# CRP-GLDC 2020 CoA-level REPORTING Template

The 2020 Cluster Annual Report provides a synthesis of main progress and achievements in implementing the annual Plan of Work. When populating the narratives and tables sections, please carefully consider the [2020 POWB](https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11766/11540), and where relevant, highlight key progress around FP to FP collaboration, gender & youth, capacity development, markets and partnerships in agribusiness, and climate change.

## **Part A: NARRATIVE SECTION**

The narrative section should tell a clear story for a non-specialist reader with no prior knowledge of the CRP. Please avoid long lists of diverse achievements – instead, make reference to the Tables, and if possible, complete the Tables first, before compiling the narrative.

We recognize that there is potential repetition of some information between the general sections at the front and specific sections such as gender, efficiency, capacity development etc.

The reason for having the specific sections is the way the System Organization uses this information: it is much easier for us to pull out relevant information and specific examples for a table from a specific section (e.g. on capdev).

Please review all the sections first and allocate your narrative information accordingly. Please spell out all acronyms in the tables, and the first time in the narrative section. A “GUIDANCE” word flanks section titles (where relevant), which is hyperlinked to the guide in the annex of this template.

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>TEMPLATE STARTS HERE<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<

### **1.** Key Results *\*header, no text required*

### **1.2.** Progress (spheres of control and influence) *\*header, no text required*

### **1.2.1.** Highlight Global Progress and Achievements (max. 100 words). [**GUIDANCE**](#_Guidance_for_Section)

The primary focus of 1.4’s work in 2020 involved the execution of GLDC’s impact estimation strategy. This included three sub-studies to evidence the extent of GLDC improved variety adoption (SLO target 1.1) and estimate the impacts of the promotion of such crops in nutrition (SLO targets 2.2 and 2.3) and soil organic matter (SLO 3.2). Provisional results associated with the first adoption synthesis study were generated, estimating that 11,799,732 more farming households have planted improved GLDC varieties on 7,879,924 hectares of land from the 2011 onwards. Two additional impact studies were carried out during 2020, providing estimates that GLDC has assisted

### **1.2.2.** Cluster contribution towards Flagship progress on Outputs and Outcomes (max. 500 words) [**GUIDANCE**](#_Guidance_for_Section_1)

Significant progress has been made to estimate GLDC’s impacts on key SLO targets. While the final results of the particular sub-studies underway in 2020 will not be out until the first quarter of 2021, the provisional results are promising:

1. **Systematic review undertaken on the adoption of improved GLDC crops in target countries, with adoption estimation extrapolation (Woldeyohanes et al., forthcoming)**. 220 potential studies were screened, with 68 meeting inclusion criteria and reviewed. Out of the 68 retained adoption and impact studies, only 35 country by crop combinations (CCCs) with the latest adoption data were used for the synthesis of adoption estimate and extrapolation purposes. Where two or more adoption studies based on surveys from different time periods were available for a country crop combination, the latest data was used for the synthesis, while the remaining used to track the adoption progress over the years and to calculate adoption growth rate per year. Provisional estimates are that 35,375,145 ha. are under improved GLDC varieties among 46,559,683 farming households in GLDC’s 13 target countries. If we focus on the 2011 period onwards, these figures are 10,791,032 and 15,458,870 for area (ha.) and farming households, respectively.

In 2020, another DNA-based adoption and impact study carried out in a non-priority GLDC target country (Bangladesh) found that 644,988 households had adopted improved lentil varieties (ILVs) (Atnafe et al., *forthcoming*).

2. **Systematic review undertaken of effects of GLDC crops on soil health (Oborn et al. forthcoming)**. 11,306 documents screened, with 462 meeting inclusion criteria (334 for systematic review and 147 for meta-analysis). Results are in progress of being synthesized. They will be combined with the adoption estimates to estimate the impacts of GLDC crops on soil health.

3**. Estimating the contribution of GLDC crops to nutrition (Oduol et al., forthcoming)**. Innovative methodology undertaken to a) assess key nutrition gaps in GLDC target countries; and b) estimate the contribution of GLDC crops to daily energy and protein requirements in GLDC targeting criteria. Very initial results reveal that GLDC crops meet 9% and 21% of the energy and protein requirements of adopting households, respectively.

