



RESEARCH
PROGRAM ON
Water, Land and
Ecosystems

Led
by:



CGIAR Research Program on Water, Land and Ecosystems: Annual Report 2012

2012 Annual Report of the CGIAR Research Program on Water, Land and Ecosystems (WLE)

Cover photo:cc: Oxfam International



Led by



A. Key Messages

This was a startup year for the CGIAR Research Program on Water, Land and Ecosystems (WLE), focused on gaining buy-in from partners and further articulating both the value proposition of the program as well as how it operates.

A major area of achievement was clarifying [organizational arrangements](#) and appointing leaders to the program. This has included:

- Each WLE partner agreed on budgets and signed contracts. They also identified a Science Focal Point to be the main contact point of each institution with WLE. In all, 162 research activities were mapped to the program in 2012.
- Strategic Research Portfolio (SRP) leaders were appointed from IWMI, IFPRI, ICRAF and CIAT, and consultations took place for the Rainfed, Irrigation, Basins and Resource Recovery & Reuse SRPs.
- The WLE Management Committee¹, responsible for program planning and strategic management, was established, holding its first face-to-face meeting in November.
- The WLE Steering Committee with 11 members was established in 2012 and held its first meetings in September and December.
- An Operations Team has been established including a Program Director, Program Manager, Support Scientist and Communication and Knowledge Management support.

A major achievement has been the establishment of the Ecosystem Services & Resilience (ESS&R) Working Group led by Bioversity, which has proven to be a dynamic forum for collaboration for partners within and outside WLE. Outputs include two proposals to the Ecosystem Services for Poverty Alleviation research program and publication of WLE papers including one in *BioScience*² on the importance of matching ecological and governance scales in the management of ecosystem services.

A guidance document was prepared on WLE Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning & Impact Assessment, which was the basis for partner level reporting and SRP-level evaluations of reports and activity plans against a standard template. A complete system for M&E will be implemented in 2013, including the establishment of a meaningful program baseline. Moreover, WLE held a joint Knowledge Management and Communication workshop in October in collaboration with the CRP on Livestock and Fish. The [WLE website](#) and [blog](#) underpin WLE's strategy for engagement with CGIAR and external partners, with the blog generating 9,000 unique page views from 42 posts in 2012 since going live in September.

Programmatically, a major challenge has been to articulate how WLE operates as a whole and different elements link together. This is largely due to the legacy of projects mapped to WLE that have contractual obligations that restrict the ability of the program to move into new integrated areas of research for development. In addition, the initial set of impact pathways described in the proposal had to be revised. WLE initiated a strategic planning process to hone its direction with a draft developed in September 2012. The [plan is now being reworked](#) following recommendations from the Management and Steering Committees to operationalize the program in *focal regions*. [Three focal regions will be designed](#) in 2013 (Volta/Niger, Indus/Ganges and Nile/Eastern Africa) and further focal regions will follow in 2014; at the same time, the program also will continue to accommodate research in other regions and at a global scale for learning and outreach.

Finally, the Program Director appointed in February 2012 resigned at the end of the year. An Interim Director has been appointed and a full-time replacement will be secured in 2013. While this was initially a setback for the program, there is now greater involvement of the IWMI

¹ Based on consultation with CGIAR DGs in 2012, the composition of the WLE Management Committee was adjusted in early 2013 to ensure that all institutions that have committed significant W1 & W2 funding are now represented

² Fremier, A.K., F. DeClerck², N.A. Bosque-Perez, N. Estrada Carmona, R. Hill, T. Joyal, L. Keesecker, P.Z. Klos, A. Martinez-Salinas, R. Niemeyer, A. Sanfiorenzo, K. Welsh, and J.D. Wulforst. (2013). Understanding spatial-temporal lags in ecosystem services to improve incentive mechanisms and governance. Submitted to *Bioscience*. *In Press, accepted Feb 12, 2013*

Management Team in WLE, improved communications with partners and stronger ownership of the program by the newly broadened Management Committee.

WLE is attempting to improve sustainable intensification of agriculture and to ensure that the benefits associated with sustainable natural resource management are shared among stakeholders, particularly the poor and marginalized. These two stories exemplify WLE work:

- The incorporation of the National Irrigation Management Fund in India's 12th Five Year Plan worth USD 1.25 billion, is designed to incentivize irrigation agencies to improve the management of India's public irrigation system. This is a direct outcome of the IWMI Tata Program engagement with the Planning Commission and will make a significant impact in increasing the performance of canal-based irrigation schemes, thereby improving overall efficiency in water use.
- The Africa Soil Information Service project has applied advanced infrared soil spectroscopy technology, soil mapping methods and analytical tools for landscape assessment to 60 sentinel sites. This initiative has significantly advanced soil and landscape assessment mapping science and capacity in sub-Saharan Africa, and will be an invaluable resource in planning sustainable intensification. The project, led by CIAT, was a collaboration with ICRAF, Colombia University, ISRIC and national partners in Mali, Tanzania, Malawi, Kenya and Nigeria.

Financial Summary

Component	2012 Activity Plan (USD 000's)				2012 Actual Expenditures (USD 000's)			
	W1&W2	W3 & Bilateral	Other Funds	Total	W1&W2	W3 & Bilateral	Other Funds	Total
Total	29,064	45,682	496	75,243	22,359	32,983	132	55,474

WLE expenditure in 2012 was \$55.5m against a budgeted total of \$75.2m. The divergence was due to i) Essential Program Activities budget underexpenditure due to a late start delaying activities including recruitments and ii) \$12.4m shortfall in bilateral funding. An approach for tracking gender-related investments is being developed within WLE's Gender Strategy.

B. Impact Pathway and Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs)

WLE formulated four goals to guide its work in the coming 12 years:

- Food security and livelihoods of male and female farmers in Sub-Saharan Africa are improved through expansion of small-scale irrigation and strategic improvements in rainfed agricultural systems which do not compromise ecosystem functions underpinning sustained development.
- Livelihoods of rural poor, particularly women, in Asia, are strengthened through improved irrigation and agricultural water management.
- The development of water, land, energy and ecosystems is maintained and enhanced through the equitable sharing of benefits and risks among different uses and users across key river basins and landscapes.
- The concept of agriculture within vibrant ecosystems is adopted as a central tenet of the global discourse on sustainable development.

IDOs and impact pathways to achieve these will be developed for *each of the focal regions* and at the global scale. An example of how these focal region impact pathways may look has been developed for the Volta ([Volta Impact Pathway draft document](#)) and is indicative of the types of

outcomes we seek. This will include livelihood outcomes, changes in policies and legislation as well as innovative linkages with the private sector where business models are used.

Activity clusters, indicators and IDOs were still in development at the end of the year, therefore the baselines that will be needed to measure progress along WLE Impact Pathways are not yet compiled. WLE's Monitoring and Evaluation system will guide the establishment of baselines including initiating a survey of baseline data available for WLE's portfolio of individual activities to assess its value and any potential gaps.

C. Progress along the Impact Pathway

C.1 Narrative of major achievements, by Theme

Given that agreements with partners were only signed midway through year and impact pathways are still being designed, it has not been possible to undertake a systematic review of progress along the IPs during this first year; instead the following narrative refers to a few highlighted activities representing important outputs and outcomes. Further details can be found within the individual partner reports, which can be found [here](#).

One hundred sixty-two activities were implemented in 2012 with funding from Windows 1, 2 and 3 as well as bilateral funding; the full list of which is available [here](#). Partners provided data for indicators based on a template sent by WLE at the end of the reporting period. It has not been possible to address several of the indicators since the amended template from the Consortium Office was only received recently and partners were not asked to collect certain data during their 2012 activities.

Results of the irrigation SRP's partner workshop in May included a spotlight on the potential of water management to increase agriculture productivity in African and peri-urban agriculture (with the RRR SRP). The SRP also held a number of e-discussions and a workshop with FAO. Further planning was carried out on African irrigation, water management in Eastern Gangetic Basin, and managing salt-water balance in the Indus and Central Asian irrigation systems.

The Rainfed SRP made progress in aligning partners and with global initiatives. Activities included a partner workshop in June, consultative processes in developing a white paper, co-hosting a UNEP-STAP workshop on soil carbon, visiting partners and donors, and engaging in high level conferences and forums. These activities have introduced WLE at various forums in Europe and Australia, and have begun new research collaborations with partners including FAO, Economics of Land Degradation (ELD) and UNCCD.

The Resource Recovery and Re-Use (RRR) SRP was already underway at IWMI, hence it has become operational very quickly within WLE. The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)-funded flagship project works in nine peri-urban areas in Asia, Africa and Latin America. RRR research is mainly led by IWMI with ICRISAT implementing a North-South technology transfer project in India and ICARDA addressing grey water reuse in the Near East. Activity clusters were developed on business opportunities for resource recovery and use, the use of safe wastewater, and efficient water and land management in peri-urban areas (with SRP Irrigation). Brochures were developed for these activities and a business plan for the SRP has been drafted, which will serve as a model for the other SRPs.

The River Basins SRP kicked off with a workshop in May and has developed activity clusters on managing water resources variability, resource allocation and benefit sharing, water and energy for food and water data and accounting. Inception meetings were held for components on natural and built infrastructure and "Underground Taming of Floods" (UTF) through innovative

groundwater recharge. These and parallel CPWF developments resulted in several new ideas on revitalizing water storage as a means of buffering water resources variability, putting the natural flow regulating ecosystem services into focus, and improving management of reservoir storage for livelihoods. Two special sessions for the Global Water Systems Project 2013 conference on the water, energy and food nexus also were developed and WLE and the basin theme were introduced at various international forums.

The Information SRP has developed activity clusters on connecting information to development decisions and measuring agro-ecosystem health. A workshop on Applied Information Economics took place in October, which resulted in the design of an Intervention Decision Model framework, in partnership with Hubbard Decision Research. This will be used to analyze interventions across the WLE research portfolio, in many cases focusing on intervention decisions in the focal regions to identify high value information needs, beginning in 2013.

The Ecosystem Service and Resilience working group, comprising members from each center and from each SRP, met for the first time in October 2012. The group has compiled a working list of CRP research on ecosystem services. It is currently working on the development of the Ecosystem Service and Resilience framework with active contributions from CRP partners (e.g. CIRAD, Ecoagriculture Partners, Stockholm Resilience Center, and the Natural Capital Project) which will be launched at the Ecosystem Service partnership meeting in Bali in 2013. Working group leadership has presented WLE to partners in the U.S. and Europe. The group is currently engaged in integrating ecosystem service work across the SRPs with a specific focus on WLE focal regions.

A list of all completed indicators for WLE submitted by each center is available [here](#). In all cases, data given for CPWF is for the period April 2011-April 2012, since the program has a different reporting structure and has not been able to collect data for the calendar year of 2012.

C.2 Progress towards outputs

WLE counts seven major flagship products (following the definition given in Annex 1) that were in the early stages of development in 2012: 1) Integrated frameworks for assessment and diagnosis of landscape integrity; 2) Intervention packages and adoption frameworks for spatially- and socially-explicit integrated solutions to increase eco-efficiency of production systems and enhance ecosystem services and livelihoods; 3) Catalogues of promising RRR business cases and models for nutrient, water and energy; 4) Demonstrated technical performance of underground solutions and wetlands in terms of mitigation of flood risks (UTF) and conjunctive management of flood and droughts, with potential large economic benefits to farmers; 5) Water Accounting (WA+) framework that summarizes water resources flows, stocks, conditions and management at the basin level; 6) Probabilistic Intervention Decision Modeling Platform; 7) Global Information and Knowledge Facility for Agrobiodiversity Conservation and Usage.

Partner centers cited a number of flagship products in their reports to WLE. Based on the definition in Annex 1, we have classified 41 of these products as tools. About 15% of these tools likely can be assessed for gender-disaggregated impact. Examples of such products include a gendered map of farming systems in Sub-Saharan Africa, and a participatory video of rainwater management issues between farmers and policy makers. Highlights from the wide variety of outputs from WLE include:

- The January 2013 publication of “Essential Biodiversity Variables” in Science (vol 339, 18 January 2013) identifies candidate essential biodiversity variables that need to be monitored by the global community in order to reduce the rate of biodiversity loss, avert dangerous biodiversity change, and meet the 2020 Aichi Targets of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Through Bioversity, WLE represents agricultural and development sectors on the

Intergovernmental Panel on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services focusing on how the poor benefit from ecosystem services.

