

# CGIAR Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CAAFS)

## 2012 Annual report

### A. Key Messages

#### *Synthesis of progress and challenges in implementing the CRP*

CAAFS progressed well in 2012, achieving numerous outcomes in multiple countries. Over the year CCAFS released four flagship products, five major tools and 77 journal publications (Annex 1). CCAFS maintained six open-access data-bases with over 40,000 users<sup>1</sup>. The gender strategy was finalized and implementation commenced.<sup>2</sup> Overall, the risks and challenges declined compared to 2011, but some significant ones remained.

1. *Products/Tools.* Examples of flagship products: an index-based insurance product released in Ethiopia to help pastoralists better manage climate variability<sup>3</sup>; "climate-smart villages" established in 22 sites in nine countries where technologies are trialed in an integrated and participatory manner. Examples of major tools launched: a protocol for measuring and monitoring soil organic stocks, crucial for advancing understanding of adaptation and mitigation potentials<sup>4</sup>; the gender and climate change research training guidelines launched together with FAO<sup>5</sup>; a participatory social return on investment framework to ensure local perspectives feed into national adaptation planning.<sup>6</sup>

2. *Outcomes.* (i) *Global.* Research and engagement by CCAFS was fundamental in the prioritizing and design by the Global Crop Diversity Trust and the Kew Millennium Seed Bank of the 10-year US\$ 50 million programme focusing on pre-breeding for climate change adaptation, an essential element in breeding for 2030 climates. CCAFS research efforts have also played a key role in the Climate Services Partnership (CSP), expanding its focus on services for smallholder farmers who need better climate information to maximize production in the face of climate variability<sup>7</sup>. (ii) *National.* CCAFS research was used in national adaptation planning or in informing the investment of climate funds in Nepal<sup>8</sup>, Nicaragua<sup>9</sup>, Mexico<sup>10</sup>, Kenya<sup>11</sup> and Rwanda<sup>12</sup>. CCAFS together with partners helped inform pro-poor mitigation policy development in at least five countries.<sup>13</sup> This latter work is significant as it opens the door to finance and incentives for low emissions development. (iii) *Local practices.* CCAFS is working on numerous climate-smart technologies, which will have to be considerably scaled up. Some examples include the following. Research has helped a local NGO that specializes in ICT-based farmer advisories to reach 6000 farmers in 419 villages of District Kurushetra of Haryana, India. Other work on conservation agriculture in Haryana has over 400 farmers now testing climate-smart technologies, tripling their crop income. The Chief Minister of Haryana has also announced incentives for the adoption and promotion of these technologies.<sup>14</sup> Work on climate-smart "greenhouses" in Peru with about 300 youth and women is now being trialed by an NGO in Bolivia.<sup>15</sup>

3. *Challenges.* The risks reported by CCAFS in 2011 have by and large declined in significance. The challenge of 'research actually carried out not aligned to the Program Plan' has been much reduced through further streamlining of the research agenda. CCAFS inherited on-going work, some of which was non-strategic. Each year all proposed activities are rated for their degree of strategic alignment and budget allocations to participating centres are partly based on this assessment (see section G). A key challenge remaining relates to "lack of capacity to attract donors to build up bilateral funding and/or Centers not allocating bilateral funds to CCAFS." CCAFS has a relatively low percentage of bilateral funding. One reason may be that Centers tend to raise funds for the CRPs they lead rather than the CRPs they participate in. In phase two of the CRPs, greater clarity on the boundaries among CRPs is needed.

#### *Synthesis of two significant achievements/success stories*

1. *Improving farmer livelihoods through climate-smart coffee:* Research on coffee-based systems in East Africa and Central America was highlighted in over 30 press articles<sup>16</sup> including in major media outlets such as the BBC.<sup>17</sup> Coffee was selected for study because amongst many agricultural

commodities examined, it was one of the most sensitive to climate change, through impacts on coffee suitability, yield, quality and pest and disease pressure. Field-testing by IITA in East Africa has shown how best to intercrop coffee with one of its mandate crops – banana – to double revenue, reduce the impact of climate shocks on households, and increase carbon sequestration. Numerous coffee value chain actors, including the national authorities in Rwanda, Burundi, and Uganda, are validating and embracing the recommendation to intercrop coffee with banana. Traditionally, these countries recommended, and sometimes enforced, coffee monocropping<sup>18,19</sup>. In Central America, CIAT's research on coffee has led one of the largest coffee roasters in the US (Green Mountain Coffee Roasters) to design an investment plan for supporting its suppliers in diversifying livelihoods to improve food security during the 'thin months'. This work has also been used in the Nicaragua National Adaptation Plan for the Agricultural Sector, the government document that directs public investment in climate change adaptation.<sup>20</sup>

*2. Commission report released and used by significant development actors:* In March 2012, the Commission on Sustainable Agriculture and Climate Change, an independent panel of 13 senior scientists supported by CCAFS and the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, released its final report.<sup>21</sup> This was one of the four CCAFS flagship products for 2012, produced after an 18-month research and engagement process, facilitated by CCAFS but independent in its findings. The final report received extensive media coverage in major international outlets, including the BBC, Reuters, Time, Nature, and a further 30 outlets.<sup>22</sup> The document was downloaded over 30,000 times in 2012 and the associated video animation viewed over 16,000 times. The Commission's recommendations guided the framework for Agriculture Day at Rio+20, attended by 600 participants and 600 online viewers, with speakers and panellists including three Ministers from Brazil. Recommendations have helped inform policy dialogue in numerous countries. In Mexico, the Commission Report was used in Congress to support a draft climate change bill, which was subsequently passed as the General Climate Change Law 2012, the third such law in the world. In Bangladesh, the report was used to validate Bangladesh's submission on agriculture to the UNFCCC. In Kenya, the Commission Report was a reference for preparing Kenya's agriculture act. The UN Committee on Food Security drew on the report to prepare its recommendations around climate change and food security. Climate change adaptation and mitigation policies are at a very early stage in most jurisdictions, so this report has been significant in mobilizing thinking and action.<sup>23</sup>

*Financial summary:*

CCAFS' 2012 budget was US\$69.8 million including funds from the CGIAR Fund and other bilateral sources. Total execution in 2012 was \$67.6 million (including committed funds of \$4.2 million) broken down as follows: 98% execution of W1&W2 funds and 93% execution of bilateral and W3 funds. Gender and social differentiation research activities were in the order of \$6.85 million, which equals to approximately 10% of the total execution. One of the recognized challenges – *funding uncertainty* – was much reduced in 2012, though the IITA crisis did slow down implementation in some Centers and resulted in high amounts of committed funds.

**B. Impact Pathway and Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs)**

In its initial program plan, CCAFS had twelve outcomes, three per Theme.<sup>24</sup> In common with other CRPs, CCAFS is now formalizing a new theory of change and a set of Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs).<sup>25</sup> CCAFS is also refining its impact pathways, focusing on the behavioral changes that are needed at multiple levels to achieve the IDOs. CCAFS will deliver IDOs through up to five "flagship projects" that address the impact pathways to enhance the likelihood that the knowledge generated through research activities will lead to the IDOs that in turn contribute to the SLOs. In line with other CRPs, CCAFS will submit a draft 10-page proposal to the Consortium Office on 3 June 2013, which will make the case for selected IDOs, "flagship projects" and impact pathways to deliver those IDOs, and the set of partnerships and resources required. CCAFS has also volunteered, on behalf of the

Consortium, to test the new system of deploying resources to Centers based on IDOs; CCAFS plans to trial one flagship project in 2013.

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

#### **C.1 Narrative of major achievements, by Theme**

Annual progress is measured against CCAFS theory of change, as distilled into the logframe<sup>26</sup> which specifies milestones (in terms of outputs) for each calendar year. Of the 43 milestones, 14 were partially accomplished (33%), and 29 fully accomplished (67%).<sup>27</sup>

Longer-term progress will be measured against the CCAFS baseline, implemented across three levels: household, village and organizations. The baseline describes current behavior in relation to livelihood systems and farming practices. The baselines have been conducted in 15 sites in East Africa, West Africa and South Asia. These are all freely available on the web.<sup>28</sup> Similar baselines will be undertaken in the regions established during late 2012 (Latin America and South East Asia).

Most of the major achievements for 2012 are reported as outputs and outcomes in Sections A, C2 and C3 of this report. Additional major achievements included establishment of operations and initiation of activities in two new regions selected via an evidence-based stakeholder process during 2011 (Latin America and South East Asia), organization of two large-scale multi-partner policy events, Agriculture and Rural Development Day at Rio+20 (600 live and 600 online participants)<sup>29</sup> and its successor Agriculture, Landscapes and Livelihoods Day at COP in Doha (400 live and 700 online participants)<sup>30</sup>, and further thematic achievements detailed below.

Adaptation to Progressive Climate Change: "Farms of the Future" uses the climate analogue tool to match the projected future agro-climates of CCAFS research sites with other sites that have statistically similar agro-climates today, to raise capacity of farmers and scientists via facilitated cross-site learning visits. The methodology was piloted successfully in Nepal, Tanzania and Ghana, where groups of male and female farmers travelled to sites that represent likely future climates for their farms. Documentation included recommendations for scaling up, analysis of the learning process and socio-cultural factors, and advice to policy-makers on community-level adaptive capacity<sup>31</sup>. Bioversity's "Seeds-for-needs" uses modern GIS technologies to help rural Ethiopian women farmers to identify, conserve and access the most promising local genetic resources to enable adaptation to climate change<sup>32</sup>. Also, a virtual catalogue of 1270 peer-reviewed publications on widely promoted climate-smart practices has been established through a combination of online surveys and formal meta-analysis. Substantial progress has also been made on pests and diseases under climate change, including a series of technical reports and a new iteration of the RIDEV model. An integrated research program on socio-ecological systems for adaptation has been launched, and a synthetic analysis of National Adaptation Plans in three CCAFS regions has been completed.<sup>33</sup>

Adaptation through Managing Climate Risk: A systematic review of gender issues in climate risk management was undertaken, as well as a gender-disaggregated field-based analysis of local access to and use of climate information. With partners, a consultative review of the decentralized decision-making processes within the Ethiopian government identified critical decision points that affect budget allocation, agricultural planning, and risk management to improve delivery and uptake of advance climate information. Considerable effort is being put into improvement of crop forecasting tools and associated knowledge management, user accessibility and capacity building. These efforts are likely to lead to major flagship outputs, co-produced with partners, in coming years.<sup>34</sup>

Pro-Poor Climate Change Mitigation: Substantial empirical research on issues of adoption of mitigation technologies, access to institutions (including carbon markets), governance arrangements and social differentiation (including gender) has been undertaken across several participating Centers. The multi-partner SAMPLES program (Standard Assessment of Mitigation Potential and Livelihoods) has been launched, led by ICRAF, which aims to develop whole-landscape protocols for assessing the feasibility, value and trade-offs for different mitigation options available to smallholder farmers,

initially in East Africa (Kenya) and South-East Asia (Philippines) with expansion to Latin America planned for 2014. The SAMPLES program includes both technical (measurement of GHG fluxes) and institutional components, and a strong capacity enhancement focus.<sup>35</sup>

***Integration for Decision Making:*** The stakeholder-led future scenarios process has been completed in one region and is in progress in two others, leading to specific outcomes such as support to the East African Farmers Federation (EAFF) to increase their capacity to engage in the East African Community (EAC). Further progress was made on “Regional Integrated Assessments with the Tradeoff Analysis Model for Multi-Dimensional Impact Assessment (TOA-MD)” which builds capacity for research teams to improve their understanding of agricultural system sustainability and to inform policy decisions.<sup>36</sup> A new climate change and social learning (CCSL) knowledge network was established. Working together under the “Global Futures for Agriculture” project, scientists from seven Centers have used a suite of biophysical and socioeconomic models to evaluate and prioritize research investments, promising technologies and policy reforms under climate change. Policy makers were consulted in early stages to ensure that relevant parameters are being included in the models. CCAFS has also been a central partner in the Agricultural Model Inter-comparison and Improvement Project (AgMIP), a cross-model scenario comparison exercise for the Fifth Assessment Report of the IPCC. This comparative work has also resulted in significant changes to the leading crop modeling suite (decision support system for agrotechnology transfer: DSSAT) and to the ten leading global economic models that are included.<sup>37</sup>

### **C.2 Progress towards outputs:**

With partners, CCAFS developed four flagship products and five flagship tools during 2012, plus maintained six open-access databases. These are detailed below. In addition, CCAFS fully (67%) or partially (33%) achieved its 43 milestones scheduled for 2012.<sup>38</sup>

#### *Flagship products:*

*Climate-smart villages* are the CCAFS field research sites at which farmers and scientists do participatory research to trial technologies and practices in an integrated manner. Farmers select technologies and practices relevant to their sites. The trials provide policy-relevant evidence to inform scaling up. This evidence is supplemented by work on other technologies and practices from outside the CCAFS sites, including decision tools and trade-off analysis to enable prioritization of options. There are currently 22 climate-smart villages in West Africa, East Africa and South Asia; further sites will be added in South-East Asia and Latin America in 2013 and 2014. Trials go hand in hand with capacity enhancement. For example, 1700 women farmers received training on climate risk management in Bihar, India.<sup>39,40</sup>

*An index-based livestock insurance product launched in southern Ethiopia*, following the success with a similar product in northern Kenya, where the first payments were made in 2012. The project is still at the pilot stage, but in partnership with the private sector is anticipated to scale up during 2013.<sup>41</sup> The insurance product increases resilience to climate variability among pastoralists. The use of a weather index rather than actual losses to trigger pay-outs reduces transactions costs and increases access by poor pastoralists.

*Commission report:* the report of the independent Commission on Sustainable Agriculture and Climate Change, supported by CCAFS, has been instrumental in policy processes in several countries (see section A).<sup>42</sup>

In 2012 the global Committee on Food Security (CFS) commissioned the *Food Security and Climate Change Report*. The high-level, multi-author report was led by IFPRI under CCAFS. It involved an extensive review of what is known about the impact of climate change on the commodities and natural resource systems in the CGIAR mandate. The CFS used the report to make multiple decisions on climate change, including a direct recommendation to the UNFCCC to consider agriculture.<sup>43</sup>

#### *Flagship tools:*

The *protocol and tool for measuring and monitoring soil organic carbon stocks* can be combined with climate information to provide detailed diagnoses of agricultural suitability and adaptation options, as well as providing information on carbon stocks for mitigation initiatives.<sup>44</sup>

*Land-Use Planning for Low Emissions Development Strategy (LUWES)* is a set of guidance, typically accompanied by capacity building and support, that enables analyses of the trade-offs between economic opportunity and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions; it has been used by CCAFS partners in Indonesia for example.<sup>45,46</sup>

The *Gender and Climate Change Research in Agriculture and Food Security Training Guide* has been co-developed by CCAFS and FAO to inform quantitative and qualitative gender research, and has been used to train field staff.<sup>47</sup> It is the key tool for mainstreaming gender activities at field level in CCAFS.

The *Participatory Social Return on Investment (PSROI) framework* is a practical tool for communities and development practitioners to assess, compare and select among community-based adaptation (CBA) options. It has been piloted in CCAFS sites and the methodology will be included in the Fifth Assessment Report of the IPCC.<sup>48</sup>

*MarkSIM GCM* is a stochastic downscaling tool to provide geographically specific simulations of future rainfall series. Users can download series of simulated rainfall data for any specific geo-referenced site to use in various applications such as models of crop performance and yields under climate change.<sup>49</sup>

*Open-access databases:*

Key CCAFS open-access databases include “CCAFS Climate” for downscaled GCM data,<sup>50</sup> the Climate Analogue Tool for matching sites with analogous agricultural climates over space and time,<sup>51</sup> AgTrials, a repository of 4600 climate-specific sets of agricultural trial data,<sup>52</sup> Dataverse which houses the full set of CCAFS baseline data<sup>53</sup> and the Bioversity-facilitated “GCP Crop Ontology”, which harmonizes crop-specific terminology on climate-relevant genetic information (e.g. phenotype, breeding, germplasm, pedigree, traits) to inform breeding for current and future climates.<sup>54</sup>

### **C.3 Progress towards the achievement of outcomes**

**Adaptation to Progressive Climate Change:** Policy is being influenced as a result of field-research on climate-smart technologies. In East Africa, for example, IITA work focussed on banana-coffee intercropping, as described as a success story in Section A above. The CIAT work on coffee systems has been used in the Nicaragua National Adaptation Plan for the Agricultural Sector, which directs public investment in adaptation.<sup>55</sup> Similarly, IWMI undertook a climate vulnerability assessment for the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and Department of Soil Conservation and Watershed Management of Nepal (DSCWM). This has helped in the design of the watershed component of the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR), under the Climate Investment Fund (CIF). This program will help Nepal transform to a climate resilient development path.<sup>56</sup>

CCAFS also works with major development actors to get research results to scale. Research led by CIAT scientists over 5-6 years provided the evidence for the Global Crop Diversity Trust and the Kew Millennium Seed Bank to invest in the design of a 10-year US\$ 50 million programme was then funded by the Norwegian Government to collect crop wild relatives and pre-breed for climate change adaptation. CCAFS subsequently led vulnerability analyses for 28 prioritised crops to select key traits for pre-breeding. This work will benefit climate change adaptation at the global scale.<sup>57</sup>

**Adaptation through Managing Climate Risk:** CCAFS has identified a number of major global players with which to partner to ensure joint learning and research uptake. CCAFS research efforts have played a key role in the Climate Services Partnership (CSP) expanding its focus on smallholder farmers, and in the strategies of its member organizations such as USAID and World Vision. USAID’s Global Climate Change Team has adopted the idea of using an evaluation of Mali’s innovative agrometeorological advisory program to inform its strategy for investing in climate services, and is supporting ideas for strengthening climate services for farmers in Africa and South Asia, which came

out of a jointly sponsored workshop. World Vision's Secure the Future program in East Africa now plans to include climate services for farmers among the resilience-building interventions within this program, building on CCAFS research. Better climate and weather information is an essential step toward building the resilience of farmers to a variable and changing climate.<sup>58</sup>

CIMMYT assessed mobile-phone farm advisories in India. This helped NGO Kisan Sanchar – that specialises in ICT-based farmer advisories – to design strategies to scale up of their services. The NGO has combined forces with mobile phone manufacturers to include inbuilt applications in the handsets to improve delivery of advisories at a low cost, including information to manage climate risk. Kisan Sanchar also established contacts with the village governing bodies (*Panchayats*) to help them digitalize and get connected to various agricultural and non-agricultural information sources through e-Panchayat. A total of 6000 farmers in 419 villages of District Kurushetra of Haryana are now linked with the government extension system. Furthermore, 150 volunteers across 110 districts in 9 states of Northern India are trained to improve information flow to smallholders.<sup>59</sup>

*Pro-Poor Climate Change Mitigation:* CCAFS, together with partners FAO and Unique Forestry and Land Use, and ministry officials from twelve countries, analysed how agriculture should be considered in Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) of the UNFCCC. A review of the state of NAMA development and steps of technical and economic analysis, prioritization and stakeholder engagement supported the preparation of agricultural NAMAs in at least five countries, led to a funding proposal to create an agricultural NAMA in Indonesia, and stimulated use of key messages in the development of NAMAs or other low emissions development policy in at least five countries. This work is significant as it opens the door to finance and incentives for low emissions development.<sup>60</sup>

*Integration for Decision Making:* Much of CCAFS work is through participatory action research, be it with farmers, industry or climate change negotiators. The work ensures focus on issues of relevance to key stakeholders. Examples of such work, where scaling up has been initiated include the following. CIMMYT activities have helped to empower rural youths with resource management technologies, such as conservation agriculture, in Haryana, India. Working through farmer cooperatives some 3000 persons have been capacitated. Over 400 farmers are now using these climate-smart technologies, tripling their crop income. The Chief Minister of Haryana has also announced incentives for the adoption and promotion of these technologies. CIP has trialed climate-smart greenhouses in Peru with about 300 youth and women.<sup>61</sup> The greenhouses are low-cost, built from local materials and agrofils. This horticultural initiative addresses food security and climate risk, while also reducing the spread of agriculture into carbon-rich grasslands. An NGO in Bolivia has taken up the technology and is implementing it in schools.<sup>62</sup>

#### **C.4 Progress towards Impact**

Under the program plan, CCAFS is scheduled to conduct its first impact studies after three years.