4. **Additional impact studies for other SLO targets**

The above Bangladesh lentil study estimate that the adoption of ILVs led to 580 kg/ha (40%) higher yields and US$501/ha (47%) higher gross margins. If we assume from World Bank data that the poverty rate among lentil growing areas is approximately 25%, this implies that over 160,000 households (657,600 people) were supported to exit poverty. Another study in Nigeria (Melesse et al., *forthcoming*) found significant income effects among household adopting improved GLDC groundnut varieties. Using World Bank estimates, again, we can safely assume that at least 65% of adopting households are below the poverty line, allowing us to estimate that over 290,000 households (1,479,000 people) have been supported to exit poverty.

### **1.2.2.a.** Relevance to Covid-19 by CoA (max. 150 words) [**GUIDANCE**](#_Guidance_for_Section_2)

Given that the work under the GLDC impact estimation strategy involves synthesizing existing data and evidence, its execution has not been significantly affected by Covid-19.

### **1.2.3.** Variance from Planned Program for this year *\*header, no text required, please address this section in the following subsections: 1.2.3.a, 1.2.3.b, 1.2.3.c*

### **1.2.3.a.** Have any promising research areas been significantly **expanded**? (max 50 words) [**GUIDANCE**](#_Guidance_for_Section_3)

No

### **1.2.3.b.** Have any research lines been dropped or significantly **cut back**? (max 50 words) [**GUIDANCE**](#_Guidance_for_Section_3)

No

### **1.2.3.c.** Has the cluster or specific research areas **changed direction**? (max 50 words) [**GUIDANCE**](#_Guidance_for_Section_3)

No

### 2.2. Partnerships *\*header, no text required*

### **2.2.1.** Highlights of **External** Partnerships (max. 60 words) [**GUIDANCE**](#_Guidance_for_Section_4)

The Swedish Agricultural University (SLU) is leading the systematic review on the effects of GLDC groups on soil health. Key synthesized evidence from this work will be used to estimate GLDC’s contribution to SLO target 3.2.

### **2.2.2.** **Cross-CGIAR** Partnerships (max. 60 words) [**GUIDANCE**](#_Guidance_for_Section_5)

Not applicable

### **2.7.** Use of W1-2 Funding (max. 50 words) [**GUIDANCE**](#_Guidance_for_Section_6)

Given that the GLDC impact estimation strategy is focusing on GLDC itself, it is funded entirely through W1 funds.

Note: Please ensure that all 2020 published journal articles within your cluster are reported to MEL Platform. It is reported to MEL towards a deliverable, and can be done following this [guide](https://cgiarmel.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/MEL/pages/10780674/CRP%2BDeliverable%2BReporting). Journal articles are to be reported in MEL with a DOI for ISI/SCOPUS Journal Articles and with a Handle link for Grey Literature.

## **PART B: TABLES SECTION**

### Table 1. Evidence on Progress towards SLO targets (Sphere of interest) [**GUIDANCE**](#_Guidance_for_Table_1)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SLO Target (2022)** | **Brief summary of new evidence of CGIAR contribution**Put N/A if the specific SRF target is not applicable to your CRP.Put “No new evidence in 2020” if the target is potentially relevant, but there is no new evidence available**.**Spell out all acronyms.*Max. 150 words per entry.* | **Expected additional contribution before end of 2022**(if not already fully covered)**Optional narrative. Evidence not required.***Max. 100 words* | **Geographical scope (with location)**Global, Regional (e.g. West Africa), Multi-national, National (e.g. Philippines), Sub-national**Required**. |
| **SLO1 : Reduce Poverty** |
| **1.1. ADOPTION** : 100 million more farm households have adopted improved varieties, breeds, trees, and/or management practices | One key component of GLDC’s impact estimation strategy is to synthesize all existing evidence of the adoption of improved GLDC studies. Provisional estimates were generated at the end of 2020. From the results from completed adoption studies, it is estimated that **46,559,683** households have adopted improved GLDC varieties in GLDC’s 13 target countries, with **15,458,870** additional households doing so from 2011 onwards.  | The study will be completed in the first quarter of 2021 and released initially as a working paper followed by journal submission.  | Africa and Asia |
| **1.2. EXIT POVERTY** : 30 million people, of which 50% are women, assisted to exit poverty | This is another component of GLDC’s impact estimation strategy and a key focus of Cluster 1.4’s work in 2021. However, two impact studies were carried out in 2020 that evidence that **2,136,600** people have been assisted to exit poverty in Nigeria and Bangladesh through the adoption of improved groundnut and lentil varieties, respectively. | The impact estimation of GLDC varieties on the existing poverty target will be completed as a working paper in 2021 and submitted as a journal article.  | Africa and Asia |
| **SLO2 : Improve Food and Nutrition Security for Health** |
| **2.1. YIELD INCREASE :** Improve the rate of yield increase for major food staples from current <1% to 1.2-1.5% per year | Focus of 2021, which build on FP4 breeding evidence and combine this with the above adoption evidence.  |  | Africa and Asia |
| **2.2. MINIMUM DIETARY REQUIREMENTS** : 30 million more people, of which 50% are women, meeting minimum dietary energy requirements | Another key component of GLDC’s impact estimation strategy. Protocol developed in 2020, plus initial analysis. The piece builds on the synthesis of adoption evidence described under 1.1.  |  | Africa and Asia |
| **2.3. MICRONUTRIENT DEFICIENCIES** : 150 million more people, of which 50% are women, without deficiencies in one or more essential micronutrients | Same as 2.2.  |  | Africa and Asia |
| **SLO3 : Improve Natural Resources and Ecosystem Services** |
| **3.1. WATER AND NUTRIENT EFFICIENCY :** 5% increase in water and nutrient efficiency in agroecosystems |  |  |  |
| **3.2. REDUCED GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION** : Reduction in ‘agriculturally’- related greenhouse gas emissions by 5% | Another key study being carried out under CoA 1.4—in collaboration with FP3—is systematic review of the effects of GLDC crops on soil health, including carbon sequestration. The review is well underway and a working paper focusing on carbon sequestration is to come out in the first quarter of 2021.  |  | Africa and Asia |
| **3.3. ECOSYSTEM RESTORED** : 55 M ha degraded land area restored |  |  |  |
| **3.4. PREVENTION OF DEFORESTATION** :2.5 M ha forest saved from deforestation |  |  |  |

