A. Key Messages

Synthesis of progress and challenges in implementing the CRP

CCAFS 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. The gender strategy was finalized and implementation commenced. 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; "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; the gender and climate change research training guidelines launched together with FAO; a participatory social return on investment framework to ensure local perspectives feed into national adaptation planning.

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 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. (ii) National. CCAFS research was used in national adaptation planning or in informing the investment of climate funds in Nepal, Nicaragua, Mexico, Kenya and Rwanda. CCAFS together with partners helped inform pro-poor mitigation policy development in at least five countries. 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. Work on climate-smart "greenhouses" in Peru with about 300 youth and women is now being trialed by an NGO in Bolivia.

3. Challenges. In 2011 CCAFS reported five major risks. These 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. 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, and another reason is the widening of the scope of other CRPs to include climate change. 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 using coffee-based climate-smart approaches: Research on coffee-based systems in East Africa and Central America was highlighted in over 30 press articles including in major media outlets such as the BBC. It demonstrates the sensitivity of coffee systems 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 banana and coffee to double revenue,
reduce climate shocks, and reduce household vulnerability. 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\textsuperscript{18,19}. 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.\textsuperscript{20}

2. Commission report released and used by significant development actors: In March 2012, the Commission on Sustainable Agriculture and Climate Change released its final report.\textsuperscript{21} This was one of the four CCAFS flagship products for 2012, produced after an 18-month research and engagement process. The final report received extensive media coverage in major international outlets, including the BBC, Reuters, Time, Nature, and a further 30 outlets.\textsuperscript{22} The document was downloaded over 30,000 times in 2012 and the associated video animation viewed over 16,000 times. The recommendations guided the framework for Agriculture Day at Rio+20, attended by 600 participants and 600 on-line 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.\textsuperscript{23}

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.\textsuperscript{24} In common with other CRPs, CCAFS is now formalizing a new theory of change and a set of Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs).\textsuperscript{25} CCAFS is proposing five IDOs, focusing on behavioral change at farmer, local institutional, national and international levels, and also including one targeting gender inequity. CCAFS is also refining its impact pathways, focusing on the behavioral changes that are needed at multiple levels to achieve the IDOs. In this way, the program aims to enhance the likelihood that the knowledge generated through research activities will lead to the IDOs that in turn contribute to the SLOs.

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\textsuperscript{26} 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%).\textsuperscript{27}

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. 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) and its successor Agriculture, Landscapes and Livelihoods Day at COP in Doha (400 live and 700 online participants), and further thematic achievements detailed below.

**Adaptation to Progressive Climate Change:** The "Farms of the Future" 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 includes recommendations for scaling up, analysis of the learning process and socio-cultural factors, and advice to policy-makers on community-level adaptive capacity). Bioversity’s “Seeds-for-needs” uses modern GIS technologies to help rural Ethiopian women farmers to identify, conserve and access the most promising local genebank resources to enable adaptation to climate change. Also, a virtual catalogue of 1270 peer-reviewed publications on widely promoted climate-smart practices has been established through a combination of on-line 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.

**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 use of climate information. With partners, a consultative review of the decentralized decision-making processes within the Ethiopian government identified critical decision points that impact 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, use accessibility and capacity building. These efforts are likely to lead to major flagship outputs, co-produced with partners, in coming years.

**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 the East African context. The SAMPLES program includes both technical (measurement of GHG fluxes) and institutional components, and a strong capacity enhancement component.

**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 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. 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. 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.\(^\text{37}\)

**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.\(^\text{38}\)

**Flagship products:**

*Climate-smart villages* are research sites where technologies and practices are trialed in an integrated manner: learning-by-doing is promoted, best practices are distilled and policy challenges and options are identified and discussed, always with an eye to scaling up. There are currently 22 climate-smart villages, concentrated in West Africa, East Africa and South Asia. Technology testing goes hand in hand with capacity strengthening and joint learning. For example, given the focus on gender, some 1700 women farmers received training on climate risk management in Bihar in India.\(^\text{39,40}\)

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.\(^\text{41}\)

*Commission report*: the Commission on Sustainable Agriculture and Climate Change report has been instrumental in policy processes in several countries (see section A).\(^\text{42}\)

The *Food Security and Climate Change Report (HLPE, CFS, FAO)*, a high-level, multi-author report was led by IFPRI. It also involved an extensive review of what is known about climate change and the commodities and natural resource systems in the CGIAR mandate. The process resulted in decisions on climate change by the world Committee on Food Security, which included a direct recommendation to the UNFCCC process, paving the way for consideration of agriculture.\(^\text{43}\)

**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, as well as being key to mitigation initiatives.\(^\text{44}\)

*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.\(^\text{45,46}\)

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.\(^\text{47}\) It is one of the tools to ensure mainstreaming of gender activities in CCAFS.