#### **D. GENDER RESEARCH ACHIEVEMENTS**

CCAFS made significant progress in 2012 towards integrating gender analysis across all research themes in accordance with its gender strategy. Analyses of the CCAFS baselines studies (at 3 levels), which incorporated gender, were carried out in 2012, and the data and reports made freely available on DataVerse. Most of the Centers are in the process of recruiting new gender specialists and are developing gender-targeted work within CCAFS. Many Centers were involved in the implementation of the household farm characterization survey (IMPACT-Lite) that has key gender components, across 13 countries and 16 CCAFS sites in 2012. In 2012, CCAFS also catalyzed collaborative research and capacity development for shared gender-targeted research standards and tools - IFPRI, ILRI and ICRAF all helped develop a new gender-disaggregated intra-household survey and train local partners in these new, open access intra-household gender tools. Training of local partners began in 2012, as this work will be implemented in sites in three CCAFS regions in 2013 in Uganda, Kenya, Bangladesh (with other CRPs) and Senegal. This work contributes to gender outcomes related to enhanced tools and capacity of local partners to collect gender-disaggregated data.

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

CCAFS regional programs have undertaken a ‘bottom-up’ joint development (with local partners, including organizations with similar gender goals) of impact pathways with explicit gender pathways in all CCAFS sites. This includes the development of site-specific (gender) indicators and plans for monitoring them. Specific targets, and who will measure progress towards them have to be defined jointly with partners, and this is part of the impact pathway development process underway. CCAFS has defined and is collecting baseline data on the main dimensions of gender inequality in its initial three regions (i.e. ‘meets requirements’ – Annex 2). A number of gender-related indicators in Annex 1 have low figures (for % of technologies, products, tools that have an explicit target of women farmers, or which have been assessed for gender disaggregated effects). Higher targets are in place for 2013, and progress towards those are being monitored.

### **D.2 Institutional architecture for gender mainstreaming in place**

The core CCAFS team boosted its capacity in gender research with the addition of two internationally recruited scientists with strong gender research experience in 2012. All Theme and Regional research leaders have gender-related objectives and funds, and have brought in gender expertise to meet those objectives. CCAFS gender strategy sets budgeting targets for each research leader of between 6% and 24% allocated explicitly to gender, and performance is evaluated against these targets. CCAFS is also providing resources to key regional partners to enhance their capacities in gender research. CCAFS is working closely with all the centers through the gender network to develop a working paper series (and a special journal issue) highlighting significant CCAFS and CGIAR gender results. CCAFS is planning with AWARD to train some of their “master trainers” in the new gender research methods that were jointly designed and tested with FAO in 2011-2012 (participatory methods) and more quantitative intra-household tools with the CCAFS Gender Advisory Group (made up of CGIAR, University and other gender experts) in 2012 in order to scale these out broadly with local partners across Africa. As CCAFS is still finalizing its M&E system, CCAFS performance ‘approaches requirements’ (Annex 2).

## **E. PARTNERSHIPS BUILDING ACHIEVEMENTS**

Through its strategy for partnership, engagement and communications,<sup>63</sup> CCAFS seeks to engage actively with key partners to drive user-driven research, science-based dialogue, knowledge sharing and evidence-based policy.

CCAFS was designed as a collaborative programme between CGIAR and the Earth System Science Partnership (ESSP), to bring CGIAR’s agricultural expertise and local networks together with the climatological and other expertise of the Global Environmental Change academic community. Active collaborations with this community in 2012 included working with University of Oxford and IIASA<sup>64</sup> to quantify the climatic dimensions of East African stakeholders’ future socio-economic and political scenarios, with the Universities of Oxford and Cape Town to develop regional climatic projections,<sup>65</sup> and with the Earth Research Institute on statistical techniques for predicting precipitation at sub-regional scales.<sup>66</sup> The impact pathway of these efforts is to improve forecasting of agro-climates at scales that are relevant to national and sub-national decision-makers.

CCAFS aligns with national and regional bodies and policy priorities via National Learning Platforms that bring together the research and policy communities in regular meetings and co-production of outputs. The National Learning Platforms constitute the key pathway for CCAFS science to inform policy at the national level. National policy-makers’ interest in the interplay between agriculture and climate policy at the global level is also instrumental in how CCAFS links between sub-national, national, regional and global levels. For example, in 2012 CCAFS’ new partnership with the Africa Climate Policy Centre and continued collaboration with the regional bodies (COMESA, EAC and SADC) provided the set of much needed workshops, and the scientific base, for African countries to develop, for the first time, joint submissions on agriculture to the UNFCCC.<sup>67</sup>

CCAFS has built clear working relationships with other CRPs. Examples include joint funding of a staff member between GRISP and CCAFS, selection of joint sites across multiple CRPs in Bangladesh, joint site location with CRP1.1 in West Africa and India, joint global engagement work on UNFCCC with CRP6, and strategic planning among breeders from multiple commodity CRPs to prioritize breeding options for a changing climate. These processes will continue in 2013, including a planning meeting among CRPs 5, 6 and 7.

Use of CCAFS' outputs and outcomes by key partners in 2012 has included citation of CCAFS evidence during policy formulation in Bangladesh, Kenya, Nicaragua and Mexico, and innovative non-research partnerships to apply CCAFS research, such as CIMMYT's work with an NGO and mobile phone companies in India to scale up access to mobile-phone based climate and agriculture advisory services.

The Consortium partnership survey found that overall 81% of CCAFS' partners are satisfied with the relationship.<sup>68</sup> Expertise, communications and research outcomes are the indicators on which CCAFS performs strongest, with global expertise and working with partners being among the top performing dimensions. Transparency is the indicator on which this CRP is seen as least strong. Collaboration is CCAFS' strongest performing indicator, with a score 16 points higher than CGIAR as a whole.

## **F. CAPACITY BUILDING**

CCAFS capacity enhancement activities are mainstreamed within the research activities under the four research themes. As outlined in the CCAFS capacity enhancement strategy,<sup>69</sup> the goal is to raise both the capacity of research partners and the capacity of others to demand and use that research.

In 2012, CCAFS supported over 8500 people (46% women) in short courses and 962 people (49% women) in long-term courses (see Annex 1). Short-term training activities have focused on building capacity to use and adapt analytic tools, such as the Climate Analogue Tool, the Gap Analysis technique, the IMPACT model (International Model for Policy Analysis of Agricultural Commodities and Trade), the IMPACT-Lite household model and the protocols for collecting baseline data at household, village and organizational levels. Gender analysis has been a particular focus, with the development in 2012 with FAO of a manual on research approaches and techniques for gender research, which is used to raise the capacity of field researchers in the CCAFS regions.<sup>70</sup>

Technical skills have also been a focus, particularly in the underdeveloped area of emissions data and mitigation options. Two examples are ILRI's work with national and regional research partners to build African capacity to measure and mitigate greenhouse gases in livestock systems,<sup>71</sup> and IRRI's work to enable Vietnamese partners to collect the first emissions data from the major lowland rice systems.<sup>72,73</sup> This capacity-building approach was mainstreamed into the early stages of the SAMPLES program, designed to develop protocols for assessment of GHG fluxes in smallholder landscape contexts, which will expand during 2013.

CCAFS has additionally invested in raising capacity in analysis and development of climate policy, for example through the IFAD-IFPRI Strategic Partnership to Develop Innovative Policies on Climate Change Mitigation and Market Access in Ghana and Vietnam.<sup>74</sup> Recognizing that policies are not enough on their own, CCAFS has also provided capacity building on decision aids, such as WorldFish's work to capacitate inclusion of climate issues into coastal management in the coral triangle of the Pacific<sup>75</sup> and IWMI's capacity enhancement of decision-makers responsible for managing water in the urban-rural interface under a changing climate.<sup>76</sup>

## **G. RISK MANAGEMENT**

### *1. Funding uncertainty*

This remains the top risk in CCAFS. While there was definitely improvement within 2012, the funding freeze slowed down implementation (e.g. reduced partner disbursements) in some Centers leading to high levels of committed, but not dispersed, funds at the end of 2012. Uncertainty between-years remains high, with Centers taking a 10-30% cut in budget in 2013, compared to 2012. To allow for

advance planning, budget envelopes for the forthcoming year are given to Centers by mid-year, whereas budget allocations from the Consortium are only received much later in the year. This results in much guesswork which does not facilitate advance planning.

*2. Lack of capacity to attract donors to build up bilateral funding and/or Centers not allocating bilateral funds to CCAFS:*

CCAFS has a relatively low percentage of its total budget covered by bilateral funding (35% in 2011; 26% in 2012). As CCAFS is a highly dispersed program (among Centers), the expectation is that participating Centers use their own resource mobilization efforts to raise bilateral funds. While this is happening in some Centers, others focus their attention on the CRP they lead. In addition, because of CCAFS strong focus on strategic coherence and integration, some Centers prefer to classify bilateral projects under the CRP they control, even if this means shifting the boundary of the CRP.

*3. Research actually carried out not aligned to the Program Plan:*

CCAFS inherited on-going work from 15 Centers. Some of that was non-strategic. In addition, different Centers have different priorities and ways of working that are not in line with the CCAFS strategy (e.g. does not sufficiently incorporate gender and social differentiation; is too focussed on climate impact and vulnerability assessment as opposed to options for adaptation). A target has been set of three years (end of 2013) to phase out non-strategic work and get greater strategic coherence. "Strategic alignment" is also a heavily weighted variable in the performance management system used in CCAFS. This system resulted in a sliding scale for 2013 budget reductions, with 10% reduction for the best performing Center and 30% reduction for the poorest performing Center.

## **H. LESSONS LEARNED**

*i. Level of confidence/uncertainty of the indicators provided in Annex 1.*

CCAFS has relatively good confidence in the numbers presented in Annex 1 apart from those for indicators 33 and 34 (number of hectares and number of farmers), given these require adoption-type studies. Further work is needed on the definitions of 'products', 'tools' and other concepts in the indicator table.

*ii. Changes in research focus*

No major changes in direction were made in 2012. However, CCAFS inherited a large number of disparate on-going work from participating Centers. In 2012, as in 2011, the management team conducted an exercise to prioritize Activities proposed in draft 2013 workplans, by giving Centers feedback on the strategic value of their proposed work. Overall, 3% of proposed Activities were rated as not strategic, 40% were rated as somewhat strategic and 57% as highly strategic. Centers then revised their activities thus giving greater strategic alignment in 2013.

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

One indicator of concern is the number of ISI journal papers produced, as very few were produced relative to the size of the program. This has been communicated to Program Participants at the annual CCAFS retreat and means of improving production of ISI papers were discussed. Other indicators of concern relate to gender. Very few tools, products and technologies have an explicit gender focus, and very few have been assessed for gender-differentiated impacts. The management team will need to enhance incentives to ensure gender dimensions are included and assessed, including giving greater weight to gender in the CCAFS performance management system.

CCAFS conducted a survey among program participants on their perceptions regarding program implementation, focusing on science, partnerships and leadership. In general, very

positive feedback was received.<sup>77</sup> Two concerns were focused on in the annual retreat: lack of coordination and coherence in regional programs and transparency of budget allocation. Subsequent discussions with program participants indicated that while these variables were of most concern, the level of that concern was not very high.

Two further issues of concern have been raised in management and Independent Science Panel meetings. (i) Limited inter-Center work at climate-smart villages. While inter-Center work has increased, with several notable successes, there is scope for greater strategic alignment among Centers towards achievement of CCAFS outcomes. This will also be achieved through the new IDO system, where IDOs will be framed around regional needs and all Centers will be expected to contribute in synergy, where appropriate. (ii) On-going reform in the global environmental change community. The Earth System Science Partnership (ESSP), the original partner with the CGIAR in CCAFS has now been dissolved, replaced by Future Earth. However Future Earth is not yet fully established so further development of the partnership is awaiting the completion of the transition process. Stocktaking and further planning of the partnership will be conducted in late 2013.

## I. CRP FINANCIAL REPORT

See Annex 3 attached

<sup>1</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/2012\\_indicators\\_consolidated\\_report.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/2012_indicators_consolidated_report.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ccafs\\_gender\\_strategy2012-final.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ccafs_gender_strategy2012-final.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ILRI%20technical\\_report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ILRI%20technical_report_2012.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> <http://worldagroforestry.org/project/measurement-soil-carbon-stocks>

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.ccafs.cgiar.org/gender>

<sup>6</sup> <http://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/21076>

<sup>7</sup> <http://scalingup.iri.columbia.edu>

<sup>8</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/IWMI%20technical%20report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/IWMI%20technical%20report_2012.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ciat\\_technical\\_report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ciat_technical_report_2012.pdf)

<sup>10</sup> <http://ccafs.cgiar.org/blog/food-security-and-climate-change-one-year-after-commissions-report>

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>12</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/IITA%20technical%20report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/IITA%20technical%20report_2012.pdf)

<sup>13</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/TL\\_3\\_Technical\\_report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/TL_3_Technical_report_2012.pdf) (note the survey to policy makers was confidential, so countries are currently unknown)

<sup>14</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/CIMMYT%20%20Technical%20Report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/CIMMYT%20%20Technical%20Report_2012.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/CIP%20technical%20report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/CIP%20technical%20report_2012.pdf)

<sup>16</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ciat\\_technical\\_report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ciat_technical_report_2012.pdf)

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.ciatnews.cgiar.org/2012/12/19/climate-reality-project-colombian-coffee>

<sup>18</sup> <http://ccafs.cgiar.org/blog/uganda-coffee-and-banana-go-better-together>

<sup>19</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/IITA%20technical%20report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/IITA%20technical%20report_2012.pdf)

<sup>20</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ciat\\_technical\\_report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ciat_technical_report_2012.pdf)

<sup>21</sup> <http://ccafs.cgiar.org/commission>

<sup>22</sup> <http://ccafs.cgiar.org/blog/media-coverage-actions-needed-feed-world-changing-climate>

<sup>23</sup> <http://ccafs.cgiar.org/blog/food-security-and-climate-change-one-year-after-commissions-report>

<sup>24</sup> <http://ccafs.cgiar.org/our-work/research-themes>

<sup>25</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/publication-document/final\\_ccafs\\_overall\\_impact\\_pathway\\_and\\_theory\\_of\\_change.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/publication-document/final_ccafs_overall_impact_pathway_and_theory_of_change.pdf)

<sup>26</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ccafs\\_consolidated\\_logframe-2012-2015.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ccafs_consolidated_logframe-2012-2015.pdf)

<sup>27</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/2012\\_milestone\\_progress\\_report.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/2012_milestone_progress_report.pdf)

<sup>28</sup> <http://ccafs.cgiar.org/resources/baseline-surveys>

<sup>29</sup> <http://ccafs.cgiar.org/blog/small-wins-small-farmers-rio20>

<sup>30</sup> <http://ccafs.cgiar.org/blog/report-back-agriculture-landscapes-and-livelihoods-day>

<sup>31</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/TL\\_1\\_Technical\\_report\\_2012\\_v2.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/TL_1_Technical_report_2012_v2.pdf)

<sup>32</sup> [http://www.biodiversityinternational.org/research/sustainable\\_agriculture/seeds\\_for\\_needs.html](http://www.biodiversityinternational.org/research/sustainable_agriculture/seeds_for_needs.html)

<sup>33</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/TL\\_1\\_Technical\\_report\\_2012\\_v2.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/TL_1_Technical_report_2012_v2.pdf)

<sup>34</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/TL\\_2\\_Technical\\_report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/TL_2_Technical_report_2012.pdf)

<sup>35</sup> [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/TL\\_3\\_Technical\\_report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/TL_3_Technical_report_2012.pdf)