### Table 2. Condensed list of policy contributions in this reporting year (Sphere of Influence)

Please list policy contributions in Table 2, for example any contributions to national breeding or data policies. Full supporting information should be submitted to [MEL Platform](https://mel.cgiar.org/blog/add/policy_case/1), following this [guide](https://cgiarmel.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/MEL/pages/964657158/Policy%2Bcontribution). There is no need to fill Columns 2 to 9 when the policy contribution is already recorded in MEL. It is mandatory for Policies with **maturity Levels 2** and **3**, to be linked to an Outcome/Impact Case Report (OICR), and strongly recommended for Level 1. OICR can be added to [MEL Platform](https://mel.cgiar.org/blog/add/outcomestory/1).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Col 1** | **Col 2** | **Col 3** | **Col 4** | **Col 5 to 8** | **Col 9** |
| **Title** of policy, legal instrument, investment or curriculum to which CGIAR contributed (max 30 words)*Spell out acronyms in every row* | **Description** of policy, legal instrument, investment or curriculum to which CGIAR contributed (30 words).See guidance for what to cover. | **Level of Maturity** | Link to **sub-IDOs**(max. 2) | CGIAR **cross-cutting marker** score | Link to **OICR** (obligatory if Level of Maturity is 2 or3) or link to **evidence** (e.g. PDF generated fromMIS) |
| Gender | Youth | Capdev | Climate Change |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### Table 3. List of Outcome/ Impact Case Reports from this reporting year (Sphere of Influence)

Please list any Outcome/ Impact Case Reports (OICR) generated in this reporting year2. The report can be for (a) a new Outcome/ Impact Case, (b) one that has progressed to a new level of maturity, and (c) one that has been updated but has the same level of maturity. Please ensure that all OICRs already **linked to your reported Policies and/or Innovations are indeed part of this list.** OICR may be recorded to [MEL Platform](https://mel.cgiar.org/blog/add/outcomestory/1), following this [guide](https://cgiarmel.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/MEL/pages/17183739/Outcome%2BStories%2BGuidelines?search_id=c4b67f0b-0d6d-4115-b0f1-65ef6ecb4edb). There is no need to fill Column 3 when the OICR is already recorded in MEL.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title of Outcome/ Impact Case Report (OICR)** | **Link** to full OICR. | **Maturity level** drop down for: 1, 2, or 3 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Table 4. Condensed list of innovations by stage for this reporting year