- A concept of flood attenuation through underground storage demonstrated that in a river basin of some 16,000 km² such as the Chao Phraya in Thailand, an additional 5,000 million m³ of flood water can be harvested in the long-term. While this was only an initial assessment, it sets an example. Linked to this, regional analysis on flood risks has been undertaken in South Asia (in partnership with CCAFS) and similar work is being conducted in Southeast Asia. Estimated long-term annual economic losses of USD 20 billion, attributable to catastrophic floods in flood hotspots globally, sets a preliminary threshold against which to evaluate further benefits. This estimate will be further refined in 2013, and more site-specific estimates may be possible.
- Investment options for scaling-up irrigation and the M&E for Agricultural Water Management Indicators are being undertaken to help the Southern African Development Community achieve its target of doubling the area under irrigation by 2015. An annual status and outlook report including investment levels and the tracking of Agricultural Water Indicators are two high-level outputs that serve as sources of information and evidence for investment and policy decisions.
- Partners tested partial root-zone drying technologies in potatoes in the tropical arid Peruvian coast, and two semi-arid temperate areas in China; Gansu and Inner Mongolia provinces. The Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences has started trials to test the concept with drip irrigation in 2012. Soil carbon assessments under different uses were conducted in the Andes and Kenya.
- The economic value of water-related ecosystem services was determined in four watersheds in Peru and Colombia by means of different economic methods and input from hydrologists and agronomists. These are being used as reference values for Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) negotiation and for redefining PES design strategies.
- Within RRR, a revision of the agricultural policy in a province of Sri Lanka was achieved based on research on business opportunities related to urban farming, which in turn catalyzed a revision to the National Agriculture Policy. FAO published its Farmer Field School manual based on WLE research on safe wastewater use, and USEPA-USAID Wastewater Use Guidelines, international chapter, build strongly on this research for WHO and refer to WLE. WHO has signed a memorandum of understanding with IWMI to join its Global Expert Group on water quality. A manual "Safety Guidelines for Grey and Wastewater Use in Palestine" was adopted by policy makers and beneficiaries in the MENA region.
- The CPWF in the Nile has developed and tested tools, models and scenarios for its landscape approach to rainwater management, utilizing primary and secondary biophysical and socio-economic data in three sentinel sites in the uplands of Ethiopia with differing degrees of land degradation. At these sites, primary biophysical data (meteorological, soil and groundwater and stream discharge), economic surveys of livelihoods, and both formal and informal governance structures have been evaluated. Innovation platforms have been established at the local level to identify issues and possible solutions.
- The CPWF in Mekong, along with the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Sida released a one-hour documentary film on the impacts of hydropower development in the region. This film was widely viewed throughout the Mekong region through the Goethe Institute Southeast Asian Film Festival which attracts more than 500,000 viewers. The movie has appeared on Vietnam National TV as well as Thai Public Broadcasting Station.

- The first ever environmental flow assessment of the Ganges produced multiple outputs ranging from a guide for replicating the study in other Indian river basins, a methodology paper on the trade-off between environmental and agricultural water needs in the basin, a water allocation model for the basin, and a pioneering idea of how to incorporate spiritual water requirements into basin water development plans.
- 158 publications, listed [here](#).

C.3 Progress towards the achievement of outcomes

The following highlights from WLE activities are at a *general outcome level*, rather than being focused on the IDOs of the CRP, as these are under development. They include:

- CIAT and IITA are contributing to N2Africa a major initiative to improve soil fertility and yields among smallholder farmers by introducing nitrogen fixation technologies. The initiative focuses on growing legumes such as soybeans, cowpeas and peanuts, as well as using the most advanced rhizobium, compost and chemical fertilizer practices. Some legumes are particularly effective at converting nitrogen in the air to the soil through their roots – the soil bacteria rhizobium aids in such nitrogen fixing. N2Africa will reach more than 225,000 farmers, more than 50 percent of whom are women, in eight sub-Saharan African countries with more countries soon to be on board. The project is changing behavior in farming techniques. It was designed as a development program, but at the same time data collected through field trials can be used to better understand crop production variability and target future interventions with the goal of improving livelihoods and sustaining resources.
- Since 2005, CIAT and CPWF have been working on understanding benefit sharing mechanisms (BSM) to maintain watersheds in Peru. In close partnership with the Ministry of Environment of Peru, the projects have helped define priority areas and design a BSM for the Cañete River Basin. Cañete will be used by the Ministry as a pilot project to guide the development of BSMs in more than 30 additional basins. CIAT and CPWF also recently served on an advisory group to draft national Ecosystem Services legislation. The work in Peru has advanced this year to the design of a trust fund to finance the Cañete BSM and with the likely support of IFAD and the Global Environment Facility. The proposed scheme would use funds provided by downstream users such as urban water consumers and river rafting tourism operators and invest the money in improved water and land management practices, and conservation in the highlands.
- Since 2007, IWMI has worked to foster transboundary cooperation on two small rivers in Central Asia – the Khojabakirgansai shared by Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, and the Shakhimardansa in Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan. In contrast to a basin wide approach in managing water resource on these transboundary rivers, it has been recognized that potential conflicts in this volatile region can be eased through cooperation on small rivers, with the hope such efforts will spread. The two rivers feed into the Syr Darya River which, in turn, empties into the depleted Aral Sea. IWMI organized workshops and helped provide a framework for joint river-management action plans. Changed behaviors have included better communication during extreme weather events, joint water measurements and data sharing, more reliable and timely water distribution, improved maintenance, and a process for resolving disputes. The next logical step is to replicate the process in other places, and encourage regional organizations to set up special funds to support such cooperation.
- Livestock is the largest on-farm income generator in Zimbabwe and together with off-farm income such as labor and remittances, it drives a household's financial portfolio. To stimulate greater reinvestment in agriculture, ICRISAT has led a project over the past decade to develop small stock markets. In Gwanda district, for example, a strong local market has

helped raise the value of one goat from USD 10 to USD 60. The rewards from these functional markets have illustrated to farmers the value of feed and fodder, stimulated on-farm thinking about the value of feed resources, and are slowly changing farmers' investments in crop production, especially the use of legumes as fodder crops. The work is done using an innovation platform approach that brings together various stakeholders in a value chain to determine where the bottlenecks may be found. Changes in how farmers use new technologies has been seen as well as changes between participants in the platforms.

- ICARDA works with home farmers in arid and semi-arid areas of Jordan, Lebanon and Palestine to promote the safe use of wastewater and grey water for irrigation. A total of 24 grey-water treatment units were installed in target areas between 2010-2012. Project beneficiaries in Jordan formed their own Grey-Water Reuse Association, and safe reuse of grey water was promoted through a public-awareness campaign that included posters, radio discussions and a video. Training, particularly targeting women, was conducted on the operation and maintenance of the systems. As an example of the project and a change of behavior, a group of farmers and technical staff from the West Bank and Gaza Strip visited farms, research stations and water treatment plants in Jordan to learn how to safely use grey water and wastewater, and how to monitor water quality with simple tests. The Palestinians have since repaired a neglected wastewater treatment station in the city of Ateel in the northern West Bank.

C.4 Progress towards Impact

Two illustrative activities leading to impact include:

- The WLE Program is influencing the 12th Five Year Plan of the Government of India, through its co-funding of the IWMI Tata Program (ITP) research. ITP research contributed to the core ideas of a USD 250 million investment to rewire a rural power grid to separate and intelligently ration electricity to farmers and their agricultural wells. The Jyotigram scheme in Gujarat was used to control groundwater overpumping caused by heavily-subsidized electricity, and is being replicated in several states of India. This directly led to a USD 450 million tubewell recharge scheme announced by India's Finance Minister in the 2007 budget. These and other outcomes of this research effort have led to the incorporation of a USD 1.25 billion National Irrigation Management Fund in India's 12th Five Year Plan. The fund is designed to incentivize irrigation agencies to improve the management of India's public irrigation system.
- In Tanzania, AgWater Solutions recommendations were presented to the Parliamentary Committee on Agriculture, Water and Livestock. The Committee pledged to support a USD 6 million increase in the Ministry of Agriculture 2012-2013 budget to accommodate the proposed solutions for smallholder farmers. The meeting resulted in substantial media interest and a follow-up media workshop. As a result, the AWM project and proposed solutions have been highlighted on prime time TV, radio and print media. In August 2012, the Deputy Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives, confirmed that the project research and dialogue process were important factors in the government's decision to increase national investment in agriculture.

D. GENDER RESEARCH ACHIEVEMENTS

The Gender, Poverty and Institutions Coordinator was recruited in 2012 with the Coordinator beginning in March 2013. Emphasis on gender issues was provided through the CGIAR Gender Strategy, with CPWF providing support on principles of gender mainstreaming. As the gender strategy is still being developed, WLE decided to continue with selected gender-related research

activities, which will feed into the gender strategy once completed. Overall, WLE partners state that 37 of their outputs in 2012 will be used to enhance gender equality. These include:

- One hypothesis being tested is that low adoption of soil and water conservation practices by smallholder farmers is due to lack of gender neutral technologies, as most conservation measures are either labor or cash intensive and are difficult for women to adopt.
- Research on nitrogen fixation in Africa has involved Women4Women, an NGO dealing exclusively with women from post-war areas, to implement a program for women on processing legume products into various recipes for improved nutrition and income.
- A case study was carried out on women's farmer-based organizations and gender mainstreaming in national, regional and local level politics in the Upper East Region of Ghana and carried out gender training for the Ganges Basin Challenge.
- Under the AgWater Solutions project, methods for mapping gendered farm management systems in Sub-Saharan Africa were explored. An interactive gender map for Africa was produced which illustrates gender-related farming systems to inform future investments. Papers were developed on Gendered Farming Systems and Gender Aspects of Small Private Irrigation.
- The complementary roles of men and women in market-oriented urban vegetable farming were analyzed to assess opportunities and disadvantages which gender mainstreaming would cause if current activity domains would be accessible to the opposite gender³.
- An activity on grey water use created beneficiary women's committees and undertook 28 training sessions with women of beneficiary households. This project supported six demonstration site visits from partners in Lebanon and Palestine, providing training on the installation, operation and maintenance of household grey-water treatment units.
- An assessment of integrated landscape initiatives for Latin America and Africa (Ecoagriculture Partners, Bioversity, Conservation International and ICRAF) was completed, with a similar effort now launched in Asia. These assessments considered the motivating forces that drove more than 300 landscape scale co-management initiatives. The survey included several components related to the role of gender both in terms of driving efforts, and representation in leadership.

D.1 Gender equality targets defined

Gender equality targets are being established through two processes. Within the SRPs, the most pertinent gender issues are being identified in specific research areas through a gender analysis, which will feed into the development of targets. Since a majority of gender issues are context and culturally specific, a more process-oriented and participatory approach also will be used within WLE focal regions to develop appropriate targets. A set of indicators and a monitoring process will be developed as part of the initial design work in these regions, beginning with Volta/Niger, Indus/Ganges and Nile/East Africa. Baselines will be defined as part of WLE's strategy for Monitoring and Evaluation.

³ Drechsel, P., L. Hope and O. Cofie. 2013. Gender mainstreaming: Who wins? Gender and irrigated urban vegetable production in West Africa. *Journal of Gender and Water (wH2O)* Vol 2:15-17

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

Each partner has, to different degrees and success, established mechanisms to perform research in a gender-sensitive way. So far, there has been limited capacity within the CRP management to add value to this. However with the appointment of a Gender, Poverty and Institutions Coordinator, there is now a strong basis for developing the capacity within WLE. The type of support and training needed will be identified through a rapid but thorough gender audit done within each of the SRPs. The main method of mainstreaming will be to ensure a limited set of criteria within each SRP, tailored to each SRP, and to ensure that the coordinator is linked with the gender focal points of our partners for the development of the research design within the focal regions.

E. PARTNERSHIPS BUILDING ACHIEVEMENTS

WLE engages at the CGIAR system level with African partners through the Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Program, which has now become the chief means of engagement with new partners in Africa. The ESS&R working group involves volunteers from all WLE partners as well as the Stockholm Resilience Center, CIRAD, the Natural Capital Project and EcoAgriculture Partners among others. Stockholm Resilience and EcoAgriculture have been particularly strong advocates for integrated approaches to landscape management, while the Natural Capital Project has pioneered tools and models for evaluating ecosystem service provision at landscape scales for decision makers. Through the basins SRP, a potential link to the insurance industry is under analysis for flood risk assessment and inundation mapping in Southern Africa and Southeast Asia.

