrition-sensitive, like [Realigning Agriculture to Improve Nutrition \(RAIN\)](#) and Helen Keller International's (HKI) [homestead food production programs](#) (primarily agriculture but integrated with health care, gender and poverty support). For each evaluation, a detailed [theory of change](#) is developed and the process is evaluated with partners and integrated with subsequent impact evaluation. In 2012, baseline reports and process evaluations were conducted in an integrated agriculture and health program in Zambia (with Concern Worldwide) and process evaluations and endline surveys in Burkina Faso (with HKI). Evaluations of nutrition-specific interventions in the Alive and Thrive and PM2A programs included designing and conducting process evaluations, collecting cost data and reporting on baseline survey results. These evaluations are progressing as planned to incrementally provide needed evidence over the next 2-5 years.

New research on policy platforms is beginning with a variety of partners within the [Transform Nutrition, Partnerships and Opportunities to Strengthen and Harmonize Actions for Nutrition in India \(POSHAN\)](#) and [Leveraging Agriculture for Nutrition in South Asia \(LANSA\)](#) projects. Activities include policy and evidence reviews, stakeholder mapping, and studies of services provisions and social protections. In 2012, the [Tackling the Agriculture Nutrition Disconnect in India \(TANDI\)](#) project produced important [policy briefs](#) on how the agriculture sector can become pro-nutrition. Also in 2012, Bioversity, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and partners produced a policy advocacy [publication on sustainable diets](#) and launched a four country program looking at biodiversity and nutrition, supported by the Global Environment Fund (GEF).

#### **C.2 Progress towards outputs (1 ½ page)**

Progress varies, depending on the stage of research in the different Themes. **Theme 1: Nutrition-Sensitive Value Chains**, is the newest Theme. In 2012, most of the efforts were in planning and establishing priorities. There will be increasing outputs in subsequent years.

In **Theme 2: Biofortification**, a variety of research outputs, necessary for delivering products, from breeding, diagnostics, nutritional efficacy and ex-ante consumer demand were completed. Some highlights (with additional details in the embedded links) include:

- **Release of high-yielding micronutrient enhanced varieties** – three varieties of vitamin A maize and five varieties of high-iron bean were [released in 2012](#).
- **New high-throughput, low-cost methods developed and tested to measure vitamins and minerals in staple crops** - a new technology called [x-ray fluorescence analysis \(XRF\)](#), used for mineral determination in mining, was adapted for analysis of minerals in crops in a number of Centers. This technology has now been deployed to National Agricultural Research System (NARS) breeding partners in four countries; staff training is ongoing.
- **Evidence of nutritional efficacy and bioavailability (crops and foods)** – research studies of nutritional efficacy of [orange-fleshed sweet potatoes](#) and vitamin A maize were published in 2012. Bioavailability studies of carotenoids (provitamin A) for [cassava](#), [bananas and plantains](#) and for [iron in beans and iron and zinc in wheat](#) were published. Large scale efficacy studies for vitamin A maize in Zambia and iron pearl millet in India were completed in 2012 and will be reported in 2013.

- **Consumer acceptance and pilot dissemination studies** – In 2012, a consumer acceptance study was carried out for high-iron pearl millet in India. Consumers preferred products made from the high-iron pearl millet variety, and when given nutrition information, were willing to pay about 30% more. A discrete choice experiment for [willingness to pay](#) for vitamin A maize in Zambia was also published.

Within **Theme 3: Agriculture-Associated Diseases**, a variety of outputs from diagnostic tests to prioritization methodologies, disease burden estimates and a special journal issue compiling food safety studies in informal value chains were produced.

- **Aflatoxin diagnostics** - A low-cost aflatoxin detection kit, developed by ICRISAT was promoted in Niger, Mali and Nigeria in 2012. Training manuals and brochures were developed in 2012 and will be used in 2013 to conduct hands-on training programs for research personnel from Asia and sub-Saharan Africa to promote effective use of the diagnostic assay in detecting and managing aflatoxin contamination in crops.
- **Prioritization of zoonoses** - An important output, widely publicized, was the [report on priority zoonoses](#) in low income countries linked to poverty and livestock systems. This report prioritized highest prevalence zoonoses and also the geographic regions and countries for initial actions.
- **Disease burden estimates of RVF** – a [comprehensive global burden of disease study](#) included estimates of RVF DALY loss from an ILRI and partner team.
- **Zoonoses and food safety in informal markets** – [a special journal issue](#), brought together a number of studies on urban zoonotic disease risk and food safety including differential gender risk and risk reduction using social innovations.

Key highlights from **Theme 4: Integrated ANH Programs and Policies** included:

- **Dietary assessment methods** – a number of publications on [household consumption and expenditure surveys](#) for household nutrition evaluation were produced.
- **Sustainable diets** – FAO and Bioversity have been collaborating on developing the concept and framework for sustainable diets. A [major publication](#) was released in 2012.
- Anticipating the growing impact of the **dietary transition and obesity** in low- and middle-income countries, IFPRI and partners contributed to a [systematic review](#) and an [assessment of e-learning devices](#).
- A number of publications highlighting the context and drivers for persistent high levels of **malnutrition in India** were released as part of [TANDI](#). An important [policy brief](#), summarizing key actions for decision makers was produced.
- **Evaluations of integrated agriculture and health care programs** to improve diets and reduce anemia – initial results were reported on randomized trials in Burkina Faso in 2012. Scaled up interventions are planned for other countries in West Africa (Senegal, Côte d'Ivoire and Mali) and in Tanzania over the next few years.
- **Evaluations of nutrition-specific interventions** – rigorous evaluations of nutrition-specific interventions by development implementers are being conducted. Key outputs include reports on process theory of change to guide process and impact evaluations. Examples include baseline reports for [Burundi](#) with Mercy Corps and the Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance-2 project (FANTA-2) and lessons learned from scaling up programs in Bangladesh with BRAC.
- **Agriculture and nutrition linkages** – evidence reviews from three countries – Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Bangladesh – were released as part of LANSAs, providing much-needed context-specific work on the evidence and missing links needed to characterize the pathways between agriculture and improved nutrition.

### **C.3 Progress towards the achievement of outcomes (1 ½ page)**

In our assessment of outcomes, we highlight examples in which ANH research has resulted in: capacity change (changes in knowledge, attitudes, and skills); practice change; or changes in the enabling environment.

#### **Capacity and practice change**

- National breeding programs in seven target countries continue to be highly involved in breeding biofortified crops and regularly interface with the CGIAR Centers providing biofortified parent material; thirteen varieties were released in 2012 and several varieties of high-zinc wheat, high-zinc rice, and provitamin A cassava (2<sup>nd</sup> wave) are in national registration trials. Capacities of national breeding program staff have been strengthened through training on new technologies, such as XRF (mineral) and iCheck (provitamin A) measurement tools.
- NGOs, such as Amassa Afrique Verte, have been supported and have built their capacity in groundnut processing. The Aga Khan Foundation with support from ICRISAT trained more than 1000 women in aflatoxin management, such as pre- and post-harvest techniques and product handling in West Africa.
- In Nigeria, the National Agricultural Extension and Research Liaison Services (NAERLS) has been supported by IITA in its activities to promote the proper use of this technology through the development of training materials and the training of farmers and extension agents through workshops and practical demonstrations. Training materials and events focused on basic information on aflatoxins, instruction on aflasafe™ application in the field, and soil and grain sampling protocols (to evaluate efficacy of biocontrol). The agreement with NAERLS to train 100 extension agents working in public and private agricultural establishments included a second level of training where trained extension agents imparted knowledge about aflatoxin and its management to more than 25,000 farmers in Nigeria.
- Supporting veterinary and public health partners with molecular diagnostics capacity is critical to their capacity to detect and monitor changes in pathogen populations due to the intensification of agriculture and rapid changes in ecosystems. In Kenya, veterinary, wildlife and public health authorities have been supported to track the emergence of RVF through a pathogen detection platform at the ILRI campus. This platform integrates sample collection and management, a bio-repository, sequencing, bio-informatics and reporting systems. In addition to arbo-virus detection in Kenya, these technologies have been used to provide sequencing information to support Onderstepoort Veterinary Institute in South Africa in developing and validating its molecular diagnostics for zoonotic disease outbreaks. New zoonotic outbreaks are an increasing concern in intensifying smallholder and pastoral systems across Africa.

#### **Changes in the enabling environment**

- Agriculture and policy makers from other sectors have been slow to include nutrition in their policies and strategies. However, for orange-fleshed sweet potato, high-iron bean, and high-iron pearl millet in Rwanda, India, and Nigeria, nutritional efficacy evidence from clinical trials is making a difference. Biofortification has been included in the draft national nutrition strategy for Rwanda, and discussions are underway for including biofortification in Nigerian food and nutrition guidelines. In Zambia, biofortification is included in the CAADP draft investment plan. At international level, background documents have been prepared through Codex Alimentarius to develop an international standard for labeling food products produced using biofortification by conventional breeding.
- By using the cost-effective diagnostic assay, ICRISAT's aflatoxin diagnostic laboratory in West and Central Africa analyzed groundnut samples in Mali and Niger for the World Food Programme (WFP) to ensure that the locally-produced Plumpy'nut® product is free of aflatoxin.



- In India, the IFPRI team is an integral part of the Indian nutrition coalition. It helped the nutrition coalition organize a meeting with its partners in June 2012, in which results from the TANDI and POSHAN projects were discussed with Indian ministries and the planning commission to inform new government plans for improving nutrition outcomes. In 2012, Abt Associates, commissioned by The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, reviewed HarvestPlus' progress in achieving outcomes through their research and development impact pathway. On research progress they noted "advances in knowledge of metabolism, bioavailability, biomarkers, functional indicators, and algorithms to predict biological impact based on the diet composition. It has also created tools and procedures to assess nutritional status of iron, zinc, and provitamin A in populations. These achievements are the result of HarvestPlus' interactions with the researchers doing the most important work on these three micronutrients worldwide. At the same time it has enhanced the technical abilities, professional involvement, and enthusiastic commitment of local partners in the countries that have been selected as targets of the interventions."
- On evaluations of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions, researchers work closely with program implementers to develop program theories of change and rigorously test these. One example is the collaboration with BRAC on a nutrition-specific community trial in Bangladesh, in which a detailed program theory of change was evaluated and adjustments to the program implementation made.