Please complete the table below and **report the supporting evidence** required in the [MEL Platform](https://mel.cgiar.org/innovation/addinnovation), following this [guide](https://cgiarmel.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/MEL/pages/689864906/Innovation%2BReporting?search_id=c4b67f0b-0d6d-4115-b0f1-65ef6ecb4edb). Note that only CoA, FP leaders, and CRP Admin can create an innovation record in MEL. Please request the record to be opened to be populated by the innovation focal person. There is no need to fill Columns 2 to 4 when the innovation is already recorded in MEL.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Title of innovation with link** (e.g. MEL submission). | **Innovation Type** | **Stage of innovation** | **Geographic scope (with location)** |
| Please see indicator guidance for details Max. 30 words.Do not use acronyms. | e.g. Production systems and management practices, Social science, Genetic, Research and communication methodologies and tools, Other, Biophysical Research | e.g. Stage 1 (end of research), Stage 2 (end of piloting), Stage 3 (available for uptake), Stage 4 (uptake by next users) | e.g. Global, Regional (West Africa), Multi-national, National (Philippines), Sub-national |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Table 8. Key external partnerships

Please list up **to five important partnerships** for 2020 for each cluster, using the table below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Lead CoA** | **Brief description of partnership aims**(max. 30 words) | **List of key partners in partnership.****Do not use acronyms.** | **Main area of partnership (may choose multiple)**Dropdown: Research/Delivery/Policy/Capacity Development/Other, please specify  |
| 1.4 | GLDC impact estimation | Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences | **Research** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Table 9. Internal Cross-CGIAR Collaborations

Please include collaborations with one or more CRPs or Platforms – or in some cases with other Centers, if these are not already core partners for your CRP.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Brief description of the collaboration** | **Name(s) of collaborating CRP(s), Platform(s) or Center(s)** | **Optional: Value added, in a few words**e.g. scientific or efficiency benefits |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Table 12. Examples of W1/2 Use in this reporting period (2020) [**GUIDANCE**](#_Guidance_for_Table)

At the moment it is not possible to fully track W1/2 expenditure on activities and deliverables throughout the CGIAR, something that is of immense interest to Funders. We are working on long-term solutions to this, but in the meantime, the objective of this table is to provide an intermediate solution in self- reporting key activities and deliverables that were funded through W1/2 in the past year.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Col. 1** | **Col. 2** |
| **Please give specific examples, one per row****(including through set aside strategic research funds or partner funds)**Max 50 words/example, but please aim for 30 | **Select broad area of use of W1/2 from the categories below - (drop down)****Select only one category in the** [**GUIDANCE**](#_Guidance_for_Table)**.** |
| GLDC impact estimation strategy  | MELIA |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## ANNEX: Guidance for each narrative and table sections above:

### Guidance for Section 1.2.1

Progress towards SDGs and SLOs (sphere of interest, with research results frequently predating the CRP).

Please provide a short narrative on:

1. overall contribution of the CGIAR towards the SRF targets in the relevant area of work for the CRP, based on rigorous adoption and/or impact data. Please complete Table 1: Evidence on Progress towards SRF targets (Sphere of interest) and make reference to this in the text.
2. any areas of learning from impact assessments which have influenced the direction of the program. (if relevant)

[go back to template](#_1.2.1._Highlight_Global)

### Guidance for Section 1.2.2

Please provide brief summary narratives about how this cluster has contributed to how the flagship progressed towards the agreed ‘Program outcomes’, introducing Table 5 (Milestones) to the reader, highlighting (1) major pieces of work and innovations, and (2) any major course corrections. Where relevant, indicate cross-CoA and cross-flagship linkages and how one the cluster supported the flagship built on or worked with another to get results.

Please complete the following tables/submit the following data to MIS and refer to them in the text, as appropriate:

* Table 2: Condensed list of policy contributions
* Table 3: List of Outcome/ Impact Case Reports from this reporting year (Sphere of Influence)
* Table 4: Condensed list of innovations by stage for this reporting
* Table 5: Summary of status of Planned Outcomes and Milestones (Sphere of Influence-Control)

[go back to template](#_1.2.2._Flagship_progress)

### Guidance for Section 1.2.2.a

Please provide a brief summary about how this cluster has adapted their research owing to Covid-19, highlighting:

* major incorporation of Covid-19 analyses into existing studies or
* new Covid-19 studies.

Please do not report on research funded by the new CGIAR Covid-19 Hub. The Hub will report separately to the CGIAR System Organization.

[go back to template](#_1.2.2.a._Relevance_to)

### Guidance for Section 1.2.3

Please provide a brief summary under the following headings.