The *Participatory Social Return on Investment (PSROI) framework* is a practical tool for communities and development practitioners to assess and compare community-based adaptation (CBA) options and has been piloted in CCAFS sites.\(^\text{48}\)

*MarkSIM GCM* is a stochastic downscaling tool to provide geographically specific simulations of future rainfall series, which in turn can be used in other applications such as crop models.\(^\text{49}\)

**Open-access databases:**

Key CCAFS open-access databases include CCAFS Climate for downscaled GCM data,\(^\text{50}\) the Climate Analogue Tool for matching sites with analogous agricultural climates over space and time,\(^\text{51}\) AgTrials, a repository of 4600 climate-specific agricultural trial data,\(^\text{52}\) Dataverse which houses the full set of CCAFS baseline data\(^\text{53}\) 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.\textsuperscript{54}

**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.\textsuperscript{55} 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.\textsuperscript{56}

CCAFS also works with major development actors in order to get research results to scale. Research led by CIAT scientists over 5-6 years and regular discussions with the Global Crop Diversity Trust and the Kew Millennium Seed Bank were fundamental in the prioritizing and design of a 10-year US$ 50 million programme funded by the Norwegian Government to collect crop wild relatives and pre-breed for climate change adaptation. CCAFS-led vulnerability analyses for 28 prioritised crops led to the selection of priority traits for pre-breeding among collected materials.\textsuperscript{57}

**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.\textsuperscript{58}

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.\textsuperscript{59}

**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.\textsuperscript{60}

**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. The greenhouses are low-cost, built from local materials and agrofilms. 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.

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 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, 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 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, and with the Earth Research Institute on statistical techniques for predicting precipitation at sub-regional scales.

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. National policy-makers’ interest in the interplay between agriculture and climate policy at the global level is 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.

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 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. 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. Compared to CGIAR as a whole, 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, 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 (see Annex 1). 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 has subsequently been used to raise the capacity of field researchers in the CCAFS regions.\textsuperscript{70}

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,\textsuperscript{71} and IRRI’s work to enable Vietnamese partners to collect the first emissions data from the major lowland rice systems.\textsuperscript{72,73} 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.\textsuperscript{74} 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\textsuperscript{75} and IWMI’s capacity enhancement of decision-makers responsible for managing water in the urban-rural interface under a changing climate.\textsuperscript{76}

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. 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.

11. Ibid
http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/TL_3_Technical_report_2012.pdf (note the survey to policy makers was confidential, so countries are currently unknown)
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I. CRP FINANCIAL REPORT

See Annex 3 attached
Annex 1: CRP indicators of progress, with glossary and targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRPs concerned by this indicator</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator</th>
<th>Deviation narrative</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>1. Number of flagship “products” produced by CRP</td>
<td>These are frameworks and concepts that are significant and complete enough to have been highlighted on web pages, published 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</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>2. % of flagship products produced that have explicit target of women farmers/NRM managers</td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>3. % of flagship products produced that have been assessed for likely gender-disaggregated impact</td>
<td>Reports/papers describing the products should include a focus on gender-disaggregated impacts if they are to be counted</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>4. Number of “tools” produced by CRP</td>
<td>These are significant decision-support tools, guidelines, and/or training manuals that are significant and complete enough to have been highlighted on web pages, published 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</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>5. % of tools that have an</td>
<td>The web pages, blog stories, press releases and policy briefs</td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 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)