- 
- 36 <http://tradeoffs.oregonstate.edu>
- 37 [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/TL\\_4\\_Technical\\_report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/TL_4_Technical_report_2012.pdf)
- 38 [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/2012\\_milestone\\_progress\\_report.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/2012_milestone_progress_report.pdf)
- 39 <http://ccafs.cgiar.org/blog/hundreds-elected-women-rural-bihar-get-trained-climate-change-and-food-security>
- 40 [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/RPL\\_SAs\\_Technical\\_report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/RPL_SAs_Technical_report_2012.pdf)
- 41 <http://livestockinsurance.wordpress.com>
- 42 <http://ccafs.cgiar.org/node/853>
- 43 [http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/hlpe/hlpe\\_documents/HLPE\\_Reports/HLPE-Report-3-Food\\_security\\_and\\_climate\\_change-June\\_2012.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/hlpe/hlpe_documents/HLPE_Reports/HLPE-Report-3-Food_security_and_climate_change-June_2012.pdf)
- 44 <http://worldagroforestry.org/project/measurement-soil-carbon-stocks>
- 45 <http://www.asb.cgiar.org/PDFwebdocs/LUWES%202012%20V1.pdf>
- 46 <http://blog.worldagroforestry.org/index.php/2013/03/20/training-for-low-emissions-development-in-Indonesia>
- 47 [www.ccafs.cgiar.org/gender](http://www.ccafs.cgiar.org/gender)
- 48 <http://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/21076>
- 49 <http://gismap.ciat.cgiar.org/MarkSimGCM>
- 50 [www.ccafs-climate.org](http://www.ccafs-climate.org)
- 51 <http://gismap.ciat.cgiar.org/analogues>
- 52 <http://www.agtrials.org>
- 53 <http://dvn.iq.harvard.edu/dvn/dv/CCAFSbaseline.jsessionid=4aa3b98e3c03e9377f3d2d2590b0>
- 54 <http://www.cropontology.org>
- 55 [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ciat\\_technical\\_report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ciat_technical_report_2012.pdf)
- 56 [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/IWMI%20technical%20report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/IWMI%20technical%20report_2012.pdf)
- 57 [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ciat\\_technical\\_report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ciat_technical_report_2012.pdf)
- 58 <http://scalingup.iri.columbia.edu>
- 59 [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/CIMMYT%20%20Technical%20Report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/CIMMYT%20%20Technical%20Report_2012.pdf)
- 60 [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/TL\\_3\\_Technical\\_report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/TL_3_Technical_report_2012.pdf)
- 61 [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/CIMMYT%20%20Technical%20Report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/CIMMYT%20%20Technical%20Report_2012.pdf)
- 62 [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/CIP%20technical%20report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/CIP%20technical%20report_2012.pdf)
- 63 <http://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/27829>
- 64 <http://ccafs.cgiar.org/blog/ccafs-scenarios-engage-regions-plan-uncertain-futures>
- 65 <http://hdl.handle.net/10568/27832>
- 66 <http://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/21724>
- 67 [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/RPL\\_EA\\_Technical\\_report\\_2012\\_v2.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/RPL_EA_Technical_report_2012_v2.pdf)
- 68 [http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/fileadmin/templates/ispc/documents/Mobilizing\\_science/Partnership\\_survey\\_results\\_Feb\\_2012.pdf](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/fileadmin/templates/ispc/documents/Mobilizing_science/Partnership_survey_results_Feb_2012.pdf)
- 69 [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ccafs\\_capacity\\_enhancement\\_strategy.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ccafs_capacity_enhancement_strategy.pdf)
- 70 [www.ccafs.cgiar.org/gender](http://www.ccafs.cgiar.org/gender)
- 71 [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ILRI%20technical\\_report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ILRI%20technical_report_2012.pdf)
- 72 <http://www.lucci-vietnam.info>
- 73 [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/IRRI%20technical\\_report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/IRRI%20technical_report_2012.pdf)
- 74 [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/IFPRI%20Technical%20Report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/IFPRI%20Technical%20Report_2012.pdf)
- 75 <http://www.worldfishcenter.org/ongoing-projects/adaptation-pathways-responding-climate-change>
- 76 [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/IWMI%20technical%20report\\_2012.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/IWMI%20technical%20report_2012.pdf)
- 77 <http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/CCAFS%20MiniSurvey%20Cooper.pdf>

## Annex 1: CRP indicators of progress, with glossary and targets<sup>1</sup>

CRPs concerned by this indicator	Indicator	Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator	Deviation narrative	2012		2013	2014
				Target (if available for 2012) <sup>2</sup>	Actual	Target	Target
<b>KNOWLEDGE, TOOLS, DATA</b>							
All	1. Number of flagship "products" produced by CRP	These are frameworks and concepts that are significant and complete enough to have been highlighted on web pages, publicized through blog stories, press releases and/or policy briefs. They are significant in that they should be likely to change the way stakeholders along the impact pathway allocate resources and/or implement activities. They should be products that change the way these stakeholders think and act. Tools, decision-support tools, guidelines and/or training manuals are not included in this indicator			4	7	8
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			25%	35%	45%
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			0%	20%	35%
All	4. Number of "tools" produced by CRP	These are significant decision-support tools, guidelines, and/or training manuals that are significant and complete enough to have been highlighted on web pages, publicized through blog stories, press releases and/or policy briefs. They are significant in that they should be likely to change the way stakeholders along the impact pathway allocate resources and/or implement activities			5	8	8
All	5. % of tools that have an	The web pages, blog stories, press releases and policy briefs			33%	35%	45%

<sup>1</sup> For further details: [http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/2012\\_indicators\\_consolidated\\_report.pdf](http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/2012_indicators_consolidated_report.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> As this format was only received in early 2013, no targets were set for 2012.

CRPs concerned by this indicator	Indicator	Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator	Deviation narrative	2012		2013	2014
				Target (if available for 2012) <sup>2</sup>	Actual	Target	Target
	explicit target of women farmers	supporting indicator #4 must have an explicit focus on women farmers/NRM managers to be counted					
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			0%	20%	35%
All	7. Number of open access databases maintained by CRP				6	8	9
All	8. Total number of users of these open access databases				43,220	60,000	100,000
All	9. Number of publications in ISI journals produced by CRP				77	85	90
1,2,3, 4, 6	10. Number of strategic value chains analyzed by CRP				N/A	N/A	N/A
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			9	4	3
1,5,6,7	12. Estimated population of above-mentioned agro-ecosystems				TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT AND INNOVATION PLATFORMS</b>							
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			4,679	7,000	7,000

CRPs concerned by this indicator	Indicator	Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator	Deviation narrative	2012		2013	2014
				Target (if available for 2012) <sup>2</sup>	Actual	Target	Target
		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					
All	14. Number of trainees in short-term programs facilitated by CRP (female)	(see above, but for female)			3,989	6,500	7,000
All	15. Number of trainees in long-term programs facilitated by CRP (male)	The number of people who are currently enrolled in or graduated in the current fiscal year from a bachelor's, master's or Ph.D. program or are currently participating in or have completed in the current fiscal year a long term (degree-seeking) advanced training program such as a fellowship program or a post-doctoral studies program. A person completing one long term training program in the fiscal year and currently participating in another long term training program should be counted only once.			488	500	500
All	16. Number of trainees in long-term programs facilitated by CRP (female)	(see above, but for female)			474	500	500
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.			24	5	5
<b>TECHNOLOGIES/PRACTICES IN VARIOUS STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT</b>							

CRPs concerned by this indicator	Indicator	Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator	Deviation narrative	2012		2013	2014
				Target (if available for 2012) <sup>2</sup>	Actual	Target	Target
All	18. Number of technologies/NRM practices under research in the CRP (Phase I)	<p>Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related and NRM-related technologies and innovations including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation. Relevant technologies include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including biodegradable packaging</li> <li>• Biological: New germplasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;</li> <li>• Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides sustainably and environmentally applied, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies;</li> <li>• Management and cultural practices: sustainable water management; practices; sustainable land management practices; sustainable fishing practices; Information technology, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resource management practices that increase productivity and/or resiliency to climate change. IPM, ISFM, and PHH as related to agriculture should all be included as improved technologies or management practices.</li> </ul> <p>New technologies or management practices under research counted should be only those under research in the current reporting year. Any new technology or management practice</p>			256	250	250

CRPs concerned by this indicator	Indicator	Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator	Deviation narrative	2012		2013	2014
				Target (if available for 2012) <sup>2</sup>	Actual	Target	Target
		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	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			7%	10%	20%
All	20. % of technologies under research that have been assessed for likely gender-disaggregated impact	Reports/papers describing the products should include a focus on gender-disaggregated impacts if they are to be counted			9%	20%	30%
1,5,6,7	21 Number of agro-ecosystems for which CRP has identified feasible approaches for improving ecosystem services and for establishing positive incentives for farmers to improve ecosystem functions as per the CRP's recommendations	Use the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA) typology of cultivated systems and of forests and woodland systems (MEA, 2005, Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Current State and Trends, Volume 1) to define these agro-ecosystems; identify the regions if possible			19	15	17
1,5,6,7	22. Number of people who will potentially benefit from plans, once finalised, for the scaling up of strategies	Indicate the potential number of both women and men			TBD	TBD	TBD
All, except 2	23. Number of technologies /NRM practices field tested (phase II)	Under "field testing" means that research has moved from focused development to broader testing and this testing is underway under conditions intended to duplicate those encountered by potential users of the new technology. This might be in the actual facilities (fields) of potential users, or it might be in a facility set up to duplicate those conditions.			57	60	60
1,5,6,7	24. Number of agro-ecosystems for which innovations (technologies,	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			12	15	15

CRPs concerned by this indicator	Indicator	Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator	Deviation narrative	2012		2013	2014
				Target (if available for 2012) <sup>2</sup>	Actual	Target	Target
	policies, practices, integrative approaches) and options for improvement at system level have been developed and are being field tested (Phase II)	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				29%	35%	35%
1,5,6,7	26. Number of published research outputs from CRP utilised in targeted agro-ecosystems				19	30	40
All, except 2	27. Number of technologies/NRM practices released by public and private sector partners globally (phase III)	In the case of crop research that developed a new variety, e.g., the variety must have passed through any required approval process, and seed of the new variety should be available for multiplication. The technology should have proven benefits and be as ready for use as it can be as it emerges from the research and testing process. Technologies made available for transfer should be only those made available in the current reporting year. Any technology made available in a previous year should not be included.			1	5	10
<b>POLICIES IN VARIOUS STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT</b>							
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			59	50	50

CRPs concerned by this indicator	Indicator	Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator	Deviation narrative	2012		2013	2014
				Target (if available for 2012) <sup>2</sup>	Actual	Target	Target
		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.			18	15	15
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/decre to improve the policy environment for smallholder-based agriculture.)			4	5	10
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/decre) of new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority).			4	5	10
All	32. Number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures passed for which implementation has begun (Stage 5)	: ...completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority)			3	5	10
<b>OUTCOMES ON THE GROUND</b>							
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			287,792	450,000	1,000,000
All	34. Number of farmers and	Indicate the regions where this is occurring and whether the			928,312	2,000,000	4,000,000

CRPs concerned by this indicator	Indicator	Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator	Deviation narrative	2012		2013	2014
				Target (if available for 2012) <sup>2</sup>	Actual	Target	Target
	others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of CRP research	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			a/b TBD	a/b TBD	a/b TBD

## 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"> <li>- CRP scientists and managers with responsibility for gender in the CRP's outputs are appointed, have written TORS.</li> <li>- 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</li> <li>-CRP M&amp;E system has protocol for tracking progress on integration of gender in research</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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</li> <li>-CRP M&amp;E system has protocol for tracking progress on integration of gender in research</li> </ul> <p>And</p> <p>A CRP plan approved for capacity development in gender analysis</p>	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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</li> <li>-CRP M&amp;E system has protocol for tracking progress on integration of gender in research</li> </ul> <p>And</p> <p>A CRP plan approved for capacity development in gender analysis</p> <p>And</p> <p>The CRP uses feedback provided by its M&amp;E system to improve its integration of gender into research</p>

**Annex 3: CRP Financial Reporting Templates – see below spreadsheets**

## INDEX

### CRP Financial Reporting Templates

Ref	Description	Responsibility	2012	2013	Comments
<b>Budget and Financial Reports</b>					
L101	CRP Cumulative Financial Summary	Lead Center	Yes	Yes	Simplified format - no longer at Theme level
L106	CRP Annual Funding Summary	Lead Center	Yes	Yes	Small changes in format
L111	CRP Annual Financial Summary	Lead Center	Yes	Yes	Small changes in format
L121	CRP - Expenditure by Natural Classification Report	Lead Center	Yes	Yes	Small changes in format
L131	CRP - Themes Report	Lead Center	Yes	Yes	New report - but note this information was previously incorporated in L101
<b>Analytical Financial Reports</b>					
L201	CRP - Bilateral Grants Report	Lead Center	Yes	Yes	No changes in format
L211	CRP Partnerships Report	Lead Center	Yes	Yes	No changes in format
<b>Cash Flow Reports</b>					
L401	Funding - Windows 1 and 2 Cash Flows	Lead Center	Yes	Yes	No changes in format
L411	Funding - Window 2 Report	Lead Center	Yes	Yes	New report, requested by Donors, Paris meeting
<b>Total of Reports Required</b>			<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	

**Notes**

For 2012, CRP Lead Centers are required to submit 9 financial reports for each CRP.  
 Most reports are for current year only. Exceptions are L101 and L411, which are multi-year (cumulative).  
 All reports shown here are for individual CRP's. The Consortium Office will prepare consolidated CRP reports.

## CGIAR TEMPLATE: L101

## Report Description

**Name of Report:** CCAFS-CRP7 Cumulative Financial Summary  
**Reporting Line:** Lead Center Report to Consortium Office  
**Frequency/Period:** Every 6 months  
**Delivery:** 45 days after period end

## CRP No. 7: CCAFS - CLIMATE CHANGE, AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SECURITY

Period: January 1/2011 - December 31/2012

Amounts in USD thousands

Summary Report - by CG Partners	(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 (1)	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center funds	Total Funding
1. AFRICA RICE	788	-	799	-	1,586	788	-	853	-	1,641	(0)	-	(54)	-	(54)
2. BIODIVERSITY	7,686	-	3,903	-	11,589	7,735	124	4,007	-	11,865	(48)	(124)	(104)	-	(276)
3. CIAT	17,257	-	6,949	-	24,205	17,358	986	7,631	-	25,975	(101)	(986)	(682)	-	(1,769)
4. CIFOR	709	-	526	-	1,235	696	-	414	-	1,110	12	-	112	-	125
5. CIMMYT	8,196	-	2,435	-	10,631	7,389	84	2,840	-	10,313	807	(84)	(405)	-	318
6. CIP	3,011	-	1,800	-	4,810	2,835	-	1,505	-	4,340	176	-	295	-	470
7. ICARDA	2,856	-	1,207	-	4,063	2,856	94	1,024	-	3,975	0	(94)	183	-	89
8. ICRAF	9,860	-	4,472	-	14,332	9,614	450	5,931	-	15,996	246	(450)	(1,459)	-	(1,663)
9. ICRISAT	7,685	-	1,726	-	9,411	5,994	1,280	1,887	-	9,161	1,691	(1,280)	(161)	-	249
10. IFPRI	3,604	-	4,182	-	7,786	2,843	-	3,166	-	6,009	761	-	1,016	-	1,777
11. IITA	1,759	-	485	-	2,244	1,804	115	492	-	2,411	(46)	(115)	(7)	-	(168)
12. ILRI	11,424	-	3,630	-	15,054	10,223	-	2,575	-	12,797	1,202	-	1,056	-	2,257
13. IRRI	1,323	-	697	-	2,020	1,288	-	531	-	1,818	35	-	167	-	202
14. IWMI	5,656	-	3,488	-	9,143	5,753	42	2,564	-	8,359	(97)	(42)	924	-	785
15. WORLD FISH	987	-	3,496	-	4,538	877	-	3,066	-	3,943	110	-	430	54	594
<b>Total for CRP7</b>	<b>82,800</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>39,794</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>122,648</b>	<b>78,054</b>	<b>3,176</b>	<b>38,485</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>119,714</b>	<b>4,747</b>	<b>(3,176)</b>	<b>1,309</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>2,935</b>
	<b>68%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>162%</b>	<b>-108%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Notes

(1) Reported expenditure does not include \$4.2 million of W1&W2 committed funds which are to be accounted for in 2013. For further details please refer to the COMMITTED FUNDS sheet where a breakdown is provided

<b>CGIAR TEMPLATE: L1016</b>						
<b>Report Description</b>						
<b>Name of Report:</b> CCAFS-CRP7 Annual Funding Summary						
<b>Reporting Line:</b> Lead Center Report to Consortium Office						
<b>Frequency/Period:</b> Every 6 months						
<b>Delivery:</b> 45 days after period end						
<b>CRP No. 7: CCAFS - CLIMATE CHANGE, AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SECURITY</b>						
<b>Period:</b> January 1/2012 - December 31/2012						
Amounts in USD thousands						
<b>PART 1 - Annual FINANCE PLAN (Totals for Windows 1 and 2 combined)</b>						
Approved Level for Year - Initial Approval (as per PIA)						55,000
Approved Level for Year - Final Amount						41,400
<b>PART 2 - Funding Summary for Year</b>						
<b>CRP7 2012 Actual Funding</b>						
		<b>Window 1</b>	<b>Window 2 (1)</b>	<b>Window 3</b>	<b>Bilateral Funding</b>	<b>Total Funding</b>
1	<b>W1 Donors</b>	19,395	-	-	-	19,395
2	Australia	-	863	-	-	863
3	Ireland	-	398	-	-	398
4	Netherlands	-	2,058	-	-	2,058
5	IPM-Switzerland	-	-	115	-	115
6	USAID	-	-	94	-	94
7	BMGF	-	-	67	-	67
8	WB	-	-	62	-	62
9	China	-	-	52	-	52
10	Others	-	-	80	-	80
11	USAID	-	-	-	1,470	1,470
12	ACIAR	-	-	-	1,410	1,410
13	CP Funds	-	-	-	1,328	1,328
14	IFAD	-	-	-	954	954
15	GIZ	-	-	-	943	943
16	State of Netherlands	-	-	-	822	822
17	FAO	-	-	-	808	808
18	GTZ	-	-	-	748	748
19	BMZ	-	-	-	559	559
20	IRRI	-	-	-	511	511
21	Environment Canada	-	-	-	401	401

22	ADB	-	-	-	376	376
23	AusAID	-	-	-	355	355
24	GCP	-	-	-	267	267
25	European Commission	-	-	-	635	635
26	Cornell	-	-	-	252	252
27	NOR	-	-	-	249	249
28	GoG	-	-	-	214	214
29	IFPRI	-	-	-	208	208
30	The Global Crop Diversity	-	-	-	205	205
31	FONTAGRO	-	-	-	197	197
32	Finland	-	-	-	181	181
33	OPEC	-	-	-	163	163
34	IWMI	-	-	-	130	130
35	AFESD	-	-	-	128	128
36	WWF	-	-	-	127	127
37	PWCS	-	-	-	123	123
38	ICRAF	-	-	-	122	122
39	IDRC	-	-	-	115	115
40	Bioforsk	-	-	-	109	109
41	CIAT	-	-	-	106	106
42	Danida	-	-	-	97	97
43	Rockefeller Foundation	-	-	-	94	94
44	BAR	-	-	-	93	93
45	ILRI	-	-	-	93	93
46	CORAF/WECARD	-	-	-	91	91
47	GOI	-	-	-	89	89
48	CRS	-	-	-	88	88
49	COADY	-	-	-	82	82
50	NORAD	-	-	-	79	79
51	CUAS	-	-	-	74	74
52	CIP	-	-	-	72	72
53	DEWHA	-	-	-	67	67
54	SDC	-	-	-	66	66
55	Universidad del Cauca	-	-	-	66	66
56	ICAR	-	-	-	62	62
57	INIA	-	-	-	60	60
58	Anonymous (UK fundraising)	-	-	-	57	57
59	CIDA	-	-	-	53	53
60	WOTRO	-	-	-	53	53
61	CIRAD	-	-	-	51	51
62	Others	-	-	-	894	894
<b>Total for CRP7</b>		<b>19,395</b>	<b>3,319</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>16,595</b>	<b>39,779</b>