Please answer all sub-questions: (put “N/A” if not applicable) :

**1.2.3.a:** Have any promising research areas been significantly expanded? If so, for each example, please explain clearly where the demand came from (promising research results, demand from partners etc.). Where has the money for expansion come from? (max. 150 words)

**1.2.3.b:** Have any research lines been dropped or significantly cut back? (Please note that cutting research lines which do not seem to be delivering is seen by Funders and System Organization as a sign of good management, not of failure.) If so, please give specific examples and brief reasons. If funding was reallocated to other work, where did the money go? (max. 150 words)

**1.2.3.c:** Has this clusters or specific research areas changed direction? If so, please describe how, and the reason. (max. 150 words)

[go back to template](#_1.2.3._Variance_from)

### Guidance for Section 2.2.1

Please summarize any interesting highlights, value added and points to improve/ learning points from this year (**e.g. on private sector partnerships**) and make reference where appropriate to Table 8: Key external partnerships.

[go back to template](#_2.2.1._Highlights_of)

### Guidance for Section 2.2.2

Please summarize general points on highlights, value added and points to improve/ learning points from this year and make reference where appropriate to Table 9: Internal Cross-CGIAR Collaborations. Any points you can include on added value of new structures (e.g. Platforms, integrating CRPs) would be very useful.

[go back to template](#_2.2.2._Cross-CGIAR_Partnerships)

### Guidance for Section 2.7

Please complete Table 12: Examples of W1/2 Use in this reporting period. In a short narrative or bullet points if the table is not used, briefly elaborate on any particularly interesting points on your use of W1/2: e.g. any important achievements and/or cross-cutting work made possible. This information will be used to contribute to an overall system level narrative on the benefits and value added of W1/2. There is no need to repeat general information from previous sections, but please give any particularly telling examples you may have of the value added of pooled funding.

[go back to template](#_2.7._Use_of)

### Guidance for Table 1: Evidence on Progress towards SLO targets (Sphere of interest)

Instructions: Please complete this table with any available high-quality evidence on progress that was published or made available in 2020. Be aware: if you want to report several contributions to one specific SLO, please disaggregate the contributions into different rows (please see and follow the example in the sample Table 1 in the template).

Please provide information on all relevant SRF targets for a single study or innovation, to the extent possible.

If the adoption or impact data comes from a relevant innovation or contribution of the CGIAR prior to the CRP start-up (e.g. varieties released before the CRP start-up, which for most CRPs would be approximately 2012), then please support statements with published references, as shown in the 2017 Annual Report Annex Table A above.

Nearly all adoption or impact studies fall into the above category. There are (as yet) a few cases in which the estimated figures for at-scale adoption or impact result from an innovation released within the CRP period, for example some biofortification numbers in 2017. If this is the case, then the statement must be supported by a link to an Outcome/ Impact Case Report Maturity Level 3 (preferably in the Results Dashboard or if not, with unique identifier from any appropriate repository, e.g. CGSpace).

For any help or further clarification, please contact CRP-GLDC MEL team, and/or PMU

[go back to template](#_Table_1._Evidence)

### Guidance for Table 12: Examples of W1/2 Use in this reporting period (2020)

**Note on Column 2:** Explanation and some examples to help with categorization of the categories offered:

While understanding that some activities fall into several categories, it is still convenient for system-level presentation to divide the results by main category.

If a choice must be made, it is usually preferable to select a more specific category (towards the top of the list) in preference to a phase of research (bottom of list).

* **Policy:** sole or partial funding source for dissemination of findings, learning from evidence etc. For example, policy workshops, contracts with partners working on policy etc.
* **Partnerships:** start-up and maintenance of partnerships.
* **Capacity development:** Any activities reported under capdev indicator.
* **Other cross-cutting issues:** gender, youth, climate change; e.g. funding research projects tagged as ‘principal’ for one of these; funding cross-cutting work by the Program Management Unit; funding specific gender/youth/Climate Action ‘add ons’ to other projects. In every case, it should be obvious from the title of the activity what the cross-cutting issue is.
* **Other Monitoring, learning, evaluation and impact assessment (MELIA):** Activities covered under the MELIA section of this reporting template.
* **Contingency/ emergency:** e.g. immediate unplanned response to a new virulent disease, or moving germplasm collections as a result of conflict.
* **Pre-start up:** Conceptualization, design, ex-ante analysis before research start-up; For example: foresight, ex-ante studies, building theories of change, proof of concept studies for novel areas of work. However, start-up meetings with partners should normally be tagged as ‘partnerships’.
* **Research:** sole or partial funding source for a research line or significant research activity.
* **Delivery:** funding for any activities connected with scale-up and delivery.
* **Other, specify** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[go back to template](#_Table_12._Examples)