



CGIAR Research Program on Grain Legumes

2012 Annual Performance Report

*Submitted to the CGIAR Consortium on behalf of all Partners
by ICRISAT (Lead Center)
15 May 2013*



RESEARCH
PROGRAM ON
GrainLegumes



and public and private
institutes and organizations,
governments, and farmers
worldwide

I. CRP PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT FOR JULY-DECEMBER 2012

A. Key Messages

The CGIAR Research Program on Grain Legumes (hereafter referred to by its short name 'GrainLegumes') officially initiated operations on 1 July 2012. Despite its very recent origin, [GrainLegumes](#) has significant impacts and achievements to report, having inherited a portfolio of ongoing partnership-based work by the participating Centers CIAT, ICARDA, ICRISAT (lead), and IITA.

The first major achievement of the new Program was receiving approval from the Fund Council on October 16, 2012 of the comprehensive 229-page [proposal](#) (fifth version). Intensive consultations among the partners over the two-year period of preparation that culminated in this approval formed a good basis of common understanding and coordination for this new initiative.

Meanwhile, research-for-development (R4D) continued apace, delivering large impacts towards the four CGIAR System Level Outcomes in 2012. [Major bean impact in Eastern/Southern Africa](#) is one of two successes highlighted further below. [Chickpea improvement continued to exhibit major impact in Ethiopia](#) (one million households, 75% yield increase, projected \$111 million benefits lifting 0.7 million people out of poverty by 2030), [Andhra Pradesh \(India\)](#) (area increased six-fold, production ten-fold) and [Myanmar](#) (sown area and yields have both doubled). An in-depth survey concluded that the [adoption of modern groundnut varieties](#) by 22% of farmers is contributing to food security in [Nigeria](#). High-impact partnership garnered praise from the National Association of Smallholder Farmers of [Malawi](#) (NASFAM) and from [Nigeria](#) on inclusive market-oriented development, seed systems and [aflatoxin](#) management. [Pigeonpea hybrids](#) are [poised](#) for major impact in the coming years as the world's first commercial hybrid of any grain legume crop. The [hybrid ICPH 2740](#) was released in Andhra Pradesh in 2012, and tests in farmer's fields indicate that a [35% increase in grain yield](#) can be expected.

Yet much remains to be done. India, the world's largest pulse grain producer and consumer, still faces a [challenging](#) demand-supply gap. In Africa, the preliminary [report](#) of the CGIAR adoption study (DIIVA project) indicates relatively moderate adoption rates by 2010 for improved varieties in Africa for pigeonpea (34%), bean (32%), groundnut (22%), chickpea (20%), faba bean (14%), and lentil (10%) (estimates are not available for cowpea or soybean). These levels represent significant impacts in major production areas, but seed system constraints and policy & institutional shortcomings [restrain](#) them from being even higher. Intensive efforts continued to make [headway](#) in 2012 on improving seed availability through [innovative](#) approaches and projects such as 'Tropical Legumes'.

GrainLegumes' global [partnership](#) also continued to achieve important progress in basic and applied research during the year. The complete sequencing of the chickpea genome is a highlight indicated below. In addition, leading-edge initiatives used molecular tools to [explore](#) the reservoirs of genetic diversity available in wild relative species and to [overcome barriers](#) to gene transfer into cultivated crops. Progress continued against difficult environmental [stresses](#) such as adaptation to [drought](#), [heat](#), [low soil fertility](#), and resistance/tolerance to important [diseases](#) and [insect pests](#). A better understanding of biological nitrogen fixation constraints and opportunities was gained, including the effects and interactions of drought, low phosphorous, and symbiotic bacterial diversity.

Two major achievements/successes that GrainLegumes is pleased to highlight for 2012 are the following.

- 1) The [sequencing](#) of the complete chickpea genome was achieved by a global [consortium](#) led by ICRISAT in 2012, adding to the same milestone achieved for pigeonpea in 2011. Without the catalytic leadership of a CGIAR institution it is unlikely that these two developing-world crops would have joined the ranks of soybean (a highly industrialized crop) as the first three grain legume genomes

sequenced worldwide. Genome sequences and maps will greatly [increase](#) the effectiveness and efficiency of plant breeding over the coming years and decades. [Cross-crop genomic learning](#) will be a major benefit realized over time from GrainLegumes' multi-crop R4D approach.

2) New/updated [impact assessments](#) during 2012 indicated that [bean improvement has generated US\\$200 million in benefits to five million smallholder households](#) in Eastern/Southern Africa. In 2012 [five iron-biofortified varieties](#) were released by Rwanda. They hail a new and important direction in grain legume breeding: the improvement of human nutrition. By 2013 it is [expected](#) that over half a million people will be consuming iron-rich beans.