## CGIAR TEMPLATE: L111

## Report Description

**Name of Report:** CCAFS-CRP7 Annual Financial Summary  
**Reporting Line:** Lead Center Report to Consortium Office  
**Frequency/Period:** Every 6 months  
**Delivery:** 45 days after period end

## CRP No. 7: CCAFS - CLIMATE CHANGE, AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SECURITY

Period: January 1/2012 - December 31/2012

Amounts in USD thousands

Summary Report - by CG Partners	(a) CRP2012 Fin plan approved budget (2)					(b) CRP 2012 Expenditure					(c) Variance this Year				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2 (executed) (1)	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center funds	Total Funding
1. AFRICA RICE	741	-	599	-	1,339	741	-	552	-	1,293	(0)	-	46	-	46
2. BIODIVERSITY	4,075	-	1,999	-	6,074	4,123	124	1,476	-	5,723	(48)	(124)	522	-	350
3. CIAT (3)	11,699	-	3,454	-	15,153	11,342	11	3,055	-	14,408	357	(11)	399	-	745
4. CIFOR	569	-	526	-	1,095	557	-	414	-	970	12	-	112	-	125
5. CIMMYT	4,016	-	1,142	-	5,158	3,169	84	1,549	-	4,802	847	(84)	(407)	-	356
6. CIP	2,163	-	649	-	2,812	1,988	-	349	-	2,336	176	-	300	-	476
7. ICARDA	1,366	-	678	-	2,044	1,366	94	394	-	1,855	0	(94)	284	-	189
8. ICRAF	5,593	-	2,341	-	7,933	5,257	-	2,945	-	8,202	335	-	(604)	-	(269)
9. ICRISAT	4,407	-	724	-	5,131	3,862	-	1,335	-	5,197	545	-	(611)	-	(66)
10. IFPRI	3,090	-	1,852	-	4,942	2,329	-	1,047	-	3,376	761	-	805	-	1,567
11. IITA	955	-	338	-	1,293	966	115	267	-	1,348	(11)	(115)	71	-	(55)
12. ILRI	7,333	-	706	-	8,039	5,544	-	375	-	5,919	1,789	-	332	-	2,120
13. IRRI	1,182	-	347	-	1,529	1,083	-	269	-	1,352	99	-	78	-	177
14. IWMI	3,603	-	1,164	-	4,766	3,590	42	1,076	-	4,708	13	(42)	87	-	59
15. WORLD FISH	581	-	1,903	54	2,538	471	-	1,493	-	1,964	110	-	410	54	574
<b>Total for CRP7</b>	<b>51,373</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>18,420</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>69,846</b>	<b>46,388</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>16,595</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>63,453</b>	<b>4,985</b>	<b>(470)</b>	<b>1,824</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>6,394</b>
	<b>74%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>-7%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Notes

(1) Reported expenditure does not include \$4.2 million of W1&W2 committed funds which are to be accounted for in 2013. For further details please refer to the COMMITTED FUNDS sheet where a breakdown is provided

(2) 2012 W1+2 Budget includes 2011 carried forward funds.

(3) Figures includes not only CIAT's as a Participating Center but as a hosting center of CCAFS' TLs/RPLs, partner universities, Coordinating Unit and Management.

## CGIAR TEMPLATE: L121

## Report Description

<b>Name of Report:</b>	CRP7 / CCAFS - Expenditure by natural classification (by Center)
<b>Reporting Line:</b>	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
<b>Frequency/Period:</b>	Every six months
<b>Delivery:</b>	45 days after period end

## CRP No. 7: CCAFS - CLIMATE CHANGE, AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SECURITY

Period: January 1/2012 - December 31/2012

Amounts in USD 000's

Total CRP7	Actual Budget - This Year				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
Personnel	14,772	-	6,165	-	20,937
Collaborators Costs - CGIAR Centers	1,941	-	719	-	2,660
Collaborator Costs - Partners	13,808	-	4,038	1	17,847
Supplies and services	8,946	-	3,881	31	12,857
Operational Travel	2,317	-	1,517	15	3,849
Depreciation	1,118	-	186	-	1,304
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>42,902</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>16,507</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>59,455</b>
Indirect Costs	8,471	-	1,913	7	10,391
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>51,373</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>18,420</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>69,846</b>

Actual Expenses - This Year					
Windows 1 & 2 (executed) (1)	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding	
12,608	220	4,536	-	17,364	
2,532	3	377	-	2,912	
9,544	76	4,844	-	14,464	
10,073	82	3,595	-	13,750	
2,567	21	1,420	-	4,008	
1,007	3	211	-	1,221	
<b>38,331</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>14,983</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>53,720</b>	
8,056	65	1,612	-	9,733	
<b>46,388</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>16,595</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>63,453</b>	

Unspent Budget - This Year					
Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding	
2,164	(220)	1,630	-	3,573	
(591)	(3)	342	-	(252)	
4,264	(76)	(806)	1	3,383	
(1,128)	(82)	286	31	(893)	
(249)	(21)	97	15	(159)	
111	(3)	(25)	-	83	
<b>4,570</b>	<b>(405)</b>	<b>1,524</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>5,736</b>	
415	(65)	301	7	658	
<b>4,985</b>	<b>(470)</b>	<b>1,824</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>6,394</b>	

## Amounts for each participating center below:

1. AFRICA RICE	Actual Budget - This Year				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
Personnel	153	-	130	-	283
Collaborators Costs - CGIAR Centers	-	-	-	-	-
Collaborator Costs - Partners	91	-	155	-	245
Supplies and services	131	-	214	-	345
Operational Travel	105	-	38	-	143
Depreciation	157	-	12	-	168
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>636</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>548</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,184</b>
Indirect Costs	105	-	50	-	155
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>741</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>599</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,339</b>

Actual Expenses - This Year					
Windows 1 & 2 (executed)	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding	
151	-	53	-	204	
0	-	-	-	-	
141	-	263	-	404	
176	-	86	-	262	
84	-	102	-	186	
92	-	18	-	110	
<b>644</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,166</b>	
96	-	30	-	127	
<b>741</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>552</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,293</b>	

Unspent Budget - This Year					
Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding	
1	-	77	-	78	
-	-	-	-	-	
(50)	-	(108)	-	(159)	
(45)	-	128	-	83	
21	-	(64)	-	(43)	
64	-	(7)	-	58	
<b>(8)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>18</b>	
8	-	20	-	28	
<b>(0)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>46</b>	

2. BIODIVERSITY	Actual Budget - This Year				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
Personnel	1,651	-	654	-	2,305
Collaborators Costs - CGIAR Centers	-	-	-	-	-
Collaborator Costs - Partners	340	-	519	-	858
Supplies and services	1,332	-	272	-	1,603
Operational Travel	96	-	226	-	322
Depreciation	11	-	1	-	12
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>3,429</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,671</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>5,100</b>
Indirect Costs	646	-	327	-	973
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>4,075</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,999</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>6,074</b>

Actual Expenses - This Year					
Windows 1 & 2 (executed)	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding	
1,484	67	474	-	2,025	
-	-	35	-	35	
703	20	293	-	1,016	
1,181	22	358	-	1,562	
95	4	95	-	194	
2	-	-	-	2	
<b>3,465</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>1,255</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4,833</b>	
658	10	222	-	890	
<b>4,123</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>1,476</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>5,723</b>	

Unspent Budget - This Year					
Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding	
166	(67)	181	-	280	
-	-	(35)	-	(35)	
(363)	(20)	226	-	(157)	
150	(22)	(87)	-	41	
2	(4)	131	-	129	
9	-	1	-	10	
<b>(35)</b>	<b>(113)</b>	<b>416</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>268</b>	
(13)	(10)	106	-	83	
<b>(48)</b>	<b>(124)</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>350</b>	

3. CIAT	Actual Budget - This Year				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
Personnel	2,296	-	821	-	3,117
Collaborators Costs - CGIAR Centers	114	-	-	-	114
Collaborator Costs - Partners	4,503	-	1,598	-	6,100
Supplies and services	1,476	-	637	-	2,113
Operational Travel	225	-	175	-	400
Depreciation	121	-	10	-	131
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>8,735</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,241</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11,976</b>
Indirect Costs	2,963	-	214	-	3,177
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>11,699</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,454</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>15,153</b>

Actual Expenses - This Year (3)					
Windows 1 & 2 (executed)	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding	
1,849	-	378	-	2,227	
364	-	-	-	364	
4,291	8	1,778	-	6,077	
1,529	2	644	-	2,175	
276	-	121	-	397	
91	-	7	-	98	
<b>8,399</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2,929</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11,338</b>	
2,943	1	126	-	3,070	
<b>11,342</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3,055</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>14,408</b>	

Unspent Budget - This Year					
Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding	
447	-	442	-	890	
(249)	-	-	-	(249)	
212	(8)	(181)	-	23	
(53)	(2)	(7)	-	(62)	
(51)	-	54	-	3	
30	-	3	-	34	
<b>336</b>	<b>(10)</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>638</b>	
21	(1)	87	-	107	
<b>357</b>	<b>(11)</b>	<b>399</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>745</b>	

4. CIFOR	Actual Budget - This Year				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
Personnel	280	-	264	-	544
Collaborators Costs - CGIAR Centers	75	-	-	-	75
Collaborator Costs - Partners	-	-	32	-	32
Supplies and services	76	-	100	-	176
Operational Travel	35	-	35	-	70
Depreciation	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>898</b>
Indirect Costs	103	-	95	-	197
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>569</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>526</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,095</b>

Actual Expenses - This Year					
Windows 1 & 2 (executed)	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding	
291	-	247	-	538	
65	-	-	-	65	
65	-	65	-	130	
35	-	42	-	77	
-	-	-	-	-	
<b>456</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>353</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>810</b>	
100	-	60	-	161	
<b>557</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>970</b>	

Unspent Budget - This Year					
Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding	
(11)	-	17	-	6	
10	-	-	-	10	
-	-	32	-	32	
11	-	35	-	47	
(0)	-	(7)	-	(7)	
-	-	-	-	-	
<b>10</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>88</b>	
2	-	35	-	37	
<b>12</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>125</b>	

5. CIMMYT	Actual Budget - This Year				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
Personnel	1,166	-	297	-	1,463
Collaborators Costs - CGIAR Centers	-	-	88	-	88
Collaborator Costs - Partners	638	-	326	-	963
Supplies and services	866	-	226	-	1,092

Actual Expenses - This Year (3)					
Windows 1 & 2 (executed)	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding	
1,182	25	355	-	1,562	
-	3	66	-	69	
262	23	521	-	806	
861	18	313	-	1,192	

Unspent Budget - This Year					
Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding	
(16)	(25)	(58)	-	(99)	
-	(3)	22	-	19	
376	(23)	(196)	-	157	
4	(18)	(87)	-	(101)	

Operational Travel	373	-	51	-	424
Depreciation	506	-	23	-	529
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>3,548</b>	-	<b>1,010</b>	-	<b>4,558</b>
Indirect Costs	468	-	131	-	600
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>4,016</b>	-	<b>1,142</b>	-	<b>5,158</b>

6. CIP Actual Budget - This Year					
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
Personnel	674	-	224	-	897
Collaborators Costs - CGIAR Centers	-	-	-	-	-
Collaborator Costs - Partners	299	-	130	-	429
Supplies and services	766	-	126	-	891
Operational Travel	82	-	54	-	136
Depreciation	15	-	38	-	53
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>1,835</b>	-	<b>571</b>	-	<b>2,406</b>
Indirect Costs	329	-	77	-	406
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>2,163</b>	-	<b>649</b>	-	<b>2,812</b>

7. ICARDA Actual Budget - This Year					
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
Personnel	564	-	169	-	733
Collaborators Costs - CGIAR Centers	-	-	-	-	-
Collaborator Costs - Partners	125	-	-	-	125
Supplies and services	338	-	274	-	612
Operational Travel	111	-	105	-	216
Depreciation	-	-	15	-	15
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>1,138</b>	-	<b>563</b>	-	<b>1,701</b>
Indirect Costs	228	-	115	-	343
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>1,366</b>	-	<b>678</b>	-	<b>2,044</b>

8. ICRAF Actual Budget - This Year					
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
Personnel	1,866	-	913	-	2,779
Collaborators Costs - CGIAR Centers	225	-	117	-	342
Collaborator Costs - Partners	1,671	-	210	-	1,880
Supplies and services	687	-	515	-	1,202
Operational Travel	287	-	211	-	498
Depreciation	124	-	70	-	194
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>4,859</b>	-	<b>2,035</b>	-	<b>6,894</b>
Indirect Costs	733	-	305	-	1,039
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>5,593</b>	-	<b>2,341</b>	-	<b>7,933</b>

9. ICRISAT Actual Budget - This Year					
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
Personnel	1,206	-	188	-	1,394
Collaborators Costs - CGIAR Centers	248	-	-	-	248
Collaborator Costs - Partners	1,468	-	263	-	1,731
Supplies and services	700	-	158	-	858
Operational Travel	187	-	28	-	215
Depreciation	13	-	-	-	13
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>3,822</b>	-	<b>637</b>	-	<b>4,459</b>
Indirect Costs	585	-	87	-	672
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>4,407</b>	-	<b>724</b>	-	<b>5,131</b>

10. IFPRI Actual Budget - This Year					
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
Personnel	793	-	570	-	1,364
Collaborators Costs - CGIAR Centers	180	-	500	-	680
Collaborator Costs - Partners	1,037	-	200	-	1,237
Supplies and services	457	-	325	-	782
Operational Travel	161	-	236	-	398
Depreciation	10	-	-	-	10
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>2,639</b>	-	<b>1,832</b>	-	<b>4,471</b>
Indirect Costs	452	-	20	-	472
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>3,090</b>	-	<b>1,852</b>	-	<b>4,942</b>

11. IITA Actual Budget - This Year					
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
Personnel	303	-	118	-	421
Collaborators Costs - CGIAR Centers	42	-	14	-	56
Collaborator Costs - Partners	111	-	29	-	140
Supplies and services	237	-	86	-	324
Operational Travel	95	-	35	-	130
Depreciation	13	-	6	-	19
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>802</b>	-	<b>288</b>	-	<b>1,090</b>
Indirect Costs	153	-	50	-	203
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>955</b>	-	<b>338</b>	-	<b>1,293</b>

12. ILRI Actual Budget - This Year					
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
Personnel	2,096	-	443	-	2,539
Collaborators Costs - CGIAR Centers	607	-	-	-	607

228	5	92	-	326
229	2	34	-	265
<b>2,763</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>1,383</b>	-	<b>4,221</b>
406	9	166	-	581
<b>3,169</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>1,549</b>	-	<b>4,802</b>

Actual Expenses - This Year (3)					
	Windows 1 & 2 (executed)	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
672	-	180	-	852	
-	-	-	-	-	
190	-	3	-	193	
675	-	45	-	720	
90	-	40	-	130	
41	-	48	-	90	
<b>1,669</b>	-	<b>316</b>	-	<b>1,984</b>	
319	-	33	-	352	
<b>1,988</b>	-	<b>349</b>	-	<b>2,336</b>	

Actual Expenses - This Year					
	Windows 1 & 2 (executed)	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
519	35	79	-	632	
-	-	-	-	-	
153	8	106	-	267	
361	29	99	-	489	
95	8	62	-	165	
10	1	14	-	26	
<b>1,138</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>360</b>	-	<b>1,579</b>	
228	14	34	-	276	
<b>1,366</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>394</b>	-	<b>1,855</b>	

Actual Expenses - This Year					
	Windows 1 & 2 (executed)	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
1,240	-	503	-	1,743	
273	-	93	-	365	
1,255	-	880	-	2,135	
1,121	-	746	-	1,866	
418	-	358	-	777	
264	-	13	-	278	
<b>4,572</b>	-	<b>2,594</b>	-	<b>7,165</b>	
686	-	351	-	1,037	
<b>5,257</b>	-	<b>2,945</b>	-	<b>8,202</b>	

Actual Expenses - This Year					
	Windows 1 & 2 (executed)	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
819	-	342	-	1,161	
316	-	-	-	316	
931	-	350	-	1,281	
861	-	292	-	1,153	
231	-	165	-	397	
38	-	40	-	78	
<b>3,197</b>	-	<b>1,189</b>	-	<b>4,386</b>	
665	-	146	-	811	
<b>3,862</b>	-	<b>1,335</b>	-	<b>5,197</b>	

Actual Expenses - This Year (3)					
	Windows 1 & 2 (executed)	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
728	81	511	-	1,240	
295	-	-	-	295	
491	181	672	-	1,244	
429	151	580	-	1,160	
101	57	159	-	317	
31	22	53	-	106	
<b>2,076</b>	<b>923</b>	<b>2,999</b>	-	<b>5,998</b>	
254	123	377	-	754	
<b>2,329</b>	<b>1,047</b>	<b>3,376</b>	-	<b>5,752</b>	

Actual Expenses - This Year					
	Windows 1 & 2 (executed)	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
514	81	127	-	722	
14	-	2	-	16	
92	-	19	-	111	
158	4	72	-	234	
43	3	18	-	64	
1	-	-	-	1	
<b>822</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>238</b>	-	<b>1,148</b>	
144	26	30	-	200	
<b>966</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>267</b>	-	<b>1,348</b>	

Actual Expenses - This Year (4)					
	Windows 1 & 2 (executed)	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
1,389	-	176	-	1,565	
420	-	-	-	420	

145	(5)	(41)	-	98
276	(2)	(12)	-	263
<b>785</b>	<b>(76)</b>	<b>(372)</b>	-	<b>337</b>
62	(9)	(35)	-	19
<b>847</b>	<b>(84)</b>	<b>(407)</b>	-	<b>356</b>

Unspent Budget - This Year					
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
2	-	44	-	46	
-	-	-	-	-	
109	-	127	-	236	
91	-	81	-	171	
(9)	-	14	-	6	
(26)	-	(10)	-	(37)	
<b>166</b>	-	<b>256</b>	-	<b>422</b>	
9	-	45	-	54	
<b>176</b>	-	<b>300</b>	-	<b>476</b>	

Unspent Budget - This Year					
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
45	(35)	90	-	100	
-	-	-	-	-	
(28)	(8)	(106)	-	(142)	
(23)	(29)	174	-	123	
17	(8)	43	-	51	
(10)	(1)	1	-	(11)	
<b>0</b>	<b>(80)</b>	<b>202</b>	-	<b>122</b>	
(0)	(14)	81	-	67	
<b>0</b>	<b>(94)</b>	<b>284</b>	-	<b>189</b>	

Unspent Budget - This Year					
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
626	-	409	-	1,035	
(48)	-	24	-	(24)	
415	-	(671)	-	(255)	
(434)	-	(231)	-	(665)	
(131)	-	(148)	-	(279)	
(180)	-	57	-	(123)	
<b>248</b>	-	<b>(559)</b>	-	<b>(311)</b>	
48	-	(46)	-	2	
<b>335</b>	-	<b>(604)</b>	-	<b>(269)</b>	