Links have been made with other CRPs, including CCAFS in particular, to share experience, processes and templates for CRP management and introduce a degree of harmonization in terms of reporting and planning requirements across a few of the CRPs. It was agreed that the three NRM CRPs will coordinate at a strategic level, to be pursued further in 2013.

Within each portfolio, there are examples of cross-CRP interactions. During the Rainfed workshop, presentations were made by scientists who work in both WLE and these other programs. Rainfed is working closely with other CRPs and there are ongoing discussions with these to co-location of activities and joint projects. East, West and Southern Africa offer significant opportunities to work together across scales and agendas among these programs, as does Central America. The ESS&R group collaborates with Dryland Systems, Humidtropics and Aquatic Agriculture Systems CRPs, as well as with Forests, Trees and Agroforestry on ecosystem service research and frameworks. The Information Systems SRP is supporting the CGIAR process of developing System-Level Outcome Impact Pathways and Linkages; land health surveillance methods are being used as a baseline and monitoring system in a number of CGIAR and other projects. Mars Inc. is supporting application of land health surveillance to prioritize and monitor improved agro-ecosystem productivity in the smallholder cocoa sector in Cote d'Ivoire. The World Bank Living Standards Measurement Study requested CGIAR assistance to pilot soil monitoring using soil spectroscopy into the LSMS protocol. The overlap with Dryland Systems and Humidtropics in the Volta Basin, and with Humidtropics in the Nile, presents a critical opportunity for cross-scale interaction.

The IFAD grant on mainstreaming CPWF innovations addresses targeting uptake and brokerage with IFAD and other development agencies. The Planning Commission of the Government of Bangladesh recently invited the Ganges Basin Development Challenge to develop joint policy briefs with the recommendations based on its innovative research findings.

The value of information analysis of WLE interventions is being conducted in partnership with Hubbard Decision Research, a professional private consulting firm.

F. CAPACITY BUILDING

WLE is now defining its strategy for capacity development, which will facilitate a more coherent capacity building portfolio for 2013 onwards. In 2012, WLE supported 3,802 trainees through its research activities. Of these 1,443 were female. WLE-related activities involved 299 MSc/PhD students, of whom 114 were female. CPWF implemented capacity building events for more than 745 people and engaged more than 2,500 people in more than 220 outreach events. Of these 55% were male and 45% female. An estimated 95% of participants were from Africa, Asia and Latin America. CPWF engaged 95 students, 82 MScs, 13 PhDs, 1 MPhil, of which 34 (36%) female students; 94 of these students are nationals from CPWF basin countries. The RRR SRP supported together with UN-Water the training of NARS in 70 countries, in [safe wastewater use](#). Details of individual trainings can be found in partner reports. Highlights include IFPRI training of 15 staff from two NGOs in India on the “groundwater game”; CIAT’s training of more than 110 NARs partners in socio-economic and agronomic data collection, and Open Data Kit data collection using Samsung tablets in Kenya and Tanzania.

A few examples of the many training workshops under WLE in 2012 include:

- Training workshop on Applied Information Economics/ Decision Analysis Workshop “How to Measure Sustainable Agriculture”
- Group training: Water users associations and community engagement (two workshops for IFAD-supported AWM/NRM projects in Eastern and Southern Africa)
- Group training: Knowledge sharing workshop and exchange visit on water users associations and infrastructure for spate irrigation (IFAD-supported projects in Ethiopia)
- More than 500 visitors to ICRAF’s Soil-Plant Spectral Diagnostics Laboratory learned about new methods for low cost, high throughput soil analysis.

G. RISK MANAGEMENT

In 2012 there was a lack of additional W1&2 funding available to encourage innovation. Funds have now been made available for this and the process is under development. Uncertainty about the possibilities for carry-over of unspent W1&W2 funds during 2012 has caused considerable concern among contributing partners, who were not able or willing to absorb the risk of reduced funding for their activity portfolio under WLE for 2013.

WLE in 2012 supported 162 separate activities, an approach which is not sustainable in the long term but was a necessity due to the legacy nature of projects during the development period for SRPs, activity clusters and the strategy for the program as a whole. The program will now move toward a focal region approach which will show the interactions between different research efforts within a landscape, creating more coherency within the program.

The administrative burden from the CGIAR management during this period of establishing CRPs and setting up systems took time away from WLE planning and research. Considerable effort and resources have been expended to meet demands from the Consortium Office. There is considerable fatigue among collaborators within and outside the CGIAR with the continuous consultation and redefinition process.

H. LESSONS LEARNED

One of the main lessons learned is that if the CRP is going to be a real partnership-driven program, there is a need for greater buy-in as WLE was seen primarily as the “IWMI” CRP. After discussions with various Director Generals, the WLE Management Committee was expanded. There are now co-leaders for each SRP that has allowed more partners to participate directly in the governance of WLE as well as broadened the focus. In addition, a substantial amount of time was spent articulating the impact pathways of the SRPs into activity clusters.

Another lesson that has emerged is the importance of forming solid Theories of Change and Impact Pathways at the regional level where change is most likely to occur and where real integration of the SRPs can happen. The initial proposal and program setup was very “silo’d” with each SRP working on its own. It was found that where integration most naturally happens is in geographies. Each SRP was broken down into two to four activity clusters, allowing for more geographic and thematic focus. The next step in 2013 and 2014 will be to establish integrated impact pathways in WLE focal regions where SRPs can work together.

The need for adaptive and flexible evolution of the SRP was also important. For instance, the Rainfed SRP was identified as the least defined. In 2012 a number of workshops with partners were held to better define the SRP. This has led to a better articulation of its theories of change, closer integration and linkages with the ESS&R working group as well as greater buy-in of partners. Likewise the Information SRP reoriented its initial emphasis on ecosystem health surveillance systems in priority river basins, and instead re-directed efforts on new decision analysis research to identify high-value variables and indicators that could most improve major development intervention decisions in WLE. Having such a flexible research agenda which meets the challenges and opportunities identified by development partners will be essential if WLE research is going to have outcomes.

i. Estimate the overall level of confidence/uncertainty of the indicators provided in Table 1.

See footnotes to Annex 1

ii. Description, if relevant, of research avenues that did not produce expected results, and description of implications for the CRP, such as new research directions pursued instead and their expected outputs and outcomes.

ILRI’s efforts under WLE were focused on the development of a proposal, the intended outcome of which was that policymakers, planners and pastoralists use insights on the role of ecosystem services to support the livelihoods of pastoralists and to identify grazing and rangeland management options that will strengthen livelihood support over the long-term. However, the proposal submission was not successful.

iii. Lessons learned by the CRP from monitoring the indicators and from qualitative analyses of progress.

Indicators that could be tracked at this stage are, as expected, mainly at the output end of the spectrum, with more outcome oriented results expected as the program grows. From the indicators we have been able to measure within the current portfolio of activities, we can see that training and publications have been a major focus and that sex-disaggregation of data needs more focus in the future of WLE.

A lesson learned is that the indicators in Annex 1 may provide a distorted view. WLE has asked contributing centers to provide their indicators, which has two potential risks:

- i. Accountability – it is not clear for some indicators whether they are to be attributed to WLE or to individual centers. It is also not clear whether “double reporting” is likely, i.e. are indicators such as outputs attributed to one or more CRPs and, if so, whether that is justified.
- ii. ‘Traceability’ or compliance; how do indicators realistically contribute to the CRP and how can we ensure quality control? Monitoring these indicators appears likely to bear huge transaction costs on the part of the centers and the CRP(s).

Not all of the original indicators were meaningful. For example “number of countries using results” cannot be aggregated across activities as countries will be counted several times. It was useful to receive a set of more considered indicators, however these arrived too late to be measured in 2012. For meaningful qualitative analysis of progress, there should be clear qualitative indicators. Indicators such as No. 11 “number of targeted agro-ecosystems analyzed/characterized by CRP” are not useful without qualitative information. The guideline to “Use the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA) typology [...] to define these agro-ecosystems and specify the regions concerned” is not helpful to WLE which has with a more integrative focus, putting people first.

Other questions arising include:

- The legitimacy of counting only ISI journals as indicators while the CGIAR is moving toward a system in which open access to research is becoming more important. Many open access journals are not ISI, but may still be highly reputable and more accessible outlets for valuable peer-reviewed research. Technical journals written in local languages often bear important impact in the regions where we work. Web-based documents that are easily accessible and useable by our primary stakeholders and development partners also bear relevance.
- Why trainees and students are not segregated into developing and developed countries. This together with the gender disaggregation would provide more meaningful insights than gender disaggregation alone.

Annexes

Annex 1: CRP indicators of progress, with glossary and targets⁴

WLE partners had been asked to provide data for a set of indicators which were provided in the first annual report template received. Where possible, data collected have been used to complete this table, however many of these indicators are not answerable by the data available; for this reason there are a number of gaps in the table in terms of achievements for 2012 and also for targets for 2012 – 14 since WLE partners have not yet set these.

⁴ Where possible, data for the following original indicators have been used to complete this table, however many of the new indicators are not answered by these:

- Number of publications in ISI (Institute for Scientific Information, now Thomson Scientific) journals
- Number of flagship “products”/“technologies”/“tools”/“policies” produced -
- Number of open access databases maintained
- Number of users of open-access databases
- Number of hits/views/requests coming in through electronic media such as knowledge banks, CRP and institutional home portals, websites, other ICT media
- Number of trainees (total)
 - Out of which: number of female trainees
 - Out of which: number of male trainees
 - Out of which: number of trainees from developing countries
 - Out of which: number of trainees from developed countries
- Number of M.Sc. and PhD students supervised (total)
 - Out of which: number of female M.Sc. and PhD students
 - Out of which: number of male M.Sc. and PhD students
 - Out of which: number of M.Sc. and PhD students from developing countries
 - Out of which: number of M.Sc. and PhD students from developed countries
- Number of meetings, workshops, seminars
- Number of countries using results
- Number of agencies, actors using tools & results in implementation
- Number of outputs used to enhance gender equality

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
KNOWLEDGE, TOOLS, DATA							
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		Not available	None	7 ⁵	Not available
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		Not available	None	15% ⁶	Not available
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		Not available	None	15% ⁷	Not available
All	4. Number of “tools”	These are significant decision-support tools, guidelines, and/or		Not	41 ⁸	Not	Not

⁵ Estimate: 1) Integrated frameworks for assessment and diagnosis of landscape integrity; 2) Intervention packages and adoption frameworks for spatially- and socially-explicit integrated solutions to increase eco-efficiency of production systems and enhance ecosystem services and livelihoods; 3) Catalogues of promising RRR business cases and models for nutrient, water and energy; 4) Demonstrated technical performance of underground solutions and wetlands in terms of mitigation of flood risks (UTF); 5) Water Accounting (WA+) framework that summarizes water resources conditions and management at the basin level; 6) Probabilistic Intervention Decision Modeling Platform; 7) Global Information and Knowledge Facility for Agrobiodiversity Conservation and Usage

⁶ Product no. 2, socially-explicit integrated solutions to increase eco-efficiency of production systems and enhance ecosystem services and livelihoods.

⁷ Idem

⁸ Number of “tools”, is based on the assumption that Centers providing number of flagship products as they did for 2012 refer more precisely to ‘tools’

	produced by CRP	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		available		available	available
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		Not available	Not available ⁹	Not available	Not available
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		Not available	15% ¹⁰	Not available	Not available
All	7. Number of open access databases maintained by CRP			None	None ¹¹	Not available	Not available
All	8. Total number of users of these open access databases			Not available	Not available ¹²	Not available	Not available
All	9. Number of publications in ISI journals produced by CRP			Not available	158 ¹³	Not available	Not available
1,2,3, 4, 6	10. Number of strategic value chains analyzed by CRP						
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		Not available	3 ¹⁴	3	3
1,5,6,7	12. Estimated population of above-mentioned agro-ecosystems			Not available	Not available ¹⁵	Not available	Not available

⁹ Impossible to analyze within short time-frame

¹⁰ 2012 estimate derived from Center reporting; 2013-14 not available (unknown)

¹¹ WLE did not establish and maintain open access databases as yet; participating centers do and have noted these in individual reports

¹² Idem

¹³ Based on reports from partners. WLE has not verified that all are published in ISI journals.