Financial summary: total expenditure, percentage allocated to gender research and total funding (from all sources, including bilateral and window 3) compared to expected budget

Centers	Budget as per Annual Financial Plans					Actual Expenses				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
CIAT	1,540	-	4,976	-	6,516	1,407	-	3,380	-	4,787
ICARDA	1,604	369	1,891	-	3,864	1,235	257	739	-	2,231
ICRISAT	4,087	6,476	6,719	-	17,282	3,002	4,626	4,799	-	12,427
IITA	2,880	1,504	2,401	-	6,785	1,823	782	2,254	-	4,859
GCP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	10,111	8,349	15,987	-	34,447	7,467	5,665	11,172	-	24,304
Percentage	29%	24%	46%	0%	100%	31%	23%	46%	-	100%

Efforts began in late 2012 to establish management, governance and operations structures for oversight and implementation of GrainLegumes. Due to the delayed approval (16 October 2012) and consequent uncertainty about funding for most of the reporting period, the hiring of permanent staff was deferred and is expected to be completed in early 2013. The budget uncertainty was also a major reason why GrainLegumes underspent its budget by 29% during the period.

B. Impact Pathway and Intermediate Development Outcomes

GrainLegumes is developing its Intermediate Development Outcomes following the guidelines provided by the CGIAR Consortium. These will derive from the impact pathways outlined in the final approved [proposal](#).

C.1 Narrative of major achievements, by Theme

The following sections are mainly organized according to Product Lines, because these are the outcome and impact-oriented themes approved by the Fund Council for GrainLegumes. This is not intended to overshadow the importance of cross-theme achievements and activities, which are reflected in GrainLegumes' [Strategic Components](#). Here are a few crosscutting highlights.

Cross-theme selected highlights

Molecular mapping is rapidly [identifying](#) more molecular markers and genes of value and their relatedness across the genomes of pigeonpea, chickpea, groundnut and related species. This makes more efficient and effective use of advanced molecular research facilities and expertise. These initiatives not only cut across themes, but also engage vigorous global partnerships.

At the other end of the R4D spectrum – towards development impacts – the sharing of experiences and learning is equally valuable. For example, the distribution of seeds in [small packs](#) has proven effective across crops in increasing smallholder's access to improved varieties. GrainLegumes is working with innovative seed organizations across crops to make small seed packs available.

Pulse crop production shortfalls are a major concern for India, the world's largest producer and consumer. Many of the issues cut across pulse crops. A 2012 GrainLegumes [policy brief](#) analyzes the causes and recommends corrective actions.

In a major cross-crop knowledge-sharing achievement, ICRISAT and the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR) with partners worldwide [organized and hosted](#) the major Sixth International Conference on Legume Genetics and Genomics in Hyderabad, India during 2-7 October 2012, convening over 500 delegates from 44 countries who presented 62 talks and 293 posters in 13 sessions.

Beyond cross-crops to cross-CGIAR, an intensive two-day [meeting](#) was held (3-4 September, Nairobi) by representatives from five Centers and three Consortium Research Programs (maize, human nutrition and grain legumes) to coordinate and harmonize their work on mycotoxins across crops and themes.

Product Line 1 – Drought and low-phosphorous tolerant common bean, cowpea, and soybean

[Climbing beans](#) are more than doubling bean yields in [Rwanda](#), where the crop is a dietary staple. A 2012 [impact assessment](#) concluded the US\$16 million investment in bean R4D in Eastern and Southern Africa over 17 years has yielded more than US\$200 million in benefits for more than 5 million rural households in nine countries; improved bean varieties have been adopted on 1.6 million hectares, or nearly 60% of the bean area in the region. Benefiting from the efforts of HarvestPlus and GrainLegumes, Rwanda released five [iron-rich bean](#) varieties. These impacts were made possible through strong partnerships fostered by the Pan-Africa Bean Research Alliance ([PABRA](#)).

Product Line 2 – Heat-tolerant chickpea, common bean, faba bean and lentil

Global [partnership](#) led by ICRISAT completes the [sequencing](#) of the chickpea genome, opening new [vistas](#) for improvement of the crop and adding [understanding](#) of the crop's evolution.

Genetic differences in [heat tolerance](#) were quantified in different growth stages in chickpea (vegetative, [flowering](#) and grain-filling), identifying [heat tolerant](#) lines for use in breeding for adaptation to climate change.

