



Fund

Fund Council

5th Meeting (FC5)—Washington, DC

July 6-8, 2011

Fund Council comments on CRP 5 Proposal

(Working Document - For Discussion Only)

*Document presented for Agenda Item 7:
CRP 5 - Water, Land and Ecosystems*

Submitted by:
Fund Council

Comments on CRP5 Proposal: Water, Land and Ecosystems

FC Member	Comments
Australia	<p>General Comments:</p> <p>The Strategic Research Portfolio (SRP) narratives define the issues and challenges well. These include the justification, problem statement, lessons learned, potential impact areas, theory of change and research questions. However it is weaker on research methodology, outputs, outcomes, and impacts. Most of the SRPs represent a summary of the content of the current project portfolio rather than a plan for the future. With one or two exceptions, they also lack verifiable outcome and impact indicators and the impact pathways are generic. The proposal indicates that new plans will have to await completion of these projects in three years. Hence CRP 5 is very much a transition CRP. This suggests that decisions about funding CRP 5 from the CGIAR Fund await the further articulation of these plans.</p> <p>Additionally the suggested resource allocations among the eight SRP over five years are not informed by <i>ex ante</i> impact assessment or a systematic priority assessment exercise, which is a major deficiency. Indeed there is no discussion of how the allocations were arrived at, but it seems they largely derive from existing projects, which begs the question of how the new planning exercise might influence the allocations. This reinforces the need for <i>ex ante</i> impact assessment and a systematic priority assessment exercise to accompany the proposed SRP planning exercise. Final decisions on CRP 5 should await the completion of these processes.</p> <p>The CRP involves 13 centers and a myriad of other partners, which makes it complex and ambitious. It could benefit from a narrowing of the agenda to make it more tractable from a governance, management and accountability perspective. Here again the suggested priority assessment exercise could assist.</p> <p>The comparative advantages of the CGIAR to lead the two SRP on resource recovery and reuse, and ecosystems compared to other suppliers, needs to be more firmly established than they are in the proposal.</p> <p>There is a need for clarification of the coordination, governance and management overheads proposed in the budgets, as was the case in other CRPs. The rates here are in general much lower than in other CRPs but this may be because some costs are recovered elsewhere. Again this reinforces the need for a review of all CRP management, coordination and institutional overheads by the CB once all CRP proposals are completed to ensure transparency, consistency and efficiency</p>

Specific Comments:

- The strengths of the proposal are the narratives providing the rationales for the SRPs. A good example is that for the irrigation SRP where a succinct statement says it all (p.36): “Historically, surface irrigation was built to deliver higher land productivity. Today they are also expected to deliver higher water productivity.”. Apparently there is to be a new approach to replace the earlier participatory irrigation management/irrigation management transfer models amongst users. Instead the focus will be on improved management and accountability of irrigation agencies.
- One of the appealing aspects of the irrigation SRP is the plan to use cross-country, cross-system comparative analyses to provide lessons for Sub-Saharan Africa as it moves to expand its irrigated agriculture. The challenge in Asia is different, namely to improve existing systems. This SRP is one of the few with verifiable if ambitious outcome indicators over specified timeframes.
- While *a priori* CRP 5 complements CRP 1 on the basis of the scales involved, as described in Annex 6, it appears that a significant part of the rainfed SRP in the former is concerned with the alleviation of adoption constraints facing 480,000 smallholders on four continents. It is not clear how this small scale orientation relates to the larger scale issues that CRP 5 is predicated on. The interventions involve integrated packages of HYV, soil, water and nutrient management practices and value chain innovations. This is a very complex agenda which seems to ignore the experience with the package of practices approach in India in the Green Revolution era. While it was well known that there were large multiplicative benefits to adoption of all recommended practices compared to individual components, for many good reasons most small farmers only adopted them sequentially.
- The rainfed SRP lists only generic outcomes and impacts that are non-verifiable. The impact pathways are weak with general references such as an emphasis on institutional collaboration, multi-disciplinary research, farmer participation and multi-stakeholder learning alliances. These provide little confidence in this SRP.
- The pastoral systems SRP emphasizes participatory action research and empowerment. Like most other SRP, for the ensuing three years it represents a continuation of existing projects, with little description of what the new programs will consist of after three years. The expected outcomes and impacts are not verifiable, which is a deficiency.
- The groundwater SRP has an excellent overview of the challenges, lessons and opportunities in this growing sector and the three basic research questions seem appropriate. As with most other SRP the expected outcomes and impacts are not verifiable, which is a deficiency.
- The recovery of waste SRP provides a persuasive case for linking the CGIAR to non-traditional partners in sanitation, waste management and public health. This is a relatively new initiative and is to be applauded. There is an obvious link with CRP 4 in research on health risks and it is moot as to where this SRP is best placed to reside. However it is not clear whether the CG currently has a comparative advantage in this area but perhaps it should develop some capability if there are no other suppliers and IPG are possible. The proponents