#### **C.4 Progress towards Impact (1/4 page)**

Detailed impact pathways and program theories have been developed for biofortification and for nutrition-specific interventions. Two 2012 highlights from adoption tracking were:

- Multiplication of seeds and planting material led to biofortified crops being grown by more than 200,000 smallholder households in seven low-income countries in 2012 with clear plans for rapid adoption increase to come. Delivery partnerships with the public and private sector continue to be developed, and adoption rates associated with those will be measured beginning in 2014.
- In the case of orange-fleshed sweet potato in Bangladesh, CIP has empowered more than 2500 farmers, nearly half of whom are women, to plant orange-flesh sweet potato vines as their primary crop in order to sell vines to other interested farmers.

#### **D. GENDER RESEARCH ACHIEVEMENTS (1 page)**

The [A4NH Gender Strategy](#) was developed and submitted in November 2012 and has been approved by the Consortium Office. In A4NH, gender research is integral to its overall research plan. Specific gender objectives have been developed for each of the four research themes and gender considerations included in the three impact pathways and theory of change. As with other research progress, achievements in gender research are greatest in more mature research areas.

Biofortification explicitly targets the nutritional needs of women and children; nutritional efficacy is tested for women and children, and biofortification targets the micronutrient deficiencies – iron-deficiency anemia, vitamin A deficiency, and zinc deficiency – for which deficiency rates are highest among children and women. However, delivery often reaches populations at the household level. To better target the delivery of biofortified crops and understand their potential impact, HarvestPlus has conducted varietal adoption studies in each of its target countries and completed the final study for Nigeria in 2012. Results from these studies provide insights into household decision making, seed variety dissemination, and labor practices, which inform the delivery strategies in target countries. For

example, when delivering orange-fleshed sweet potato and high-iron beans in Uganda, delivery and nutrition trainings are targeted to women and caretakers of children. In other contexts, such as the delivery of high-iron pearl millet in India, training and information targets both men and women, emphasizing the agronomic superiority of the high-iron pearl millet variety as well as its nutritional attributes.

The agriculture-associated disease research included gender research objectives and gender disaggregated data collection in all projects in 2012. Gender research seeks to understand the differential risks of men and women to disease. In 2012, [a paper](#) assessing differential gender knowledge, attitudes, practices and risks for cryptosporidiosis was published. In addition, food safety assessments in informal markets in which 11 studies focused on products which are mainly managed by women (poultry, smoked fish, milk in West Africa, processed meat) were completed. Another gender research objective is that women have increased capacity to manage risk. In Nigeria, [a study](#) of food safety indicators across butchers' associations showed that female butchers had better food safety practices, better quality of meat, and there was less gastro-intestinal illness among the people who consumed this meat compared to male butchers.

Gender research is well integrated into the research and program theories of change in the integrated ANH programs Theme. It is well understood that empowering women improves nutrition outcomes for infants and young children, in particular, and this has been highlighted as one of the [key results](#) in analyses within TANDI. Major progress in more widespread assessments of women's empowerment was made in 2012 with the publishing of the [Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index](#) (WEAI) with important contributions from IFPRI researchers working in A4NH and the CRP on Policies, Institutions and Markets (PIM). An [analysis](#) of the importance of women's empowerment in child nutrition outcomes was published in 2012.

#### **D.1 Gender equality targets defined**

In 2012, the [A4NH Gender Strategy](#) established objectives of our gender research, which are integral to the achievement of improved nutrition and health outcomes. An initial evaluation plan was described. In 2013, impact pathways and theory of change for nutrition and health outcomes for A4NH will be further developed, with indicators, and a more detailed evaluation plan developed.

#### **D.2 Institutional architecture for gender mainstreaming in place (integration of gender across the research cycle)**

In 2012, we conducted an initial baseline survey of research projects within A4NH (see [A4NH Gender Strategy](#) pp 18-20) as to their attention to gender across the research cycle. Initial weaknesses in gender research were noted in the involvement of men and women in the innovation process, a gender-responsive M&E, and impact assessment system. An analysis across the A4NH research portfolio, noted three main categories of gender research integration currently present:

1. Minimal gender research integration – often only collection of gender disaggregated data
2. Specific gender research hypothesis formulated and tested and gender disaggregated data collected and analyzed
3. Gender research integrated into overall research.

In 2013, gender capacity development activities will focus on strengthening research in categories 1 and 2.

#### **E. PARTNERSHIP BUILDING ACHIEVEMENTS (1/2 page)**

Partnerships are essential to A4NH success. Working across ANH communities requires contributions from very different groups and skills in integrating them. Impact-oriented research demands collaboration with partners who can translate research knowledge and technologies into benefits at scale. In 2012, A4NH developed and shared our partnership strategy, [Agriculture for Nutrition and Health – Strategies and Principles for Transformative Partnerships](#). A number of comments were received and incorporated. At the Second Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development (GCARD2), A4NH participated in three partnership events: 1) one convened with partners on regional strategies (Africa - Senegal, South Asia – Public Health Foundation of India and Latin America -Embrapa); 2) one on gender and nutrition with the Global Donor Platform; and 3) one parallel session in which A4NH partnerships for scaling up were presented and discussed. We will revise our partnership strategy as we develop the A4NH strategic results framework in 2013.

At present, there is strong interest globally in linking nutrition and health goals to agriculture research and development. Translation to country investment plans is weaker and more variable. The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) process and country investment plans provide an opportunity for strengthening these linkages. A4NH participates in the African Union – New Partnership for Africa’s Development (AU-NEPAD) meetings of CAADP to strengthen agriculture-nutrition linkages, including the adoption of biofortified crops. For food safety, efforts are catalyzed by regional champions working with RECs and countries in East, West and southern Africa. For South Asia, the LANSa project, coordinated by the MS Swaminathan Foundation, is a partnership bringing together key partners. Major partnership agreements also exist with BRAC (across all A4NH themes), the Public Health Foundation of India, the Nutrition Coalition (India) and many other groups. For Latin America, A4NH and HarvestPlus regional and national biofortification and diet quality programs are coordinated by Embrapa and bring together all CGIAR Centers based in the region with national partners.

Early partnership efforts are focusing on scaling up. We are building on strong partnerships with development implementers such as [Helen Keller International](#), [Concern Worldwide](#) and [BRAC](#). For scaling up biofortified crops, HarvestPlus has developed a partnership with [World Vision](#). The World Food Programme is an important mechanism for public distribution of foods and there is engagement around biofortified crops and nutritional evaluations of food, food voucher and cash transfer programs with PIM. Development banks are committed to improving the nutrition and health outcomes from their agriculture and rural development programs. A4NH is an active member of the World Bank’s [SecureNutrition Platform](#) and is in discussions with IFAD on collaboration for enhancing the nutrition and health outcomes of IFAD’s program portfolio. There are many individual research collaborations between A4NH research teams and universities. Beyond those, A4NH actively supports the [Agri-Health research network](#) and is actively working in regional networks such as the [Ecohealth Resource Centers](#) at Chiang Mai University (Thailand) and University of Gadjah Mada (Indonesia). Partnerships with the private sector are critical for scaling up, but challenging for nutrition outcomes. HarvestPlus works closely with [seed companies](#) in the adoption of biofortified maize and pearl millet. For agri-food private sector links we have established an MOU and working relationship with GAIN, a public-private partnership, and have worked closely with the business school at [McGill University](#) on integrating agricultural, business and social innovation.

#### **F. CAPACITY BUILDING (1/2 page)**

Together with partnerships, capacity building is and will be increasingly strategically aligned with our impact pathways. However, given the novelty of the ANH research agenda, we also plan to work closely with and support networks of academic institutions, like the [Agri-Health network](#) supported by the

Leverhulme Center for Integrative Research on Agriculture and Health (LCIRAH) doing research and capacity building across these research areas. Some highlights of large capacity building initiatives in 2012 include:

- **Capacity development in XRF technology with national partners**  
In 2012, [XRF machines](#) were installed at: Rwanda Agricultural Board, Kigali; INERA, Bukavu, DRC; ICRISAT and Directorate of Rice Research (Hyderabad, India), with about 15 technicians trained to use this technology. HarvestPlus and CIMMYT have trained 12 research assistants in Zambia to conduct carotenoid analyses at the Tropical Disease Research Centre (TDRC) and the Zambia Agriculture Research Institute (ZARI), and will continue capacity building in 2013 with inter-laboratory proficiency tests.
- **Germplasm multiplication and delivery of biofortified crops for widespread adoption**  
In Nigeria, over 480 extension agents and facilitators have been trained on multiplication systems, delivery strategies, and monitoring and evaluation in the four target states; additionally, 300 farmers have been trained in rapid multiplication techniques to produce the stems that will be distributed in 2013. In Rwanda, 152 agrodealers were trained in marketing high-iron beans and agronomic skills; 116 seed multipliers were trained on agronomic production techniques for high-iron beans, and 14 extension staff were given a train-the-trainer course on delivery and agronomic production. In India, seed retailers and marketing representatives of Nirmal Seeds, a delivery partner, received training on high-iron pearl millet production and marketing. About 3,300 farmers also received training on the agronomic and health benefits of growing high-iron pearl millet. In Uganda, about 10,000 farmers received training in agronomy and nutrition.
- **Ecosystem approaches to better management of zoonotic emerging infectious diseases**  
The [EcoZD project](#) is building the capacity of more than 100 infectious disease control personnel, NGOs, and researchers in six countries in Southeast Asia to use an EcoHealth approach to augment prevention and control of priority emerging infectious diseases by providing support for coordination of research projects and facilitating learning across countries. In addition, two EcoHealth Resource Centres have developed curriculum, conducted multidisciplinary research with teams of students and faculty, and are well-positioned to serve as resources for information, outreach, and policy engagement for the region.