Product Line 3 – Short-duration, drought-tolerant and aflatoxin-free groundnut

Vigorous efforts continued to broaden the genetic base of groundnut and introgress valuable traits through [synthetic amphidiploids](#) and the assessment of Bolivian [landraces](#). Molecular markers used to characterize 72 wild *Arachis* accessions [found](#) much larger genetic diversity than in cultivated groundnut, including nine alleles associated with new genetic variability for potentially increasing grain oil content.

Leading-edge research [demonstrated](#) that the DREB1A gene transgenically inserted into groundnut increases rooting depth by 20% under drought stress, increasing water extraction and [increasing](#) pod and root mass in comparison to vegetative mass.

Groundnut lines genetically transformed with chitinase genes expressed [resistance](#) to *Aspergillus flavus*, the fungal agent of aflatoxin in seed inoculations, as well as resistance to the causal fungi of late leaf spot and rust diseases.

Product Line 4 – High nitrogen-fixing chickpea, common bean, faba bean and soybean

Drought-tolerant bean lines [exhibited](#) higher levels of improved biological nitrogen fixation.

Product Line 5 – Insect-smart chickpea, cowpea, and pigeonpea production systems

The genetic base of pigeonpea is being broadened for insect resistance and other difficult traits through molecular assessments of the crop's [evolution](#), gene pool [diversity](#) and [gene flow](#) as well as wide crosses to [tertiary](#) and [quaternary](#) gene pools. Progeny from crosses between pigeonpea and its secondary gene pool species *Cajanus actifolius* exhibited [resistance](#) to the crop's most serious

insect pest, the *Helicoverpa* pod borer. Resistance was associated with high levels of flavonoids in flowers and buds; resistance via [protease inhibitors](#) was also identified in other wild relative species.

Product Line 6 – Extra-early chickpea and lentil varieties

Early-maturing chickpeas are having major impact in [Ethiopia](#), [India](#) and [Myanmar](#). [Benefits](#) to Ethiopia alone over the period 2001-2030 were [projected](#) to be worth US\$111 million, [changing](#) smallholder's lives. The land area sown to chickpea and grain yields in Myanmar doubled during 2001-09. Data were collected in Andhra Pradesh, India for a detailed impact assessment of the chickpea revolution to be published in 2013.

Product Line 7 – Herbicide-tolerant, machine-harvestable chickpea, faba bean and lentil varieties

Screening of 300 chickpea and 200 lentil genotypes for tolerance to two post-emergence herbicides, imazethapyr and metribuzin under field conditions revealed large genetic variation for herbicide tolerance.

Product Line 8 – Pigeonpea hybrid and management practices

Aggressive seed system capacity-building and dissemination efforts are underway to achieve a hybrid revolution in India. The pigeonpea hybrid ICPH 2740 was released in 2012 in Andhra Pradesh state after demonstrating a 35% yield advantage in on-farm trials.

Molecular markers associated with pigeonpea's remarkable developmental [plasticity](#), the determinate *versus* indeterminate growth habit, were mapped. [Super-early](#) non-hybrid pigeonpea lines (80-90 days to maturity) were bred for very short-season niches.

C.2 Progress towards outputs

GrainLegumes pursues outputs of useful germplasm, plant breeding and related knowledge, methodologies and specialized technology services to accelerate and expand impacts that benefit the poor.

Product Line 1 – Drought and low-phosphorous tolerant common bean, cowpea, and soybean

A yield trial of common bean under severe terminal drought testing three-species progenies resulted in lines with as much as 300 kg (30%) higher yield than drought tolerant, heat tolerant *Phaseolus acutifolius*.

Sixty advanced cowpea breeding lines were identified with combined drought tolerance and resistance to *Striga gesnerioides*.

Two sets each of twelve soybean lines tested in 2012 off-season at Kasinthula Research Station, Malawi showed significant differences under both intermittent and terminal drought.

Product Line 2 – Heat-tolerant chickpea, common bean, faba bean and lentil

Genetic variation in heat tolerance in chickpea was observed in anther development, pollination and pod set. ICARDA identified four common possible pleiotropic QTLs on linkage groups 3 and 4 of chickpea that are associated with drought resistance.

The common assumption that breeding for deeper roots will increase drought resistance in chickpea was questioned by [results](#) from crop simulation modeling that instead predict a yield penalty from investing in additional root biomass.

The EcoCrop model was adapted to the Andean bean gene pool in collaboration with the CGIAR Research Program CCAFS, showing far greater heat effects than on other bean gene pools.

Product Line 3 – Short-duration, drought-tolerant and aflatoxin-free groundnut

ICRISAT's advanced lysimeter/rainout shelter facility was used to more precisely measure genetic variability in transpiration efficiency (TE). Limited variation in TE was found during the low vapor pressure deficit (VPD) season while large variation was observed during the high VPD (dry) season.