Unspent Budget - This Year					
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
387	-	(154)	-	233	
(68)	-	-	-	(68)	
537	-	(87)	-	450	
(161)	-	(134)	-	(295)	
(44)	-	(137)	-	(181)	
(25)	-	(40)	-	(65)	
<b>625</b>	-	<b>(552)</b>	-	<b>73</b>	
(80)	-	(59)	-	(139)	
<b>545</b>	-	<b>(611)</b>	-	<b>(66)</b>	

Unspent Budget - This Year					
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
65	-	59	-	124	
(115)	-	500	-	385	
546	-	19	-	565	
29	-	173	-	202	
60	-	179	-	239	
(21)	-	(22)	-	(43)	
<b>563</b>	-	<b>908</b>	-	<b>1,472</b>	
198	-	(103)	-	95	
<b>761</b>	-	<b>805</b>	-	<b>1,567</b>	

Unspent Budget - This Year					
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral Funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
(211)	(81)	(9)	-	(301)	
28	-	12	-	40	
19	-	10	-	29	
79	(4)	15	-	90	
53	(3)	17	-	66	
12	-	6	-	18	
<b>(20)</b>	<b>(89)</b>	<b>50</b>	-	<b>(58)</b>	
9	(				

Collaborator Costs - Partners	2,446	-	-	-	2,446
Supplies and services	724	-	87	-	810
Operational Travel	336	-	63	-	399
Depreciation	26	-	-	-	26
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>6,233</b>	-	<b>593</b>	-	<b>6,826</b>
Indirect Costs	1,100	-	113	-	1,213
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>7,333</b>	-	<b>706</b>	-	<b>8,039</b>

	481	-	-	-	481
	1,795	-	113	-	1,908
	655	-	38	-	693
	-	-	-	-	26
	<b>4,740</b>	-	<b>326</b>	-	<b>5,066</b>
	805	-	48	-	853
	<b>5,544</b>	-	<b>375</b>	-	<b>5,919</b>

	1,965	-	-	-	1,965
	(1,072)	-	(26)	-	(1,097)
	(319)	-	25	-	(294)
	26	-	-	-	26
	<b>1,494</b>	-	<b>267</b>	-	<b>1,761</b>
	295	-	65	-	360
	<b>1,789</b>	-	<b>332</b>	-	<b>2,120</b>

<b>13. IIRI</b>	<b>Actual Budget - This Year</b>				
	<b>Windows 1 &amp; 2</b>	<b>Window 3</b>	<b>Bilateral Funding</b>	<b>Center Funds</b>	<b>Total Funding</b>
Personnel	166	-	131	-	297
Collaborators Costs - CGIAR Centers	-	-	-	-	-
Collaborator Costs - Partners	80	-	59	-	139
Supplies and services	615	-	94	-	709
Operational Travel	80	-	27	-	107
Depreciation	119	-	-	-	119
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>1,060</b>	-	<b>311</b>	-	<b>1,371</b>
Indirect Costs	122	-	36	-	159
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>1,182</b>	-	<b>347</b>	-	<b>1,529</b>

	<b>Actual Expenses - This Year</b>				
	<b>Windows 1 &amp; 2 (executed)</b>	<b>Window 3</b>	<b>Bilateral Funding</b>	<b>Center Funds</b>	<b>Total Funding</b>
	162	-	99	-	261
	-	-	-	-	-
	121	-	92	-	213
	416	-	16	-	432
	63	-	42	-	105
	206	-	-	-	206
	<b>968</b>	-	<b>249</b>	-	<b>1,217</b>
	115	-	20	-	135
	<b>1,083</b>	-	<b>269</b>	-	<b>1,352</b>

	<b>Unspent Budget - This Year</b>				
	<b>Windows 1 &amp; 2</b>	<b>Window 3</b>	<b>Bilateral Funding</b>	<b>Center Funds</b>	<b>Total Funding</b>
	3	-	33	-	36
	-	-	-	-	-
	(41)	-	(33)	-	(74)
	199	-	79	-	278
	17	-	(15)	-	1
	(87)	-	-	-	(87)
	<b>91</b>	-	<b>62</b>	-	<b>154</b>
	7	-	16	-	23
	<b>99</b>	-	<b>78</b>	-	<b>177</b>

<b>14. IWMI</b>	<b>Actual Budget - This Year</b>				
	<b>Windows 1 &amp; 2</b>	<b>Window 3</b>	<b>Bilateral Funding</b>	<b>Center Funds</b>	<b>Total Funding</b>
Personnel	1,223	-	356	-	1,578
Collaborators Costs - CGIAR Centers	450	-	-	-	450
Collaborator Costs - Partners	917	-	411	-	1,328
Supplies and services	500	-	188	-	688
Operational Travel	106	-	77	-	183
Depreciation	4	-	11	-	15
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>3,199</b>	-	<b>1,043</b>	-	<b>4,242</b>
Indirect Costs	403	-	121	-	524
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>3,603</b>	-	<b>1,164</b>	-	<b>4,766</b>

	<b>Actual Expenses - This Year</b>				
	<b>Windows 1 &amp; 2 (executed)</b>	<b>Window 3</b>	<b>Bilateral Funding</b>	<b>Center Funds</b>	<b>Total Funding</b>
	1,264	13	360	-	1,637
	785	-	-	-	785
	431	17	266	-	713
	424	7	268	-	699
	106	1	60	-	167
	1	-	13	-	14
	<b>3,011</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>967</b>	-	<b>4,015</b>
	579	4	110	-	693
	<b>3,590</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>1,076</b>	-	<b>4,708</b>

	<b>Unspent Budget - This Year</b>				
	<b>Windows 1 &amp; 2</b>	<b>Window 3</b>	<b>Bilateral Funding</b>	<b>Center Funds</b>	<b>Total Funding</b>
	(41)	(13)	(5)	-	(59)
	(335)	-	-	-	(335)
	486	(17)	146	-	615
	76	(7)	(81)	-	(11)
	(0)	(1)	17	-	16
	2	-	(2)	-	1
	<b>188</b>	<b>(37)</b>	<b>76</b>	-	<b>227</b>
	(175)	(4)	11	-	(169)
	<b>13</b>	<b>(42)</b>	<b>87</b>	-	<b>59</b>

<b>15. WORLDFISH</b>	<b>Actual Budget - This Year</b>				
	<b>Windows 1 &amp; 2</b>	<b>Window 3</b>	<b>Bilateral Funding</b>	<b>Center Funds</b>	<b>Total Funding</b>
Personnel	336	-	888	-	1,224
Collaborators Costs - CGIAR Centers	-	-	-	-	-
Collaborator Costs - Partners	84	-	108	1	193
Supplies and services	41	-	579	31	651
Operational Travel	38	-	157	15	210
Depreciation	-	-	1	-	1
<b>Sub-total of Direct Costs</b>	<b>499</b>	-	<b>1,733</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>2,279</b>
Indirect Costs	82	-	169	7	259
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>581</b>	-	<b>1,903</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>2,538</b>

	<b>Actual Expenses - This Year</b>				
	<b>Windows 1 &amp; 2 (executed)</b>	<b>Window 3</b>	<b>Bilateral Funding</b>	<b>Center Funds</b>	<b>Total Funding</b>
	343	-	652	-	995
	-	-	181	-	181
	2	-	92	-	94
	21	-	327	-	348
	46	-	127	-	173
	-	-	1	-	1
	<b>412</b>	-	<b>1,381</b>	-	<b>1,793</b>
	59	-	112	-	171
	<b>471</b>	-	<b>1,493</b>	-	<b>1,964</b>

	<b>Unspent Budget - This Year</b>				
	<b>Windows 1 &amp; 2</b>	<b>Window 3</b>	<b>Bilateral Funding</b>	<b>Center Funds</b>	<b>Total Funding</b>
	(6)	-	236	-	229
	-	-	(181)	-	(181)
	82	-	16	1	99
	20	-	252	31	302
	(8)	-	30	15	37
	-	-	(0)	-	(0)
	<b>87</b>	-	<b>352</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>486</b>
	23	-	57	7	88
	<b>110</b>	-	<b>410</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>574</b>

Notes

- (1) Reported expenditure does not include \$4.2 million of W1&W2 committed funds which are to be accounted for in 2013. For further details please refer to the COMMITTED FUNDS sheet where a breakdown is provided
- (2) By the time CIAT elaborated its 2012 Financial Statements, not all the University final financial reports were received, therefore there is a slight difference with what has been reported in this report.
- (3) By the time CIAT elaborated its 2012 Financial Statements, CIMMYT, CIP and IFPRI's neither final financial reports nor comfort letters had been received, therefore figures in CIAT's 2012 FS correspond to latest estimated figures provided by these two centers.
- (4) By the time CIAT elaborated its 2012 Financial Statements, ILRI had submitted a preliminary financial report indicating \$905K of bilateral execution. Final figures and comfort letter indicate that only \$375k of bilateral funds have been executed.



Theme 1	1,426	-	411	-	1,837	1,013	30	503	-	1,546	413	(30)	(92)	-	291
Theme 2	1,578	-	444	-	2,022	1,146	33	554	-	1,733	432	(33)	(110)	-	290
Theme 3	655	-	189	-	844	476	14	236	-	725	180	(14)	(47)	-	119
Theme 4	357	-	97	-	454	282	7	132	-	421	75	(7)	(35)	-	33
Gender Strategies	-	-	-	-	-	254	-	124	-	378	(254)	-	(124)	-	(378)
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>4,016</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,142</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>5,158</b>	<b>3,169</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>1,549</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4,802</b>	<b>847</b>	<b>(84)</b>	<b>(407)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>356</b>

	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
Theme 1	665	-	152	-	817	682	-	134	-	815	(17)	-	18	-	1
Theme 2	875	-	435	-	1,311	494	-	162	-	656	381	-	273	-	655
Theme 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Theme 4	623	-	62	-	685	555	-	53	-	608	68	-	9	-	77
Gender Strategies	-	-	-	-	-	257	-	-	-	257	(257)	-	-	-	(257)
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>2,163</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>649</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,812</b>	<b>1,988</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,336</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>476</b>

	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
Theme 1	1,176	-	485	-	1,660	1,206	62	298	-	1,566	(30)	(62)	187	-	95
Theme 2	190	-	193	-	383	160	32	96	-	289	30	(32)	96	-	94
Theme 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Theme 4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender Strategies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>1,366</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>678</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,044</b>	<b>1,366</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,855</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(94)</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>189</b>

	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
Theme 1	660	-	612	-	1,272	179	-	622	-	801	481	-	(10)	-	471
Theme 2	756	-	658	-	1,414	554	-	669	-	1,223	202	-	(11)	-	191
Theme 3	2,062	-	900	-	2,963	1,745	-	1,316	-	3,061	317	-	(416)	-	(99)
Theme 4	2,114	-	171	-	2,285	1,320	-	1,493	-	2,813	794	-	(3)	-	791
Gender Strategies	-	-	-	-	-	1,459	-	164	-	1,623	(1,459)	-	(164)	-	(1,623)
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>5,593</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,341</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>7,933</b>	<b>5,257</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,945</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>8,202</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(604)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(269)</b>

	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
Theme 1	980	-	480	-	1,460	715	-	777	-	1,492	265	-	(297)	-	(32)
Theme 2	1,576	-	129	-	1,705	1,289	-	250	-	1,539	287	-	(121)	-	166
Theme 3	515	-	-	-	515	453	-	-	-	453	-	-	-	-	62
Theme 4	1,335	-	115	-	1,450	1,184	-	309	-	1,492	151	-	(194)	-	(42)
Gender Strategies	-	-	-	-	-	220	-	-	-	220	(220)	-	-	-	(220)
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>4,407</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>724</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>5,131</b>	<b>3,862</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,335</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>5,197</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(611)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(66)</b>

	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
Theme 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Theme 2	729	-	-	-	729	487	-	-	-	487	241	-	-	-	241
Theme 3	531	-	1,714	-	2,245	337	-	960	-	1,296	194	-	754	-	948
Theme 4	1,831	-	138	-	1,969	1,392	-	87	-	1,479	439	-	52	-	490
Gender Strategies	-	-	-	-	-	113	-	-	-	113	(113)	-	-	-	(113)
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>3,090</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,852</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4,942</b>	<b>2,329</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,047</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,376</b>	<b>761</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>805</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,567</b>

	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
Theme 1	433	-	151	-	584	417	49	114	-	580	16	(49)	37	-	4
Theme 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Theme 3	354	-	187	-	541	287	34	79	-	400	67	(34)	108	-	141
Theme 4	168	-	-	-	168	134	17	38	-	189	34	(17)	(38)	-	(21)
Gender Strategies	-	-	-	-	-	127	15	35	-	178	(127)	(15)	(35)	-	(178)
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>955</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,293</b>	<b>966</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,348</b>	<b>(11)</b>	<b>(115)</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(55)</b>

	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
Theme 1	750	-	-	-	750	592	-	375	-	966	158	-	(375)	-	(216)
Theme 2	933	-	-	-	933	553	-	-	-	553	380	-	-	-	380

Theme 3	1,404	-	17	-	1,421	883	-	-	-	883	521	-	17	-	538
Theme 4	4,246	-	689	-	4,935	2,693	-	-	-	2,693	1,554	-	689	-	2,243
Gender Strategies	-	-	-	-	-	824	-	-	-	824	(824)	-	-	-	(824)
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>7,333</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>706</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>8,039</b>	<b>5,544</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>5,919</b>	<b>1,789</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,120</b>

	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
Theme 1	354	-	206	-	560	360	-	132	-	493	(6)	-	74	-	68
Theme 2	94	-	-	-	94	59	-	-	-	59	35	-	-	-	35
Theme 3	581	-	141	-	722	528	-	96	-	625	52	-	45	-	97
Theme 4	153	-	-	-	153	87	-	-	-	87	66	-	-	-	66
Gender Strategies	-	-	-	-	-	49	-	40	-	89	(49)	-	(40)	-	(89)
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>1,182</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,529</b>	<b>1,083</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,352</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>177</b>

	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
Theme 1	1,789	-	1,024	-	2,813	1,655	37	947	-	2,639	134	(37)	77	-	174
Theme 2	567	-	93	-	660	572	3	86	-	661	(5)	(3)	7	-	(1)
Theme 3	191	-	-	-	191	187	-	-	-	187	4	-	-	-	4
Theme 4	1,056	-	47	-	1,103	877	2	43	-	922	179	(2)	3	-	181
Gender Strategies	-	-	-	-	-	299	-	-	-	299	(299)	-	-	-	(299)
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>3,603</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,164</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4,766</b>	<b>3,590</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>1,076</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4,708</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>(42)</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>59</b>

	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
Theme 1	132	-	534	-	666	5	-	280	-	285	127	-	254	-	381
Theme 2	158	-	701	23	882	155	-	568	-	723	3	-	133	23	159
Theme 3	208	-	174	3	385	183	-	135	-	319	25	-	39	3	67
Theme 4	83	-	494	28	604	89	-	260	-	349	(6)	-	233	28	255
Gender Strategies	-	-	-	-	-	39	-	249	-	289	(39)	-	(249)	-	(289)
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total - All Costs</b>	<b>581</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,903</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>2,538</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,493</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,964</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>574</b>

Notes

(1) Reported expenditure does not include \$4.2 million of W1&W2 committed funds which are to be accounted for in 2013. For further details please refer to the COMMITTED FUNDS sheet where a breakdown is provided

## CGIAR TEMPLATE: L201

## Report Description

Name of Report: CRP7 / CCAFS - Bilateral Grants (by Center)

Reporting Line: Lead Center Report to Consortium Office

Frequency/Period: Every six months

Delivery: 45 days after period end

## CRP No. 7: CCAFS - CLIMATE CHANGE, AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SECURITY

Period: January 1/2012- December 31/2012

Amounts in USD 000's

TOTAL FOR CRP7			Expenditure		
Donor Acronym	Donor Name		Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
<b>W3</b>					
1	IPM-Switzerland	0	-	115	(115)
2	USAID		-	94	(94)
3	BMGF		-	67	(67)
4	WB		-	62	(62)
5	China	0	-	52	(52)
6	Others	0	-	80	(80)
	<b>Total W3</b>		-	<b>470</b>	<b>(470)</b>
<b>Bilateral</b>					
7	USAID		2,033	1,470	563
8	ACIAR	0	1,536	1,410	125
9	CP Funds		1,400	1,328	72
10	IFAD		1,583	954	629
11	GIZ		1,064	943	121
12	State of Netherlands	0	933	822	112
13	FAO	0	831	808	23
14	GTZ		-	748	(748)
15	BMZ	0	687	559	128
16	IRRI		410	511	(101)
17	Environment Canada		-	401	(401)
18	ADB		452	376	77
19	EC		1,055	635	420
20	AusAID		301	355	(54)
21	GCP		74	267	(193)
22	Cornell		244	252	(8)
23	NOR		565	249	316
24	GoG		62	214	(152)
25	IFPRI		176	208	(32)
26	The Global Crop Diversity		336	205	131
27	FONTAGRO		294	197	97
28	Finland		-	181	(181)
29	OPEC	0	188	163	25
30	IWMI		54	130	(76)
31	AFESD		115	128	(13)
32	WWF		110	127	(17)
33	PWCS	0	95	123	(29)
34	ICRAF		108	122	(14)
35	IDRC		146	115	32
36	Bioforsk		84	109	(24)
37	CIAT		25	106	(81)
38	Danida	0	100	97	3

39	Rockefeller Foundation	Rockefeller Foundation	94	94	-
40	BAR	Philippines Bureau of Agricultural Research	99	93	6
41	ILRI		0	93	(93)
42	CORAF/WECARD	Conseil ouest et centre africain pour la recherche	82	91	(9)
43	GOI		115	89	26
44	CRS		0	104	15
45	COADY	Governors of St. Francis Xavier University	91	82	9
46	NORAD	Norway	217	79	139
47	CUAS	Cologne University of Applied Sciences	90	74	16
48	CIP		0	72	(72)
49	DEWHA	Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water and Heritage	74	67	8
50	SDC	Swiss Development Corporation	39	66	(27)
51	Universidad del Cauca		0	100	34
52	ICAR	India Council for Agricultural Research	268	62	206
53	INIA	Instituto de Investigaciones Agropecuarias	516	60	455
54	Anonymous (UK fundraising)		0	90	34
55	CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency	57	53	5
56	WOTRO	WOTRO Science for Global Development	59	53	6
57	CIRAD	Centre de Cooperation Internationale en Recherche	83	51	32
58	Others		0	1,179	285
	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>18,420</b>	<b>16,595</b>	<b>1,824</b>
	<b>Total for CRP7</b>		<b>18,420</b>	<b>17,065</b>	<b>1,355</b>