## **G. RISK MANAGEMENT (less than 1/2 page)**

*Three major risks that may hinder the expected delivery of results and their mitigation:*

1. Partnerships are critical given the cross-sectoral nature of the research and development challenges. Research and development partnerships are complex in the design, implementation and evaluation of integrated programs. The current partnerships with BRAC and HKI serve as good working models. These models include links with health services but further discussions with other health partners are needed. For the value chain and policy impact pathways, there is less experience with partners, particularly in the private sector and with the health sector. The essential early step is to jointly develop the impact pathways and theory of change with open processes for monitoring and evaluation. In Section E, we describe early partnership initiatives. In 2013 and 2014, we plan to work closely with these partners in specifying impact pathways, theories of change and evaluation plans and processes. In these tasks, capacity needs for essential national partners will be identified and plans made to address these.
2. Another benefit of specifying impact pathways and theories of change is in the clarification of expected results. For example, in the value chain pathway, research can expect to inform actions of value chain actors that can lead to improving the availability and access of safe and nutritious foods. A more complex step is how these foods are combined into improved diets. For

mothers and infants, the availability and accessibility of more nutritious foods needs to be integrated with health care to improve diet quality. Reductions in stunting will require yet more complex interventions including water and sanitation, gender empowerment, poverty reduction and social protection. An important goal of A4NH research is to improve our understanding of the context and combinations of interventions required.

3. Performance management and coordination is the third key element of risk management. A4NH involves 11 CGIAR Centers and numerous partners, with a mixture of capacities and experience. A critical task will be to update and implement the monitoring and evaluation system, once the strategic results framework is refined in September 2013. The Program Management Committee and Center Focal Points have made progress in developing a more common understanding of the impact pathways and have agreements in place with milestones. Our experience is that more detailed program theories of change and verification systems are needed for systematic and faster progress.

#### **H. LESSONS LEARNED (1 page)**

The major elements of the approved proposal for A4NH are sound. The impact pathways, key partners and main challenges were described and important research components included. As was expected, the key challenges will be in better specification of impact pathways and in forging an effective and performing research and development partnership with key actors.

The A4NH program has a relatively diverse portfolio. Research activities are how they are managed are well defined for biofortification and the governance and oversight arrangements provided by the Harvest Plus Program Advisory Committee (PAC) have been left in place in 2012. Impact pathways and theories of change are most advanced for the development and adoption of biofortified food staples and for the evaluation of integrated ANH programs to improve nutrition. The pathways developed are based on sound ex-ante studies, a portfolio of complementary research activities and a systematic process of learning.

Other components of the A4NH portfolio are at an earlier stage. For example in the value chain pathways for nutritious and safe foods, we will need to integrate outputs from a variety of CGIAR Center research and other value chains for nutritious foods to promote dietary diversity and quality. Much needs to be learned about how to influence consumer behavior and demand, which will be one of the key contributions of A4NH to value chain research. Globally, this has been identified as a key gap in a [recent review](#) of agriculture-nutrition projects.

Likewise, cross-sectoral policy processes is also a new area of research in which a more systematic learning approach is required and in which more specific initial theories of change are required to plan and implement research. Good progress was made in 2012 in establishing partnerships for this research in the Transform Nutrition and LANSAs projects. These projects have developed initial theories of change as part of their inception documents and we expect to learn much in the next couple of years in how policy processes and other enabling actions can be improved.

## CRP indicators of progress, with glossary and targets

CRPs concerned by this indicator	Indicator	Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator	Deviation narrative (if actual is more than 10% away from target)	2012		2013	2014
				Target (if available for 2012)	Actual	Target	Target
<b>KNOWLEDGE, TOOLS, DATA</b>							
All	1. Number of flagship "products" produced by CRP	These are frameworks and concepts that are significant and complete enough to have been highlighted on web pages, publicized through blog stories, press releases and/or policy briefs. They are significant in that they should be likely to change the way stakeholders along the impact pathway allocate resources and/or implement activities. They should be products that change the way these stakeholders think and act. Tools, decision-support tools, guidelines and/or training manuals are not included in this indicator			6	13	17
All	2. % of flagship products produced that have explicit target of women farmers/NRM managers	The web pages, blog stories, press releases and policy briefs supporting indicator #1 must have an explicit focus on women farmers/NRM managers to be counted			67%	100%	82%
All	3. % of flagship products produced that have been assessed for likely gender-disaggregated impact	Reports/papers describing the products should include a focus on gender-disaggregated impacts if they are to be counted			17%	8%	29%
All	4. Number of "tools" produced by CRP	These are significant decision-support tools, guidelines, and/or training manuals that are significant and complete enough to have been highlighted on web pages, publicized through blog stories, press releases and/or policy briefs. They are significant in that they should be likely to change the way stakeholders along the impact pathway allocate resources and/or implement activities			13*	26	26
All	5. % of tools that have an explicit target of women farmers	The web pages, blog stories, press releases and policy briefs supporting indicator #4 must have an explicit focus on women farmers/NRM managers to be counted			46%	46%	42%
All	6. % of tools assessed for likely gender-disaggregated impact	Reports/papers describing the products should include a focus on gender-disaggregated impacts if they are to be counted			8%	12%	12%
All	7. Number of open access databases maintained by CRP				6*	3	9
All	8. Total number of users of these open access databases				unknown	unknown	unknown
All	9. Number of publications in ISI journals produced by CRP				115	72	73
1,2,3,4,6	10. Number of strategic value chains analyzed by CRP				12	14	7

Note: No. 7 -\* 1= Bioversity International with FAO food composition databases

1= ILRI Azizi biorepository

3=Women's Empowerment in Ag Index for Uganda, Guatemala, Bangladesh (hosted by IFPRI)

1=Global Hunger Index (hosted by IFPRI)

CRPs concerned by this indicator	Indicator	Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator	Deviation narrative (if actual is more than 10% away from target)	2012		2013	2014
				Target (if available for 2012)	Actual	Target	Target
1,5,6,7	11. Number of targeted agro-ecosystems analysed/characterised by CRP	Use the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA) typology of cultivated systems and of forests and woodland systems (MEA, 2005, Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Current State and Trends, Volume 1) to define these agro-ecosystems and specify the regions concerned			N/A	N/A	N/A
1,5,6,7	12. Estimated population of above-mentioned agro-ecosystems				N/A	N/A	N/A
CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT AND INNOVATION							
All	13. Number of trainees in short-term programs facilitated by CRP (male)	The number of individuals to whom significant knowledge or skills have been imparted through interactions that are intentional, structured, and purposed for imparting knowledge or skills should be counted. This includes farmers, ranchers, fishers, and other primary sector producers who receive training in a variety of best practices in productivity, post-harvest management, linking to markets, etc. It also includes rural entrepreneurs, processors, managers and traders receiving training in application of new technologies, business management, linking to markets, etc., and training to extension specialists, researchers, policymakers and others who are engaged in the food, feed and fiber system and natural resources and water management. Include training on climate risk analysis, adaptation, mitigation, and vulnerability assessments, as it relates to agriculture. Training should include food security, water resources management/IWRM, sustainable agriculture, and climate change resilience			37,092**	10,148	15,659
All	14. Number of trainees in short-term programs facilitated by CRP (female)	(see above, but for female)			12,718**	10,116	15,626
All	15. Number of trainees in long-term programs facilitated by CRP (male)	The number of people who are currently enrolled in or graduated in the current fiscal year from a bachelor's, master's or Ph.D. program or are currently participating in or have completed in the current fiscal year a long term (degree-seeking) advanced training program such as a fellowship program or a post-doctoral studies program. A person completing one long term training program in the fiscal year and currently participating in another long term training program should be counted only once.			34	20***	25***
All	16. Number of trainees in long-term programs facilitated by CRP (female)	(see above, but for female)			42	15	15

Note: No.13 and 14 \*\* Gender-disaggregated data for some short-term trainings was not collected in 2012 nor estimated for 2013-2014. Total number of male trainees in short-term programs likely includes female trainees.

CRPs concerned by this indicator	Indicator	Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator	Deviation narrative (if actual is more than 10% away from target)	2012		2013	2014
				Target (if available for 2012)	Actual	Target	Target
1,5,6,7	17. Number of multi-stakeholder R4D innovation platforms established for the targeted agro-ecosystems by the CRPs	To be counted, a multi-stakeholder platform has to have a clear purpose, generally to manage some type of tradeoff/conflict among the different interests of different stakeholders in the targeted agro-ecosystems, and inclusive and clear governance mechanisms, leading to decisions to manage the variety of perspectives of stakeholders in a manner satisfactory to the whole platform.			N/A	N/A	N/A
All	18. Number of technologies/NRM practices under research in the CRP (Phase I)	<p>Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related and NRM-related technologies and innovations including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation. Relevant technologies include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including biodegradable packaging</li> <li>• Biological: New germplasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;</li> <li>• Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides sustainably and environmentally applied, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies;</li> <li>• Management and cultural practices: sustainable water management; practices; sustainable land management practices; sustainable fishing practices; Information technology, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resource management practices that increase productivity and/or resiliency to climate change. IPM, ISFM, and PHH as related to agriculture should all be included as improved technologies or management practices.</li> </ul> <p>New technologies or management practices under research counted should be only those under research in the current reporting year. Any new technology or management practice under research in a previous year but not under research in the reporting year should not be included.</p>			188,002	175,007	150,010
All	19. % of technologies under research that have an explicit target of women farmers	The papers, web pages, blog stories, press releases and policy briefs supporting indicator #x must have an explicit focus on women farmers/NRM managers to be counted			0%	0%	0%

No. 15 - \*\*\*Some centers did not report gender of long-term trainees for 2013 and 2014, so listed as male.