Seven out of nine transgenic events of groundnut overexpressing the rice chitinase gene showed lower *Aspergillus flavus* (causal agent of aflatoxin) infection than the resistant control cultivar J11.

The distribution of *Aspergillus* species was [mapped](#) in Malawi over two years; 23-50% of 1,397 seed samples exceeded export limits of the toxin, especially those from drought-prone locations.

High levels of resistance to *Botrytis* grey mold are not available in the cultivated chickpea gene pool. [Progress](#) was reported in 2012 in transferring resistance from the wild species *Cicer reticulatum*.

Product Line 4 – High nitrogen-fixing chickpea, common bean, faba bean and soybean

In collaboration with INRA-Morocco, phenotypic characterization of 123 rhizobia nodulating chickpea lines revealed wide variability for tolerance to heat, salinity, and water stress.

Twenty faba bean lines were tested for their nitrogen efficiency under low phosphorous conditions in collaboration with INRA, Montpellier, France.

Product Line 5 – Insect-smart chickpea, cowpea, and pigeonpea production systems

Eighteen interspecific derivative lines of chickpea were found resistant to *Helicoverpa* pod borer. Transgenic chickpea events with *cryIIAa* were also evaluated for resistance; the event BS6H resulted in 100% larval mortality.

Tests [began](#) on inoculating bean seed plants with the fungus *Beauveria bassiana* so that it can multiply inside the crop and colonize its grains, protecting against storage weevils. This would be much cheaper and easier than spraying this fungus on the entire commercial crop.

Two *Helicoverpa* pod borer-tolerant pigeonpea genotypes, ENT 11 and ICPL 32WR were recommended for release in India.

Detailed lab studies on the effect of combining neem oil and the pod borer-specific virus MaviMNPV on key insect pests of cowpea (aphids, thrips, pod borers and pod sucking bugs) found the bio-pesticide combination to be as or more effective than the standard chemical insecticide. A new efficient method for producing the virus was developed using sprouting cowpea grains.

Product Line 6 – Extra-early chickpea and lentil varieties

A [baseline study](#) assessed the potential for chickpea to be cultivated in the vast (12 million hectares) off-season rice fallow land in the Indo-Gangetic Plains; although the crop is well-adapted there, offseason drought, low prices and marketing issues constrain its adoption. For lentil, a baseline survey was carried out on potential areas for extra-early varieties in the short-season window between rice crops and in rice fallows in Bangladesh and Eastern India.

Product Line 7 – Herbicide-tolerant, machine-harvestable chickpea, faba bean and lentil varieties

A field screening technique was standardized for chickpea tolerance to two post-emergence herbicides (imazathapyr and metribuzin). Several genotypes tolerant to either imazethapyr or metribuzin were identified. Crosses were made to develop recombinant inbred lines. Large genetic variation was also observed in lentil.

Forty-four elite lentil lines with machine harvestable traits were selected for evaluation and yield performance.

Product Line 8 – Pigeonpea hybrid and management practices

A new CMS source, A₈ was identified from *Cajanus reticulatus* with promising maintainers.

Twenty experimental hybrids were produced by using female (A) lines possessing the obcordate leaf character that serves as a morphological marker to aid in the roguing of off-types in the early vegetative stage.

To study of the potential for spillover effects of pigeonpea hybrids across countries and eco-regions, a targeting study was carried out in 2012. Homologous zones suitable for pigeonpea production were identified.

C.3 Progress towards the achievement of outcomes

GrainLegumes outcomes mainly take the form of the adoption of improved varieties accompanied by supportive management practices, partnership and capacity-building, expertise and backstopping services.

Product Line 1 – Drought and low-phosphorous tolerant common bean, cowpea, and soybean

Drought resistant common bean varieties are poised for release in Ethiopia, Kenya and Tanzania.

Two IITA-derived cowpea breeding lines were released officially in 2012 in Tanzania, and another two in Burkina Faso.

To ensure relevancy to farmer's needs, 1,700 cowpea farmers participated in participatory variety selection trials in West and Central Africa. Four promising lines were selected in Burkina Faso; nine in Ghana; and three in Nigeria.

Product Line 2 – Heat-tolerant chickpea, common bean, faba bean and lentil

Fifty-seven demonstrations were conducted under late sown conditions on heat tolerant chickpea cultivar JG 14 in two states (Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh), in India. The heat-tolerant cultivar JG 14 yielded 30% higher than the control in on-farm tests.

Product Line 3 – Short-duration, drought-tolerant and aflatoxin-free groundnut

Improved short-duration and drought tolerant varieties were introduced into Africa (Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Malawi, Tanzania, Uganda, Mozambique, Zimbabwe) and Asia (India, Bangladesh). Over 15,000 farmers were involved in participatory varietal selection.