## Bilateral Grants for each participating center below:

1. AFRICA RICE			Expenditure		
Item	Donor Acronym	Donor Name	Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	<b>Bilateral</b>	<b>Bilateral</b>			
1	GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Internationale Zusammenarbeit	456	438	19
2	WOTRO	WOTRO Science for Global Development	59	53	6
3	CIRAD	Centre de Cooperation Internationale en Recherche	83	51	32
4	UNL	University of Nebraska	-	11	(11)
	<b>Total for CRP7</b>		<b>599</b>	<b>552</b>	<b>46</b>

2. BIOVERSITY			Expenditure		
Item	Donor Acronym	Donor Name	Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	<b>W3</b>	<b>W3</b>			
1	WB	World Bank	-	62	(62)
2	China		0	52	(52)
3	India		0	10	(10)
	<b>Total W3</b>	<b>Total W3</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>(124)</b>
	<b>Bilateral</b>	<b>Bilateral</b>			
4	State of Netherlands		0	615	82
5	GCP	Generation Challenge Program	74	267	(193)
6	FAO		0	210	(19)
7	IFAD	International Fund for Agriculture Development	525	119	406
8	Anonymous (UK fundraising)		0	57	34
9	CIAT	Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical	-	54	(54)
10	The Christensen Fund		0	248	209

11	European Commission	EC	57	38	19
12	IWMI	Internacional Water Management Institute	-	37	(37)
13	GRDC	Grains Research & Development Corporation	-	22	(22)
14	GCDT	Global Crop Diversity Trust	-	11	(11)
15	McKnight Foundation	McKnight Foundation	12	7	5
16	WB	World Bank	105	-	105
	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>1,999</b>	<b>1,476</b>	<b>522</b>
	<b>Total for CRP7</b>		<b>1,999</b>	<b>1,600</b>	<b>399</b>

3. CIAT			Expenditure		
Item	Donor Acronym	Donor Name	Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	<b>W3</b>	<b>W3</b>			
1	IFAD	IFAD	-	11	(11)
	<b>Total W3</b>	<b>Total W3</b>	-	<b>11</b>	<b>(11)</b>
	<b>Bilateral</b>	<b>Bilateral</b>			
2	CP Funds	Challenge Program Funds	1,400	1,328	72
3	Other		0	208	(208)
4	The Global Crop Diversity	The Global Crop Diversity	336	205	131
5	FONTAGRO	FONTAGRO	294	197	97
6	IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute	153	147	6
7	OPEC		0	141	0
8	ACIAR		0	258	134
9	PWCS		0	95	(29)
10	BMZ		0	110	11
11	Danida		0	100	3
12	CRS		0	104	15
13	Universidad del Cauca		0	100	34
14	JIRCAS	JIRCAS	45	48	(3)
15	GMCRC		0	56	12
16	CIMMYT	Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y	52	43	9
17	CDKN		0	70	36
18	PNUMA		0	100	72
19	UVG		0	14	(1)
20	GCDT		0	15	6
21	CP Funds	Challenge Program Funds	7	7	(0)
22	Danida		0	2	2
23	Other	World Bank	2	1	0
	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>3,454</b>	<b>3,055</b>	<b>399</b>
	<b>Total for CRP7</b>		<b>3,454</b>	<b>3,066</b>	<b>388</b>

4. CIFOR			Expenditure		
Item	Donor Acronym	Donor Name	Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	<b>Bilateral</b>	<b>Bilateral</b>			
1	AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development	165	219	(54)
2	European Commission	EC	114	87	28
3	NORAD	Norway	217	79	139
4	ICRAF	World Agroforestry Centre	29	29	-
	<b>Total for CRP7</b>		<b>526</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>112</b>

5. CIMMYT			Expenditure		
Item	Donor Acronym	Donor Name	Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	<b>W3</b>	<b>W3</b>			
1	BMGF	BMGF	-	67	(67)
2	TNULS (UMB)	TNULS (UMB)	-	17	(17)
	<b>Total W3</b>	<b>Total W3</b>	-	<b>84</b>	<b>(84)</b>
	<b>Bilateral</b>	<b>Bilateral</b>			-
3	ACIAR	ACIAR	555	756	(201)
4	IRRI	International Rice Research Institute	410	511	(101)
5	USAID	USAID	11	162	(151)
6	GIZ	GIZ	51	39	13
7	SFSA	SFSA	37	33	4
8	IFPRI	IFPRI	23	28	(5)
9	IWMI	IWMI	54	20	34
	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>1,142</b>	<b>1,549</b>	<b>(407)</b>
	<b>Total for CRP7</b>		<b>1,142</b>	<b>1,633</b>	<b>(491)</b>

6. CIP			Expenditure		
Item	Donor Acronym	Donor Name	Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	<b>Bilateral</b>	<b>Bilateral</b>			
1	GoG	Government of Germany	62	214	(152)
2	INIA	Instituto de Investigaciones Agropecuarias	516	60	455
3	CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency	-	53	(53)
4	OPEC	The OPEC Fund for International Development	46	21	25
5	CIAT	Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (NEV)	25	-	25
	<b>Total for CRP7</b>		<b>649</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>300</b>

7. ICARDA			Expenditure		
Item	Donor Acronym	Donor Name	Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	<b>W3</b>	<b>W3</b>			
1	USAID	United States Agency for International Developm	-	94	(94)
	<b>Total W3</b>	<b>Total W3</b>	-	<b>94</b>	<b>(94)</b>
	<b>Bilateral</b>	<b>Bilateral</b>			
2	ACIAR	Australian Center for International Agricultural R	310	182	128
3	AFESD	Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development	115	128	(13)
4	ADB	Asian Development Bank	-	67	(67)
5	USAID	United States Agency for International Developm	138	15	123
6	IFAD	International Fund for Agriculture Development	115	2	113
	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>678</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>284</b>
	<b>Total for CRP7</b>		<b>678</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>189</b>

8. ICRAF			Expenditure		
----------	--	--	-------------	--	--

Item	Donor Acronym	Donor Name	Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	<b>Bilateral</b>	<b>Bilateral</b>			
1	GTZ	Deutsche Gessellschaft fur Technische Zusammen	-	748	(748)
2	FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United	640	584	56
3	Environment Canada	Environment Canada	-	401	(401)
4	IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development	409	329	80
5	Cornell	Cornell University	244	252	(8)
6	Finland	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland	-	181	(181)
7	CORAF/WECARD	Conseil ouest et centre africain pour la recherche	82	91	(9)
8	COADY	Governors of St. Francis Xavier University	91	82	9
9	WWF	World Wildlife Foundation	70	82	(11)
10	SDC	Swiss Development Corporation	39	66	(27)
11	ICAR	India Council for Agricultural Research	268	62	206
12	CIAT	International Center Tropical Agriculture	-	50	(50)
13	Others	Multidonor	-	16	(16)
14	USAID	United States Agency for International Developm	496	-	496
<b>Total for CRP7</b>			<b>2,341</b>	<b>2,945</b>	<b>(604)</b>

**9. ICRISAT****Expenditure**

Item	Donor Acronym	Donor Name	Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	<b>Bilateral</b>	<b>Bilateral</b>			
1	USAID		0	582	(582)
2	GIZ		0	416	64
3	ADB		0	139	(10)
4	ILRI		0	93	(93)
5	GOI		0	89	26
6	IRA		0	16	(16)
<b>Total for CRP7</b>			<b>724</b>	<b>1,335</b>	<b>(611)</b>

**10. IFPRI****Expenditure**

Item	Donor Acronym	Donor Name	Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	<b>Bilateral</b>	<b>Bilateral</b>			
1	USAID	US Agency of International development	1,367	668	699
2	IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development	321	258	63
3	FANRPAN	Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy A	42	47	(4)
4	Columbia University	Columbia University	121	40	81
5	IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute	-	33	(33)
<b>Total for CRP7</b>			<b>1,852</b>	<b>1,047</b>	<b>805</b>

**11. IITA****Expenditure**

Item	Donor Acronym	Donor Name	Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	<b>W3</b>	<b>W3</b>			
1	IPM-Switzerland		0	115	(115)
<b>Total W3</b>			<b>-</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>(115)</b>

	Bilateral	Bilateral				
2	ICRAF		0	79	93	(14)
3	CIP		0	-	72	(72)
4	DANISH		0	-	31	(31)
5	Netherlands		0	-	31	(31)
6	MECN-T		0	22	25	(3)
7	OXFAM GB		0	-	6	(6)
8	MLURI-EU		0	76	5	71
9	FAO		0	-	5	(5)
10	UNIV. OF LEADS		0	-	2	(2)
11	DLO		0	-	0	(0)
12	BMZ		0	73	-	73
13	DGP-CRSP		0	10	-	10
14	GIZ		0	26	-	26
15	USAID		0	20	-	20
16	WUR		0	30	-	30
17	McKnight Foundation		0	2	(2)	4
	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>		<b>338</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>71</b>
	<b>Total for CRP7</b>			<b>338</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>(44)</b>

12. ILRI			Expenditure		
Item	Donor Acronym	Donor Name	Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	<b>Bilateral</b>	<b>Bilateral</b>			
1	Commission of the European Communities	Commission of the European Communities	706	375	332
	<b>Total for CRP7</b>		<b>706</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>332</b>

13. IRRI			Expenditure		
Item	Donor Acronym	Donor Name	Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	<b>Bilateral</b>	<b>Bilateral</b>			
1	ACIAR	Australian Centre for International Agricultural R	257	195	62
2	CUAS	Cologne University of Applied Sciences	90	74	16
	<b>Total for CRP7</b>		<b>347</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>78</b>

14. IWMI			Expenditure		
Item	Donor Acronym	Donor Name	Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	<b>W3</b>	<b>W3</b>			
1	CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency	-	34	(34)
2	ACIAR	Australian Centre for International Agricultural R	-	7	(7)
	<b>Total W3</b>	<b>Total W3</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>(42)</b>
	<b>Bilateral</b>	<b>Bilateral</b>			
3	IFAD	International Fund for Agriculture Development	213	244	(31)
4	State of Netherlands	State of Netherlands	236	206	29
5	ACIAR	Australian Centre for International Agricultural R	155	153	2
6	IDRC	International Development Research Centre	146	115	32
7	Bioforsk	Norwegian Institute for Agricultural and Environr	84	109	(24)
8	Rockefeller Foundation	Rockefeller Foundation	94	94	-

9	GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusamm	51	50	0
10	ADB	Asian Development Bank	45	44	1
11	European Commission	European Commission	46	27	19
12	IRA	Institute of Resource Assessment (IRA), Tanzania,	18	17	1
13	WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature, India	10	10	(0)
14	ICIMOD	International Centre for Integrated Mountain De	9	5	3
15	CIAT	Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (thrc	-	1	(1)
16	CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency	57	-	57
	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>1,164</b>	<b>1,076</b>	<b>87</b>
	<b>Total for CRP7</b>		<b>1,164</b>	<b>1,118</b>	<b>46</b>

**15. WORLD FISH****Expenditure**

Item	Donor Acronym	Donor Name	Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	<b>Bilateral</b>	<b>Bilateral</b>			
1	BMZ	German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperat	504	460	44
2	NOR	Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs	565	249	316
3	AusAID	Australian Agency for International Developmen	135	135	0
4	ADB	Asian Development Bank	278	126	152
5	European Commission	European Commission	132	109	23
6	BAR	Philippines Bureau of Agricultural Research	99	93	6
7	IWMI	International Water Management Institute (IWM	-	73	(73)
8	DEWHA	Department of Sustainability, Environment, Wat	74	67	8
9	USAID	United States Agency for International Developn	-	42	(42)
10	LGED	International Fund for Agricultural Development	-	41	(41)
11	WWF	World Wildlife Fund	30	36	(6)
12	NHI	National Heritage Institute	38	35	2
13	FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United	-	9	(9)
14	WI	United States Agency for International Developm	-	9	(9)
15	CGIAR CONSORTIUM OFFICE	CGIAR Consortium Board	4	4	0
16	UQ	University of Queensland	3	3	(0)
17	SEAT	Sustainable Trade in Ethical Aquaculture (Uni Of:	39	-	39
	<b>Total for CRP7</b>		<b>1,903</b>	<b>1,493</b>	<b>410</b>
	<b>TOTAL FOR CRP7</b>		<b>18,420</b>	<b>17,065</b>	<b>1,355</b>

## CGIAR TEMPLATE: L211

## Report Description

Name of Report: CRP7 / CCAFS - CRP Partnerships Report

Reporting Line: Lead Center Report to Consortium Office

Frequency/Period: Every six months

Delivery: 60 days after period end

## CRP No. 7: CCAFS - CLIMATE CHANGE, AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SECURITY

Period: January 1/2012 - December 31/2012

Amounts in USD 000's

TOTAL FOR CRP7				Actual Expenses - This Year				
Item	Institute Acronym	Institute Name	Country	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral	Center Funds	TOTAL
1		0 Copenhagen University as a	Denmark	599	-	1,632	-	2,231
2	ILRI	International Livestock Res	Kenya	692	-	20	-	712
3		0 Columbia University as a pa	United States	595	-	-	-	595
4	ICRAF	World Agroforestry Center	Kenya	576	-	84	-	660
5		0 Vermont University as a pa	United States	423	-	-	-	423
6	IWMI	International Water Manag	Sri Lanka	285	-	101	-	386
7	IRRI	International Rice Research	Philippines	215	-	141	-	356
8		0 Adelaide University	Australia	349	-	-	-	349
9	ARC	ARC	Singapore	322	-	18	-	340
10	IIAM	IIAM	Mozambique	263	-	43	-	306
11	African Biodiversity Conservation and Innovations Centre	African Biodiversity Conser	Kenya	251	-	-	-	251
12		0 University of Gottingen	Germany	-	-	240	-	240
13		0 Leeds University as a CCAFS	United Kingdom	239	-	-	-	239
14	ICRISAT	Int Crp Rs Inst SemArid-	India	46	5	174	-	225
15	ETC	ETC/Prolinnova	Netherlands	216	-	-	-	216
16		0 University of Oxford	United Kingdom	212	-	-	-	212
17		0 University of Reading	United Kingdom	203	-	-	-	203
18	CARE	CARE DENMARK	Denmark	64	-	128	-	192
19	AGRHYMET	AGRHYMET	Niger	186	-	-	-	186
20	WWBV	WaterWatch B.V	Netherlands	-	-	169	-	169
21	IDS	Institute of Development St	United Kingdom	161	-	-	-	161
22	GeoSAS	GeoSAS	Ethiopia	153	8	-	-	161
23	NUI Galway	NUI Galway	Ireland	160	-	-	-	160
24	CIMMYT	CIMMYT	Mexico	156	-	-	-	156
25	KARI	Kenya Agricultural Research	Kenya	122	-	29	-	152
26	UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD	UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD	United Kingdom	150	-	-	-	150
27	University of California Santa Barbara	University of California Sant	United States	150	-	-	-	150
28	WFC	WorldFish Center	Malaysia	150	-	-	-	150
29	IURN-PACO	International Union for Con	Burkina Faso	137	-	-	-	137
30	IFPRI	Int. Food Policy Res	United States	137	-	-	-	137
31	UQ	Others	United States	0	20	116	-	136
32	CGPDI	CGPDI	Brazil	136	-	-	-	136
33	UF	UF	United States	135	-	-	-	135
34	BIOVERSITY	BIOVERSITY	Italy	130	-	-	-	130
35	ECOAGRICULTURE PARTNERS	ECOAGRICULTURE PARTNEF	United States	127	-	-	-	127
36	HUAS	Hamburg University of Appi	Germany	-	-	123	-	123
37	UGOE	Georg-August-Universitat G	Germany	-	-	123	-	123
38	EIAR	International Crops research	India	20	-	101	-	121
39		0 University of Columbia	United States	120	-	-	-	120
40	INSAH	Institute du Sahel	Mali	120	-	-	-	120
41	KIT	Karlsruhe Institute of Techn	Germany	-	-	109	-	109
42		0 Basque Center for Climate C	Spain	108	-	-	-	108
43	CIP	CIP	Peru	89	-	15	-	104
44	KARTTUR	KARTTUR	Sweden	100	-	-	-	100
45	QNFSP	QNFSP	Qatar	100	-	-	-	100
46	WUR	Wagenigen University	Netherlands	95	-	-	-	95
47	IIASA	International Institute for /	Austria	90	-	-	-	90
48	SID	Society for International De	Kenya	90	-	-	-	90
49	CASP	CREATIVE AGRI SOLUTIONS	India	88	-	-	-	88
50	CSE	Center de Suivi Ecologique	Senegal	86	-	-	-	86
51	K-State	K-State	United States	84	-	-	-	84
52	KID	KID - CHINA	China	-	-	82	-	82
53	IIE	Int. Institute for Envt & Dev	United Kingdom	81	-	-	-	81
54	UOS-USF	University of Osnabrück - Ir	Germany	-	-	80	-	80
55	EMBRAPA	EMBRAPA	Brazil	75	-	-	-	75
56	DNDC-ART	DNDC-ART	United States	75	-	-	-	75
57	IITA	IITA	Nigeria	44	-	29	-	73
58		0 Centre Regional AGRHYME	Burkina Faso	59	-	14	-	73
59	Xin TianBi, Beijing	Xin TianBi, Beijing	China	-	-	70	-	70
60	CAN THO UNIVERSITY	CAN THO UNIVERSITY	Viet Nam	70	-	-	-	70
61		0 University of Adelaide	Australia	68	-	-	-	68
62	CSIRO	CSIRO	Australia	40	-	27	-	67
63	ABARES	Institute of Development St	United Kingdom	67	-	-	-	67
64	NARS	National Aquatic Research	Zambia	-	-	67	-	67
65	CATIE	CATIE	Costa Rica	53	-	12	-	64
66	GCP	GCP	United Kingdom	-	-	64	-	64
67	PT Strategic Asia	PT Strategic Asia	Indonesia	64	-	-	-	64
68	CIAT	International Center for Tro	Colombia	62	-	-	-	62
69	LI-BIRD	Local Initiatives for Biodiver	Nepal	40	-	21	-	61
70	NRI	NRI	United Kingdom	60	-	-	-	60
71		0 University of Illinois	United States	39	20	-	-	59
72	WSU	WSU	United States	59	-	-	-	59
73	AIT	Asian institute of Technolog	China	-	-	59	-	59
74		0 University of Cape Town	South Africa	59	-	-	-	59
75	VPT	Vi Planterar Trad	Sweden	59	-	-	-	59
76	SARI	SARI	Tanzania, United Republic O	16	-	42	-	58
77	IAR	Institute of Agricultural Res	Nigeria	58	-	-	-	58
78	MSU	Midland State University (N	Zimbabwe	-	-	57	-	57
79	ANACIM	Agence Nationale de l'Aviat	Senegal	55	-	-	-	55
80	MASENO UNIVERSITY	MASENO UNIVERSITY	Kenya	-	-	53	-	53
81	MRSI	Ministère de la Recherche c	Burkina Faso	15	-	38	-	53