CRPs concerned by this indicator	Indicator	Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator	Deviation narrative (if actual is more than 10% away from target)	2012		2013	2014
				Target (if available for 2012)	Actual	Target	Target
TECHNOLOGIES/PRACTICES IN VARIOUS STAGES OF							
All	20. % of technologies under research that have been assessed for likely gender-disaggregated impact	Reports/papers describing the products should include a focus on gender-disaggregated impacts if they are to be counted			0%	0%	0%
1,5,6,7	21 Number of agro-ecosystems for which CRP has identified feasible approaches for improving ecosystem services and for establishing positive incentives for farmers to improve ecosystem functions as per the CRP's recommendations	Use the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA) typology of cultivated systems and of forests and woodland systems (MEA, 2005, Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Current State and Trends, Volume 1) to define these agro-ecosystems; identify the regions if possible			N/A	N/A	N/A
1,5,6,7	22. Number of people who will potentially benefit from plans, once finalised, for the scaling up of strategies	Indicate the potential number of both women and men			N/A	N/A	N/A
All, except 2	23. Number of technologies /NRM practices field tested (phase II)	Under "field testing" means that research has moved from focused development to broader testing and this testing is underway under conditions intended to duplicate those encountered by potential users of the new technology. This might be in the actual facilities (fields) of potential users, or it might be in a facility set up to duplicate those conditions.			1,548	1,209	1,008
1,5,6,7	24. Number of agro-ecosystems for which innovations (technologies, policies, practices, integrative approaches) and options for improvement at system level have been developed and are being field tested (Phase II)	Use the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA) typology of cultivated systems and of forests and woodland systems (MEA, 2005, Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Current State and Trends, Volume 1) to define these agro-ecosystems and specify the regions where field testing is underway			N/A	N/A	N/A
1,5,6,7	25. % of above innovations/approaches/options that are targeted at decreasing inequality between men and women				N/A	N/A	N/A
1,5,6,7	26. Number of published research outputs from CRP utilised in targeted agro-ecosystems				N/A	N/A	N/A
All, except 2	27. Number of technologies/NRM practices released by public and private sector partners globally (phase III)	In the case of crop research that developed a new variety, e.g., the variety must have passed through any required approval process, and seed of the new variety should be available for multiplication. The technology should have proven benefits and be as ready for use as it can be as it emerges from the research and testing process. Technologies made available for transfer should be only those made available in the current reporting year. Any technology made available in a previous year should not be included.			10	6	12

CRPs concerned by this indicator	Indicator	Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator	Deviation narrative (if actual is more than 10% away from target)	2012		2013	2014
				Target (if available for 2012)	Actual	Target	Target
POLICIES IN VARIOUS STAGES OF							
All	28. Numbers of Policies/ Regulations/ Administrative Procedures	Number of agricultural enabling environment policies / regulations / administrative procedures in the areas of agricultural resource, food, market standards & regulation, public investment, natural resource or water management and climate change adaptation/mitigation as it relates to agriculture that underwent the first stage of the policy reform process i.e. analysis (review of existing policy / regulation / administrative procedure and/or proposal of new policy / regulations / administrative procedures).			9	59	32
	Analyzed (Stage 1)						
		Please count the highest stage completed during the reporting year – don't double count for the same policy.					
All	29. Number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation (Stage 2)	.....that underwent the second stage of the policy reform process. The second stage includes public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure.			2	2	3
All	30. Number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures presented for legislation(Stage 3)	: ... underwent the third stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/decreed to improve the policy environment for smallholder-based agriculture.)			1	1	1
All	31. Number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures prepared passed/approved (Stage 4)	: ...underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process (official approval (legislation/decreed) of new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority).			0	1	1
All	32. Number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures passed for which implementation has begun (Stage 5)	: ...completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority)			0	0	1
OUTCOMES ON THE GROUND							
All	33. Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of CRP research	Indicate the regions where this is occurring and whether the application of technologies is on a new or continuing area			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
All	34. Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of CRP research	Indicate the regions where this is occurring and whether the application of technologies is on a new or continuing area and indicate:			203,972	304,600	418,200
		34 (a) number of women farmers concerned					
		34(b) number of male farmers concerned					

Report Description	L101														
Name of Report	CRP Cumulative Financial Summary														
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office														
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months														
Period	1 January 2011 - 31 December 2012										4				
	(a) Cumulative budget per annual financial plans.					(b) Actual Expenses - Cumulative					(c) Variance - Cumulative				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding
Africa Rice	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bioversity	1,670		1,116		2,786	1,563		1,116		2,679	107				107
CIAT	670		1,154		1,824	631		1,154		1,785	39				39
CIFOR	-		-		-	-		-		-	-				-
CIMMYT	-		-		-	-		-		-	-				-
CIP	460		1,570		2,030	309		1,570		1,879	151				151
ICARDA	-		-		-	-		-		-	-				-
ICRISAT	1,050		46		1,096	909		46		955	141				141
IFPRI	5,640	1,025	40,045	186	46,896	2,612	1,025	40,045	186	43,868	3,028			(0)	3,028
IITA	1,460	12	3,076		4,548	990	12	3,076		4,078	470				470
ILRI	3,220		3,155		6,375	1,820		3,155		4,975	1,400				1,400
IRRI	-		-		-	-		-		-	-				-
IWMI	-		-		-	-		-		-	-				-
World Agroforestry	340		192		532	259		192		451	81				81
World Fish	40		240		280	17		240		257	23				23
<b>Totals for CRP</b>	<b>14,550</b>	<b>1,037</b>	<b>50,594</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>66,367</b>	<b>9,110</b>	<b>1,037</b>	<b>50,594</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>60,927</b>	<b>5,440</b>			<b>(0)</b>	<b>5,440</b>
	<b>22%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Notes</b>															
Windows 1 and 2 budget is based on the initial allocation															
Window 3 and bilateral funding budget is based on actual expenditure- assumption; budget equals expenditure at year end.															
<b>IFPRI's expense is cumulative (includes 2011 expenses)</b>															
<b>ICRISAT's bilateral grant has been reduced for the amount reported with HP (\$1177K)</b>															
<b>CIP revised expense has increased by \$47K -figures on the IFPRI audit report are based on prior submission</b>															
Section (a) is cumulative - includes financial plan of current year as well as those of prior years.															
Section (b) is cumulative - refers to all costs since inception, not just current year.															
Section (c) amounts are the differences between Sections (a) and (b).															

Report Description	L106				
Name of Report	CRP Annual Funding Summary				
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office				
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months				
<b>Period</b>	<b>1 January 2012 - 31 December 2012</b>				<b>4</b>
<b>PART 1 - Annual FINANCE PLAN (Totals for Windows 1 and 2 combined)</b>					
Approved Level for Year - Initial Approval					1455
Approved Level for Year - Final Amount					1715
<b>PART 2 - Funding Summary for Year</b>					
	<b>CRP 2012 Actual Funding</b>				
	<b>Window 1</b>	<b>Window 2</b>	<b>Window 3</b>	<b>Bilateral funding</b>	<b>Total Funding</b>
AATF				19	19
ACIAR		874		170	1044
ADB				17	17
AUSTRIA				101	101
Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation				2952	2952
Carasso Foundation				1	1
Centro Internacioanl de Agricultura Tropical				42	42
CGIAR	986	2612		0	3598
CIAT/IFPRI				1034	1034
Concern Worldwide				38	38
Denmark		315			315
DFID				1514	1514
Donald Danforth Plans Science Center				5	5
European Commission			1025	375	1400
Family Health Intl.				4434	4434
Foreign Ministry of Finland				58	58
Germany GIZ				321	321
Global Alliance Improve N				90	90
HarvestPlus*				32140	32140
Helen Keller Intl./USAID				120	120
ICIPE				390	390
IDRC		3650		1713	5363
IFAD Fruit				192	192
IRISH AID				88	88
IRISH GOVT		606		55	661
John Hopkins				111	111
JSI Res. & Training/USAID				279	279
McKnight Foundation				46	46
Ministry of Foreign Affairs -Finland				98	98
MS Swaminathan Res. Found				64	64
MTT Agrifood Research				439	439
NERC				38	38
NIGERIA				60	60
OFID				11	11
OPEC				118	118
OTHERS				2	2

<b>PART 2 - Funding Summary for Year</b>					
<b>CRP 2012 Actual Funding</b>					
	<b>Window 1</b>	<b>Window 2</b>	<b>Window 3</b>	<b>Bilateral funding</b>	<b>Total Funding</b>
Peru				44	44
Rockefeller Foundation				126	126
Save the Children/USAID				153	153
Swiss TPB				21	21
SWITZERLAND				82	82
The Netherlands		4214		112	4326
UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)				15	15
UNEP-GEF				493	493
UOE				35	35
USAID/WB		2051	12	2101	4164
USDA				156	156
Wellcome Trust				121	121
<b>Totals for CRP</b>	<b>986</b>	<b>14,322</b>	<b>1,037</b>	<b>50,594</b>	<b>66,939</b>
<b>Notes</b>					
*- HarvestPlus receives funding from BMGF,CIDA,DFID,USAID and Syngenta Foundation					
Amount shown for Window 1 donors is total, as these funds are co-mingled					
<b>Amounts shown for Window 2 donors are as per Report L411</b>					
<b>Amounts shown for Window 3 donors are as per Report L201</b>					
<b>Amounts shown for Bilateral funding are as per Report L201</b>					

Report Description	L111															
Name of Report	CRP Annual Financial Summary															
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office															
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months															
Period	1 January 2012 - 31 December 2012															
(a) CRP2012 Fin plan approved budget						(b) CRP 2012 Expenditure					(c) Variance this Year					
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	
Africa Rice	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	
Bioversity	1,670		1,116		2,786	1,563		1,116		2,679	107				107	
CIAT	670		1,154		1,824	631		1,154		1,785	39				39	
CIFOR	-		-		-	-		-		-	-				0	
CIMMYT	-		-		-	-		-		-	-				0	
CIP	460		1,570		2,030	309		1,570		1,879	151				151	
ICARDA	-		-		-	-		-		-	-				0	
ICRISAT	1,050		46		1,096	909		46		955	141				141	
IFPRI	5,640	1,025	40,045	186	46,896	2,612	1,025	40,045	186	43,868	3,028			(0)	3028	
IITA	1,460	12	3,076		4,548	990	12	3,076		4,078	470				470	
ILRI	3,220		3,155		6,375	1,820		3,155		4,975	1,400				1400	
IRRI	-		-		-	-		-		-	-				0	
IWMI	-		-		-	-		-		-	-				0	
World Agroforestry	340		192		532	259		192		451	81				81	
World Fish	40		240		280	17		240		257	23				23	
<b>Totals for CRP</b>	<b>14,550</b>	<b>1,037</b>	<b>50,594</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>66,367</b>	<b>9,110</b>	<b>1,037</b>	<b>50,594</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>60,927</b>	<b>5,440</b>			<b>(0)</b>	<b>5,440</b>	
	<b>267%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>930%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1220%</b>	<b>167%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>930%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1120%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>	
<b>Notes</b>																
<b>Notes</b>																
Windows 1 and 2 budget is based on final allocation																
Window 3 and bilateral funding budget is based on actual expenditure for the year, given it is end of the year.																
Section (a) amounts are as per the latest financing plan																
Section (b) amounts are for actual expenses in current year																
Section (c) amounts are the differences between Sections (a) and (b).																