	<p>need to establish whether this is the case. They state that learning alliances with the private sector and public health sector will be established with a lot of social marketing. Alternative business models that manage different waste systems at varying scales will be examined and action research conducted. It is not easy to see where the comparative advantage of the CGIAR is in this new milieu. The waste recovery SRP does contain some verifiable outcomes but the expected impacts are only posed in generic terms, which is disappointing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The river basins SRP has an excellent justification narrative and effectively builds on the original work of a previous DG of IWMI, David Seckler. The plan is to include land management and not just water management in future along with crop-water efficiency as an addendum to irrigation efficiency. The case for this agenda is convincing, although crop-water efficiency would seem more appropriate to plot and farm scales than landscapes and basins. The aim is to embed in decision making forums to influence discourse about investments, but this needs to be grounded in quality research and it is not clear whether the embedding is research and/or extension. The proponents have thought a lot about entry points that provide levers for change. The challenge in this area, which the proponents well know, is that basins by definition are immense with multiple and disparate stakeholders. Building up expertise, credibility and an honest broker reputation is paramount, challenging and takes time. This in itself justifies long-term funding and implies that <i>a priori</i> this SRP deserves priority if convincing and verifiable/attributional expected output, outcome and ultimately impact indicators could be established for the M & E program. At present these are sadly lacking in the proposal. For example with respect to outcomes: "...decisions ...are informed..."; "...mechanisms are in use...". The IPG attributes seem clear as a further justification for priority however. • As with most other SRPs the justification for the ecosystem services SRP is good. However the proposed paradigm shift and the links to impact pathways are unconvincing. In principle this SRP focuses on market failure and appears <i>a priori</i> to be a legitimate candidate for the CGIAR. The questions are: (i) Are the proposed researchable issues tractable? (ii) If so are the intellectual property issues such that the expected benefits will accrue to the poor? (iii) What is the comparative advantage of the CGIAR in this area compared to others? These require more attention in the proposal. As with other SRPs, the three year outputs apparently largely derive from ongoing projects and the outcomes specified for six years are generic and non-verifiable. The impacts listed are really outcomes. • The information systems SRP is a key strategic component of the proposal. The aim is to enhance the use of GIS, spatial data, remote sensing and global data sets to better inform policy on the environment. There is a convincing narrative provided on the comparative advantage of the CGIAR in this area and the IPG attributes associated with open data sharing platforms (p.139). Sentinel sites will be employed to monitor land and water problems, risks and to evaluate interventions; these sites will be jointly designed with CRP 6, which is pleasing. M & E will include indicators of soil health, vegetation and hydrology at the sites. The spatial information and decision support systems will be freely available to national and international users to assess land health, water scarcity and quality over time and the impacts of interventions. Unfortunately outcomes are generic
--	--