82	LEI, Stichting Dienst Landbouwkundig Onderzoek	LEI, Stichting Dienst Landbouwkundig Onderzoek	51	-	-	-	51
83	CAAS	CAAS China	51	-	-	-	51
84	Others	Others	1,826	25	1,140	-	2,991
<b>Total for CRP</b>			<b>12,076</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>5,221</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>17,376</b>

**1. AFRICA RICE**

Item	Institute Acronym	Institute Name	Country	Actual Expenses - This Year				
				Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral	Center Funds	TOTAL
1	UGOE	Georg-August-Universität G	Germany	-	-	123	-	123
2	WUR	Wagenigen University	Netherlands	95	-	-	-	95
3	IRRI	International Rice Research	Philippines	-	-	57	-	57
4	ISAR	Institut de Recherche Agror	Rwanda	-	-	36	-	36
5	ARI	Agricultural Research Institi	Tanzania, United Republic O	-	-	23	-	23
6	NACCRI	National Crops Resources R	Uganda	-	-	23	-	23
7	ISRA	Institut Senegalais de Rech	Senegal	19	-	-	-	19
8	IER	Institut d'Economie Rurale	Mali	12	-	-	-	12
9	IRAD	Institut de Recherche Agric	Cameroon	10	-	-	-	10
10	INERA	Institut de l'Environnement	Burkina-Faso	6	-	-	-	6
<b>Total for CRP7</b>				<b>141</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>404</b>

**2. BIODIVERSITY**

Item	Institute Acronym	Institute Name	Country	Actual Expenses - This Year				
				Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral	Center Funds	TOTAL
1	African Biodiversity Conservation and Innovations Centre	African Biodiversity Conser	Kenya	251	-	-	-	251
2	Basque Center for Climate Change	Basque Center for Climate ( Spain		108	-	-	-	108
3	IDS	Institute of Development St	United Kingdom	70	-	-	-	70
4	LI-BIRD	Local Initiatives for Biodiver	Nepal	40	-	21	-	61
5	University of Illinois	University of Illinois	United States	39	20	-	-	59
6	MRSI	Ministère de la Recherche c	Burkina Faso	15	-	38	-	53
7	NARI	National Agricultural Resea	Papua New Guinea	-	-	49	-	49
8	National Agricultural Research Laboratories	National Agricultural Resea	Uganda	15	-	32	-	47
9	RAB	Rwanda Agriculture Board	Rwanda	15	-	26	-	41
10	Mekelle University	Mekelle University	Ethiopia	41	-	-	-	41
11	Sirinka Agricultural Research Center	Sirinka Agricultural Researc	Ethiopia	41	-	-	-	41
12	Gross National Happiness Commision	Gross National Happiness (	Bhutan	15	-	25	-	40
13	ONS	Oficina Nacional de Semilla	Rwanda	15	-	24	-	39
14	IICA	Instituto Interamericano de Costa Rica		-	-	26	-	26
15	ICRISAT	Int Crp Rs Inst SemArid-	India	-	-	21	-	21
16	CATIE	CATIE	Costa Rica	8	-	12	-	20
17	FUNDIT	Fundación para la Innovac	Guatemala	12	-	3	-	15
18	Ministry of Agriculture	Ministry of Agriculture	Nepal	-	-	15	-	15
19	ICHORD	Indonesian Center for Horti	Indonesia	14	-	-	-	14
20	IITA	IITA	Nigeria	-	-	14	-	14
21	Ministere Agriculture, Code d'Ivoire	Ministere Agriculture, Code	Cote D'Ivoire	-	-	13	-	13
22	ASOCUCH-FPMA	Asociación de Organizacion	Guatemala	-	-	7	-	7
23	Fundación PROINPA	Fundación PROINPA	Bolivia	4	-	-	-	4
24	REFSO	Rural Energy and Food secu	Kenya	-	-	1	-	1
25	KARI	Kenya Agricultural Research	Kenya	-	-	1	-	1
26	Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences	Chinese Academy of Agricu	China	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total for CRP7</b>				<b>703</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,051</b>

108246.77

**3. CIAT**

Item	Institute Acronym	Institute Name	Country	Actual Expenses - This Year				
				Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral	Center Funds	TOTAL
1	Copenhagen University as a participant	Copenhagen University as a	Denmark	599	-	1,632	-	2,231
2	Columbia University as a participant	Columbia University as a pa	United States	595	-	-	-	595
3	Vermont University as a participant	Vermont University as a pa	United States	423	-	-	-	423
4	Adelaide University	Adelaide University	Australia	349	-	-	-	349
5	ARC	ARC	Singapore	303	-	-	-	303
6	IIAM	IIAM	Mozambique	263	-	-	-	263
7	Leeds University as a participant	Leeds University as a CCAF	United Kingdom	239	-	-	-	239
8	University of Oxford	University of Oxford	United Kingdom	212	-	-	-	212
9	GeoSAS	GeoSAS	Ethiopia	153	8	-	-	161
10	NUI Galway	NUI Galway	Ireland	160	-	-	-	160
11	CGPDI	CGPDI	Brazil	136	-	-	-	136
12	QNFSP	QNFSP	Qatar	100	-	-	-	100
13	BIODIVERSITY	BIODIVERSITY	Italy	93	-	-	-	93
14	K-State	K-State	United States	84	-	-	-	84
15	ILRI	ILRI	Kenya	84	-	-	-	84
16	UF	UF	United States	75	-	-	-	75
17	EMBRAPA	EMBRAPA	Brazil	75	-	-	-	75
18	CIP	CIP	Peru	74	-	-	-	74
19	GCP	GCP	United Kingdom	-	-	64	-	64
20	PT Strategic Asia	PT Strategic Asia	Indonesia	64	-	-	-	64
21	NRI	NRI	United Kingdom	60	-	-	-	60
22	WSU	WSU	United States	59	-	-	-	59
23	ICRAF	ICRAF	Kenya	50	-	-	-	50
24	SDPI	SDPI	Pakistan	50	-	-	-	50
25	Future Water	Future Water	Netherlands	46	-	-	-	46
26	NDRI	NDRI	Nepal	45	-	-	-	45
27	CATIE	CATIE	Costa Rica	45	-	-	-	45
28	IITA	IITA	Nigeria	44	-	-	-	44
29	CIRAD	CIRAD	France	40	-	-	-	40
30	CSIRO	CSIRO	Australia	40	-	-	-	40
31	Reading University	Reading University	United Kingdom	32	-	-	-	32
32	CORPOICA	CORPOICA	Colombia	-	-	23	-	23
33	Princeton University	Princeton University	United States	22	-	-	-	22
34	CIMMYT	CIMMYT	Mexico	19	-	-	-	19
35	SARI	SARI	Tanzania, United Republic O	16	-	-	-	16
36	OTHER PARTNERS	OTHER PARTNERS	N/A	-	-	15	-	15
37	SEI	SEI	Sweden	10	-	-	-	10
38	ESPOL	ESPOL	Ecuador	-	-	8	-	8

39	CIAT-AFRICA	CIAT-AFRICA	Kenya	8	-	-	-	8
40	Florida University	Florida University	United States	8	-	-	-	8
41	CIAT-NICARAGUA	CIAT-NICARAGUA	Nicaragua	-	-	8	-	8
42	Green Ink	Green Ink	United Kingdom	8	-	-	-	8
43	Coopedota	Coopedota	Costa Rica	-	-	7	-	7
44	INTA	INTA	Nicaragua	-	-	6	-	6
45	CROPSTER	CROPSTER	Austria	-	-	5	-	5
46	Universidad de Manizales	Universidad de Manizales	Colombia	-	-	5	-	5
47	FEDEPLATANO	FEDEPLATANO	Colombia	-	-	5	-	5
48	AGRHYMET	AGRHYMET	Niger	(27)	-	-	-	(27)
<b>Total for CRP</b>				<b>4,655</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1,778</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>6,441</b>

**4. CIFOR**

Item	Institute Acronym	Institute Name	Country	Actual Expenses - This Year				
				Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral	Center Funds	TOTAL
1	ICRAF		0 Kenya	65	-	-	-	65
<b>Total for CRP7</b>				<b>65</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>65</b>

**5. CIMMYT**

Item	Institute Acronym	Institute Name	Country	Actual Expenses - This Year				
				Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral	Center Funds	TOTAL
1	ICRISAT	THE UNIVERSITY OF QUEEN	Australia	-	5	153	-	159
2	UQ	Others	0	0	20	116	-	136
3	CASP	CREATIVE AGRI SOLUTIONS	India	88	-	-	-	88
4	UF	UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA	United States	60	-	-	-	60
5	EIAR	International Crops research	India	-	-	59	-	59
6	ASARECA	Ethiopian Institute of Agrici	Ethiopia	46	-	-	-	46
7	IIAM	ASARECA	Uganda	-	-	43	-	43
8	SARI	Institute of de invstigacao A	Zimbabwe	-	-	42	-	42
9	EIAR	SARI	Tanzania, United Republic O	-	-	42	-	42
10	ARC	ARC-CBIRF Been	Tanzania, United Republic O	19	-	18	-	37
6	KARI	ETHIOPIAN INSTITUTE OF A	Ethiopia	6	-	29	-	35
7	MU	KARI	Kenya	-	-	30	-	30
8	UA	MURDOCH UNIVERSITY	Australia	-	-	30	-	30
9	IDE	THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERD	United Kingdom	28	-	-	-	28
10	IPNI	INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPN	United Kingdom	-	-	26	-	26
11	Others	INTERNATIONAL PLANT NU	United States	15	-	1	-	16
<b>Total for CRP7</b>				<b>262</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>588</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>875</b>

**6. CIP**

Item	Institute Acronym	Institute Name	Country	Actual Expenses - This Year				
				Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral	Center Funds	TOTAL
1	University of California Santa Barbara	University of California Sant	United States	150	-	-	-	150
2	ALTAGRO	ALTAGRO	Bolivia	40	-	-	-	40
3	KEPHIS	KEPHIS	Kenya	-	-	6	-	6
4	ICIPE	ICIPE	Kenya	-	-	5	-	5
5	University of Hamburg	University of Hamburg	Germany	-	-	(8)	-	(8)
<b>Total for CRP7</b>				<b>190</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>193</b>

**7. ICARDA**

Item	Institute Acronym	Institute Name	Country	Actual Expenses - This Year				
				Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral	Center Funds	TOTAL
1	CAAS	CAAS	China	51	-	-	-	51
2	ARC Egypt	ARC Egypt	Egypt	-	-	41	-	41
3	ICBA	ICBA	United Arab Emirates	-	-	29	-	29
4	ARARI	ARARI	Ethiopia	28	-	-	-	28
5	CSIRO	CSIRO	Australia	-	-	27	-	27
6	INRA	INRA	Morocco	12	-	9	-	21
7	EIAR	EIAR	Ethiopia	20	-	-	-	20
8	UZSPCA	UZSPCA	Uzbekistan	20	-	-	-	20
9	Oregon State university	Oregon State university	United States	15	-	-	-	15
10	NCARE	NCARE	Jordan	-	8	-	-	8
11	(IRA/Medenine) CCAPS	(IRA/Medenine) CCAPS	Morocco	7	-	-	-	7
<b>Total for CRP7</b>				<b>153</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>267</b>

**8. ICRAF**

Item	Institute Acronym	Institute Name	Country	Actual Expenses - This Year				
				Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral	Center Funds	TOTAL
1	University of Gottingen	University of Gottingen	Germany	-	-	240	-	240
2	ETC	ETC/Prolinnova	Netherlands	216	-	-	-	216
3	CARE	CARE DENMARK	Denmark	64	-	128	-	192
4	IRRI	International Rice Research	Philippines	103	-	84	-	187
5	UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD	UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD	United Kingdom	150	-	-	-	150
6	ECOAGRICULTURE PARTNERS	ECOAGRICULTURE PARTNEF	United States	127	-	-	-	127
7	ILRI	ILRI	Kenya	123	-	-	-	123
8	KIT	Karlsruhe Institute of Techn	Germany	-	-	109	-	109
9	KARTTUR	KARTTUR	Sweden	100	-	-	-	100
10	ICRAF	ICRAF	Costa Rica	88	-	9	-	97
11	IIASA	International Institute for /	Austria	90	-	-	-	90
12	SID	Society for International De	Kenya	90	-	-	-	90
13	KID	KID - CHINA	China	-	-	82	-	82
14	DNDC-ART	DNDC-ART	United States	75	-	-	-	75
15	Xin TianBi, Beijing	Xin TianBi, Beijing	China	-	-	70	-	70
16	AIT	Asian institute of Technolog	China	-	-	59	-	59
17	MASENO UNIVERSITY	MASENO UNIVERSITY	Kenya	-	-	53	-	53
18	MEDIAE LTD	MEDIAE LTD	Kenya	50	-	-	-	50
19	NAFRI	National Agriculture and Fo	Lao People'S Democratic Rej	-	-	41	-	41
20	CIFOR	The Centre for Internationa	Indonesia	-	-	41	-	41
21	NFA	NATIONAL FORESTRY AUTH	Uganda	34	-	-	-	34
22	FLIPSIDE SUSTAINABILITY	FLIPSIDE SUSTAINABILITY	Canada	30	-	-	-	30
23	AARHUS UNIVERSITY	AARHUS UNIVERSITY	Denmark	30	-	-	-	30

24	TTSA	TANZANIA TREE SEED AGEN	Tanzania, United Republic O	30	-	-	-	30
25	KEFRI	Kenya Forestry Research Int	Kenya	29	-	-	-	29
26	Chiang Mai University	Chiang Mai University	Thailand	-	-	27	-	27
27	PANOSEA	PANOS EAST AFRICA	Uganda	24	-	-	-	24
28	KU	Forest Landscape Departm	Denmark	20	-	-	-	20
29	UNIQUE FORESTRY & LAND USE	UNIQUE FORESTRY & LAND	Germany	14	-	-	-	14
30	LBDA	Lake Basin Development A	Kenya	13	-	-	-	13
31	UPLBFI	University of the Philippine	Philippines	10	-	-	-	10
32	GRAM-UTTHAN	GRAM-UTTHAN	India	-	-	10	-	10
33	HNBGU	Hemwati Nandan Bahuguni	India	-	-	10	-	10
34	Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology	Maharana Pratap University	India	-	-	10	-	10
35	ANACIM	ANACIM	Senegal	7	-	-	-	7
36	Green Ink Publishing services	Green Ink Publishing servic	United Kingdom	6	-	-	-	6
37	IITA	International Institute of Tr	Nigeria	6	-	-	-	6
<b>Total for CRP7</b>				<b>1,528</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>973</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,501</b>

9. ICRISAT				Actual Expenses - This Year				
Item	Institute Acronym	Institute Name	Country	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral	Center Funds	TOTAL
1	ICRAF	ICRAF	Kenya	316	-	-	-	316
2	AGRHYMET	AGRHYMET Regional Cente	Niger	213	-	-	-	213
3	IURN-PACO	International Union for Con	Burkina Faso	137	-	-	-	137
4	Others	Others	(blank)	66	-	69	-	135
5	HUAS	Hamburg University of App	Germany	-	-	123	-	123
6	INSAH	Institute du Sahel	Mali	120	-	-	-	120
7	KARI	Kenya Agricultural Research	Kenya	116	-	-	-	116
8	CSE	Center de Suivi Ecologique	Senegal	86	-	-	-	86
9	University of Nebraska, USA	Centre Regional AGRHYME	Burkina Faso	59	-	14	-	73
10	MSU	Midland State University (v	Zimbabwe	-	-	57	-	57
11	ANACIM	Agence Nationale de l'Aviat	Senegal	55	-	-	-	55
12	CSIR-SARI	CSIR-Savana Agricultural Re	Ghana	43	-	-	-	43
13	AEDD	Agence de l'Environnement	Mali	-	-	25	-	25
14	CNEDD	Conseil National de l'Enviro	Niger	-	-	25	-	25
15	DA/MAER	Direction de l'Agriculture/v	Senegal	-	-	25	-	25
16	FNZ	Federation Nian Zwe	Burkina Faso	18	-	-	-	18
17	MSDZ	Meteorological services de	Zimbabwe	-	-	8	-	8
18	ROPPA	Reseau des organisations e	Burkina Faso	5	-	-	-	5
19	IER	Institut d'Economie Rurale	Mali	5	-	-	-	5
20	INERA	Institut de l'Environnement	Burkina Faso	3	-	-	-	3
21	INRAN	Institute National de Reche	Niger	3	-	-	-	3
22	ISRA	Institut Senegalais de Rech	Senegal	2	-	-	-	2
23	BARC	BARC, Bangladesh	Bangladesh	-	-	2	-	2
24	DOA	DOA, Thailand	Thailand	-	-	1	-	1
<b>Total for CRP7</b>				<b>1,247</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,598</b>

10. IFPRI (1)				Actual Expenses - This Year				
Item	Institute Acronym	Institute Name	Country	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral	Center Funds	TOTAL
1		World Agroforestry Center	Kenya	60	-	75	-	135
2	IRRI	International Potato Center	Peru	76	-	-	-	76
3	ABARES	Institute of Development S	Netherlands	67	-	-	-	67
4		International Center for Tro	Colombia	62	-	-	-	62
5	IDS	Australian Bureau of Agric	Australia	62	-	-	-	62
6		LEI, Stichting Dienst Landb	Netherlands	51	-	-	-	51
7	CSIR	University of Illinois	United States	50	-	-	-	50
8	IAE	Data Analysis and Technical	Bangladesh	46	-	-	-	46
9	CASRAD, VAAS	Institute for Agricultural En	Viet Nam	20	-	22	-	42
10	CIAT	Amsterdam Optimization IV	Netherlands	35	-	-	-	35
11	CIP	Council of Scientific and Inc	Ghana	15	-	15	-	30
12	ICRISAT	International Livestock Res	Kenya	30	-	-	-	30
13	CIMMYT	Climate Focus North Ameri	United States	30	-	-	-	30
14	NIAPP	International Rice Research	Philippines	25	-	-	-	25
15	ICRAF	International Institute for A	Austria	25	-	-	-	25
16		Kwame Nkrumah University	Ghana	25	-	-	-	25
9	IIASA	Centre for Agrarian System	Viet Nam	-	-	20	-	20
10	ILRI	Grupo de Gestao de Recurs	Mozambique	-	-	20	-	20
11		International Maize and Wf	Mexico	15	-	-	-	15
12		Senegalese Agricultural Res	Senegal	15	-	-	-	15
13	ISRA	International Institute of Tr	Nigeria	15	-	-	-	15
14	IITA	Obiri, Beatrice Darko (Fores	Ghana	-	-	15	-	15
15		Crane-Droesch, Andrew (UX	United States	15	-	-	-	15
16		International Crops Researc	India	12	-	-	-	12
9	BRU	Perez, Nicostrato	Philippines	11	-	-	-	11
10		Jones, James W. (University	United States	11	-	-	-	11
11		Falcao, Mario Paulo (Bairro	Mozambique	-	-	8	-	8
12		DNDC Application, Researc	United States	-	-	5	-	5
13		Terrell, Julie Gabrowski	United States	5	-	-	-	5
14	KNUST	Yabes, Mathilde Esther	Uruguay	4	-	-	-	4
15		Utah, Amarachi	United States	4	-	-	-	4
16		Yeboah, Edward	United States	1	-	-	-	1
17		National Institute of Agricul		-	-	1	-	1
<b>Total for CRP7</b>				<b>786</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>967</b>