**Report Description** L121  
**Name of Report** CRP Financial Report - Expenditure by natural classification (by Center)  
**Reporting Line** Lead Center Report to Consortium Office  
**Frequency/Period** Every 6 months

**Period** 1 January 2011 - 31 December 2012

	Annual Budget					Actual Expenses - This Year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
<b>Total CRP</b>															
Personnel	6346	271	7656	43	14316	3875	271	7656	43	11844	-2472	0	0	0	-2472
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	112	0	15916	0	16028	74	0	15916	0	15990	-38	0	0	0	-38
Collaborator Costs - Partners	190	314	16031	73	16608	131	314	16031	73	16549	-59	0	0	0	-59
Supplies and Services	4495	211	5188	30	9924	2926	211	5188	30	8355	-1569	0	0	0	-1569
Operational Travel	818	91	1927	16	2851	463	91	1927	16	2496	-355	0	0	0	-355
Depreciation	268	11	603	2	884	167	11	603	2	783	-101	0	0	0	-101
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>12228</b>	<b>898</b>	<b>47320</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>60611</b>	<b>7635</b>	<b>898</b>	<b>47320</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>56017</b>	<b>-4593</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-4593</b>
Indirect Costs	2322	139	3274	22	5757	1475	139	3274	22	4910	-847	0	0	0	-847
<b>Total - all Costs</b>	<b>14550</b>	<b>1037</b>	<b>50594</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>66367</b>	<b>9110</b>	<b>1037</b>	<b>50594</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>60927</b>	<b>-5440</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-5440</b>

Amounts for each participating center below:

<b>IFPRI</b>															
	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
Personnel	2800	264	4811	43	7918	1266	264	4811	43.0	6384	-1534	0	0	0	-1534
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	8	0	15846	0	15854	4	0	15846	0.0	15850	-4	0	0	0	-4
Collaborator Costs - Partners	59	314	14002	73	14448	28	314	14002	73.1	14417	-31	0	0	0	-31
Supplies and Services	1452	209	2148	30	3839	688	209	2148	30.2	3075	-764	0	0	0	-764
Operational Travel	460	88	1079	16	1643	218	88	1079	16.0	1401	-242	0	0	0	-242
Depreciation	114	11	206	2	333	54	11	206	1.8	273	-60	0	0	0	-60
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>4893</b>	<b>886</b>	<b>38092</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>44035</b>	<b>2258</b>	<b>886</b>	<b>38092</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>41400</b>	<b>-2635</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-2635</b>
Indirect Costs	747	139	1953	22	2861	354	139	1953	22	2468	-393	0	0	0	-393
<b>Total - all Costs</b>	<b>5640</b>	<b>1025</b>	<b>40045</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>46896</b>	<b>2612</b>	<b>1025</b>	<b>40045</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>43868</b>	<b>-3028</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-3028</b>

<b>BIOVERSITY</b>															
	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
Personnel	837	0	415	0	1252	783	0	415	0	1198	-54	0	0	0	-54
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Collaborator Costs - Partners	18	0	284	0	302	17	0	284	0	301	-1	0	0	0	-1
Supplies and Services	540	0	278	0	818	505	0	278	0	783	-35	0	0	0	-35
Operational Travel	9	0	49	0	58	8	0	49	0	57	-1	0	0	0	-1
Depreciation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>1403</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1026</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2429</b>	<b>1313</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1026</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2339</b>	<b>-90</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-90</b>
Indirect Costs	267	0	90	0	357	250	0	90	0	340	-17	0	0	0	-17
<b>Total - all Costs</b>	<b>1670</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1116</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2786</b>	<b>1563</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1116</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2679</b>	<b>-107</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-107</b>

<b>CIAT</b>															
	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
Personnel	268	0	519	0	787	252	0	519	0	771	-16	0	0	0	-16
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Collaborator Costs - Partners	0	0	33	0	33	0	0	33	0	33	0	0	0	0	0
Supplies and Services	286	0	377	0	662	269	0	377	0	646	-17	0	0	0	-17
Operational Travel	6	0	52	0	58	6	0	52	0	58	0	0	0	0	0
Depreciation	8	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>981</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1549</b>	<b>535</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>981</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1516</b>	<b>-33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-33</b>
Indirect Costs	102	0	173	0	275	96	0	173	0	269	-51	0	0	0	-51
<b>Total - all Costs</b>	<b>670</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1154</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1824</b>	<b>631</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1154</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1785</b>	<b>-84</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-84</b>

<b>CIP</b>															
	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
Personnel	60	0	364	0	424	40	0	364	0	404	-20	0	0	0	-20
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Collaborator Costs - Partners	0	0	653	0	653	0	0	653	0	653	0	0	0	0	0
Supplies and Services	167	0	271	0	438	113	0	271	0	383.5	-55	0	0	0	-55
Operational Travel	48	0	98	0	146	33	0	98	0	130.5	-16	0	0	0	-16
Depreciation	107	0	12	0	119	72	0	12	0	84	-35	0	0	0	-35
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1398</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1781</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1398</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1655</b>	<b>-126</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-126</b>
Indirect Costs	77	0	172	0	249	52	0	172	0	224	-25	0	0	0	-25
<b>Total - all Costs</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1570</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1570</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1879</b>	<b>-151</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-151</b>

<b>ICRISAT</b>															
	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
Personnel	350	0	24.05	0	374.05	303	0	24	0	327	-47	0	0	0	-47
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Collaborator Costs - Partners	51	0	6.7304	0	58	44	0	7	0	51	-7	0	0	0	-7
Supplies and Services	383	0	13.0472	0	397	332	0	13	0	345	-51	0	0	0	-51
Operational Travel	49	0	0.8272	0	49	42	0	1	0	43	-7	0	0	0	-7
Depreciation	36	0	0.6768	0	36	31	0	1	0	32	-5	0	0	0	-5
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>869</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>45.3316</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>914</b>	<b>752</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>797</b>	<b>-117</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-117</b>
Indirect Costs	181	0	0.9624	0	182	157	0	1	0	158	-24	0	0	0	-24
<b>Total - all Costs</b>	<b>1050</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>46.294</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1096.294</b>	<b>909</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>955</b>	<b>-141</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-141</b>

<b>IITA</b>															
	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
Personnel	518	7	680	0	1205	351	7	680	0	1038	-167	0	0	0	-167
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	103	0	70	0	173	70	0	70	0	140	-33	0	0	0	-33
Collaborator Costs - Partners	62	0	145	0	207	42	0	145	0	187	-20	0	0	0	-20
Supplies and Services	506	2	1100	0	1608	343	2	1100	0	1445	-163	0	0	0	-163
Operational Travel	55	3	302	0	360	37	3	302	0	342	-18	0	0	0	-18
Depreciation	0	0	361	0	361	0	0	361	0	361	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>1243</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2658</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3913</b>	<b>843</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2658</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3513</b>	<b>-400</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-400</b>
Indirect Costs	217	0	418	0	635	147	0	418	0	565	-70	0	0	0	-70

Period 1 January 2011 - 31 December 2012

	Annual Budget					Actual Expenses - This Year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
<b>Total - all Costs</b>	<b>1460</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3076</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4548</b>	<b>990</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3076</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4078</b>	<b>-470</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-470</b>
<b>ILRI</b>															
Personnel	1368	0	687	0	2054	773	0	687	0	1460	-595	0	0	0	-595
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Collaborator Costs - Partners	0	0	816	0	816	0	0	816	0	815.6	0	0	0	0	0
Supplies and Services	1053	0	944	0	1997	595	0	944	0	1539	-458	0	0	0	-458
Operational Travel	133	0	298	0	431	75	0	298	0	373	-58	0	0	0	-58
Depreciation	0	0	-21	0	-21	0	0	-21	0	-21	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>2553</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2723</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5276</b>	<b>1443</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2723</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4166</b>	<b>-1110</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-1110</b>
Indirect Costs	667	0	432	0	1099	377	0	432	0	809	-290	0	0	0	-290
<b>Total - all Costs</b>	<b>3220</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3155</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6375</b>	<b>1820</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3155</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4975</b>	<b>-1400</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-1400</b>
<b>World Agroforestry</b>															
Personnel	131	0	75	0	206	100	0	75	0	174.5	-31	0	0	0	-31
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Collaborator Costs - Partners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supplies and Services	106	0	36	0	142	81	0	36	0	116.5	-25	0	0	0	-25
Operational Travel	56	0	27	0	83	43	0	27	0	70	-13	0	0	0	-13
Depreciation	3	0	29	0	32	2	0	29	0	31	-1	0	0	0	-1
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>-71</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-71</b>
Indirect Costs	44	0	25	0	69	34	0	25	0	59	-10	0	0	0	-10
<b>Total - all Costs</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>532</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>-81</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-81</b>
<b>WORLD FISH</b>															
Personnel	16	0	81	0	97	7	0	81	0	88	-9	0	0	0	-9
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Collaborator Costs - Partners	0	0	92	0	92	0	0	92	0	92	0	0	0	0	0
Supplies and Services	2	0	21	0	23	1	0	21	0	22	-1	0	0	0	-1
Operational Travel	2	0	21	0	23	1	0	21	0	22	-1	0	0	0	-1
Depreciation	0	0	15	0	15	0	0	15	0	15	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>-12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-12</b>
Indirect Costs	19	0	10	0	29	8	0	10	0	18	-11	0	0	0	-11
<b>Total - all Costs</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>-23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-23</b>

Notes

Windows 1 and 2 budget is prepared following the expenditure pattern of centers given this is a new request after center's submission  
 Window 3 and bilateral budget is based on actual expenditure for the year, given it is end of the year  
 Totals within this report must agree with amounts reported in L111



<b>Report Description</b>	<b>L131</b>	564	
Name of Report	CRP Themes Report (by Center, and Funding Source)	191	
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office	2433	
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months	5640	3207

