# CRP-GLDC 2020 FP-level REPORTING Template

**FP1 – Priority Setting & Impact Acceleration**

### **1.** Key Results

### **1.1.** Executive Summary (max. 100 words)

The work in Flagship 1 aims to enhance the relevance and impacts of GLDC research through improved targeting and priority-setting. A gender-sensitive prioritization of varietal attributes of GLDC crops is being undertaken in several target countries to define the most important end-user preferred traits to be targeted by the breeders. The work on rural aspirations has generated evidence informing technology targeting and scaling efforts. Gender and youth research focused on strategies for youth integration and the effects of migration on feminization of agriculture. Adoption and impact studies have been carried out to generate evidence of GLDC’s progress towards the SLO targets.

### **1.2.** Progress (spheres of control and influence)

### **1.2.1.** Highlight Global Progress and Achievements (max. 100 words).

GLDC is on track to achieve the key SLO targets such as adoption of improved varieties, increased yields and incomes, and poverty reduction. A systematic review and synthesis of adoption studies showed that over XX million households have adopted improved varieties of GLDC crops with an aggregate planted area of over YY million ha in the target countries ([Woldeyohanes et al. 2020](https://mel.cgiar.org/reporting/download/report_file_id/23453)). In Bangladesh, adoption of improved lentil varieties increased yields by 40% (580 kg/ha) and gross margins by 47% (US$501/ha), assisting an estimated 657,600 people to exit poverty. In Nigeria, adoption of improved groundnut varieties has led to significant income effects, assisting an estimated 1.5 million people to exit poverty ([Melesse et al. 2020](https://mel.cgiar.org/reporting/download/report_file_id/25186)). In Ethiopia, adoption of improved chickpea varieties led to a 58.5% increase in chickpea yields and 5% increase in household dietary diversity ([Murendo et al. 2020](https://mel.cgiar.org/reporting/download/report_file_id/25267)).

### **1.2.2.** Flagship progress towards Outputs and Outcomes (max. 1000 words)

The work in Flagship 1 aims to enhance the relevance and impacts of GLDC research through improved gender-sensitive targeting and priority-setting informed by ex-ante impact evaluations as well as adoption and impact studies. A multicriteria ranking method—Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS)—has been developed using *ShinyApp* and applied to rank a range of GLDC research and technology options. The work on prioritization of varietal attributes and product profiles aims to define the most important end-user preferred traits for GLDC crops to be targeted by the breeders. Results from a choice experiment conducted in Tanzania showed priority traits for groundnut and sorghum that help guide the development of product profiles for these crops as well as customer profiles using latent class analysis. For groundnut, the results showed strong preferences of farmers for varieties that are high yielding and tolerant to pests, diseases and extreme weather conditions. However, preferences are heterogenous across different groups of groundnut farmers, with market-oriented farmers having strong preferences for high yields and other subsistence farmers having preferences for high tolerance to pests, diseases, and harsh environmental conditions. For sorghum, on the other hand, the results showed that farmers prefer sorghum varieties that are high yielding, early maturing, white in color and tolerant to pests, diseases and adverse weather conditions. A gender dimension has also been integrated into the work on trait preference assessment. Preliminary results from studies conducted in West Africa showed that where women and men faced similar constraints, they tended to share similar trait preferences.

As part of the larger targeting effort, Flagship 1 investigates end-user demand including consumer demand for GLDC food crops and technology demand by rural farming households. The work on rural aspirations has focused on the drivers of technology adoption and efforts have been made to reach a broad audience ([Mausch and Harris, 2020a](https://theconversation.com/not-just-farmers-understanding-rural-aspirations-is-key-to-kenyas-future-129909); [Mausch and Harris, 2020b](http://www.worldagroforestry.org/blog/2020/03/23/why-measuring-youths-aspirations-key-sustainable-and-inclusive-rural-development)). A special issue in the European Journal of Development Research on *Rural Aspirations in Africa: Livelihood Decisions and Rural Development Trajectories* is on track and will feature four papers based on GLDC research on aspirations related to youth, gender and extension services. The special Issue provides in-depth insights on heterogenous aspirations of households and will discuss how the CGIAR and its partners as well as policy makers can better account for and respond to aspirations and how this approach would enhance development strategies and project design. Using narratives to explore rural aspirations in Kenya, entry points emerge for more responsive development support and extension centred on rural visions and desires. Exploring men’s and women’s aspirations through storytelling highlighted that male out-migration shapes rural women’s agricultural opportunities and agency. While men pursue off-farm opportunities, women aspire to commercialize their farming reflecting their new realities as farm managers.