11. IITA				Actual Expenses - This Year				
Item	Institute Acronym	Institute Name	Country	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral	Center Funds	TOTAL
1	IAR	Institute of Agricultural Res	Nigeria	58	-	-	-	58
2	ICRISAT	Int Crp Rs Inst SemArid-	India	31	-	-	-	31
3	ACAT	Africa Cooperative Action T	Switzerland	-	-	21	-	21
4	KDSCADO	Kaduna State Comm. Agric.	Nigeria	17	-	-	-	17
<b>Total for CRP7</b>				<b>106</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>127</b>

12. ILRI				Actual Expenses - This Year				
Item	Institute Acronym	Institute Name	Country	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral	Center Funds	TOTAL
1	ILRI	ILRI	Kenya	420	-	-	-	420
2	University of Reading	University of Reading	United Kingdom	203	-	-	-	203
3	University of Columbia	University of Columbia	United States	120	-	-	-	120
4	IIE	Int. Institute for Env't & Dev	United Kingdom	81	-	-	-	81
5	University of Cape Town	University of Cape Town	South Africa	59	-	-	-	59
6	VPT	Vi Planterar Trad	Sweden	59	-	-	-	59
7	IFPRI	Int. Food Policy Res	United States	33	-	-	-	33
8	IDS	Institute of Development St	United Kingdom	29	-	-	-	29
9	MARIL	MARIL Development	United States	26	-	-	-	26
10	OTHER	ManagN Risk for Imprv	(blank)	22	-	-	-	22
11	IPG	Inter Plant Genetic Rs.Inst.	Bulgaria	(2)	-	-	-	(2)
12	CAS	Camco Advisory Services	Kenya	(7)	-	-	-	(7)
13	ICRISAT	Int Crp Rs Inst SemArid-	India	(15)	-	-	-	(15)
14	IRA	Inst of resource Assmt	Tanzania, United Republic O	(21)	-	-	-	(21)
15	ICRAF	ICRAF	Kenya	(28)	-	-	-	(28)
16	Sokoine University	Sokoine University	Tanzania, United Republic O	(36)	-	-	-	(36)
17	ARI	Agricultural Research Institi	Ghana	(40)	-	-	-	(40)
<b>Total for CRP7</b>				<b>900</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>900</b>

13. IRRI				Actual Expenses - This Year				
Item	Institute Acronym	Institute Name	Country	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral	Center Funds	TOTAL
1	OTHER	ManagN Risk for Imprv	(blank)	-	-	92	-	92
2	CAN THO UNIVERSITY	CAN THO UNIVERSITY	Viet Nam	70	-	-	-	70
3	Manila Observatory	Manila Observatory	Philippines	21	-	-	-	21
4	PhilRice	PhilRice	Philippines	20	-	-	-	20
5	Hue University of Agriculture and Forestry(HUAF)	Hue University of Agriculture	Viet Nam	10	-	-	-	10
<b>Total for CRP7</b>				<b>121</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>213</b>

14. IWMI				Actual Expenses - This Year				
Item	Institute Acronym	Institute Name	Country	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral	Center Funds	TOTAL
1	IWMI	International Water Manag	Sri Lanka	285	-	-	-	285
2	WWBV	WaterWatch B.V	Netherlands	-	-	169	-	169
3	WFC	WorldFish Center	Malaysia	150	-	-	-	150
4	CIMMYT	CIMMYT	Mexico	107	-	-	-	107
5	IFPRI	Int. Food Policy Res	United States	103	-	-	-	103
6	University of Adelaide	University of Adelaide	Australia	68	-	-	-	68
7	ILRI	ILRI	Kenya	66	-	-	-	66
8	CEAPRED	Center for Environmental ai	Nepal	44	-	-	-	44
9	Alternative Futures	Alternative Futures	India	40	-	-	-	40
10	SIAS	Southasia Institute of Advai	Nepal	40	-	-	-	40
11	NARC	Nepal Agricultural Research	Nepal	40	-	-	-	40
12	IFFKO	IFFKO Foundation	India	38	-	-	-	38
13	BIOVERSITY	BIOVERSITY	Italy	38	-	-	-	38
14	IRRI	International Rice Research	Philippines	36	-	-	-	36
15	Applied GeoSolutions	Applied GeoSolutions, LLC	United States	29	-	-	-	29
16	University of Peradeniya	Department of Agriculture,	Sri Lanka	28	-	-	-	28
17	MPUAT	M.P. University of Agricultu	India	-	-	25	-	25
18	NBPGR	National Bureau of Plant G	India	25	-	-	-	25
19	Pathikrit	Pathikrit	Bangladesh	25	-	-	-	25
20	Bigg Shift Communications	Bigg Shift Communications	India	20	-	-	-	20
21	VBKVK	Vidhya Bhawan Krishi Vigya	India	-	-	18	-	18
22	UBCO	University of British Colum	Canada	-	17	-	-	17
23	HIMCCA	Himalayan Alliance for Clim	Nepal	13	-	-	-	13
24	DSC	Development Support Cent	India	-	-	10	-	10
25	WFP	World Food program	Italy	10	-	-	-	10
26	University of Canterbury	University of Canterbury	New Zealand	-	-	10	-	10
27	BCAS	Bangladesh Centre for Adv	Bangladesh	9	-	-	-	9
28	Lahore University of Management Sciences	Lahore University of Manag	Pakistan	-	-	9	-	9
29	WRI	Water Research Institute	Ghana	-	-	7	-	7
30	HEDBEZ	HEDBEZ Business & Consult	Ethiopia	-	-	5	-	5
31	MWR	Hydraulics Research Station	Sudan	-	-	5	-	5
32	UDS	University for Development	Ghana	-	-	4	-	4
33	DNM	Direction Nationale de la M	Mali	-	-	3	-	3
34	Livelihood Solutions	Livelihood Solutions	India	2	-	-	-	2
<b>Total for CRP7</b>				<b>1,216</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,498</b>

15. WORLDFISH				Actual Expenses - This Year				
Item	Institute Acronym	Institute Name	Country	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral	Center Funds	TOTAL
1	IWMI	International Water Manag	Sri Lanka	-	-	101	-	101
2	UOS-USF	University of Osnabrück - Ir	Germany	-	-	80	-	80
3	NARS	National Aquatic Research	Zambia	-	-	67	-	67
4	UDSM	The University of Dar es Sal	Tanzania, United Republic O	-	-	11	-	11
5	RCMFSE	Research Center for Marine	Indonesia	-	-	7	-	7
6	CCMRS	Center for Coastal Marine F	Indonesia	-	-	7	-	7
7	SIFIP	Southern Sub-Institute for	Cambodia	2	-	-	-	2
<b>Total for CRP7</b>				<b>2</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>275</b>

TOTAL FOR CRP7				Actual Expenses - This Year				
				Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral	Center Funds	TOTAL
1.	AFRICA RICE			141	-	263	-	404
2.	BIOVERSITY			703	20	328	-	1,051
3.	CIAT			4,655	8	1,778	-	6,441
4.	CIFOR			65	-	-	-	65
5.	CIMMYT			262	26	588	-	875
6.	CIP			190	-	3	-	193

7. ICARDA	153	8	106	-	267
8. ICRAF	1,528	-	973	-	2,501
9. ICRISAT	1,247	-	350	-	1,598
10. IFPRI	786	-	181	-	967
11. IITA	106	-	21	-	127
12. ILRI	900	-	-	-	900
13. IRRI	121	-	92	-	213
14. IWMI	1,216	17	266	-	1,498
15. WORLD FISH	2	-	273	-	275
<b>Total for CRP</b>	<b>12,076</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>5,221</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>17,376</b>

**Notes:**

(1) IFPRI reported Consultancies and other CCAFS expenditures under the Partnership Line.

CGIAR TEMPLATE: L401

Report Description

<b>Name of Report:</b>	CRP7 / CCAFS - Funding Statement, Windows 1 and 2
<b>Reporting Line:</b>	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
<b>Frequency/Period:</b>	Every 3 months
<b>Delivery:</b>	30 days after period end

**PART 1 - REPORT OF LEAD CENTER**

CRP No. 7: CCAFS - CLIMATE CHANGE, AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SECURITY

Period: January 1/2012 - December 31/2012

Amounts in USD 000's

Opening Balance - 1 January		<b>2,789 (1)</b>
<b>Received from Consortium Office (actual dates)</b>		
29-Feb-12		4,390
3-May-12		11,160
14-Jul-12		5,175
26-Oct-12		5,131
27-Nov-12		2,058
21-Dec-12		15,994 (2)
<b>Total Receipts</b>		<b>43,908</b>
<b>Transfers to CG Partners</b>		
1. AFRICA RICE	439	
2. BIODIVERSITY	2,025	
3. CIAT -Partipanting Center and Universities (3)	5,794	
4. CIFOR	375	
5. CIMMYT	2,965	
6. CIP	514	
7. ICARDA	905	
8. ICRAF	3,931	
9. ICRISAT	2,713	
10. IFPRI	646	
11. IITA	635	
12. ILRI	4,294	
13. IIRRI	569	
14. IWMI	1,870	
15. WORLDFISH	290	
<b>Total Disbursements</b>		<b>(27,966)</b>
<b>Expenditure by Lead Center (CIAT)</b>		<b>(3,400) (4)</b>
<b>Lead Center -Unliquidated Advances to Partners</b>		-
<b>Funds held - end of Period</b>		<b>15,332</b>

**PART 2 - REPORT OF CGIAR PARTNERS**

CGIAR PARTICIPANTS	Funds held -Start of Period-	Transfers from Lead Center	Expenditure (W1+2) (5) (6)	Unliquidated Advances to Partners	Funds held -End of Period-
1. AFRICA RICE	99	439	(741)	-	(203)
2. BIODIVERSITY	49	2,025	(4,123)	-	(2,049)
3. CIAT -Part. Center, Lead Center and Universities	365	8,531	(11,342)	-	(2,446)
4. CIFOR	(15)	375	(557)	-	(196)
5. CIMMYT	(876)	2,965	(3,169)	-	(1,080)
6. CIP	599	514	(1,988)	-	(876)
7. ICARDA	0	905	(1,366)	-	(461)
8. ICRAF	(179)	3,931	(5,257)	(273)	(1,779)
9. ICRISAT	(369)	2,713	(3,862)	-	(1,517)
10. IFPRI	1,112	646	(2,329)	-	(572)
11. IITA	-	635	(966)	-	(331)
12. ILRI	543	4,294	(5,544)	(920)	(1,627)
13. IIRRI	92	569	(1,083)	-	(422)
14. IWMI	409	1,870	(3,590)	-	(1,311)
15. WORLDFISH	(0)	290	(471)	(110)	(291)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1,829</b>	<b>30,703</b>	<b>(46,388)</b>	<b>(1,303)</b>	<b>(15,159)</b>

Notes:

(1) USD 2,789M remain in the CASH FLOW as the OPENING CASH BALANCE 2012, but in reality, these funds were disbursed to CCAFS participants as part of the 2011 CCAFS-IFAD Agreement, which was assumed at that time to be part of the initial CCAFS 2011 BUDGET (USD 40,5M). CIAT has already signed the contract with the donor, but as of September 30, funds have not yet arrived. Once funds are received from EU, CIAT will immediately proceed with fund disbursement. **Update February 28th:** USD 2,789M were disbursed to the CCAFS participating centers and partners in 2012. CIAT prefunded the disbursement of these funds and on January 2nd, 2013 USD 2,693M were received from IFAD-CGIAR through Window 3 as an advance (95% of the Agreement).

(2) Since the USD 15.94m were received on the last official working day, funds were only transferred to participating centers and partners not until early 2013.

(3) **CIAT -Participating Center and Universities** refers to the funds related to CIAT in its role as a participating center in CCAFS and the funds managed by the Universities of Columbia, Copenhagen, Leeds and Vermont which are reported in CCAFS through CIAT.

(4) **Expenditure by Lead Center (CIAT)** refers to the funds related to the Coordinating Unit and Management costs of the CRP7.

(5) The expenditures reported in this template are supported with Comfort Letters with the exception of CIFOR and CIP figures.

(6) Reported expenditure does not include \$4.2 million of W1&W2 committed funds which are to be accounted for in 2013. For further details please refer to the COMMITTED FUNDS sheet where a breakdown is provided



## 2012 COMMITTED FUNDS REPORT



CENTER	Contract # /Purchase Order#	Partner/ Supplier name	2012 Budget (\$)	Start date	End date	Amount to be carried forward	% Out of total budget
CIAT	See details	See details	201,405	See details	See details	143,536	5%
CIFOR	Missing	ICRAF	12,200	1-Dec-12	30-Nov-13	12,200	2%
CIMMYT	See details	See details	652,383	See details	See details	500,581	12%
ICRAF	Missing	See details	471,214	See details	See details	273,044	9%
ILRI	See details	See details	494,097	See details	See details	514,989	19%
IFPRI	See details	See details	602,369	See details	See details	367,180	21%
WorldFish	See details	See details	109,705	See details	See details	109,705	19%
SUBTOTAL CENTERS						1,921,234	12%
Theme 1 (CIAT)	See details	See details	247,850	See details	See details	60,850	3%
Theme 2 (CIAT)	See details	See details	110,494	See details	See details	36,369	2%
Theme 4.2 (ILRI)	See details	See details	1,565,936	See details	See details	952,672	41%
EA (ILRI)	See details	See details	1,198,536	See details	See details	1,110,856	44%
SAs (IWMI)	4500016319	Consultancy: R. K. P. Singh	12,707	1-Oct-12	28-Feb-13	12,707	1%
LAM (CIAT)	C-177-12	CATIE	56,000	1-Sep-12	31-Aug-13	11,760	3%
SUBTOTAL TLs & RPLs						2,185,214	20%
Coordinating Unit (CIAT)		G&M review	51,520			51,520	3%
TOTAL						4,157,968	18%

## Footnote statement

This statement aims to explain the differences appearing between CCAFS' CRP 2012 financial report and the CCAFS Participating Center's 2012 Financial Statements. Differences arising include not only Windows 1&2 funds but Window 3 and bilateral funding.

### A. CRP CCAFS financial report

	Africa Rice	Bioversity	CIAT	CIFOR	CIMMYT	CIP	ICARDA	ICRISAT	IFPRI	IITA	ILRI	IRRI	IWMI	WAF	W Fish	TOTAL
<b>CCAFS</b>																
W1/2	741	4,123	11,342	557	3,169	1,988	1,366	3,862	2,329	966	5,544	1,083	3,590	5,257	471	46,388
W3/Bilateral	552	1,600	3,066	414	1,633	349	488	1,335	1,047	382	375	269	1,118	2,945	1,493	17,066
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,293</b>	<b>5,723</b>	<b>14,408</b>	<b>971</b>	<b>4,802</b>	<b>2,337</b>	<b>1,854</b>	<b>5,197</b>	<b>3,376</b>	<b>1,348</b>	<b>5,919</b>	<b>1,352</b>	<b>4,708</b>	<b>8,202</b>	<b>1,964</b>	<b>63,454</b>

### B. Participating Center Financial Statement

	Africa Rice	Bioversity	CIAT	CIFOR	CIMMYT	CIP	ICARDA	ICRISAT	IFPRI	IITA	ILRI	IRRI	IWMI	WAF	W Fish	TOTAL
<b>CCAFS</b>																
W1/2	741	4,123	11,240	557	3,169	1,988	1,366	3,862	2,329	966	5,544	1,083	3,590	5,657	471	46,686
W3/Bilateral	552	1,601	2,833	414	1,642	413	489	1,335	1,045	383	374	270	1,118	2,910	1,492	16,871
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,293</b>	<b>5,724</b>	<b>14,073</b>	<b>971</b>	<b>4,811</b>	<b>2,401</b>	<b>1,855</b>	<b>5,197</b>	<b>3,374</b>	<b>1,349</b>	<b>5,918</b>	<b>1,353</b>	<b>4,708</b>	<b>8,567</b>	<b>1,963</b>	<b>63,557</b>

### (A-B) Difference

	Africa Rice	Bioversity	CIAT	CIFOR	CIMMYT	CIP	ICARDA	ICRISAT	IFPRI	IITA	ILRI	IRRI	IWMI	WAF	W Fish	TOTAL
<b>CCAFS</b>																
W1/2	0	-	102	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(400)	-	(298)
W3/Bilateral	(0)	(1)	233	-	(9)	(64)	(1)	-	2	(1)	1	(1)	-	35	1	195
<b>Total</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(9)</b>	<b>(64)</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(365)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>(103)</b>

### Foot Note:

#### 1. For CIAT:

- ✓ W1/2 difference is a result of a) \$21k of additional expenditures from participating partner universities which were reported to CIAT after closing of CIAT's books. b) \$82k of interests gained during 2012 included in CIAT's Financial Statements as reduced expenditure while in CCAFS' financial report those funds are available to be executed in 2013.
- ✓ W3/Bilateral: CIAT's Financial Statement does not include \$233k bilateral funds raised by CCAFS participating partner universities. Bilateral funds raised by participating partner universities (outside of the CGIAR system) are not reported in the CIAT financial statement but were reported in the CCAFS financial report.

2. **For CIMMYT:** After receiving the comfort letter from CIMMYT, CIAT was informed that the 2% system cost over W3 & bilateral funds was not included in the CRP report.

3. **For CIP:** CIP acknowledged that \$65k of bilateral funds was double accounted. However CIP apparently didn't adjust their Center Financial Statement.

#### 4. For World Agroforestry Center (ICRAF):

- ✓ ICRAF acknowledged the wrong reporting under W1/2 of a bilateral grant in the amount of \$400k. However ICRAF apparently didn't adjust their Center Financial Statement.
- ✓ ICRAF didn't report to CIAT expenditures under W3/Bilateral for the amount of \$35k. However in the ICRAF Center Financial Statement an expenditure of \$35k appears.

5. All other differences are the result of rounding.