¹⁴ Result based on FAO system <http://www.fao.org/nr/gaez/en/>

CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT AND INNOVATION PLATFORMS ¹⁶							
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		Not available	2458 ¹⁷	Not available	Not available
All	14. Number of trainees in short-term programs facilitated by CRP (female)	(see above, but for female)		Not available	1443 ¹⁸	Not available	Not available
All	15. Number of trainees in long-term programs facilitated by CRP (male) ¹⁹	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.		Not available	183	Not available	Not available
All	16. Number of trainees in	(see above, but for female)		Not	114	Not	Not

¹⁵ Impossible to tell approximate number of inhabitants in those agro-ecosystems at this stage

¹⁶ Not helpful that no distinction is anymore made between "from developed countries" and "from developing countries"

¹⁷ Short-term trainees (male) counted from indicators provided by Centers, excluding CIAT's "95,000 hh reached by extension materials"

¹⁸ Idem for female trainees

¹⁹ Here we assume "long-term" trainees being MSc. & PhD students

	long-term programs facilitated by CRP (female) ²⁰			available		available	available
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.		None	None ²¹	Not available	Not available
TECHNOLOGIES/PRACTICES IN VARIOUS STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT							
All	18. Number of technologies/NRM practices under research in the CRP (Phase I)	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including biodegradable packaging • 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; • Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides sustainably and environmentally applied, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies; • Management and cultural practices: sustainable water management; practices; sustainable land management practices; sustainable fishing practices; Information technology, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing 		10 ²²	10		

²⁰ Idem for female trainees

²¹ No multi-stakeholder R4D platforms established or planned for WLE yet

²² Precise figure given for RRR only, through Safe waste water irrigation

		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. 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.					
All	19. % of technologies under research that have an explicit target of women farmers ²³	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					
All	20. % of technologies under research that have been assessed for likely gender-disaggregated impact ²⁴	Reports/papers describing the products should include a focus on gender-disaggregated impacts if they are to be counted					
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 ²⁵	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					
1,5,6,7	22. Number of people who will potentially benefit from plans, once	Indicate the potential number of both women and men					

²³ Idem for explicit target of women farmers

²⁴ Idem for % assessed for likely gender disaggregated impacts

²⁵ Number of agro-ecosystems for which WLE has identified feasible approaches for improving ecosystem services at this stage impossible to assess.

	finalised, for the scaling up of strategies ²⁶						
All, except 2	23. Number of technologies /NRM practices field tested (phase II) ²⁷	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.					
1,5,6,7	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					
1,5,6,7	25. % of above innovations/approaches/options that are targeted at decreasing inequality between men and women						
1,5,6,7	26. Number of published research outputs from CRP utilised in targeted agro-ecosystems						
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					

²⁶ Idem for scaling up

²⁷ Indicators for Phase 1 and beyond are impossible to assess at this stage; even to establish a target for this and next year

		not be included.					
POLICIES IN VARIOUS STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT							
All	28. Numbers of Policies/ Regulations/ Administrative Procedures Analyzed (Stage 1)	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). 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.					
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.)					
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).					
All	32. Number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures passed for which	: ...completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority)			1 ²⁸		

²⁸ NIMF within the 5 year plan for the Government of India.

	implementation has begun (Stage 5)						
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					
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: 34 (a) number of women farmers concerned 34(b) number of male farmers concerned					

Annex 2: Performance indicators for gender mainstreaming with targets defined

Performance Indicator	CRP performance approaches requirements	CRP performance meets requirements	CRP performance exceeds requirements
1. Gender inequality targets defined	Sex-disaggregated social data is being collected and used to diagnose important gender-related constraints in at least one of the CRP's main target populations	Sex-disaggregated social data collected and used to diagnose important gender-related constraints in at least one of the CRP's main target populations And The CRP has defined and collected baseline data on the main dimensions of gender inequality in the CRP's main target populations relevant to its expected outcomes (IDOs)	Sex-disaggregated social data collected and used to diagnose important gender-related constraints in at least one of the CRP's main target populations And The CRP has defined and collected baseline data on the main dimensions of gender inequality in the CRP's main target populations relevant to its expected outcomes (IDOs) And CRP targets changes in levels of gender inequality to which the CRP is or plans to contribute, with related numbers of men and women beneficiaries in main target populations
2. Institutional architecture for integration of gender is in place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CRP scientists and managers with responsibility for gender in the CRP's outputs are appointed, have written TORS. - Procedures defined to report use of available diagnostic or baseline knowledge on gender routinely for assessment of the gender equality implications of the CRP's flagship research products as per the Gender Strategy -CRP M&E system has protocol for tracking progress on integration of gender in research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CRP scientists and managers with responsibility for gender in the CRP's outputs are appointed, have written TORS and funds allocated to support their interaction. - Procedures defined to report use of available diagnostic or baseline knowledge on gender routinely for assessment of the gender equality implications of the CRP's flagship research products as per the Gender Strategy -CRP M&E system has protocol for tracking progress on integration of gender in research And A CRP plan approved for capacity development in gender analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CRP scientists and managers with responsibility for gender in the CRP's outputs are appointed, have written TORS and funds allocated to support their interaction. - Procedures defined to report use of available diagnostic or baseline knowledge on gender routinely for assessment of the gender equality implications of the CRP's flagship research products as per the Gender Strategy -CRP M&E system has protocol for tracking progress on integration of gender in research And A CRP plan approved for capacity development in gender analysis And The CRP uses feedback provided by its M&E system to improve its integration of gender into research

Annex 3: Consolidated Financial Report

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 2012 - 31 December 2012					CRP Nr 5 : CRP on Water, Land and Ecosystems									
	(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	1,920	-	934	-	2,854	1,919	-	580	-	2,500	1	-	354	-	354
CIAT	1,088	-	8,785	-	9,873	1,064	-	8,136	-	9,200	24	-	648	-	672
CIFOR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CIMMYT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CIP	426	-	-	-	426	394	-	-	-	394	32	-	-	-	32
ICARDA	980	-	1,770	-	2,750	773	253	1,602	-	2,627	207	(253)	168	-	123
ICRISAT	1,050	-	1,526	-	2,576	1,047	-	939	-	1,986	3	-	587	-	590
IFPRI	1,225	-	638	-	1,863	453	-	487	1	941	772	-	151	(1)	921
IITA	230	1,055	1,626	-	2,911	230	1,403	1,601	-	3,234	-	(348)	25	-	(323)
ILRI	196	-	-	-	196	196	-	174	-	370	0	-	(174)	-	(174)
IRRI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IWMI	20,340	5,196	20,771	-	46,307	14,673	4,306	11,927	-	30,905	5,667	891	8,844	-	15,402
World Agroforestry	1,440	-	3,355	471	5,266	1,440	-	1,523	127	3,091	(0)	-	1,832	344	2,175
World Fish	170	-	26	25	222	170	-	52	3	226	-	-	(26)	22	(4)
Totals for CRP	29,064	6,251	39,430	496	75,243	22,359	5,961	27,023	132	55,474	6,705	291	12,408	365	19,769
	39%	8%	52%	1%	100%	30%	8%	36%	0%	74%	34%	1%	63%	2%	100%

Notes

All figures shown here are illustrative only, and are in USD 000's

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				
Period	1 January 2012 - 31 December 2012				
CRP Nr 5 : CRP on Water, Land and Ecosystems					
PART 1 - Annual FINANCE PLAN (Totals for Windows 1 and 2 combined)					
Approved Level for Year - Initial Approval					
Approved Level for Year - Final Amount					29,064
PART 2 - Funding Summary for Year					
Only the W3 & Bilateral Component completed					
	CRP 2012 Actual Funding				
	Window 1	Window 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Total Funding
W1 Donors					-
ACF			-	25	25
ACIAR			29	1,002	1,031
ADA			-	141	141
ADB			-	158	158
AFDB			-	135	135
AFESD			-	156	156
AGRA			-	1,112	1,112
ASARECA			-	91	91
AusAID			-	1,759	1,759
Balochistan			-	27	27
BMGF			1,403	5,333	6,735
CNADA/CIDA			34	-	34
CAR			-	124	124
CARE			-	62	62
CCF			-	77	77
Challenge Program			-	31	31

China			29	-	29
CIAT			-	405	405
CIC			-	82	82
CIRAD			-	28	28
Coca Cola			-	106	106
Concern Worldwide			-	126	126
DFID			-	24	24
DFID/ICRAF			-	7	7
DFID/NERC			-	105	105
EC			-	362	362
EC/IFAD			1,446	-	1,446
EcoAgriculture			-	41	41
Emory University			-	9	9
FAO			-	359	359
FIBL			-	18	18
GDN			-	5	5
GIZ			-	601	601
Government of Finland			-	309	309
Government of India			80	545	625
Government of South Africa			49	-	49
ICAR			-	7	7
ICRISAT			-	81	81
IDRC			-	108	108
IFAD			-	2,226	2,226
IFAR			-	1	1
IFPRI (USAID)			-	478	478
IITA			-	66	66
International Water and Sanitation Centre			-	9	9
Italy			-	367	367
JAPAN			-	336	336
JICA			-	33	33
Khon Kaen University (KKU)			-	13	13
MARS			-	140	140
MBE			-	5	5
Noragric, Norwegian University of Life Sciences			-	7	7
Norway			-	24	24

OPEC			-	98	98
OXFAM			-	25	25
PN			-	58	58
PRODERN			-	36	36
ROCKFELLER			-	220	220
Sir Ratan Tata Trust			-	90	90
SM			-	93	93
Stockholm Environment Institute			-	17	17
Sweden			-	171	171
Switzerland			1,358	2,664	4,023
TCF			-	39	39
The McKnight Foundation			-	18	18
the Netherlands			-	771	771
TOO Kurylys Servis BKK, Kazakhstan			-	3	3
UNEP			-	174	174
UNEP-GEF			-	24	24
UNESCO-IHE			-	12	12
United Nations University			-	10	10
University of Yale			-	1	1
USAID			1,532	483	2,015
Wageningen University			-	1,487	1,487
WFC			-	147	147
WORLD BANK			-	141	141
WOTRO			-	2	2
WUR			-	2,808	2,808
WWF			-	10	10
Other Funds			-	154	154
			-	-	
			-	-	
Totals for CRP	-	-	5,961	27,023	32,983

Notes

All figures shown here are illustrative only, and are in USD 000's

Amount shown for Window 1 donors is total, as these funds are co-mingled

Amounts shown for Window 2 donors are as per Report L411.

Amounts shown for Window 3 donors are as per Report L201

Amounts shown for Bilateral funding are as per Report L201

Report Description	L111														
Name of Report	CRP Annual Financial Summary														
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office														
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months														
CRP Nr 5 : CRP on Water, Land and Ecosystems															
Period	1 January 2012 - 31 December 2012														

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																	
CRP Nr 5 : CRP on Water, Land and Ecosystems																		
Period	1 January 2012 - 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		
Total CRP																		
Personnel		13,258	1,308	11,310	410	26,286	8,328	1,144	6,990	82	16,545	4,930	164	4,320	328	9,741		
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers		-	1,913	1,998	-	3,911	1,918	988	554	-	3,460	(1,918)	925	1,444	-	451		
Collaborator Costs - Partners		4,257	1,365	12,106	-	17,729	3,123	1,803	6,875	0	11,801	1,135	(437)	5,231	(0)	5,928		
Supplies and Services		6,260	967	6,886	14	14,128	4,339	915	7,628	20	12,902	1,921	52	(741)	(6)	1,225		
Operational Travel		1,576	344	2,642	8	4,570	990	442	1,824	28	3,284	586	(98)	819	(20)	1,286		
Depreciation		387	55	857	-	1,299	195	87	413	-	695	192	(32)	444	-	604		
Sub-total of Direct Costs		25,739	5,952	35,800	432	67,924	18,893	5,379	24,284	131	48,687	6,846	573	11,517	301	19,236		
Indirect Costs		3,326	299	3,630	64	7,319	3,466	581	2,739	1	6,787	(140)	(282)	891	64	533		
Total - all Costs		29,064	6,251	39,430	496	75,243	22,359	5,961	27,023	132	55,474	6,705	291	12,408	365	19,769		
Amounts for each participating center below:																		
Bioversity																		
Personnel		1,021	-	155	-	1,176	1,075	-	164	-	1,238	(54)	-	(9)	-	(62)		
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Collaborator Costs - Partners		9	-	307	-	316	-	-	223	-	223	9	-	84	-	93		
Supplies and Services		559	-	213	-	772	508	-	100	-	608	51	-	113	-	164		
Operational Travel		24	-	110	-	134	30	-	16	-	47	(6)	-	94	-	87		
Depreciation		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Sub-total of Direct Costs		1,613	-	785	-	2,398	1,613	-	503	-	2,116	(0)	-	282	-	282		
Indirect Costs		307	-	149	-	456	306	-	77	-	383	1	-	72	-	73		
Total - all Costs		1,920	-	934	-	2,854	1,919	-	580	-	2,500	1	-	354	-	354		