	<p>as are most in this CRP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender issues are to be mainstreamed and a gender and equity leader will be appointed, with all SRP having a gender and equity focal point. • There will be an M & E & Learning Unit to link these activities. Impact assessment will commence in year 3 with a few studies conducted annually. • A comprehensive marketing, communications and knowledge management program is to be planned and implemented at the outset. The proposal has considerable detail about this. • There will be a Steering Committee and a Management Committee, with the DG of the Lead Centre IWMI Chairing the former. The Science and Impact Advisory Committee will report to the Management Committee rather than to the Steering Committee, which might be more appropriate. • The relationship among CRP 5 and other relevant CRP is well articulated in Annex 6. However as the CRP involves 8 SRP, 13 centers and numerous partners it is complex and ambitious. It could benefit from a narrowing of the agenda to make it more tractable from a governance, management and accountability perspective. • There is a need for clarification of the budget. For example Tables A and B (pp. 176-177) indicate the coordination and management overhead will be 4.4 and 5.4% in the two scenarios, plus 2% for the standard system overhead contribution. Later in Tables E and F (p. 184) an institutional overhead rate of 10.8 and 12.6% is specified plus the 2% system overhead. It is not clear whether the latter includes the former or is additional. Either way, these seem much lower than other CRPs, and reinforce the need for the CB to look more closely at this whole issue once all CRPs are submitted to ensure consistency and transparency. For example it appears staff, travel and other costs for governance and management in CRP 5 have not been included in these budgets, as they are accounted for elsewhere. This may partially account for the low rates observed. • There is virtually no discussion of how the balance of resources among the 8 SRP and regions, as shown in Tables A to D (pp. 176-177, 180), has been arrived at. It seems there has been no <i>ex ante</i> impact assessment conducted or planned or a systematic priority setting exercise done. The allocations seem to have been largely derived from the current projects. This is not a desirable way to allocate resources in a program requesting to spend up to \$570 million over five years. For example it would be useful to know the relative numbers of poor in the rainfed, irrigation, groundwater and pastoral systems and the likely size of economic and other benefits that could be expected from the research proposed in each of them. This could help decide if the shares of program funds allocated of 27%, 10%, 8% and 4% to these four systems respectively, are appropriate. At first blush it would seem that irrigation systems deserve to be accorded a higher priority and rainfed systems lower, but this requires further deliberation. Until a more systematic priority assessment exercise has been done it would be prudent to defer a final decision on the scope of CRP 5. Funds could be provided to facilitate this together with some additional support for the first three years. • The evolution of the Challenge Program on Water and Food as CRP 5 matures
--	--

IDRC	<p>beyond three years requires further elaboration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As with other CRPs it is envisaged that centers and CRP management would all pursue bilateral and other funding sources. As indicated earlier, this has the potential to confuse donors and requires a funding strategy and leadership from the CB. Some 20% of funding for CRP 5 in the first five years will be derived from current restricted projects, 29% from current unrestricted funds and the balance of 51% is the gap requested from the CGIAR Fund (pp. 184-185). The gap is very large, both proportionately and in dollar terms. <p>Strengths This is an ambitious program with a wide scope. The components identified are important and relevant for development; therefore the CRP has the potential to provide long term meaningful results to a large number of people in the developing world.</p> <p>Weaknesses The CRP contains a vast collection of “best bets,” each of which could make up a substantial portion of its own CRP. Thus, the program is over-ambitious, leading to a dilution of effort that could compromise the program’s ability to achieve substantial goals. In addition, it is unclear from the proposal how the sub-components are different from the traditional initiatives in the CG system, nor how these research components have evolved from those initiatives. Additionally, the coherence and integration between each of the sub-components is unclear. There is an identified lack of international resources on groundwater, irrigation and water governance. A CRP that focused on these three elements specifically would be addressing a niche of research not being addressed elsewhere. As a result, it is difficult to identify the comparative advantages of the CG system in this research area. To clarify this issue, it would be helpful to have the senior management team for this CRP identify specific goals that they intend to achieve within the next five years. The geographical distribution of ongoing projects does not include critical projects in Central America, where water access problems pose a serious threat to agricultural sustainability and food security. The linkages between CRP 5 and other CRPs are well described in Figure 1.4. However, the unique space in which CRP is operating is limited as most of the program overlaps with other CRPs. This makes it difficult to justify the existence of CRP 5 because it appears as though the majority of the work it encompasses could be easily absorbed into other related CRP programming.</p> <p>Other Comments One lesson learned from water management initiatives in the Murray-Darling river basin in Australia is that ground water and surface water comprise an integrated system. Thus, discussions of ground water management must be integrated with surface water management to avoid double counting of existing water resources, as was done in the early days of water management of the Murray-Darling river basin. This issue appears to have been overlooked in the ground water section of the CRP. The budget was not reviewed due to lack of time.</p> <p>Summary</p>
-------------	---