2 As this format was only received in early 2013, no targets were set for 2012.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRPs concerned by this indicator</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator</th>
<th>Deviation narrative</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Explicity of the mention of women farmers on the support indicator #4</td>
<td>Supporting indicator #4 must have an explicit focus on women farmers/NRM managers to be counted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>6. % of tools assessed for likely gender-disaggregated impact</td>
<td>Reports/papers describing the products should include a focus on gender-disaggregated impacts if they are to be counted</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>7. Number of open access databases maintained by CRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>8. Total number of users of these open access databases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43,220</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>9. Number of publications in ISI journals produced by CRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,3, 4, 6</td>
<td>10. Number of strategic value chains analyzed by CRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,5,6,7</td>
<td>11. Number of targeted agro-ecosystems analysed/characterised by CRP</td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,5,6,7</td>
<td>12. Estimated population of above-mentioned agro-ecosystems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Number of trainees in short-term programs facilitated by CRP (male)</td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,679</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPs concerned by this indicator</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator</td>
<td>Deviation narrative</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Number of trainees in short-term programs facilitated by CRP (female)</td>
<td>(see above, but for female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Number of trainees in long-term programs facilitated by CRP (male)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>488</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Number of trainees in long-term programs facilitated by CRP (female)</td>
<td>(see above, but for female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,5,6,7</td>
<td>17. Number of multi-stakeholder R4D innovation platforms established for the targeted agro-ecosystems by the CRPs</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TECHNOLOGIES/PRACTICES IN VARIOUS STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRPs concerned by this indicator</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator</th>
<th>Deviation narrative</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All                             | 18. Number of technologies/NRM practices under research in the CRP (Phase I) | Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related and NRM-related technologies and innovations including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation. Relevant technologies include but are not limited to:  
  • Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including biodegradable packaging  
  • Biological: New germplasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;  
  • Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides sustainably and environmentally applied, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies;  
  • Management and cultural practices: sustainable water management; practices; sustainable land management practices; sustainable fishing practices; Information technology; improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resource management practices that increase productivity and/or resiliency to climate change. IPM, ISFM, and PHH as related to agriculture should all be included as improved technologies or management practices.  
  New technologies or management practices under research counted should be only those under research in the current reporting year. Any new technology or management practice | | 256 | 250 | 250 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRPs concerned by this indicator</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator</th>
<th>Deviation narrative</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>19. % of technologies under research that have an explicit target of women farmers</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>20. % of technologies under research that have been assessed for likely gender-disaggregated impact</td>
<td>Reports/papers describing the products should include a focus on gender-disaggregated impacts if they are to be counted.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,5,6,7</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,5,6,7</td>
<td>22. Number of people who will potentially benefit from plans, once finalised, for the scaling up of strategies</td>
<td>Indicate the potential number of both women and men.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All, except 2</td>
<td>23. Number of technologies/NRM practices field tested (phase II)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,5,6,7</td>
<td>24. Number of agro-ecosystems for which innovations (technologies,</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPs concerned by this indicator</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator</td>
<td>Deviation narrative</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>policies, practices, integrative approaches) and options for improvement at system level have been developed and are being field tested (Phase II)</td>
<td>Trends, Volume 1) to define these agro-ecosystems and specify the regions where field testing is underway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,5,6,7</td>
<td>25. % of above innovations/approaches/options that are targeted at decreasing inequality between men and women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,5,6,7</td>
<td>26. Number of published research outputs from CRP utilised in targeted agro-ecosystems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All, except 2</td>
<td>27. Number of technologies/NRM practices released by public and private sector partners globally (phase III)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICIES IN VARIOUS STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT**

<p>| 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 &amp; 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 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRPs concerned by this indicator</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator</th>
<th>Deviation narrative</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. Number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation (Stage 2)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 30. Number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures presented for legislation (Stage 3)</td>
<td>: ... underwent the third stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/decree to improve the policy environment for smallholder-based agriculture.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 31. Number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures prepared passed/approved (Stage 4)</td>
<td>: ...underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process (official approval (legislation/decree) of new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority).</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 32. Number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures passed for which implementation has begun (Stage 5)</td>
<td>: ...completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OUTCOMES ON THE GROUND</strong></td>
<td>33. Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of CRP research</td>
<td>Indicate the regions where this is occurring and whether the application of technologies is on a new or continuing area</td>
<td>287,792</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 34. Number of farmers and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>928,312</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPs concerned by this indicator</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator</td>
<td>Deviation narrative</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of CRP research</td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Target (if available for 2012)</td>
<td>a/b TBD</td>
<td>a/b TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 2: Performance indicators for gender mainstreaming with targets defined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>CRP performance approaches requirements</th>
<th>CRP performance meets requirements</th>
<th>CRP performance exceeds requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender inequality targets defined</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Institutional architecture for integration of gender is in place</td>
<td>- CRP scientists and managers with responsibility for gender in the CRP’s outputs are appointed, have written TORS. - Procedures defined to report use of available diagnostic or baseline knowledge on gender routinely for assessment of the gender equality implications of the CRP’s flagship research products as per the Gender Strategy -CRP M&amp;E system has protocol for tracking progress on integration of gender in research</td>
<td>- CRP scientists and managers with responsibility for gender in the CRP’s outputs are appointed, have written TORS and funds allocated to support their interaction. - Procedures defined to report use of available diagnostic or baseline knowledge on gender routinely for assessment of the gender equality implications of the CRP’s flagship research products as per the Gender Strategy -CRP M&amp;E system has protocol for tracking progress on integration of gender in research And A CRP plan approved for capacity development in gender analysis</td>
<td>CRP scientists and managers with responsibility for gender in the CRP’s outputs are appointed, have written TORS and funds allocated to support their interaction. - Procedures defined to report use of available diagnostic or baseline knowledge on gender routinely for assessment of the gender equality implications of the CRP’s flagship research products as per the Gender Strategy -CRP M&amp;E system has protocol for tracking progress on integration of gender in research And A CRP plan approved for capacity development in gender analysis And The CRP uses feedback provided by its M&amp;E system to improve its integration of gender into research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: CRP Financial Reporting Templates – as per the attached Excel file