ICRISAT																	
Personnel		440	-	286	-	726	374	-	242	-	616	66	-	44	-	110	
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Collaborator Costs - Partners		139	-	176	-	315	3	-	224	-	227	136	-	(48)	-	88	
Supplies and Services		189	-	654	-	843	402	-	321	-	723	(213)	-	333	-	120	
Operational Travel		65	-	88	-	153	80	-	41	-	122	(15)	-	47	-	31	
Depreciation		36	-	93	-	129	8	-	5	-	13	28	-	88	-	116	
Sub-total of Direct Costs		869	-	1,297	-	2,166	867	-	834	-	1,701	2	-	463	-	465	
Indirect Costs		181	-	229	-	410	180	-	105	-	286	1	-	124	-	124	
Total - all Costs		1,050	-	1,526	-	2,576	1,047	-	939	-	1,986	3	-	587	-	590	
IFPRI																	
Personnel		474	-	215	-	689	143	-	169	0	312	331	-	46	(0)	377	
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Collaborator Costs - Partners		295	-	215	-	510	140	-	191	0	331	155	-	24	(0)	179	
Supplies and Services		275	-	116	-	391	84	-	70	0	154	191	-	47	(0)	237	
Operational Travel		35	-	22	-	58	21	-	13	0	34	15	-	9	(0)	24	
Depreciation		-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	6	(6)	-	-	-	(6)	
Sub-total of Direct Costs		1,079	-	569	-	1,648	394	-	442	1	837	685	-	127	(1)	811	
Indirect Costs		146	-	69	-	214	59	-	45	0	104	87	-	24	(0)	110	
Total - all Costs		1,225	-	638	-	1,863	453	-	487	1	941	772	-	151	(1)	922	
IITA																	
Personnel		87	339	592	-	1,018	100	281	373	-	754	(13)	58	219	-	264	
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers		-	-	-	-	-	2	69	45	-	115	(2)	(69)	(45)	-	(115)	
Collaborator Costs - Partners		31	170	244	-	445	14	602	383	-	999	17	(432)	(139)	-	(554)	
Supplies and Services		52	312	389	-	753	75	163	451	-	690	(23)	149	(62)	-	63	
Operational Travel		18	109	145	-	272	4	65	87	-	157	14	44	58	-	115	
Depreciation		8	-	115	-	123	-	76	95	-	172	8	(76)	20	-	(49)	
Sub-total of Direct Costs		196	930	1,485	-	2,611	196	1,256	1,435	-	2,886	0	(326)	50	-	(275)	
Indirect Costs		34	125	141	-	300	34	147	167	-	348	(0)	(22)	(26)	-	(48)	
Total - all Costs		230	1,055	1,626	-	2,911	230	1,403	1,601	-	3,234	0	(348)	25	-	(323)	

ILRI																	
Personnel		95	-	-	-	95	47	-	14	-	61	48	-	(14)	-	34	
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	79	-	79	-	-	(79)	-	(79)	
Collaborator Costs - Partners		33	-	-	-	33	-	-	-	-	-	33	-	-	-	33	
Supplies and Services		38	-	-	-	38	120	-	52	-	172	(82)	-	(52)	-	(133)	
Operational Travel		-	-	-	-	-	(0)	-	5	-	5	0	-	(5)	-	(5)	
Depreciation		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Sub-total of Direct Costs		167	-	-	-	167	166	-	149	-	316	0	-	(149)	-	(149)	
Indirect Costs		29	-	-	-	29	29	-	25	-	54	0	-	(25)	-	(25)	
Total - all Costs		196	-	-	-	196	196	-	174	-	370	0	-	(174)	-	(174)	
IWMI																	
Personnel		9,345	969	4,516	-	14,829	4,783	772	3,069	-	8,624	4,562	197	1,447	-	6,206	
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers		-	1,913	1,998	-	3,911	1,917	919	241	-	3,077	(1,917)	994	1,757	-	834	
Collaborator Costs - Partners		3,511	1,195	8,255	-	12,961	2,762	1,180	3,088	-	7,030	749	16	5,167	-	5,931	
Supplies and Services		4,066	655	3,478	-	8,200	2,200	673	3,566	-	6,439	1,867	(18)	(88)	-	1,761	
Operational Travel		1,193	235	1,001	-	2,429	713	356	749	-	1,817	480	(121)	252	-	612	
Depreciation		199	55	227	-	481	18	9	103	-	129	181	46	125	-	352	
Sub-total of Direct Costs		18,314	5,022	19,475	-	42,811	12,391	3,909	10,815	-	27,115	5,922	1,113	8,660	-	15,696	
Indirect Costs		2,026	174	1,296	-	3,496	2,282	396	1,112	-	3,790	(256)	(223)	184	-	(294)	
Total - all Costs		20,340	5,196	20,771	-	46,307	14,673	4,306	11,927	-	30,905	5,667	891	8,844	-	15,402	
World Agroforestry																	
Personnel		625	-	1,456	410	2,491	709	-	599	82	1,391	(84)	-	857	328	1,100	
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Collaborator Costs - Partners		118	-	276	-	394	75	-	41	-	116	43	-	235	-	278	
Supplies and Services		314	-	731	-	1,045	304	-	478	20	802	10	-	253	(20)	243	
Operational Travel		97	-	225	-	322	44	-	94	26	163	53	-	131	(26)	159	
Depreciation		98	-	229	-	327	120	-	87	-	207	(22)	-	142	-	120	
Sub-total of Direct Costs		1,252	-	2,917	410	4,579	1,252	-	1,299	127	2,679	(0)	-	1,618	283	1,900	
Indirect Costs		188	-	438	61	687	188	-	224	-	412	0	-	214	61	275	
Total - all Costs		1,440	-	3,355	471	5,266	1,440	-	1,523	127	3,091	(0)	-	1,832	344	2,175	

World Fish																	
Personnel		140	-	16	-	156		127	-	34	-	160		14	-	(18)	(5)
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
Collaborator Costs - Partners		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
Supplies and Services		0	-	4	14	18		0	-	6	0	6		0	-	(2)	14
Operational Travel		1	-	2	8	11		-	-	3	2	5		1	-	(1)	6
Depreciation		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
Sub-total of Direct Costs		142	-	21	22	185		127	-	43	3	172		15	-	(21)	19
Indirect Costs		28	-	5	3	37		43	-	10	0	54		(15)	-	(5)	(17)
Total - all Costs		170	-	26	25	222		170	-	52	3	226		(0)	-	(26)	22

Report Description	L131														
Name of Report	CRP Themes Report (by Center, and Funding Source)														
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office														
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months														
CRP Nr 5 : CRP on Water, Land and Ecosystems															
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
CRP Report - by Themes															
SRP 1: Irrigation	6,084	1,065	7,433	-	14,581	4,228	876	6,275	1	11,380	1,856	189	1,157	(1)	3,201
SRP 2: Rainfed	7,344	2,175	13,123	-	22,642	6,270	2,375	11,309	-	19,955	1,074	(200)	1,814	-	2,688
SRP 3: RRR	1,048	1,000	1,527	-	3,575	962	34	1,320	-	2,316	86	966	206	-	1,258
SRP 4: River Basins	6,825	2,010	10,582	25	19,443	6,110	1,389	4,498	3	12,000	714	621	6,084	22	7,442
SRP 5: Information	3,085	-	6,767	471	10,322	3,179	1,287	3,619	127	8,212	(94)	(1,287)	3,147	344	2,110
CRP Management/Coordination	4,680	-	-	-	4,680	1,609	-	-	-	1,609	3,070	-	-	-	3,070
Totals for CRP	29,064	6,250	39,431	496	75,243	22,359	5,961	27,022	132	55,473	6,705	290	12,409	365	19,769
Amounts for each participating center below:															
Bioversity															
SRP 1: Irrigation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 2: Rainfed	1,920	-	934	-	2,854	1,919	-	580	-	2,500	1	-	354	-	354
SRP 3: RRR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 4: River Basins	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 5: Information	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total – all Costs	1,920	-	934	-	2,854	1,919	-	580	-	2,500	1	-	354	-	354
CIAT															
SRP 1: Irrigation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 2: Rainfed	853	-	7,988	-	8,841	827	-	7,390	-	8,217	26	-	598	-	623
SRP 3: RRR	235	-	181	-	417	-	-	-	-	-	235	-	181	-	417
SRP 4: River Basins	-	-	-	-	-	237	-	172	-	409	(237)	-	(172)	-	(409)
SRP 5: Information	-	-	615	-	615	-	-	574	-	574	-	-	42	-	42
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total – all Costs	1,088	-	8,785	-	9,873	1,064	-	8,136	-	9,200	24	-	648	-	672
CIP															
SRP 1: Irrigation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 2: Rainfed	280	-	-	-	280	332	-	-	-	332	(51)	-	-	-	(51)
SRP 3: RRR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 4: River Basins	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 5: Information	146	-	-	-	146	62	-	-	-	62	83	-	-	-	83
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total – all Costs	426	-	-	-	426	394	-	-	-	394	32	-	-	-	32

ICARDA														
SRP 1: Irrigation	210	-	565	-	775	204	127	754	-	1,084	6	(127)	(189)	(309)
SRP 2: Rainfed	521	-	829	-	1,350	372	126	333	-	831	149	(126)	496	519
SRP 3: RRR	144	-	131	-	275	117	-	448	-	565	27	-	(317)	(290)
SRP 4: River Basins	105	-	245	-	350	80	-	67	-	148	25	-	177	202
SRP 5: Information	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total – all Costs	980	-	1,770	-	2,750	773	253	1,602	-	2,627	207	(253)	168	123
ICRISAT														
SRP 1: Irrigation	199	-	76	-	275	199	-	47	-	246	0	-	29	29
SRP 2: Rainfed	851	-	1,450	-	2,301	848	-	892	-	1,741	3	-	558	560
SRP 3: RRR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 4: River Basins	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 5: Information	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total – all Costs	1,050	-	1,526	-	2,576	1,047	-	939	-	1,986	3	-	587	590
IFPRI														
SRP 1: Irrigation	521	-	493	-	1,014	292	-	373	1	666	229	-	120	348
SRP 2: Rainfed	-	-	135	-	135	4	-	105	-	108	(4)	-	30	27
SRP 3: RRR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 4: River Basins	662	-	10	-	672	122	-	2	-	124	540	-	8	548
SRP 5: Information	41	-	-	-	41	35	-	7	-	42	7	-	(7)	(1)
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total – all Costs	1,225	-	638	-	1,863	453	-	487	1	940	772	-	151	922
IITA														
SRP 1: Irrigation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 2: Rainfed	230	1,055	1,626	-	2,911	230	1,403	1,601	-	3,234	-	(348)	25	(323)
SRP 3: RRR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 4: River Basins	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 5: Information	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total – all Costs	230	1,055	1,626	-	2,911	230	1,403	1,601	-	3,234	-	(348)	25	(323)
ILRI														
SRP 1: Irrigation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 2: Rainfed	196	-	-	-	196	196	-	174	-	370	0	-	(174)	(174)
SRP 3: RRR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 4: River Basins	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 5: Information	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total – all Costs	196	-	-	-	196	196	-	174	-	370	0	-	(174)	(174)