Period 1 January 2012 - 31 December 2012

	Annual Budget					Actual Expenses this Year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding
<b>CRP Report - by Themes</b>															
T1-Value Chains for Enhanced Nutrition	2678	919	1508	1	5105	2164	919	1508	1	4591	514	0	0	0	514
T2- Biofortification	1632	0	34003	143	35778	1212	0	34003	143	35357	421	0	0	0	421
T3-Agriculture Associated Diseases	4815	12	5533	2	10362	3215	12	5533	2	8762	1600	0	0	0	1600
T4-Integarted Programs and Policies	2145	106	9551	40	11842	1601	106	9551	40	11297	544	0	0	0	544
Gender Strategies	73	0	0	0	73	73	0	0	0	73	0	0	0	0	0
CRP Management/Coordination	3207	0	0	0	3207	846	0	0	0	846	2361	0	0	0	2361
<b>Totals for CRP</b>	<b>14550</b>	<b>1037</b>	<b>50594</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>66367</b>	<b>9110</b>	<b>1037</b>	<b>50594</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>60927</b>	<b>5440</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5440</b>

Amounts for each participating center below:

<b>IFPRI</b>															
T1-Value Chains for Enhanced Nutrition	564	919	155	1	1639	321	919	155	1	1396	243	0	0	0	243
T2- Biofortification	20	0	30836	143	30999	20	0	30836	143	30999	0	0	0	0	0
T3-Agriculture Associated Diseases	171	0	511	2	684	171	0	511	2	684	0	0	0	0	0
T4-Integarted Programs and Policies	1678	106	8543	40	10367	1254	106	8543	40	9943	424	0	0	0	424
Gender Strategies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CRP Management/Coordination	3207	0	0	0	3207	846	0	0	0	846	2361	0	0	0	2361
<b>Total - all Costs</b>	<b>5640</b>	<b>1025</b>	<b>40045</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>46896</b>	<b>2612</b>	<b>1025</b>	<b>40045</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>43868</b>	<b>3028</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3028</b>

<b>BIOVERSITY</b>															
T1-Value Chains for Enhanced Nutrition	1228	0	559	0	1787	1216	0	559	0	1775	12	0	0	0	12
T2- Biofortification	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T3-Agriculture Associated Diseases	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T4-Integarted Programs and Policies	442	0	557	0	999	347	0	557	0	904	95	0	0	0	95
Gender Strategies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CRP Management/Coordination	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total - all Costs</b>	<b>1670</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1116</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2786</b>	<b>1563</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1116</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2679</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>107</b>

<b>CIAT</b>															
T1-Value Chains for Enhanced Nutrition	134	0	0	0	134	113	0	0	0	113	21	0	0	0	21
T2- Biofortification	312	0	1154	0	1466	305	0	1154	0	1459	7	0	0	0	7
T3-Agriculture Associated Diseases	224	0	0	0	224	213	0	0	0	213	11	0	0	0	11
T4-Integarted Programs and Policies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gender Strategies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CRP Management/Coordination	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total - all Costs</b>	<b>670</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1154</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1824</b>	<b>631</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1154</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1785</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>39</b>

Period 1 January 2012 - 31 December 2012

	Annual Budget					Actual Expenses this Year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding
<b>CIP</b>															
T1-Value Chains for Enhanced Nutrition	37	0	307	0	344	11	0	307	0	317.5	26.5	0	0	0	26.5
T2- Biofortification	325	0	813	0	1138	226	0	813	0	1038	99.5	0	0	0	99.5
T3-Agriculture Associated Diseases	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T4-Integarted Programs and Policies	25	0	451	0	476	0	0	451	0	451	25	0	0	0	25
Gender Strategies	73	0	0	0	73	73	0	0	0	73	0	0	0	0	0
CRP Management/Coordination	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total – all Costs</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1570</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1570</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1879</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>151</b>
<b>ICRISAT</b>															
T1-Value Chains for Enhanced Nutrition	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T2- Biofortification	0	0	46	0	46	0	0	46	0	46	0	0	0	0	0
T3-Agriculture Associated Diseases	1050	0	0	0	1050	909	0	0	0	909	141	0	0	0	141
T4-Integarted Programs and Policies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gender Strategies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CRP Management/Coordination	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total – all Costs</b>	<b>1050</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1096</b>	<b>909</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>955</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>141</b>
<b>IITA</b>															
T1-Value Chains for Enhanced Nutrition	335	0	55	0	390	227	0	55	0	282	108	0	0	0	108
T2- Biofortification	975	0	1154	0	2129	661	0	1154	0	1815	314	0	0	0	314
T3-Agriculture Associated Diseases	150	12	1867	0	2029	102	12	1867	0	1981	48	0	0	0	48
T4-Integarted Programs and Policies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gender Strategies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CRP Management/Coordination	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total – all Costs</b>	<b>1460</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3076</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4548</b>	<b>990</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3076</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4078</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>470</b>
<b>ILRI</b>															
T1-Value Chains for Enhanced Nutrition	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T2- Biofortification	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T3-Agriculture Associated Diseases	3220	0	3155	0	6375	1820	0	3155	0	4975	1400	0	0	0	1400
T4-Integarted Programs and Policies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gender Strategies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CRP Management/Coordination	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total – all Costs</b>	<b>3220</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3155</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6375</b>	<b>1820</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3155</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4975</b>	<b>1400</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1400</b>
<b>World Agroforestry</b>															
T1-Value Chains for Enhanced Nutrition	340	0	192	0	532	259	0	192	0	451	81	0	0	0	532
T2- Biofortification	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T3-Agriculture Associated Diseases	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T4-Integarted Programs and Policies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gender Strategies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CRP Management/Coordination	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total – all Costs</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>532</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>532</b>

Period 1 January 2012 - 31 December 2012

	Annual Budget					Actual Expenses this Year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding
<b>WORLD FISH</b>															
T1-Value Chains for Enhanced Nutrition	40	0	240	0	280	17	0	240	0	257	23	0	0	0	23
T2- Biofortification	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T3-Agriculture Associated Diseases	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T4-Integarted Programs and Policies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gender Strategies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CRP Management/Coordination	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total – all Costs</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>

**Notes**

Budget by Theme level was provided in the previous format

Window 3 and bilateral budget is based on actual expenditure for the year

The 2 Cross-cutting areas (CRP Management and Gender Strategies) should be reported in the same way as Themes.

Totals within this report must agree with amounts reported in L111

**Report Description**

Name of Report CRP Financial Report - Bilateral Grants (by Center)  
 Reporting Line Lead Center Report to Consortium Office  
 Frequency/Period Every 6 months

**CRP Nr**

Period 1 January 2012 - 31 December 2012

	Expenditure		
	Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
<b>Totals for CRP</b>			
<b>Window 3</b>			
USAID	12	12	0
European Commission	1,025	1,025	0
Sub-total	1037	1037	0
<b>Bilateral</b>			
AATF	19	19	0
ACIAR	170	170	0
ADB	17	17	0
AUSTRIA	101	101	0
Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF)	2952	2952	0
Carasso Foundation	1	1	0
Centro Internacioanl de Agricultura Tropical	42	42	0
CIAT/IFPRI	1034	1034	0
Concern Worldwide	38	38	0
DFID	1514	1514	0
Donald Danforth Plans Science Center	5	5	0
European Commission	375	375	0
Family Health Int'l, Inc.	4434	4434	0
Foreign Ministry of Finland	58	58	0
Germany GIZ	321	321	0
Global Alliance Improve N	90	90	0
Harvest Plus Consortium	32140	32140	0
Helen Keller, Int./USAID	120	120	0
ICIPE	390	390	0
IDRC	1713	1713	0
IFAD Fruit	192	192	0
IRISH AID	88	88	0
IRISH GOVT	55	55	0
John Hopkins	111	111	0
JSI Res. & Training/USAID	279	279	0
McKnight Foundation	46	46	0
Ministry of Foreign Affairs -Finland	98	98	0
Ms. Swaminthan Res. Found	64	64	0
MTT Agrifood Research	439	439	0
NERC	38	38	0
NIGERIA	60	60	0
OFID	11	11	0
OPEC	118	118	0
OTHERS	2	2	0
Peru	44	44	0
Rockefeller Foundation	126	126	0
Save the Children/USAID	153	153	0
Swiss TPB	21	21	0
SWITZERLAND	82	82	0
The Netherlands	112	112	0
UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)	15	15	0
UNEP-GEF	493	493	0
UOE	35	35	0
USAID	2062	2062	0
USAID/WB	39	39	0
USDA	156	156	0
Wellcome Trust	121	121	0

Period 1 January 2012 - 31 December 2012

	Expenditure		
	Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
Sub-total	50594	50594	0
<b>Totals for CRP</b>	<b>51631</b>	<b>51631</b>	<b>0</b>

Bilateral Grants for each participating center below:

Center 1	(IFPRI)			
	<u>Window 3</u>			
	European Commission	1,025	1,025	0
	<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>1,025</b>	<b>1,025</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Bilateral</b>			
	ADB	17	17	0
	Concern Worldwide	38	38	0
	DFID	1443	1443	0
	Family Health Int'l, Inc.	4434	4434	0
	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF)	1446	1446	0
	Global Alliance Improve N	90	90	0
	Harvest Plus	6857	6857	0
	Harvest Plus Consortium	24189	24189	0
	Helen Keller, Int./USAID	120	120	0
	IDRC	238	238	0
	IRISH AID	88	88	0
	John Hopkins	111	111	0
	JSI Res. & Training/USAID	279	279	0
	Ms. Swaminthan Res. Found	64	64	0
	MTT Agrifood Research	439	439	0
	Save the Children/USAID	153	153	0
	USAID/WB	39	39	0
	<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>40045</b>	<b>40045</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Totals for CRP</b>	<b>41070</b>	<b>41070</b>	<b>0</b>

Center 2	(Bioversity)			
	<u>Window 3</u>			
	Sub-total	0	0	0
	<b>Bilateral</b>			
	Austria	64	64	0
	BMGF	195	195	0
	Carasso Foundation	1	1	0
	Foreign Ministry of Finland	58	58	0
	Germany GIZ	149	149	0
	Peru	44	44	0
	The Netherlands	112	112	0
	UNEP-GEF	493	493	0
	Sub-total	1116	1116	0
	<b>Totals for CRP</b>	<b>1116</b>	<b>1116</b>	<b>0</b>