A critical review of value chain approaches towards development outcomes undertaken in collaboration with the cross-cutting theme on markets and partnerships in agribusiness (MPAB) has revealed several critical trade-offs that need to be considered for future implementation ([Mausch et al. 2020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2020.100439)). The application of the agri-food system approach has allowed to shed light on critical avenues where these trade-offs play out between consumers and producers of the GLDC crops. Complementing this understanding is the review of interventions to mainstream nutritious orphan crops into African food systems which highlighted the need to closely align demand and supply side interventions ([McMullin et al. 2021](10.1016/j.gfs.2020.100465)). Scaling orphan crops requires more than seed systems or food innovation fixes. A strong engagement with farmers is necessary to demonstrate they are better off thanks to these non-monetized benefits of crop diversification, like better resilience and family nutrition. Carefully designed policy interventions are also needed, from reviewing crop production incentives and food taxes to strict regulation of food adverts, to nudge consumers, farmers and the food industry towards healthier and sustainable diets.

The work on gender and youth focused on strategies for youth integration and the effects of migration on feminization of agriculture. The study on youth realities, aspirations, transitions to adulthood and opportunity structures in dryland areashas been completed and a youth strategy paper has been prepared drawing on the country reports for Ethiopia, Uganda, and Tanzania*.* The recommendations for facilitating youth engagement in dryland agricultural value chains focus on understanding the youth, addressing gender-based discrimination in access to resources, ensuring availability of locally adapted and gender-responsive rural finance, streamlining bureaucratic rules, training youth as value chain actors and rural service providers, creating market links, providing rural infrastructure that can support youth engagement in agriculture, promoting the production of high value, early maturing, drought-resilient and disease-resistant crop varieties. A study of the effects of migration on the feminization of agriculture in dryland areas showed that women are performing more farm labor due to the increasing outmigration of men ([Baada and Najjar, 2020](10.19268/JGAFS.522020.1)). Despite the tensions and (re)negotiations that accompany these changes, particularly regarding return migration, policy interventions could leverage the increasing participation of women in dryland agriculture to improve women's livelihoods.

A number of adoption and impact studies are being carried out in an effort to provide evidence of GLDC’s progress towards the SLO targets. A systematic review and synthesis of adoption studies showed that over XX million households have adopted improved varieties of GLDC crops with an aggregate planted area of over YY million ha in the target countries ([Woldeyohanes et al. 2020](https://mel.cgiar.org/reporting/download/report_file_id/23453)). In Nigeria, an impact study of improved groundnut varieties found that 30% of the groundnut producers (or 1.8 million households) have adopted improved varieties and adoption of these varieties led to significant income effects among adopting households ([Melesse et al. 2020](https://mel.cgiar.org/reporting/download/report_file_id/25186)). With at least 65% of the adopting households living below the poverty line, the results suggest that an estimated 290,000 households (or 1.5 million people) have been supported to exit poverty through adoption of improved groundnut varieties. In Ethiopia, an impact study of improved chickpea varieties showed that 58% of the chickpea producers (or 585,000 households) have adopted improved varieties and adoption of these varieties led to a 58.5% increase in chickpea yields and 5% increase in household dietary diversity ([Murendo et al. 2020](https://mel.cgiar.org/reporting/download/report_file_id/25267)). In Bangladesh, an impact study of improved lentil varieties found that 49% of the lentil producers (or 645,000 households) have adopted improved varieties and adoption of these varieties increased yields by 40% (580 kg/ha) and gross margins by 47% (US$501/ha) ([Yigezu et al. 2020](https://mel.cgiar.org/reporting/download/report_file_id/24521)). With a poverty rate of about 25% among lentil producers based on World Bank’s data, the results suggest that an estimated 160,000 households (or 657,600 people) have been assisted to exit poverty through adoption of improved lentil varieties. A study carried out to assess key nutrition gaps in GLDC target countries and the contribution of GLDC crops to daily dietary energy and protein requirements in GLDC target countries showed that GLDC crops meet 9% and 21% of the energy and protein requirements of adopting households, respectively.