IWMI															
SRP 1: Irrigation	5,153	1,065	6,299	-	12,517	3,533	749	5,102	-	9,384	1,620	316	1,197	-	3,133
SRP 2: Rainfed	2,493	1,120	161	-	3,774	1,542	847	233	-	2,622	951	273	(72)	-	1,151
SRP 3: RRR	668	1,000	1,215	-	2,883	845	34	873	-	1,752	(177)	966	342	-	1,131
SRP 4: River Basins	5,888	2,010	10,301	-	18,200	5,501	1,389	4,204	-	11,094	387	621	6,097	-	7,106
SRP 5: Information	1,458	-	2,796	-	4,254	1,642	1,287	1,515	-	4,444	(184)	(1,287)	1,281	-	(190)
CRP Management/Coordination	4,680	-	-	-	4,680	1,609	-	-	-	1,609	3,070	-	-	-	3,070
Total – all Costs	20,340	5,195	20,772	-	46,307	14,673	4,306	11,927	-	30,905	5,667	890	8,845	-	15,402
World Agroforestry															
SRP 1: Irrigation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 2: Rainfed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 3: RRR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 4: River Basins	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 5: Information	1,440	-	3,355	471	5,266	1,440	-	1,523	127	3,091	(0)	-	1,832	344	2,175
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total – all Costs	1,440	-	3,355	471	5,266	1,440	-	1,523	127	3,091	(0)	-	1,832	344	2,175
World Fish															
SRP 1: Irrigation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 2: Rainfed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 3: RRR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SRP 4: River Basins	170	-	26	25	222	170	-	52	3	226	-	-	(26)	22	(4)
SRP 5: Information	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total – all Costs	170	-	26	25	222	170	-	52	3	226	-	-	(26)	22	(4)

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 5 : CRP on Water, Land and Ecosystems**Period 1 January 2012 - 31 December 2012**

	Expenditure		
	Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
Totals for CRP			
<u>Window 3</u>			
ACIAR	-	29	(29)
BMGF	2,055	1,403	652
CANADA/CIDA	57	34	23
China	-	29	(29)
EC/IFAD	2,738	1,446	1,292
Government of India	-	80	(80)
South Africa	-	49	(49)
Switzerland	1,400	1,358	42
USAID	-	1,532	(1,532)
Sub-total	6,250	5,961	290
<u>Bilateral</u>			
ACF	26	25	1
ACIAR	1,283	1,002	281
ADA	141	141	(0)
ADB	242	158	84
AFDB	150	135	16
AFESD	156	156	-
AGRA	1,715	1,112	603
ASARECA	124	91	33
AusAID	3,803	1,759	2,044
Balochistan	27	27	1
BMGF	5,769	5,333	436
CAR	201	124	77
CARE	62	62	-
CCF	59	77	(18)
Challenge Program	33	31	2
China Academy of Science	30	-	30
CIAT	434	405	29
CIC	105	82	23
CIRAD	28	28	-
Coca Cola	106	106	-
Concern Worlwide	200	126	74
CPWF	420	-	420
DFID	20	24	(3)
DFID/ICRAF	11	7	4
DFID/NERC	136	105	31

EC	400	362	38
EcoAgriculture	46	41	5
Emory University	9	9	-
FAO	634	359	275
FIBL	42	18	23
GDN	19	5	14
GEF	56	-	56
GIZ	481	601	(120)
Government of Finland	826	309	517
Government of India	532	545	(13)
Government of Irish	39	-	39
ICAR	54	7	47
ICRISAT	43	81	(38)
IDRC	414	108	306
IFAD	3,220	2,226	994
IFAR	-	1	(1)
IFPRI (USAID)	580	478	102
IITA	-	66	(66)
International Water and Sanitation Centre	-	9	(9)
Italy	367	367	-
JAPAN	364	336	28
JICA	50	33	17
Khon Kaen University (KKU)	13	13	-
MARS	424	140	283
MBE	5	5	-
Noragric, Norwegian University of Life Sciences	-	7	(7)
Norway	49	24	24
OPEC	99	98	1
OXFAM	25	25	0
PN	58	58	(0)
PRODERN	61	36	25
ROCKFELLER	220	220	-
Sir Ratan Tata Trust	94	90	4
SM	52	93	(41)
Stockholm Environment Institute	17	17	0
Sweden	231	171	61
Switzerland	3,420	2,664	755
TCF	-	39	(39)
The McKnight Foundation	18	18	(0)
the Netherlands	942	771	171
TOO Kurylys Servis BKK, Kazakhstan	6	3	2
UNEP	-	174	(174)
UNEP-GEF	375	24	350
UNESCO	11	-	11
UNESCO-IHE	-	12	(12)
United Nations University	10	10	-
University of Yale	-	1	(1)
USAID	1,842	483	1,358
Wageningen University	1,246	1,487	(242)
WFC	229	147	83

WORLD BANK	290	141	148
WOTRO	13	2	12
WUR	2,427	2,808	(381)
WWF	10	10	-
Other Funds	3,789	154	3,636
Sub-total	39,432	27,023	12,409
Totals for CRP	45,682	32,983	12,699

Bilateral Grants for each participating center below:

Biodiversity

Window 3

Sub-total - Window 3		-	-	-
Bilateral				
EcoAgricultural Partners	EcoAgriculture	46	41	5
International Fund for Agricultural Development	IFAD	200	291	(91)
Japan International Research Center for Agricultural Sciences	JIRCAS	6	6	-
Government of Japan	JAPAN	147	147	(0)
United Nations Environment Programme/Division of Global Environment	UNEP-GEF	375	24	350
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)	SDC	100	-	100
Minister for Development Cooperation of the Netherlands	the Netherlands	-	32	(32)
the Christensen Fund	TCF	-	39	(39)
Department for International Development	DFID	20	-	20
Other Donors	None	40	-	40
Sub-total - Bilateral		934	580	354
Totals for CRP - Biodiversity		934	580	354

CIAT

Window 3

Sub-total - Window 3		-	-	-
<u>Bilateral</u>				
Corporacion Autónoma Regional de Cundinamarca	CAR	201	124	77
The McKnight Foundation	MCKNIGHT	18	18	(0)
Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations	FAO	240	134	106
International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics	ICRISAT	43	81	(38)
Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le	CIRAD	28	28	-
Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa	AGRA	1,715	1,112	603
Wageningen University and Research Centre	WUR	2,427	2,808	(381)
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	BMGF	3,932	3,594	339
Proyecto de Desarrollo Estrategico de los Recursos Naturales	PRODERN	61	36	25
Patrimonio Natural Fondo para la Biodiversidad y Areas Protegidas	PN	58	58	(0)
Care Internacional en Nicaragua	CARE	62	62	-
International Fund for Agricultural Development	IFAD	-	16	(16)
International Institute of Tropical Agriculture	IITA	-	66	(66)
Sub-total - Bilateral		8,785	8,136	648
Totals for CRP - CIAT		8,785	8,136	648

ICARDA					
Window 3					
USAID		USAID	-	253	(253)
	Sub-total - Window 3		-	253	(253)
Bilateral					
Austrian Development Agency		ADA	141	141	(0)
Australian Center for International Agricultural Research		ACIAR	436	491	(55)
Government of Italy		Italy	367	367	-
International Fund for Agricultural Development		IFAD	100	130	(30)
Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development		AFESD	156	156	-
United States Agency for International Development		USAID	463	210	253
Coca Cola Foundation		Coca Cola	106	106	-
	Sub-total - Bilateral		1,770	1,602	168
Totals for CRP - ICARDA			1,770	1,855	(85)
ICRISAT					
Window 3					
	Sub-total - Window 3		-	-	-
Bilateral					
Association for Strengthening of Agricultural Research in Eastern and CenASARECA			124	91	33
Government of India		GOI	532	545	(13)
International Development Research Centre		IDRC	313	108	205
Cococola Foundation		CCF	59	77	(18)
Sabmiller		SM	52	93	(41)
Action Contre la Faim		ACF	26	25	1
Chllenge Program Water and Food		CPWF	420	-	420
	Sub-total - Bilateral		1,526	939	587
Totals for CRP - ICRISAT			1,526	939	587
IFPRI					
Window 3					
	Sub-total - Window 3		-	-	-
Bilateral					
Japan International Corporation		JICA	50	33	17
IWMI (BMGF)		IWMI (BMGF)	155	180	(24)
GDN		GDN	19	5	14
Government of German		GIZ	43	42	1
Asian Development Bank		ADB	197	114	83
Natural Environment Research Council		DFID/NERC	136	105	31
Leibniz Institute		GIZ/Leibniz	10	2	8
WorldFish		WFC	17	-	17
ICRAF		DFID/ICRAF	11	7	4
	Sub-total - Bilateral		638	487	151
Totals for CRP - IFPRI			638	487	151

IITA					
Window 3					
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	BMGF	1,055	1,403	(348)	
Sub-total - Window 3		1,055	1,403	(348)	
Bilateral					
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit	GIZ	3	3	-	
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	BMGF	289	31	258	
Japan International Research Centre for Agricultural Sciences	Japan	0	0	-	
United States Agency for International Development	USAID	56	49	7	
Wageningen University	Wageningen University	1,246	1,487	(242)	
Challenge Program	Challenge Program	33	31	2	
Sub-total - Bilateral		1,626	1,601	25	
Totals for CRP - IITA		2,681	3,004	(323)	
ILRI					
Window 3					
Sub-total - Window 3		-	-	-	
Bilateral					
United Nations Environment Programme	UNEP	-	174	(174)	
Sub-total - Bilateral		-	174	(174)	
Totals for CRP - ILRI		-	174	(174)	
IWMI					
Window 3					
ACIAR	ACIAR	-	29	(29)	
BMGF (GATES)	BMGF	1,000	-	1,000	
CANADA	CANADA	57	34	23	
China	China	-	29	(29)	
EC/IFAD	EC/IFAD	2,738	1,446	1,292	
India	India	-	80	(80)	
South Africa	South Africa	-	49	(49)	
Switzerland	Switzerland	1,400	1,358	42	
USAID	USAID	-	1,279	(1,279)	
Sub-total - Window 3		5,195	4,306	890	
Bilateral					
ACIAR	ACIAR	710	511	200	
ADB	ADB	45	44	1	
AFDB	AFDB	150	135	16	
AusAID	AusAID	3,803	1,759	2,044	
Balochistan	Balochistan	27	27	1	
BMGF (GATES)	BMGF	1,393	1,528	(136)	
CANADA	CANADA	-	-	-	
EC	EC	400	362	38	
Emory University	Emory University	9	9	-	
Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations	FAO	49	(3)	52	

The Research Institute of Organic Agriculture	FIBL	42	18	23
Government of Finland	Finland	-	66	(66)
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit	GIZ	209	456	(246)
Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR)	ICAR	54	7	47
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)	IFAD	2,890	1,789	1,101
IFAR Nourishing Scientific Excellence through the CGIAR	IFAR	-	1	(1)
IFPRI (USAID)	IFPRI (USAID)	580	478	102
International Water and Sanitation Centre	International Water	-	9	(9)
Japan	Japan	189	135	54
Khon Kaen University (KKU)	Khon Kaen Universit	13	13	-
Netherlands	Netherlands	942	739	203
Noragric, Norwegian University of Life Sciences	Noragric, Norwegiar	-	7	(7)
Norway	Norway	49	24	24
OPEC	OPEC	99	98	1
OXFAM	OXFAM	25	25	0
ROCKFELLER	ROCKFELLER	220	220	-
Sir Ratan Tata Trust	Sir Ratan Tata Trust	94	90	4
Stockholm Environment Institute	Stockholm Environm	17	17	0
Sweden	Sweden	231	171	61
Switzerland	Switzerland	3,320	2,664	655
TOO Kurylys Servis BKK, Kazakhstan	TOO Kurylys Servis B	6	3	2
UNESCO	UNESCO	11	-	11
UNESCO-IHE	UNESCO-IHE	-	12	(12)
United Nations University	United Nations Univ	10	10	-
University of Yale	University of Yale	-	1	(1)
USAID	USAID	1,297	205	1,092
WORLD BANK	WORLD BANK	114	131	(17)
WOTRO	WOTRO	13	2	12
WWF	WWF	10	10	-
B/F & Stability	B/F & Stability	3,749	154	3,595
Sub-total - Bilateral		20,772	11,927	8,845
Totals for CRP - IWMI		25,967	16,232	9,735

World Agroforestry
Window 3

Sub-total - Window 3		-	-	-
Bilateral		-	-	-
Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical, Colombia (CIAT)	CIAT	434	405	29
BMZ through ILRI	ILRI	216	99	117
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	FAO	277	161	116
Finnish Government through MTT	MTT	308	211	98
World Bank	World Bank	176	10	165
Mars inc.	MARS	424	140	283
GEF/CRP7	GEF	56	-	56
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	FAO	68	67	1
Finnish Government	FIND	518	32	486
Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR)	ACIAR	136	-	136
International Development Research Centre (IDRC)	IDRC	101	-	101
Irish Government/ICRAF	IRLD	39	-	39
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)	IFAD	30	-	30
United States Agency for International Development (USAID)	USAID	26	19	6
China Academy of Science		30	-	30
Center for International Cooperation (CIC)	CIC	105	82	23
Concern Worldwide		200	126	74
International Center for Living Aquatic Resources Management	ICLAM	212	147	65
Department for International Development (DFID)	DFID	-	24	(24)
Sub-total - Bilateral		3,355	1,523	1,832
Totals for CRP - World Agroforestry		3,355	1,523	1,832

World Fish
Window 3

Sub-total - Window 3		-	-	-
Bilateral		-	-	-
Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs	JAPAN	22	48	(26)
Mitsui Bussan Environment Fund	MBE	5	5	-
Other Funds		-	-	-
Sub-total - Bilateral		26	52	(26)
Totals for CRP - World Agroforestry		26	52	(26)

Notes

All figures shown here are illustrative only, and are in USD 000's
Donors shown are illustrative only. All donors of material amounts should be reported.
Note that an individual donor may make grants through Window 3 and bilaterally.
Totals within this report must agree with amounts reported in L111.