<p>USAID</p>	<p>With the right focus, this CRP has the potential to contribute meaningful change to a substantial number of people living in poverty. However, the proposal focuses too much on the <i>status quo</i> and not on the potential for new and innovative research to truly realize this potential.</p> <p>General Comments:</p> <p>We appreciate the efforts to lay out the integration with other CRPs – we note that this is particularly well articulated for CRP5’s integration with CRPs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 6. We strongly support the integration of CRP 5 and CRP1 in agro ecosystems. We also appreciate the commitment to driving towards the impact of the research portfolio, through the framework of ‘theory of change.’</p> <p>Specific Comments:</p> <p>1. Strategic coherence and clarity of program objectives</p> <p>CRP5 is a very extensive proposal incorporating several essential cross-cutting issues via cooperation with 13 of the 15 CGIAR centers. The themes and impact pathways outlined in this CRP are strong, thorough, and focused.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal currently is somewhat repetitive and could be made more succinct. A summary of the ‘theory of change’ section should be brought to the beginning of the proposal. • ‘Region-level outputs’ on p. 18 is an important section, but is not fully developed – which research sites overlap (and which regions are being referenced) and how will interaction between the SRPs be carried out? Will the highest level outputs be academic answers to the three questions on p. 19? Rather than providing answers to the questions, the output could be “CRP5 will provide analysis <u>and evidence</u> to answer the following questions:” • In general, the proposal does a nice job addressing the who, what, where, when and why of the proposed work. However, the proposal is less strong on addressing ‘how’ some of the SRPs will be tackled. A little more detail on how they plan to implement some of their work would fill in that gap making it more complete. • How will the “Regional Leader” CGIAR Center be empowered and kept on task? How will the regions carry out the approach described, to “put together a coherent set of SRP projects within regions that address specific regional problems”? If this is the key activity of the CRP going forward, how will this be carried out? • Summary table starting on p. 30 – what are the research areas, beneficiaries, and impact pathways for “Ecosystems” and for “Information”? – these lines in the table are not as sharp as the other SRPs <p>SRP descriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest condensing all SRP Justifications starting on page 34 – repetitive with overall CRP justification/background. • p. 38 – Irrigation SRP – the problem statement seems to state that the SRP will identify the most appropriate irrigation development roadmap for Sub-
---------------------	--

Saharan Africa. This would be a major contribution, but is this truly the problem statement? What about other regions? Will the SRP limit focus to SSA? The problem statement may need refining. The Theory of Change on p.42 likewise is not as sharp as it could be. Is it a lack of analysis or poor management systems by irrigation agencies that is the problem? What exactly will be targeted for change? Later, p. 46 “Outcomes and impact” seems to point to real time information being the key to unlocking accountability and performance. Again, the impact pathway needs sharpening.

- P. 48 – Rainfed SRP – the problem statement seems to state that there are 3 barriers to productivity in rainfed systems: the fact that water and soil management have been treated in silos, a lack of understanding of landscape dynamics, and a lack of focus on socioeconomic and institutional constraints in such management. Are these 3 the keys to unlocking investment in supplemental irrigation? The theory of change could be sharpened.
- Pastoral SRP, Groundwater SRP, Resource Recovery SRP, and Basin SRP have sharper Theories of Change, which is helpful.

Gender:

- The introductory section does a good job of including attention to gender issues. The section on Irrigation is the gold standard of how gender should be integrated into technical components. Subsequent components progressively reduce this attention to where the ecosystems and information sections are noticeably lacking in attention to gender issues. The Strategies, Management, and Budget sections also do a great job of addressing gender issues, including budget allocations.
- The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), adopted in 1979 by the UN General Assembly, could be referenced along with the rest of the governing international conventions.
- Language relating to women often cites them as end users and beneficiaries (particularly in the Basin section). Language could also include reference to their inclusion in processes for decision-making – as ‘decision-makers.’
- Authors could add reference to participatory action research – how can the communities themselves be involved in doing the research outlined in this proposal? How can this be an opportunity for capacity building?
- What is the process for including gender analysis in the eventual research to be carried out under this CRP?

2. Delivery focus and plausibility of impact

Throughout the CRP proposal, the authors made serious efforts to quantify impact and specify where it is most likely to occur. One important aspect which stood out through the entire document was the inclusion of soil health and soil fertility management into the proposal. Soil health has not necessarily played as significant of a role in the past with regards to agricultural development as it should and it was refreshing to see it being incorporated for improving natural ecosystems and agriculture. Likewise, the inclusion of property rights and land tenure throughout are well noted.