High yielding ability under intermittent drought was confirmed in several groundnut lines. Two breeding lines, ICGVs 97183 and 02271, and one germplasm line ICG11088 were most promising.

About 80 advanced groundnut lines were evaluated in participatory varietal selection in Asia and Africa by more than 15,000 farmers. In West/Central Africa, 85% of the 1,450 participating farmers were women.

Five groundnut varieties in Uganda (Serenut 2 (ICGV 90704), Serenut 3R (ICGV-SM 93530), Serenut 5R (ICGV-SM 99566), Serenut 8R (SGV 99019), Serenut 11T (SGV 99031) and one (CTMG 6 (ICGV 05049) in India were released. Seven new varieties (5 in Mali and 2 in India) were proposed submitted for release. Fifteen new varieties (2 in Malawi, 4 in Uganda, and 9 in India) have entered National Performance Trials.

Product Line 5 – Insect-smart chickpea, cowpea, and pigeonpea production systems

In chickpea, technology for production of the biopesticide HaNPV was shared with farmers and is being adopted in Andhra Pradesh, India. Methomyl + spinosad + flubendiamide sprays are effective on chickpea for controlling pod borers; this information has been shared with national partners for extension to farmers.

In cowpea, a youth self-help agri-enterprise in Benin is producing biopesticide mixtures.

In pigeonpea, two pod-borer tolerant genotypes were tested in over 100 on-farm trials and the farmers applied 1 to 2 less insecticide sprays on these genotypes than the commercial cultivars. These varieties are being released for cultivation to the farmers.

Product Line 8 – Pigeonpea hybrid and management practices

The pigeonpea hybrid ICPH 2740 was released in 2012 in Andhra Pradesh, India.

A novel statistical method (GGE biplot) for evaluating the stability of new pigeonpea hybrids over environments was [tested](#) to identify optimum targeting of hybrid seed.

C.4 Progress towards Impact

Concerted efforts in seed multiplication received focus, since seed availability is a widespread constraint to impact. Development partners and farmers carried out most activities; CGIAR centers mostly played a catalytic and supporting role in capacity-building and nucleus/breeder seed production.

Product Line 1 – Drought and low-phosphorous tolerant common bean, cowpea, and soybean

Small seed packs make seed affordable by the poor, particularly women. An estimated 1.8 million female and 1.1 million male farmers were reached with small seed packets of bush habit bean in 2012, enough to plant about 135,000 hectares.

About 5,000 kg of foundation seed of cowpea were produced in Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger and Nigeria. About 700 demonstration plots were established in 120 communities in seven countries.

Product Line 3 – Short-duration, drought-tolerant and aflatoxin-free groundnut

Large quantities of breeder-class groundnut seed were multiplied and shared with partners: 22 tons in Asia, 7.7 tons in WCA and 0.32 tons in ESA.

Groundnut quality seed was distributed in small packs in India (21.95 tons) and Bangladesh (1.45 tons). Over 2,000 farmers received such packs. Small packs of improved short-duration drought-tolerant groundnut varieties were made available to farmers in Asia, West and Central Africa (WCA) and Eastern and Southern Africa (ESA) in 2012. In Bangladesh, 1.45 tons seed of BARIchinabadam 8 and BARIchinabadam 4 were distributed by BARI to farmers for winter season sowing. In India, 9.0 tons of quality seed of ICGV 00351 (4 tons) and Co 6 (ICGV 87846, 5.0 tons) were distributed to farmers in Tamil Nadu. In Karnataka, 9.0 tons quality seed was distributed. In Odisha, 2.5 tons of quality seed were distributed to farmers.

Product Line 4 – High nitrogen-fixing chickpea, common bean, faba bean and soybean

Over 13,000 female and 8,800 male farmers were reached with small seed packets of climbing bean, sufficient for planting 1,200 hectares.

A soybean value chain project in Malawi and Mozambique invigorated the seed system. Fifty tons of improved TGx variety seed was distributed to both private and community-based seed producers for multiplication of certified seeds during 2012/13 season. The project reached 4,000 households, and included training on household utilization of soybean.

Product Line 5 – Insect-smart chickpea, cowpea, and pigeonpea production systems

In Kenya, Tanzania, Malawi and Uganda, 7.5 tons of breeder, 19 tons of foundation, 39 tons of certified, and 8 tons of quality declared seed of pigeonpea were produced.