45,682 32,983

Water Land and Ecosystems Annual Report 2013

Report Description	L211
Name of Report	CRP Partnerships Report
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months
CRP Nr 5 : CRP on Water, Land and Ecosystems	

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
Biodiversity																
Collaborator Costs - Others																
Sichuan Academy	China	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	20	-	-	(20)	-	(20)
Yunnan Academy of Agricultural Sciences	China	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	48	-	48	-	-	(48)	-	(48)
National Agricultural Research Organisation (NARO)	Uganda	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50	-	50	-	-	(50)	-	(50)
Institut Agronomique	Morocco	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50	-	50	-	-	(50)	-	(50)
Universidad Técnica Estatal de Quevedo (UTEQ)	Ecuador	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25	-	25	-	-	(25)	-	(25)
Corporacion INIAP	Ecuador	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30	-	30	-	-	(30)	-	(30)
Sub-total for center		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	223	-	223	-	-	(223)	-	(223)
CIAT																
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers																
ICRAF-World Agroforestry Centre	Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	300	-	300	-	-	(300)	-	(300)
IITA- International Institute of Tropical Agriculture	Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(111)	-	(111)	-	-	111	-	111
Collaborator Costs - Others																
Centro de Investigaciones y Servicios en Teledetección	Bolivia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	(5)	-	(5)
CODER- Corporación para el Desarrollo Empresarial Ruz	Colombia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	(5)	-	(5)
FUNDESOT- Fundación para el Desarrollo Sostenible Ter	Colombia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80	-	80	-	-	(80)	-	(80)
DIOBASS- Plate-forme Diobass au Kivu	Congo, The Democratic Republic Of The	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33	-	33	-	-	(33)	-	(33)
SARCAF- Service d'Accompagnement et de Renforcement	Congo, The Democratic Republic Of The	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33	-	33	-	-	(33)	-	(33)
PAD-Programme d'Appui au Développement Durable	Congo, The Democratic Republic Of The	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33	-	33	-	-	(33)	-	(33)
IDIAF- Instituto Dominicano de Investigaciones Agropec	Dominican Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	(5)	-	(5)
MARN- Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Natur	El Salvador	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	(5)	-	(5)
EIAR- Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research	Ethiopia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	10	-	-	(10)	-	(10)
KHG- KileenHomes and Gardens	Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24	-	24	-	-	(24)	-	(24)
KESOFA- Kenyan Soybean Farmers Association	Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22	-	22	-	-	(22)	-	(22)
ARDAP- Appropriate Rural Development Agriculture Pr	Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38	-	38	-	-	(38)	-	(38)
RPK- Resource Project Kenya	Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37	-	37	-	-	(37)	-	(37)
KARI- Kenya Agricultural Research Institute	Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	55	-	55	-	-	(55)	-	(55)
MOI- MOI university (Chepkoilel University College)	Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30	-	30	-	-	(30)	-	(30)
University of Nairobi	Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	(6)	-	(6)
DARS- Department of Agricultural Research Services	Malawi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	15	-	-	(15)	-	(15)
Bunda- Bunda College, University of Malawi	Malawi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33	-	33	-	-	(33)	-	(33)
DAES- Department of Agricultural Extension Services, M	Malawi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	72	-	72	-	-	(72)	-	(72)
IER- Institut d'Economie Rurale	Mali	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	62	-	62	-	-	(62)	-	(62)
ISRIC- World Soil Information	Netherlands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	286	-	286	-	-	(286)	-	(286)
UNA- Universidad Nacional Agraria	Nicaragua	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	(5)	-	(5)
IAR- Institute for Agriculture Research, Ahmadu Bello U	Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	-	26	-	-	(26)	-	(26)
UNALM/FDA- Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina	Peru	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	(5)	-	(5)
UCB- Université Catholique de Bukavu	Rwanda	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39	-	39	-	-	(39)	-	(39)
EPR- Eglise Presbytérienne au Rwanda	Rwanda	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30	-	30	-	-	(30)	-	(30)
COCOF- Conseil Consultatif des Femmes	Rwanda	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	-	32	-	-	(32)	-	(32)
CARITAS- Caritas Rwanda	Rwanda	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30	-	30	-	-	(30)	-	(30)
RAB- Rwanda Agriculture Board (former ISAR)	Rwanda	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39	-	39	-	-	(39)	-	(39)
DRD- Développement Durable Rurale	Rwanda	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49	-	49	-	-	(49)	-	(49)
UFS- University of the Free State	South Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	15	-	-	(15)	-	(15)
SARI- Selian Agricultural Research Institute	Tanzania, United Republic Of	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	-	44	-	-	(44)	-	(44)
Columbia IRI- The Trustees of Columbia University (Tro	United States	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,017	-	1,017	-	-	(1,017)	-	(1,017)
DRSS- Department of Research and Specialist Services	Zimbabwe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	-	14	-	-	(14)	-	(14)
CADS- Cluster Agricultural Development Services	Zimbabwe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	9	-	-	(9)	-	(9)
LGDA- Lower Guruve Development Association	Zimbabwe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	8	-	-	(8)	-	(8)
CTDT- Community Technology Development Trust	Zimbabwe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	-	18	-	-	(18)	-	(18)
UZ-University of Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(10)	-	(10)	-	-	10	-	10
Sub-total for center		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,448	-	2,448	-	-	(2,448)	-	(2,448)

CIP													
Collaborator Costs - Others													
Rutgers University	USA	-	-	-	-	66	-	-	66	(66)	-	-	(66)
University of Florida	USA	-	-	-	-	30	-	-	30	(30)	-	-	(30)
Sub-total for center		-	-	-	-	96	-	-	96	(96)	-	-	(96)
ICARDA													
Collaborator Costs - Others													
ARARI-Amhara Regional Agricultural Research Institute	Ethiopia	-	-	-	-	20	-	83	103	(20)	-	(83)	(103)
BOKU-Department of Water, Atmosphere and Environment	Austria	-	-	-	-	2	-	4	6	(2)	-	(4)	(6)
ARC - Agriculture Research Center	Egypt	-	-	-	-	10	21	37	67	(10)	(21)	(37)	(67)
ARC - Agriculture Research Center	Iraq	-	-	-	-	-	-	25	25	-	-	(25)	(25)
NCARE -The National Center for Agricultural Research	Jordan	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	10	-	-	(10)	(10)
ICBA-International Center for Biosaline Agriculture	United Arab Emirates	-	-	-	-	-	-	38	38	-	-	(38)	(38)
UWA-University of Western Australia	Australia	-	-	-	-	-	-	81	81	-	-	(81)	(81)
CSIRO- COMMONWEALTH SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH	Australia	-	-	-	-	-	-	150	150	-	-	(150)	(150)
INRA-Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique	Morocco	-	-	-	-	-	-	39	39	-	-	(39)	(39)
Sub-total for center		-	-	-	-	32	21	467	519	(32)	(21)	(467)	(519)
ICRISAT													
Collaborator Costs - Others													
Government of Andhra Pradesh Ground water Department	INDIA	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	3	(3)	-	-	(3)
International Development Research Center	CANADA	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	20	-	-	(20)	(20)
Rural Education and Agricultural Development (READ)	INDIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	19	-	-	(19)	(19)
BAIF Institute for Rural Development	INDIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	29	29	-	-	(29)	(29)
Water shed organisation trust	INDIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	31	-	-	(31)	(31)
Center for Improved rural health and environmental protection	INDIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	30	30	-	-	(30)	(30)
BYPASS Sansthan,	INDIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	30	30	-	-	(30)	(30)
Seva Mandir	INDIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	31	-	-	(31)	(31)
PARASAI sindhu water shed	INDIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	17	-	-	(17)	(17)
Development Research Foundation Institute	INDIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	8	-	-	(8)	(8)
Center for advanced research and development (CARD)	INDIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	-	-	(3)	(3)
Bhopal Yuva Parivaran shikshina and samagik sansthan	INDIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	7	-	-	(7)	(7)
Sub-total for center		-	-	-	-	3	-	224	227	(3)	-	(224)	(227)
IFPRI													
Collaborator Costs - Others													
Spadiet Development Int	USA	-	-	-	-	-	-	52	52	-	-	(52)	(52)
University of Texas	USA	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	(1)	(1)
Makerene University	Uganda	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	12	-	-	(12)	(12)
University of Bonn	Germany	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	17	-	-	(17)	(17)
Southern Inst. for W & Res planning	Vietnam	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	15	-	-	(15)	(15)
Tsinghua University	China	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	13	-	-	(13)	(13)
Tamil Nadu Agricultural University	India	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	16	-	-	(16)	(16)
IGSNRR	China	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	10	-	-	(10)	(10)
Wageningen Agricultural University	Netherlands	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	10	-	-	(10)	(10)
Institute of Plant Protection	China	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	15	-	-	(15)	(15)
Center for Chinese Agric. Policy	China	-	-	-	-	-	-	30	30	-	-	(30)	(30)
Foundation for Ecological Security	India	-	-	-	-	80	-	-	80	(80)	-	-	(80)
Arizona State University	USA	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	5	(5)	-	-	(5)
AEMFI	Ethiopia	-	-	-	-	20	-	-	20	(20)	-	-	(20)
Other		-	-	-	-	35	-	-	35	(35)	-	-	(35)
Sub-total for center		-	-	-	-	140	-	191	331	(140)	-	(191)	(331)