<p>World Bank-ARD</p>	<p>3. Quality of science (No comment).</p> <p>4. Quality of research and development partners Excellent partners are outlined. The challenge will be in coordination and targeting of efforts. Regarding integration and overlap with other CRPs, the section starting on p. 172 is extremely helpful. For instance, it is helpful that CRPs which have collocated research sites have been noted. The best descriptions of alignment are for CRPs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 6. The descriptions supplied for CRPs 2, 3, 4, and 7 are less concrete. While some of these CRPs are in parallel development, CRP 3 and 7 are complete and approved. This offers the chance to go into greater depth regarding alignment at this stage. USAID strongly supports the integration of CRPs 1 and 5 in agro ecosystems. This will be a continuing area of interest for USAID.</p> <p>5. Appropriateness and efficiency of program management TOP-LINE ISSUE #1: This CRP will take major coordination and institutional changes to be successful. The management structure described is unclear to this reviewer – there appears some inconsistency regarding how the authority will be delegated to carry out subcomponents of this CRP. Will the work of this CRP (which involves 13 centers) involve delegation of activities to regional or topical center lead? In one section, the CRP mentions that there will be Regional Leads (CGIAR centers), whereas elsewhere (Under Monitoring, p. 162), the CRP references that the “lead agency for each SRP project” will have its own standardized institute quality management procedures. Will the work be organized into regional or SRP leads? How will monitoring of the overall CRP be coordinated? How will institutional contracts be able to deal with the complexity inherent in such a large collaboration? Is a management specialist needed to help guide this CRP and others, as they create new ways of working in the new CGIAR? This is a larger issue that the CGIAR Consortium needs to address for all CRPs.</p> <p>6. Clear accountability and financial soundness; efficiency of governance TOP-LINE ISSUE #2: The budget outlines two scenarios (p.180: “Enhanced delivery scenario” = \$570 million and “Baseline scenario” = \$479 million). How will priorities be set if different funding levels are obtained? Would there be an across-the-board allocation of funds or would certain SRPs be funded and others not? What is achievable with different funding levels?</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) processes are described in very general terms in this CRP (p. 162-163). How will this key component be developed? Many CRPs are delaying developing M&E processes, but from USAID’s perspective, this should be indicated with more specificity from the start.</p> <p>Overall Assessment The proposal focuses on water scarcity, land degradation and ecosystem services. It consists of eight sub-programs, on rain-fed agriculture, irrigation, groundwater resource reuse, river basin management, pastoral systems, ecosystem services, and information and program management. The total budget is \$569 million, with 34% budget implemented through IWMI (lead center), 15% through CIAT, 14% through CPWT, and the remainder through ICRISAT, ICRAF and ICARDA. For a proposal of this size, it is</p>
------------------------------	--

disappointing that the document appears to be somewhat piecemeal and requiring further editing. The proposal lacks the intent to integrate water and land systems, with the exception of rain-fed agriculture. It is not clear why the proposal separates water and land from the theme of ecosystem in the first place. The information platform proposed is very helpful, especially the envisioned potential for open access. The CRP made a good effort to mainstream gender and equity.

Other Suggestions re: Quality Enhancement. Although we do not recommend making these conditions of approval, we think the CRP would be strengthened if,

1. To complement the mainstreaming of gender, the proposing team would consider developing a gender research section.
2. The CRP could consider, in addition to water scarcity, to include issues of flood management.

Recommendation: Conditional approval to fund 6 months to substantially revise the proposal for resubmission.

We support the ISPC review of this proposal, particularly their recommendations on ways to improve the CRP. Our recommended conditions of approval require revising the proposal to:

1. Improve the justification and to include (1) a summary of the main literature (with key references) on the current status of the three critical issues of water scarcity, land degradation and ecosystem services, (2) the previous and on-going research in the CGIAR system, and (3) clear rationale for the comparative advantage of the proposed CGIAR centers to conduct this research.
2. Improve the Conceptual Framework by clearly outlining the rationale for the selected framework, defining the key terms and their relationship to each other and using the terms consistently throughout the document.
3. Well define partnership strategy and the roles of each partner by including a paragraph to describe the framework of selecting external and center partners, their respective research activities, how these activities collectively contribute to proposed eight sub-programs.
4. Revise the Governance and Management section to clearly define the management structure and the committees/board within the structure. This includes a clear role of the DG for the lead center in the management structure to ensure there is no conflict of interest. If the management and governance structure is meant to be a matrix system then it is even more critical to (1) well define roles and responsibilities for each committee, particularly their reporting relationship, and to (2) ensure a program integration body that has the authority to provide oversight to the implementation organizations, and not the other way around.
5. Include a diagram to clearly lay out the impact pathways to explicitly link a cluster of outputs to outcomes, impacts and to SRF system level outcomes.