Period 1 January 2012 - 31 December 2012

		Expenditure		
		Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
<b>Center 3 (CIAT)</b>				
<u>Window 3</u>				0
	Sub-total	0	0	0
<u>Bilateral</u>				
	HarvestPlus	1094	1094	0
	OPEC	60	60	0
				0
	Sub-total	1154	1154	0
<b>Totals for CRP</b>		<b>1154</b>	<b>1154</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Center 4 (CIP)</b>				
<u>Window 3</u>				0
	Sub-total	0	0	0
<u>Bilateral</u>				
	BMGF	842	842	0
	Centro Internacioanl de Agricultura Tropical	42	42	0
	Donald Danforth Plans Science Center	5	5	0
	USAID	681	681	0
	Sub-total	1570	1570	0
<b>Totals for CRP</b>		<b>1570</b>	<b>1570</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Center 5 (ICRISAT)</b>				
<u>Window 3</u>				0
	Sub-total	0	0	0
<u>Bilateral</u>				
	McKnight Foundation	46	46	0
				0
	Sub-total	46	46	0
<b>Totals for CRP</b>		<b>46</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Center 6 (IITA)</b>				
<u>Window 3</u>				
	USAID	12	12	0
				0
	Sub-total	12	12	0
<u>Bilateral</u>				
	AATF	19	19	0
	AUSTRIA	37	37	0
	BMGF	469	469	0
	CIAT/IFPRI	1034	1034	0
	EC	142	142	0
	GIZ	17	17	0
	IRISH GOVT	55	55	0
	NIGERIA	60	60	0
	OTHERS	2	2	0
	SWITZERLAND	82	82	0
	USAID	1003	1003	0
	USDA	156	156	0
	Sub-total	3076	3076	0
<b>Totals for CRP</b>		<b>3088</b>	<b>3088</b>	<b>0</b>

Period 1 January 2012 - 31 December 2012

		Expenditure		
		Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
<b>Center 7</b>	<b>(ILRI)</b>			
	<u>Window 3</u>			
	Sub-total	0	0	0
	<b>Bilateral</b>			
	ACIAR	170	170	0
	DFID	71	71	0
	EC	19	19	0
	German GIZ	155	155	0
	ICIPE	390	390	0
	IDRC	1475	1475	0
	Ministry of Foreign Affairs -Finland	98	98	0
	NERC	38	38	0
	OPEC	58	58	0
	Rockefeller Foundation	126	126	0
	Swiss TPB	21	21	0
	UOE	35	35	0
	USAID	378	378	0
	Wellcome Trust	121	121	0
	Sub-total	3155	3155	0
	<b>Totals for CRP</b>	<b>3155</b>	<b>3155</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Center 8</b>	<b>(World Agroforestry)</b>			
	<u>Window 3</u>			
	Sub-total	0	0	0
	<b>Bilateral</b>			
	IFAD Fruit	192	192	0
	Sub-total	192	192	0
	<b>Totals for CRP</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Center 9</b>	<b>(WorldFish)</b>			
	<u>Window 3</u>			
	Sub-total	0	0	0
	<b>Bilateral</b>			
	EC	214	214	0
	FAO	15	15	0
	OFID	11	11	0
	Sub-total	240	240	0
	<b>Totals for CRP</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>0</b>

Notes

Note that an individual donor may make grants through Window 3 and bilaterally

Totals within this report must agree with amounts reported in L111.

**ICRISAT's bilateral grant has been reduced for the amount reported with HP (\$1177K)**

**Report Description**

Name of Report CRP Partnerships Report  
 Reporting Line Lead Center Report to Consortium Office  
 Frequency/Period Every 6 months

Institute	Country	Annual Budget					Actual Expenses - This Year					Unspent Budget				
		Windows 1 and 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
<b>Biodiversity</b>																
Institute Nacional de Innovacion Agraria (INIA)	Peru	0	0	35	0	35	0	0	35	0	35	0	0	0	0	0
Save the Children	UK	17	0	33	0	50	17	0	33	0	50	0	0	0	0	0
Brazilian Biodiversity Fund (FUNBIO)	Brazil	0	0	139	0	139	0	0	139	0	139	0	0	0	0	0
Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI)	Kenya	0	0	26	0	26	0	0	26	0	26	0	0	0	0	0
General Directorate of Agricultural Research and Policy	Turkey	0	0	51	0	51	0	0	51	0	51	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Sub-total for center</b>		<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>CIAT</b>																
EAP	Honduras	0	0	16	0	16	0	0	16	0	16	0	0	0	0	0
ICTA	Guatemala	0	0	13	0	13	0	0	13	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
FIDAR	Colombai	0	0	4	0	4	0	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Sub-total for center</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>CIP</b>																
ARDAP	Kenya	0	0	50	0	50	0	0	50	0	50	0	0	0	0	0
AVRDC	Bangladesh	0	0	200	0	200	0	0	200	0	200	0	0	0	0	0
BARI	Bangladesh	0	0	14	0	14	0	0	14	0	14	0	0	0	0	0
BRAC	Bangladesh	0	0	76	0	76	0	0	76	0	76	0	0	0	0	0
CREADIS	Kenya	0	0	25	0	25	0	0	25	0	25	0	0	0	0	0
CRS Rwanda	Rwanda	0	0	99	0	99	0	0	99	0	99	0	0	0	0	0
Path	USA	0	0	91	0	91	0	0	91	0	91	0	0	0	0	0
PROSHIKA	Bangladesh	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
RAB	Rwanda	0	0	52	0	52	0	0	52	0	52	0	0	0	0	0
SINA	Rwanda	0	0	45	0	45	0	0	45	0	45	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Sub-total for center</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>653</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>653</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>653</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>653</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>ICRISAT</b>																
Directorate of Groundnut Research, ICAR	India	5	-	-	-	5	5	-	-	-	5	0	0	0	0	0
Acharya NG Ranga Agricultural University	India	3	-	-	-	3	3	-	-	-	3	0	0	0	0	0
University of Agricultural Sciences-Raichur	India	5	-	-	-	5	5	-	-	-	5	0	0	0	0	0
Tamil Nadu Agricultural University	India	5	-	-	-	5	5	-	-	-	5	0	0	0	0	0
Rural Development Trust	India	4	-	-	-	4	4	-	-	-	4	0	0	0	0	0
Kaveri Seeds Limited	India	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	5	-	5	0	0	0	0	0
Pioneer Overseas Corporation	India	-	-	9	-	9	-	-	9	-	9	0	0	0	0	0
Ganga Kaveri Seeds Pvt. Ltd	India	-	-	7	-	7	-	-	7	-	7	0	0	0	0	0
Nuziveedu Seeds Limited	India	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	5	-	5	0	0	0	0	0
JK Agri Genetics Limited	India	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	6	-	6	0	0	0	0	0
Bioseed Research India Pvt. Ltd	India	-	-	7	-	7	-	-	7	-	7	0	0	0	0	0
Devgen Seeds & Crop Technology Pvt. Ltd	India	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	5	-	5	0	0	0	0	0
Vibha Agritech Limited	India	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	6	-	6	0	0	0	0	0
Metahelix Lifesciences Ltd.	India	-	-	7	-	7	-	-	7	-	7	0	0	0	0	0
Mahathma Phule Krishi Vidhya Peeth MPKV-Dh	India	-	-	12	-	12	-	-	12	-	12	0	0	0	0	0
JAU	India	-	-	11	-	11	-	-	11	-	11	0	0	0	0	0
SK Rao	India	-	-	11	-	11	-	-	11	-	11	0	0	0	0	0
Kesar Enterprises	India	-	-	4	-	4	-	-	4	-	4	0	0	0	0	0
Bayer Bio Sciences	India	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	-	2	0	0	0	0	0
MAU	India	-	-	11	-	11	-	-	11	-	11	0	0	0	0	0
CCSHAU	India	-	-	13	-	13	-	-	13	-	13	0	0	0	0	0
Hitech Seed	India	-	-	4	-	4	-	-	4	-	4	0	0	0	0	0
Nirmal Seed	India	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	-	2	0	0	0	0	0
Agith Seed	India	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	0	0	0	0	0
Adelaide Research and Innovation	Australia	-	-	52	-	52	-	-	52	-	52	0	0	0	0	0
IER	Mali	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	0	0	0	0	0
ADAF GALEY	Mali	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	0	0	0	0	0
INRAN	Niger	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	0	0	0	0	0
Fuma-Gaskiya	Niger	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	0	0	0	0	0
CAAD	Mali	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	0	0	0	0	0
Institute of Agricultural Research (IAR)	Nigeria	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	0	0	0	0	0
INERA	Burkina Faso	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	0	0	0	0	0
Naliendele Research Station (DRD)	Tanzania	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	0	0	0	0	0
Sokoine University	Tanzania	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	0	0	0	0	0
National Smallholder Farmer Association	Malawi	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	0	0	0	0	0
Kamuzu Central Hospital	Malawi	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	0	0	0	0	0
Acclon Fraterna Ecology Centre	India	4	-	-	-	4	4	-	-	-	4	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Sub-total for center</b>		<b>43</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>