ITA

Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers

Centro Internacional De Agricultura Tropical (CIAT)	Colombia	-	2	69	31	-	101	(2)	(69)	(31)	-	(101)
ICRISAT	Colombia	-	-	-	14	-	14	-	-	(14)	-	(14)
Collaborator Costs - Others												
Borno State Agric Development Project (BOSADP)	Nigeria	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	(1)	-	-	(1)
College of Agriculture & Natural Resource	Nigeria	-	-	86	132	-	218	-	(86)	(132)	-	(218)
Association of Church Development Project (ACDEP)	Ghana	-	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	(6)	-	(6)
De Compte De Recherche Agronomique De Cinzana	Malawi	-	-	4	-	-	4	-	(4)	-	-	(4)
Compte Resources INRAN	Nigeria	-	-	3	-	-	3	-	(3)	-	-	(3)
CDC / KIRINGYEMorisho Yuma	DRC	-	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	(6)	-	(6)
Dedza DADO	Malawi	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	(1)	-	(1)
DAES Salima	Malawi	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	(1)	-	(1)
DAO Lilongwe	Malawi	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	-	(0)	-	(0)
DARS	Malawi	-	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	(6)	-	(6)
Agricultural Development (DFID)	Malawi	-	-	8	-	-	8	-	(8)	-	-	(8)
Enterprises ALHERI	Nigeria	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	(2)	-	-	(2)
Urban Agricultural Network	Ghana	-	-	-	8	-	8	-	-	(8)	-	(8)
Institute of Agricultural Research (IAR)	Nigeria	-	14	2	27	-	43	(14)	(2)	(27)	-	(43)
IKURU SARL	Mozambique	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	(2)	-	(2)
INERA Station De Saria	Saria	-	-	3	-	-	3	-	(3)	-	-	(3)
JIRKUR Seed Cooperative	Nigeria	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	(1)	-	-	(1)
Kaduna State Agricultural Development Project	Nigeria	-	-	2	8	-	10	-	(2)	(8)	-	(10)
University of Agriculture, Makurdi	Nigeria	-	-	6	-	-	6	-	(6)	-	-	(6)
National Cereals Research Institute (NCRI)	Nigeria	-	-	5	-	-	5	-	(5)	-	-	(5)
Pendume Mozambique	Mozambique	-	-	3	-	-	3	-	(3)	-	-	(3)
SARI Pronaf	Ghana	-	-	4	-	-	4	-	(4)	-	-	(4)
Sasakawa Global 2000	Congo	-	-	-	25	-	25	-	-	(25)	-	(25)
SLARI	Sierra Leone	-	-	-	36	-	36	-	-	(36)	-	(36)
Soil Research Institute (SRI)	Ghana	-	-	-	20	-	20	-	-	(20)	-	(20)
Mapendo Tambwe Chantal	Congo	-	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	(6)	-	(6)
VOSIEDA	Liberia	-	-	-	33	-	33	-	-	(33)	-	(33)
ZARI	Zambia	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	-	(0)	-	(0)
Cannon Mukuna	Zambia	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	(1)	-	(1)
IER	Mali	-	-	3	-	-	3	-	(3)	-	-	(3)
Savana Agricultural Research Institute (SARI)	Ghana	-	-	-	25	-	25	-	-	(25)	-	(25)
Bayero University, Kano	Nigeria	-	-	1	5	-	7	-	(1)	(5)	-	(7)
CABI International	Kenya	-	-	30	-	-	30	-	(30)	-	-	(30)
Farm Input Promotions Africa Ltd	Kenya	-	-	214	-	-	214	-	(214)	-	-	(214)
ICIPE	Kenya	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	(1)	-	-	(1)
Ethiopian Institute of Research	Ethiopia	-	-	54	-	-	54	-	(54)	-	-	(54)
Makerer University	Uganda	-	-	86	-	-	86	-	(86)	-	-	(86)
Tanzania Fertilizer Regulatory Authority	Tanzania, United Republic Of	-	-	42	-	-	42	-	(42)	-	-	(42)
Universiteit Gent	Belgium	-	-	7	-	-	7	-	(7)	-	-	(7)
Zonal Coordinator Farming System	Tanzania, United Republic Of	-	-	4	-	-	4	-	(4)	-	-	(4)
Federal University of Technology, Minna	Nigeria	-	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	(5)	-	(5)
AATF	Kenya	-	-	30	-	-	30	-	(30)	-	-	(30)
Agronomy Trials & Others Partners	Nigeria	-	-	1	28	-	29	-	(1)	(28)	-	(29)
Sub-total for center		-	-	16	671	428	1,115	(16)	(671)	(428)	-	(1,115)

ILRI

Collaborator Costs - Others

Wollo University-UNEP001	Ethiopia	-	-	-	79	-	79	-	-	(79)	-	(79)
Sub-total for center		-	-	-	79	-	79	-	-	(79)	-	(79)

IWMI
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers

CIAT	Colombia	-	302	-	-	-	302	(302)	-	-	-	(302)
ICRAF	Kenya	-	87	-	-	-	87	(87)	-	-	-	(87)
ICRISAT	India	-	351	-	-	-	351	(351)	-	-	-	(351)
IFPRI	USA	-	8	-	167	-	175	(8)	-	(167)	-	(175)
ILRI	Kenya	-	354	561	10	-	925	(354)	(561)	(10)	-	(925)
IRRI	Philippines	-	396	212	42	-	649	(396)	(212)	(42)	-	(649)
WFC	Malaysia	-	419	146	22	-	587	(419)	(146)	(22)	-	(587)

Collaborator Costs - Others

(CEWAS) International Centre for Water Management S Switzerland		-	-	-	66	-	66	-	-	(66)	-	(66)
(EAWAG) Eidgenössische Anstalt für Wasserversorgung, Switzerland		-	-	-	120	-	120	-	-	(120)	-	(120)
Aga Khan Rural Support Programme	India	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	(1)	-	(1)
Asian Institute of Technology	Thailand	-	280	-	483	-	763	(280)	-	(483)	-	(763)
Ambo University	Ethiopia	-	6	-	-	-	6	(6)	-	-	-	(6)
Arba Minch University	Ethiopia	-	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	(6)	-	(6)
Agricultural Research Council	South Africa	-	468	-	-	-	468	(468)	-	-	-	(468)
Arid Communities and Technologies	India	-	1	-	-	-	1	(1)	-	-	-	(1)
Bahir Dar University	Ethiopia	-	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	(6)	-	(6)
Bangladesh Agricultural University	Bangladesh	-	5	-	-	-	5	(5)	-	-	-	(5)
Biotechnology and Nuclear Agriculture Research Institute	Ghana	-	-	-	7	-	7	-	-	(7)	-	(7)
C3 Labs Private Limited	Sri Lanka	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	(2)	-	(2)
Central Research Institute for Dryland Agriculture (CRIDA)	India	-	-	-	65	-	65	-	-	(65)	-	(65)
CGNET Services International	USA	-	-	-	22	-	22	-	-	(22)	-	(22)
CH2M HILL, Inc	USA	-	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	(5)	-	(5)
Central Institute for Economic Management	Hanoi, Vietnam	-	20	-	-	-	20	(20)	-	-	-	(20)
CIRAD	France	-	86	390	-	-	477	(86)	(390)	-	-	(477)
College of Agriculture and Natural Resources	Ghana	-	-	-	12	-	12	-	-	(12)	-	(12)
Consortium for the Sustainable Development of the Amazon	Peru	-	260	-	-	-	260	(260)	-	-	-	(260)
Cornell University	USA	-	24	-	-	-	24	(24)	-	-	-	(24)
Development Support Centre Ahmedabad	India	-	-	-	10	-	10	-	-	(10)	-	(10)
The D Foundation for Doing Good Work	Thailand	-	-	-	392	-	392	-	-	(392)	-	(392)
Department of Livestock & Fisheries	Vientiane, Lao PDR	-	19	-	-	-	19	(19)	-	-	-	(19)
Direction Nationale de la Météorologie	Mali	-	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	(6)	-	(6)
Enzen Global Solutions	India	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	(2)	-	(2)
Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis	South Africa	-	314	-	(2)	-	312	(314)	-	2	-	(312)
FAO: Food and Agriculture Organization	Italy	-	-	-	488	-	488	-	-	(488)	-	(488)
Gamma Systems Limited	Kenya	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	(1)	-	(1)
Glasshouse Communication	United Kingdom	-	-	-	16	-	16	-	-	(16)	-	(16)
Green Ink Publishing Services Ltd	United Kingdom	-	2	-	-	-	2	(2)	-	-	-	(2)
Hararghe Catholic Secretariat	Ethiopia	-	2	-	-	-	2	(2)	-	-	-	(2)
Hatfield Consultants Partnership	CANADA	-	-	-	20	-	20	-	-	(20)	-	(20)
HEDBEZ Business & Consultancy P.L.C	Ethiopia	-	-	-	13	-	13	-	-	(13)	-	(13)
HUNDEE-Oromo Grassroots Development Initiative	Ethiopia	-	8	-	-	-	8	(8)	-	-	-	(8)
ICEM - International Center for Environmental Management	Vietnam	-	218	-	-	-	218	(218)	-	-	-	(218)
INREM Foundation	India	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	(1)	-	(1)
Institute of Water Modelling	Bangladesh	-	164	-	-	-	164	(164)	-	-	-	(164)
International Development Enterprises (IDE)	USA	-	-	-	38	-	38	-	-	(38)	-	(38)
Institut de Recherche pour le Développement	Paris, France	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	(1)	-	(1)
Kings College London	United Kingdom	-	397	-	-	-	397	(397)	-	-	-	(397)
Lahore University of Management Sciences	Pakistan	-	-	-	34	-	34	-	-	(34)	-	(34)
Livelihoods and Natural Resources Management Institute	India	-	-	-	18	-	18	-	-	(18)	-	(18)
M.P. University of Agriculture and Technology	India	-	-	-	25	-	25	-	-	(25)	-	(25)
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries	Cambodia	-	24	-	-	-	24	(24)	-	-	-	(24)
Ministry of Water Resources	Sudan	-	-	-	13	-	13	-	-	(13)	-	(13)
National Agriculture & Forestry Research Institute	Laos	-	23	-	-	-	23	(23)	-	-	-	(23)
NARS	Kyrgyzstan	-	-	-	14	-	14	-	-	(14)	-	(14)
NARS	Tajikistan	-	-	-	15	-	15	-	-	(15)	-	(15)
NARS	Uzbekistan	-	-	-	16	-	16	-	-	(16)	-	(16)
NARS	Ethiopia	-	11	-	-	-	11	(11)	-	-	-	(11)
National Geophysical Research Institute (NGRI)	India	-	-	-	4	-	4	-	-	(4)	-	(4)
National University of Laos	Laos, PDR	-	-	-	80	-	80	-	-	(80)	-	(80)
Overseas Development Institute	United Kingdom	-	75	-	-	-	75	(75)	-	-	-	(75)
People and Nature Reconciliation	Vietnam	-	-	-	4	-	4	-	-	(4)	-	(4)
Participatory Development Training Centre	Laos, PDR	-	-	-	28	-	28	-	-	(28)	-	(28)
People in Centre Consulting Services Private Limited	India	-	9	-	-	-	9	(9)	-	-	-	(9)
Progress Marketing (Pvt) Ltd	Zimbabwe	-	-	-	212	-	212	-	-	(212)	-	(212)

Notes

All figures shown here are illustrative only, and are in USD 000's

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 L121 "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
CRP Nr 5 : CRP on Water, Land and Ecosystems	

PART 1 - REPORT OF LEAD CENTER

Opening Balance - 1 January	-	
W1 Receipts from Consortium Office (actual dates)		
01-May-12	6,583	
13-Jul-12	3,041	
26-Oct-12	3,637	
20-Dec-12	5,242	
Total Receipts		18,503
W2 Receipts from Consortium Office (actual dates)		
30-Apr-12	690	
01-May-12	2	
13-Jul-12	597	
26-Oct-12	1,470	
27-Nov-12	3,368	
Total Receipts		6,127
Transfers to CG Partners		
Bioversity	(1,182)	
CIAT	(665)	
CIP	(262)	
ICARDA	(603)	
ICRISAT	(647)	
IFPRI	(306)	
IITA	(142)	
ILRI	(121)	
World Agroforestry	(887)	
World Fish	(105)	
Total Disbursements		(4,918)
Expenditure by Lead Center (IWMI)		(14,673)
Unliquidated Advances to IWMI Partners		(92)
Funds held - end of Period		4,948

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
Bioversity	-	1,182	(1,919)		(737)
CIAT	-	665	(1,064)		(399)
CIP	-	262	(394)		(132)
ICARDA	-	603	(773)		(170)
ICRISAT	-	647	(1,047)		(401)
IFPRI	-	306	(453)		(147)
IITA	-	142	(230)		(88)
ILRI	-	121	(196)		(75)
World Agroforestry	-	887	(1,440)		(554)
World Fish	-	105	(170)		(65)
Totals	-	4,918	(7,686)	-	(2,769)

Notes

All figures illustrative only (taking CIAT as Lead Center)
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

CRP Nr 5 : CRP on Water, Land and Ecosystems

	<u>Date</u>	<u>Donor Currency</u>	<u>USD</u>	
Year 1 - 2011				
Receipts from Donors				
DFID	7-Jul-11	GBP	1,000	1,500
USAID	10-Oct-11	USD	500	500
				2,000
Transfers to Lead Center (via CO) (if applicable)				
Other Disbursements				
CSP paid to Window 1	12-Dec-11			(40)
Funds held by Trustee - end of Period	31-Dec-11			1,960
Year 2 - 2012				
Receipts from Donors				
DGIS		GBP	400	600
IBRD				
SIDA		USD	500	500
				1,100
Transfers to Lead Center (via CO)				
Transfer 1	15-Mar-12			(200)
Transfer 2	6-Jun-12			(1,500)
Transfer 3	12-Dec-12			(1,338)
Other Disbursements				
CSP paid to Window 1	10-Dec-12			(22)
Funds held by Trustee - end of Period	31-Dec-12			-

Notes

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

wle.cgiar.org
wle.cgiar.org/blogs



Led by