FAO

The CRP 5 proposal Water, Land and Ecosystems aims to sustainably improve livelihoods, reduce poverty, redress gender inequities and ensure food security through research-based solutions of three critical issues: water scarcity, land degradation and

ecosystems sustainability. To achieve its goal research components are included that cover a wide spectrum of disciplines, scales and geographic contexts, and involve an impressive number of partnerships involving CGIAR Centers, other CRPs, NARES, NGOs, universities and government and international agencies.

FAO notes that a very good effort has been made to ensure that gender issues are addressed across the programme as a cross-cutting theme.

Regarding the Strategic Research portfolio on 'Improved ecosystem services and resilience', FAO questions if there is sufficient capacity in the participating CGIAR centers in the field of pollination ecosystem services, while FAO has technical capacity with respect to pollination.

It is suggested that the following issues are taken into consideration when revising the proposal:

- Under the goals and outcomes of the programme (in the Executive Summary), it would be better to use "reduce gender inequalities" or "promote gender equality" as opposed to "redress".
- In addition to looking at the dynamics of power relations in communities and the role of this in agriculture and natural resource management, it is also important to look at women's and men's different access to natural and productive resources, as well as the laws and practices (both statutory and customary) that determine this.
- Discussions on food security seem to be mainly focused on the quantity dimension, with little attention paid to the quality dimension. The importance of nutrition security should also be recognized.
- In looking at the use of ICTs for small-scale producers, particular attention should be paid to access and use of such technologies by women farmers. This should include examining the particular constraints/barriers and challenges that women small-scale producers face in accessing and using technologies and how these can be addressed.
- What kinds of new partners and new forms of partner networks will be developed to promote uptake and to carry on development and capacity building? At what level (e.g. local, national, sub-regional, regional, global) which such networks be promoted?
- Under the "CRP5 role within the CGIAR", it may be better to use "reduce social and gender inequities" or "promote social and gender equity" as opposed to "remove".
- Please note that there is a typo ("poverty") under "Goals" in the Conceptual Framework diagram.
- Amongst the drivers of 'negative' agricultural practices (e.g. policies, information, etc.), capacity (or lack thereof) is another issue that should be mentioned/addressed.
- In terms of the cross-cutting themes, while the importance of gender and equity is included, the argument for addressing such concerns could be strengthened and made clearer. This should include explaining the relevance of gender in water, land and ecosystem sustainability, as well as the importance of addressing such issues in order to achieve desired outcomes. In terms of the

	<p>other cross-cutting theme of institutions and governance, will this include both informal and formal institutions? Similar to the previous comment on the gender theme, the importance of institutions and governance for integrated management of natural resources should be further explained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• While gender is essential as a cross-cutting theme, specific gender issues could be highlighted (where relevant) in the different strategic research portfolios and across CRP5 objectives and outputs.• With regard to consultations carried out and the identification of problem sets/issues to be addressed by partners and stakeholders, who was/will be consulted and involved in this process? e.g. governments, civil society in particular producer organizations, research institutes, etc.• Effort should be made to ensure that results/findings from the programme are shared beyond the global level and that they are disseminated and reach regional, subregional, national and local levels. <p>Regarding the Strategic Research portfolio on 'Improved ecosystem services and resilience', FAO questions if there is sufficient capacity in the participating CGIAR centers in the field of pollination ecosystem services, while FAO has technical capacity with respect to pollination. Through its Global Action on Pollination Services for Sustainable Agriculture, FAO has been coordinating and facilitating the implementation of the International Initiative for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Pollinators (also known as the International Pollinator Initiative - IPI) by undertaking, in collaboration with numerous partners, activities that contribute to the implementation of the four basic IPI elements (e.g. Assessment; Adaptive Management; Capacity Building; and Mainstreaming), and to address the management of pollination services for sustainable agriculture. It is therefore suggested to include in this CRP FAO, in its technical capacity on pollination, not only as a source of large co-funding of CRP5.</p>
--	---