Product Line 6 – Extra-early chickpea and lentil varieties

Over 8,000 MT chickpea seed of improved cultivars was produced in sub-Saharan Africa (Ethiopia, Tanzania and Kenya). In South Asia 36,000 tons of quality seed of chickpea was produced in India

and 87 tons in Bangladesh. For lentil, 18 Village Seed HUBs were established and 495 tons of foundation, certified and truthfully-labeled seed were produced.

Product Line 8 – Pigeonpea hybrid and management practices

Fifty-five tons of certified seed and 30 tons of foundation seed were supplied to 8,000 farmers in Andhra Pradesh, Odisha and Bihar states of India to be commercially grown in 2012. For commercial cultivation in 2013, 327 tons of certified seed was produced of six cultivars (4 varieties and 2 hybrids) by 1,000 farmer-seed growers. Seed storage facilities (total 25 tons capacity) were constructed in villages in Odisha state.

Partners multiplied seed to reach a goal of commercial hybrid cultivation on 100,000 hectares by 2014. Multiplication of A, B and R parent lines increased in 2012, generating 6,117 kg of nucleus/breeder seed. Government and private seed agencies were trained on hybrid seed production.

C. GENDER RESEARCH ACHIEVEMENTS

GrainLegumes is still at the early stages of implementing its proactive gender equity [strategy](#) described in the Program proposal. Nevertheless, a number of noteworthy 2012 achievements are:

An estimated 1.8 million women farmers were reached with small seed packets of *bush* habit common beans in Africa – well in excess of the number of men reached (1.1 million). The same trend prevailed at a smaller scale for *climbing* bean seed packets (13,100 women vs. 8,780 men).

In West Africa, participatory groundnut selection trials engaged 1,450 farmers, 85% of whom were women. In Mali, 1,750 farmers (90% women) and 44 extension agents were trained in integrated crop management practices including aflatoxin management.

Sixteen women's groups in Niger and six in Mali were assisted in quality seed production and entrepreneur-scale machinery that has increased seed production volumes and quality. Ten PhD students are conducting thesis research on various aspects of crop protection in grain legumes.

Significant, though still far from numerically equal participation of women in formal capacity-building events is indicated in section E.

D.2 Institutional architecture for gender mainstreaming

Institutional gender mainstreaming highlights during 2012 were:

A gender specialist, Dr. Therese Gondwe, was appointed by IITA and posted in Zambia to mainstream gender research on cowpea and soybean. GrainLegumes plans to hire four additional gender experts in 2013.

In partnership with NGOs such as Care-Malawi, NASFAM and USAID Feed the Future, a target of at least 40% female engagement in project work has been agreed.

D. PARTNERSHIP BUILDING ACHIEVEMENTS

GrainLegumes is a [partnership](#) among ten primary institutions: four CGIAR Centers (CIAT, ICARDA, IITA and led by ICRISAT). The Generation Challenge Program will be a key collaborating partner until its completion date in 2014. Key collaborating partners include the Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation (EMBRAPA), the Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research (EIAR), the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR), the Turkish General Directorate of Agricultural Research (GDAR), and the USAID-supported Legumes Innovation Lab and the Peanut and Mycotoxin Innovation Lab.

In addition to these primary partnerships, specific activities engage hundreds of additional partners from across the international, regional, governmental, non-governmental, civil society and private sectors. Space does not allow a comprehensive listing of the vast array of GrainLegumes' partnerships. Practically every activity in the Program involves multiple partners. Only a few highlights can be accommodated within allowed space below.

Being fundamental to GrainLegumes' approach, priorities and strategy, the development of the Program's proposal to the CGIAR was a focal point for partnership building in 2012. Numerous presentations and discussions to contribute ideas and shared commitment to GrainLegumes were made during the year (and in the prior two years of proposal development) to partners in different regions and sectors.

Networking is a vital partnership mechanism for GrainLegumes. It provides a platform for increasing the collective critical mass of research expertise among countries in a region; enhances knowledge-sharing, capacity-building, and joint research; and creates a safety backup of expertise and resources in regions plagued by disruptions. The Pan-Africa Bean Research Alliance ([PABRA](#)) is one of GrainLegumes' strongest partnership assets. Its record of achievement and impact with beans in Eastern and Southern Africa in 2012 was highlighted earlier.

Links with many private and public seed companies were engaged and expanded in 2012 to enable the wide range of seed multiplication efforts listed in section C.4. Partnership with farmer's groups is especially noteworthy, especially in participatory varietal selection and in farmers' role in multiplying high-quality seed.

E. CAPACITY BUILDING

Thousands of individuals from public, non-governmental, farmer and university sectors benefited from GrainLegumes training experiences in 2012. Only some highlights are mentioned here.