### **1.2.2.a.** Relevance to Covid-19 by flagship (max. 300 words)

A [news article](https://theconversation.com/covid-19-recovery-is-a-chance-to-improve-the-african-food-system-139134) has been produced in collaboration with FTA that outlines how to use recovery funds in a way that improves the African food system towards better outcomes. A study was conducted to assess the awareness and perception about COVID-19 pandemic, the coping mechanisms, and the type of disruptions in the production systems of groundnut value actors’ in Ghana, as well as the effects of COVID-19 on household agricultural production, marketing, household consumption, and nutrition outcomes. The study generally showed that awareness of COVID-19 pandemic is very high among groundnut value chain actors, but the percentage of the actors who are educated about the preventive measures and perceive that the COVID-19 pandemic disrupt the groundnut supply chain differ across the actors. There is need to intensify education on preventive measures of COVID-19 pandemic to contain the spread which may subsequently reduce labor availability and crop productivity.

### **1.2.3.** Variance from Planned Program for this year

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

No research area in FP1 has been significantly expanded. The urban food systems work has been revisited to take into account the COVID-19 pandemic.

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

No research line in FP1 has been dropped or significantly cut back.

### **1.2.3.c.** Has the flagship or specific research areas **changed direction**? (max 50 words)

The urban food systems work under CoA1.2 has been adjusted to ensure that the interventions take COVID-19 implications into account and work from this new reality.

### 2.2. Partnerships

### **2.2.1.** Highlights of **External** Partnerships (max. 60 words)

Partnerships have been solidified and broadened with German university networks (future rural Africa research group) and Institute of Development Studies (University of Sussex UK) through joint implementation of activities on rural aspirations. Gender research partnerships with social sciences departments at Makerere University in Uganda, Sokoine University in Tanzania, and Haramaya University in Ethiopia have generated the evidence and reports on the youth studies. These studies have increased the capacity of the teams in applying the data collections tools and analyses. The Swedish Agricultural University (SLU) is leading the systematic review on the effects of GLDC crops 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)

Apart from the strong collaborative work involving the core implementing partners (i.e. ICRISAT, IITA, ICRAF, and ICARDA), FP1 had cross-CRP and cross-center collaborations in 2020. A collaborative work with PIM has enabled FP1 researchers to contribute to the draft CGIAR Foresight Report prepared by the CGIAR foresight team involving all CGIAR centers. Such a partnership involves knowledge-sharing and joint scientific products through the established community of practice on foresight. A joint news publication has resulted from a collaboration with FTA and one publication on mainstreaming orphan crops based on a collaboration with FTA and A4NH. Gender research partnerships involved collaboration with Gender and Breeding Initiative/Excellence in Breeding (EiB) on gender responsive product profile development. Partnerships with RTB focused on the MEL-based social network analysis for better performing CRP aimed at identifying GLDC structures and operations that have contributed to publishing knowledge/science products and which of these have been more effective in increasing multi-disciplinary publications and evaluating how GLDC as a CRP adds more collaborations to the knowledge exchange networks.