Institute	Country	Annual Budget					Actual Expenses - This Year					Unspent Budget				
		Windows 1 and 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
<b>IFPRI</b>																
ADELAIDE RESEARCH	AUSTRALIA			1		1			1		1	0	0	0	0	0
ASSOCIACAO ACADEMICA DE	MOZAMBIQUE		60	103		163		60	103		163	0	0	0	0	0
ASSOCIATES RESEARCH	UGANDA		3			3		3			3	0	0	0	0	0
BANGLADESH RURAL	BANGLADESH			22		22			22		22	0	0	0	0	0
CARE BANGLADESH	BANGLADESH			30		30			30		30	0	0	0	0	0
CELLULE DE LUTTE CONTRE	SENEGAL		5			5		5			5	0	0	0	0	0
COLUMNEX LLC	US			1		1			1		1	0	0	0	0	0
COMMUNITY ENTERPRISES	UGANDA			30		30			30		30	0	0	0	0	0
CONSULTANCY FOR SOCIAL	ETHIOPIA			16		16			16		16	0	0	0	0	0
DATA ANALYSIS & TECH ASST	BANGLADESH			84		84			84		84	0	0	0	0	0
DATALYZE CONSULTING CORP.	CANADA			4		4			4		4	0	0	0	0	0
EURO FOOD INFO RESOURCE	BELGIUM			5		5			5		5	0	0	0	0	0
GLOBAL CENTER FOR	US			30		30			30		30	0	0	0	0	0
GROUPE DE RECHERCHE ET	FRANCE		38			38		38			38	0	0	0	0	0
HELEN KELLER INTERNATIONL	US			22		22		22			22	0	0	0	0	0
INLEKO	US			18		18			18		18	0	0	0	0	0
INSTITUT SENEGALAIS DE	SENEGAL			20		20			20		20	0	0	0	0	0
INSTITUT DE STATISTIQUES	BURUNDI			311		311			311		311	0	0	0	0	0
INSTITUTE OF DEV STUDIES	UK			655		655			655		655	0	0	0	0	0
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL & MEDICAL STUDIES	VIETNAM			170		170			170		170	0	0	0	0	0
INTER CTR DIARRHOEAL DIS	BANGLADESH			284		284			284		284	0	0	0	0	0
INVEST IN KNOWLEDGE	MALAWI		95			95		95			95	0	0	0	0	0
JARCO CONSULTING	ETHIOPIA			85		85		85			85	0	0	0	0	0
JPD SYSTEMS, LLC	US	1				1		1			1	0	0	0	0	0
LAND O'LAKES INC.	US			30		30			30		30	0	0	0	0	0
MELA RESEARCH PLC	ETHIOPIA			91		91			91		91	0	0	0	0	0
MIRUS INNOVATIONS, LLC	US		2			2		2			2	0	0	0	0	0
NIELSEN GOVERNMENT & NUTRIDEMICS	CANADA	22				22		22			22	0	0	0	0	0
PROJECT RESOURCE GROUP	US			5		5			5		5	0	0	0	0	0
PUBLIC HEALTH FOUNDATION	INDIA			36		36			36		36	0	0	0	0	0
QUICKSILVER FOUNDRY	US			204		204			204		204	0	0	0	0	0
REGENTS OF THE UNIV CALIF	US			111		111			111		111	0	0	0	0	0
SAVE THE CHILDREN	US			5		5			5		5	0	0	0	0	0
SEED SOLUTIONS	US			79		79			79		79	0	0	0	0	0
SEED SOLUTIONS	INDIA			11		11			11		11	0	0	0	0	0
SURVEYBE-ECONOMIC	UK			4		4			4		4	0	0	0	0	0
SWISS TROPICAL INSTITUTE	SWITZERLAND			137		137			137		137	0	0	0	0	0
THE NIELSEN COMPANY	US			35		35			35		35	0	0	0	0	0
UNIVERSITE GASTON BERGER	SENEGAL		41			41		41			41	0	0	0	0	0
UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS	UK			64		64			64		64	0	0	0	0	0
UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI	KENYA			46		46			46		46	0	0	0	0	0
UNIVERSITY OF UYO	NIGERIA			65		65			65		65	0	0	0	0	0
VOX LATINA	GUATEMALA			994		994			994		994	0	0	0	0	0
WAKA WAKA ESTATES LTD	ZAMBIA			29		29			29		29	0	0	0	0	0
Others (HP Challenge program partners)				8,629		8,629			8,629		8,629	0	0	0	0	0
Others			4	69	1,535	-	1,608	4	69	1,535	-	1,608	0	0	0	0
<b>Sub-total for center</b>		<b>28</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>14,002</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>14,343</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>14,002</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>14,343</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>IITA</b>																
Kari Katumani Cassava proagra	Kenya	0	0	15	0	15	0	0	15	0	15	0	0	0	0	0
CRI	Ghana	0	0	6	0	6	0	0	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0
University of Maiduguri	Nigeria	13	0	4	0	17	13	0	4	0	17	0	0	0	0	0
IAR Zaria	Nigeria	17	0	5	0	22	17	0	5	0	22	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Reserve Bank of New York	USA	0	0	41	0	41	0	0	41	0	41	0	0	0	0	0
ICRISAT	India	70	0	0	0	70	70	0	0	0	70	0	0	0	0	0
NAERLS	Nigeria	0	0	18	0	18	0	0	18	0	18	0	0	0	0	0
ZAGRA	Zambia	0	0	9	0	9	0	0	9	0	9	0	0	0	0	0
Project Programme IPM CRSP	Senegal	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Unniversite Activite De Service	Senegal	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
NIHORT	Nigeria	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
George August Universitat	Germany	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
KDSCADP	Nigeria	11	0	25	0	36	11	0	25	0	36	0	0	0	0	0
Bukola Masha	Nigeria	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rutgers University EFT	USA	0	0	8	0	8	0	0	8	0	8	0	0	0	0	0
KARI ODA Crop Protection	Kenya	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Sub-total for center</b>		<b>111</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>ILRI</b>																
Afric un int Afrc Bureau-AUIBAR		0	0	49	0	49	0	0	49	0	49	0	0	0	0	0
Ctr Int Rch Dvt-CIRDES		0	0	57	0	57	0	0	57	0	57	0	0	0	0	0
Cntr for Indonesian Vet		0	0	226	0	226	0	0	226	0	226	0	0	0	0	0
Chiang Mai Univeristy		0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0

	Country	Annual Budget					Actual Expenses - This Year					Unspent Budget				
		Windows 1 and 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
Institute																
CSIRO-Anmial Hlth Lab		0	0	76	0	76	0	0	76	0	76	0	0	0	0	0
Department of Livesotck		0	0	53	0	53	0	0	53	0	53	0	0	0	0	0
FVM-UGM		0	0	69	0	69	0	0	69	0	69	0	0	0	0	0
Global Health Group Internationla		0	0	95	0	95	0	0	95	0	95	0	0	0	0	0
General Org of Vet Serv		0	0	13	0	13	0	0	13	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
Pasteur Inst in Chi Min		0	0	34	0	34	0	0	34	0	34	0	0	0	0	0
Swiss Tropical Instit		0	0	-5	0	-5	0	0	-5	0	-5	0	0	0	0	0
Vet without Boarders		0	0	-6	0	-6	0	0	-6	0	-6	0	0	0	0	0
World Fish Center		0	0	24	0	24	0	0	24	0	24	0	0	0	0	0
Yunnan Academy of Grasld		0	0	128	0	128	0	0	128	0	128	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Sub-total for center</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>814</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>814</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>814</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>814</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>World Agroforestry</b>	<b>NONE</b>	0	0	0	0											
<b>World Fish</b>																
Nepal CEAPRED	Nepal	0	0	56	0	56	0	0	56	0	56	0	0	0	0	0
CODEC	Bangladesh	0	0	36	0	36	0	0	36	0	36	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Sub-total for center</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Totals for CRP</b>		<b>199</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>16,195</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,550</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,379</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,550</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0</b>

Notes

Amounts reported are for actual expenditure, so unliquidated advances not included.  
 Institutes should be clearly identifiable by name and/or acronym, plus country.  
 Totals within this report must agree with amounts reported in L.121 "Collaborator Costs - Partners".

**Report Description**

Name of Report	CRP Funding Statement, Windows 1 and 2
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
Frequency/Period	Every 3 months

**PART 1 - REPORT OF LEAD CENTER (CIAT used as example)**

Opening Balance - 1 January -61

**W1 Receipts from Consortium Office (actual dates)**

26-Oct-12 986

**Total Receipts** 986

**W2 Receipts from Consortium Office (actual dates)**

20-Mar-12 1,500

5-May-13 3,650

2-Jun-12 315

26-Oct-12 805

27-Nov-12 4,214

20-Dec-12 1,176

**Total Receipts** 11660

**Transfers to CG Partners**

Bioversity -1102

CIAT -442

CIP -303

ICRISAT -693

IFPRI

IITA -964

ILRI -2125

World Agroforestry -224

World Fish -26

**Total Disbursements** -5879

Expenditure by Lead Center (IFPRI) -2612

Unliquidated Advances to IFPRI Partners 0

**Funds held - end of Period** 4094

**PART 2 - REPORT OF CGIAR CENTERS**

	Funds held - start of Period	Transfers from Lead Center	Expenditure	Unliquidated Advances to Partners	Funds held - end of Period
					0
Bioversity	0	1102	-1563	0	-461
CIAT		442	-631	0	-189
CIP	0	303	-309	0	-6
ICRISAT	0	693	-909	0	-216
IFPRI	-61	2673	-2612	0	0
IITA	0	964	-990	0	-26
ILRI	0	2125	-1820	0	305
World Agroforestry	0	224	-259	0	-35
World Fish	0	26	-17	0	9
<b>Totals</b>	<b>-61</b>	<b>8552</b>	<b>-9110</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-619</b>

**Notes**

Amounts should be reported in USD 000's

Report is for each financial year.

Quarterly Reports during year are on a cumulative basis

**Report Description**

Name of Report	CRP Funding Statement, Window 2
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months

	<u>Date</u>	<u>Donor Currency</u>	<u>USD</u>
<b>Year 1 - 2011</b>			
<b>Receipts from Donors</b>			
<b>Transfers to Lead Center (via CO)</b> (if applicable)			
<b>Other Disbursements</b> CSP paid to Window 1			
<b>Funds held by Trustee - end of Period</b>	<b>31-Dec-11</b>		-
<b>Year 2 - 2012</b>			
<b>Receipts from Donors</b>			
USAID	20-Mar-12		875
ACIAR	20-Mar-12		675
IDRC	5-May-12		3,650
Denmark	2-Jun-12		315
CGIAR (W1)	26-Oct-12		986
Ireland	26-Oct-12		606
ACIAR	26-Oct-12		199
The Netherlands	27-Nov-12		4,214
USAID	20-Dec-12		<u>1,176</u>
			12,696
<b>Transfers to Lead Center (via CO)</b>			
Transfer 1	20-Mar-12		(1,500)
Transfer 2	5-May-13		(3,650)
Transfer 3	2-Jun-12		(315)
Transfer 4	26-Oct-12		(1,791)
Transfer 5	27-Nov-12		(4,214)
Transfer 6	20-Dec-12		(1,176)
<b>Other Disbursements</b> CSP paid to Window 1			
			(50)
<b>Funds held by Trustee - during the year 2012</b>			<u><u>0</u></u>

**Notes**

Amounts reported in USD 000's  
This reports is on a cumulative basis (prior periods also shown)