Product Lines 1, 2, 3. (Drought and low-phosphorous tolerant common bean, cowpea, and soybean; Heat-tolerant chickpea, common bean, faba bean and lentil; Short-duration, drought-tolerant and aflatoxin-free groundnut

Twenty-four men and 5 women were in pre- and post-graduate training. Molecular breeding training in cowpea and soybean was one of the highlights, along with thesis work on various aspects of heat and drought tolerance.

PL 4. High nitrogen-fixing chickpea, common bean, faba bean and soybean

Advanced degree theses included an MSc on the interactive effects of inoculation, phosphorus and nitrogen on nodulation, nitrogen fixation, growth and yield components of soybean; and on characterization of effective native rhizobial strains in Mozambique for enhanced nitrogen fixation in soybean.

PL 5. Insect-smart chickpea, cowpea, and pigeonpea production systems

Two graduate students, one male for PhD and one female for MSc, have begun their degree research work on thrips and aphid resistance. A female PhD student is studying bio-pesticides for cowpea. Ten PhD students are conducting thesis research on various aspects of crop protection in grain legumes.

PL 6. Extra-early chickpea and lentil varieties

208 extension personnel from Ethiopia, Tanzania, and Kenya were trained on crop management and quality seed production of chickpea. 2,293 farmers from the same countries were trained on integrated crop management technologies. 2,886 Indian farmers (25% women) and four thousand from Bangladesh (20% women) were trained in improved chickpea and lentil technologies.

PL 8. Pigeonpea hybrid and management practices

1,501 farmers, including 139 women, plus more than 50 seed technologists from the private sector were trained in pigeonpea variety and hybrid seed production.

F. RISK MANAGEMENT

The value of grain legumes and area sown to them in low-income food deficit countries (defined by FAO) is on par with that of tropical cereals such as maize. However grain legume crops' footprint is fragmented among multiple crops, mainly the eight priority grain legumes addressed by this Program. Despite the crucial value that such crop diversity provides to farmers, it is much easier for institutions to focus on simple single-crop systems. Hence this fragmentation has led to lower degrees of government policy support, less global R4D support, and impact pathway challenges in areas such as seed multiplication, information dissemination and marketing. One important consequence of these challenges has been the displacement of grain legumes cultivation into more marginal environments prone to drought and low soil fertility during the past few decades. These challenges increase both the importance, and the risk of investing in grain legume R4D.

To manage these risks, GrainLegumes R4D in 2012 continued major efforts on breeding for stress resistance in marginal environments, and on improving seed systems. Important progress has been achieved, as described earlier. Broadening the narrow genetic base of groundnut and pigeonpea also received attention as highlighted earlier.

At the administrative level of GrainLegumes, the uncertainty surrounding the approval and funding of the Program constrained program implementation during 2012 as explained in the first section of this report. Now that the Program and budget are approved, this risk has been controlled.

G. LESSONS LEARNED

The year 2012 was replete with important lessons for GrainLegumes. A major lesson was to invest heavily in strengthening partnerships and communications in order to gain the collective understanding and momentum needed to carry out grain legume improvement in the new cross-crop, cross-institution and cross-theme manner. As of early 2013, this remains a very active effort.

Within the R4D agenda, a noteworthy lesson has been the crucial importance of investing in seed systems development in order to fulfill the impact potential of new varieties. In decades past, seed systems were usually considered to be beyond the remit of CGIAR centers and their NARS partners. However, grain legume seed systems face a number of difficulties that are greater than for other crops, such as low seed-to-seed ratio, seed perishability, low seed volumes, and difficulties in developing hybrid biological and technological and economic systems. The realization that these difficulties must be addressed, institutional traditions notwithstanding, has led to a much more activist engagement in seed systems development over the past decade, made possible through crucial increases in investor support. As a result, the seed systems obstacle is being steadily eroded.

Lessons learned also include important targets that remain to be fully addressed. Especially important are gender equity; cross-institute and cross-crop activities and knowledge sharing; and the need for enhanced awareness of the benefits of investing in grain legume R4D and stronger advocacy in support of that objective.

Since GrainLegumes has only recently been launched, our first estimates of progress indicators (Table 1) are few and tentative. As GrainLegumes is implemented fully in 2013, it will establish firm metrics for each of the required indicators that can be more reliably assessed that year.