### **2.7.** Use of W1-2 Funding (max. 50 words)

Flagship 1 used the W1-2 funding to undertake a multidimensional ex-ante impact evaluation to identify the most promising GLDC research options. This involved the development of the *TOPSIS\_ShinyApp*, an application which breeders and other practitioners can use to conduct multicriteria ranking of GLDC technologies. The W1-2 funding was also used to: (!) conduct research on aspirations aimed at targeting and scaling agricultural innovations; (2) assess the potential impact of GLDC crops on urban food and nutrition security; (3) characterize the youth in the drylands of Tanzania, Uganda and Ethiopia; (4) multifaceted impact assessment GLDC innovations; (5) revision of GLDC’s theory of change and impact pathways; and (6) MEL-based social network analysis to evaluate the performance of GLDC as a CRP.

Note: Please ensure that all 2020 published journal articles within your flagship 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)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 varieties. It is estimated that over XX millionhouseholds have adopted improved GLDC varieties in GLDC’s 13 target countries, with YY million additional households doing so from 2011 onwards ([Woldeyohanes et al. 2020](https://mel.cgiar.org/reporting/download/report_file_id/23453)). In Nigeria, an adoption and impact study of improved groundnut varieties found that 30% of the groundnut producers (or 1.8 million households) have adopted improved varieties ([Melesse et al. 2020](https://mel.cgiar.org/reporting/download/report_file_id/25186)). In Ethiopia, an adoption and impact study of improved chickpea varieties showed that 58% of the chickpea producers (equivalent to 585,000 households) have adopted improved varieties ([Murendo et al. 2020](https://mel.cgiar.org/reporting/download/report_file_id/25267)). In Bangladesh, an adoption and impact study of improved lentil varieties found that 49% of the lentil producers (or 645,000 households) have adopted improved lentil varieties ([Yigezu et al. 2020](https://mel.cgiar.org/reporting/download/report_file_id/24521)). |  | Sub-Saharan Africa and South AsiaNational |
| **1.2. EXIT POVERTY**: 30 million people, of which 50% are women, assisted to exit poverty | In Nigeria, the results from an adoption and impact study ([Melesse et al. 2020](https://mel.cgiar.org/reporting/download/report_file_id/25186)) suggest that an estimated 290,000 households (or 1.5 million people) have been supported to exit poverty through adoption of improved groundnut varieties. In Bangladesh, the results from an adoption and impact study ([Yigezu et al. 2020](https://mel.cgiar.org/reporting/download/report_file_id/24521)) suggest that an estimated 160,000 households (or 657,600 people) have been assisted to exit poverty through adoption of improved lentil varieties. |  | National |
| **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 | An adoption and impact study of improved chickpea varieties in Ethiopia showed that adoption led to a 58.5% increase in chickpea yields ([Murendo et al. 2020](https://mel.cgiar.org/reporting/download/report_file_id/25267)).  |  | National |
| **2.2. MINIMUM DIETARY REQUIREMENTS**: 30 million more people, of which 50% are women, meeting minimum dietary energy requirements | An adoption and impact study of improved chickpea varieties in Ethiopia showed that adoption led to a 5% increase in household dietary diversity ([Murendo et al. 2020](https://mel.cgiar.org/reporting/download/report_file_id/25267)).  |  | National |
| **2.3. MICRONUTRIENT DEFICIENCIES**: 150 million more people, of which 50% are women, without deficiencies in one or more essential micronutrients | N/A |  |  |
| **SLO3: Improve Natural Resources and Ecosystem Services** |
| **3.1. WATER AND NUTRIENT EFFICIENCY:** 5% increase in water and nutrient efficiency in agroecosystems | N/A |  |  |
| **3.2. REDUCED GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION**: Reduction in ‘agriculturally’- related greenhouse gas emissions by 5% | N/A |  |  |
| **3.3. ECOSYSTEM RESTORED**: 55 M ha degraded land area restored | N/A |  |  |
| **3.4. PREVENTION OF DEFORESTATION**:2.5 M ha forest saved from deforestation | N/A |  |  |

### 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 |  |
| The Evolution of Gender Mainstreaming in ICARDA Lentil Program | Illustrate the impact of gender analysis on research process and accounting how gender analysis influenced the research process in the ICARDA Lentil Program, together with an analysis of the researchers’ learning about gender and change in the plant breeding process under auspices of GLDC | Maturity level 1 (draft case study completed) | Sub-IDO D.1.1 Enhanced institutional capacity of partner research organizations Sub-IDO C.1.3 Conducive agricultural policy environment. | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Gendered Youth Realities, Aspirations, Opportunity Structures and Transitions to Adulthood in the Semi-Arid Tropics: Strategy for Targeting and Engagement | The strategy aims to concurrently achieve the outcomes of: expanded, resilient and inclusive production, value addition, trading and consumption of nutritious grain legumes and dryland cereals in target countries, and improved capacity and inclusivity of agri-food system stakeholders to collaboratively develop innovations that respond to the needs of women, men and youth in GLDC-based livelihoods and value chains. | Maturity level 1 (the youth strategy document is completed and currently under technical editorial review) | Sub-IDO C.1.3 Conducive agricultural policy environment. | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### 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. to CLARISA dashboard, MARLO). | **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 |
| TOPSIS\_ShinyApp: application can be used to conduct multi-criteria ranking of GLDC technologies | Methodological tool - social sciences | Stage 1: end of research; app needs to be validated for its results | Drylands of South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Table 8. Key external partnerships

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Lead FP** | **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  |
| FP1  | Joint publication of a Special Issue on Aspirations | Future Rural Africa Research group | Research |
| FP1  | Implementation of nutrition behavior change intervention towards healthier urban food choices  | Billian Music foundation | Delivery |
| FP1  | Proposal development for further exploration of work on aspirations  | Bangor University  | Partnerships  |
| FP1  | Understanding past adoption success stories to learn for future approaches  | Institute of Development Studies  | Research |
| FP1 | Partnerships with universities’ social sciences departments in Uganda, Tanzania and Ethiopia for evidence generation on the studies among the youth | Haramaya University, EthiopiaMakerere University, UgandaSokoine University of Agriculture, Tanzania | Research, capacity development |
| FP1 | 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 |
| Development of the ‘CGIAR Foresight Report’ in collaboration with CGIAR foresight team which involves all CGIAR centers | Collaborating CRP: PIMCollaborating CGIAR center: all | Knowledge-sharing and joint scientific products through the established community of practice on foresight.  |
| Understanding the mainstreaming process of niche crops  | FTA, A4NH | Better understanding of the process through broader crop coverage, more efficient review through cross-funding |
| Research, delivery, tools and frameworks as well as fundraising especially around the concept of ‘gender responsive product profile development’ | Gender and Breeding Initiative/Excellence in Breeding | Development of gender responsive product profiles and concepts |
| MEL-based social network analysis for better performing CRP | RTB | Identify CRP-GLDC structures and operations that have contributed to publishing knowledge/science products and which of these have been more effective in increasing multi-disciplinary publications and evaluate how GLDC as a CRP adds more collaborations to the knowledge exchange networks. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### 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) |
| Research activities on manuscripts to be submitted for publication in peer-reviewed scientific journals | Pre-start up |
| Research activities on developing the TOPSIS\_ShinyApp | Pre-start up |
| Special Issue contributions (4 papers) on *Rural Aspirations in Africa: Livelihood Decisions and Rural Development Trajectories* in the European Journal of Development Research | Research |
| One paper published jointly with the Markets and Partnerships in Agribusiness on agri-food systems and value chain interventions  | Research |
| Production of a music video for better urban food choices  | Delivery |
| Understanding urban food choices symposium | Partnerships  |
| In-person meeting with Institute of Development Studies to establish partnership in the area of improving the understanding the adoption process  | Partnerships |
| 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 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-flagship linkages and how one 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 flagship 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 flagship 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)