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

CRPs concerned by this indicator	Indicator	Glossary/guidelines for measuring the indicator	Deviation narrative (if actual is more than 10% away from target)	2012		2013	2014
				Target (if available for 2012)	Actual	Target	Target
KNOWLEDGE, TOOLS, DATA							
All	1. Number of flagship “products” produced by CRP	These are frameworks and concepts that are significant and complete enough to have been highlighted on web pages, publicized through blog stories, press releases and/or policy briefs. They are significant in that they should be likely to change the way stakeholders along the impact pathway allocate resources and/or implement activities. They should be products that change the way these stakeholders think and act. Tools, decision-support tools, guidelines and/or training manuals are not included in this indicator			0	1	3
All	2. % of flagship products produced that have explicit target of women farmers/NRM managers	The web pages, blog stories, press releases and policy briefs supporting indicator #1 must have an explicit focus on women farmers/NRM managers to be counted			0	1	3
All	3. % of flagship products produced that have been assessed for likely gender-disaggregated impact	Reports/papers describing the products should include a focus on gender-disaggregated impacts if they are to be counted			0	0	2
All	4. Number of “tools” produced by CRP	These are significant decision-support tools, guidelines, and/or training manuals that are significant and complete enough to have been highlighted on web pages, publicized through blog stories, press releases and/or policy briefs. They are significant in that they should be likely to change the way stakeholders along the impact pathway allocate resources and/or implement activities			0	0	0

All	5. % of tools that have an explicit target of women farmers	The web pages, blog stories, press releases and policy briefs supporting indicator #4 must have an explicit focus on women farmers/NRM managers to be counted			0	0	0
All	6. % of tools assessed for likely gender-disaggregated impact	Reports/papers describing the products should include a focus on gender-disaggregated impacts if they are to be counted			0	0	0
All	7. Number of open access databases maintained by CRP				2	3	3
All	8. Total number of users of these open access databases				0	50	100
All	9. Number of publications in ISI journals produced by CRP				15	7	7
1,2,3, 4, 6	10. Number of strategic value chains analyzed by CRP				5	5	5
1,5,6,7	11. Number of targeted agro-ecosystems analysed/characterised by CRP	Use the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA) typology of cultivated systems and of forests and woodland systems (MEA, 2005, Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Current State and Trends, Volume 1) to define these agro-ecosystems and specify the regions concerned			-	-	-
1,5,6,7	12. Estimated population of above-mentioned agro-ecosystems				-	-	-
CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT AND INNOVATION PLATFORMS							
All	13. Number of trainees in short-term programs facilitated by CRP (male)	The number of individuals to whom significant knowledge or skills have been imparted through interactions that are intentional, structured, and purposed for imparting knowledge or skills should be counted. This includes farmers, ranchers, fishers, and other primary sector producers who receive training in a variety of best practices in productivity, post-harvest management, linking to markets, etc. It also includes rural entrepreneurs, processors, managers and traders receiving training in application of new technologies, business management, linking to markets, etc., and training to extension specialists, researchers, policymakers and others who are engaged in the food, feed and fiber system and			3552	4000	5000

		natural resources and water management. Include training on climate risk analysis, adaptation, mitigation, and vulnerability assessments, as it relates to agriculture. Training should include food security, water resources management/IWRM, sustainable agriculture, and climate change resilience .					
All	14. Number of trainees in short-term programs facilitated by CRP (female)	(see above, but for female)			6323	6000	8000
All	15. Number of trainees in long-term programs facilitated by CRP (male)	The number of people who are currently enrolled in or graduated in the current fiscal year from a bachelor's, master's or Ph.D. program or are currently participating in or have completed in the current fiscal year a long term (degree-seeking) advanced training program such as a fellowship program or a post-doctoral studies program. A person completing one long term training program in the fiscal year and currently participating in another long term training program should be counted only once.			24	24	24
All	16. Number of trainees in long-term programs facilitated by CRP (female)	(see above, but for female)			5	6	8
1,5,6,7	17. Number of multi-stakeholder R4D innovation platforms established for the targeted agro-ecosystems by the CRPs	To be counted, a multi-stakeholder platform has to have a clear purpose, generally to manage some type of tradeoff/conflict among the different interests of different stakeholders in the targeted agro-ecosystems, and inclusive and clear governance mechanisms, leading to decisions to manage the variety of perspectives of stakeholders in a manner satisfactory to the whole platform.					
TECHNOLOGIES/PRACTICES IN VARIOUS STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT							
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including 			10	10	12

		<p>biodegradable packaging</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>New technologies or management practices under research counted should be only those under research in the current reporting year. Any new technology or management practice under research in a previous year but not under research in the reporting year should not be included.</p>					
All	19. % of technologies under research that have an explicit target of women farmers	The papers, web pages, blog stories, press releases and policy briefs supporting indicator #x must have an explicit focus on women farmers/NRM managers to be counted			60%	60	60
All	20. % of technologies under research that have been assessed for likely gender-disaggregated impact	Reports/papers describing the products should include a focus on gender-disaggregated impacts if they are to be counted			0	20	20
1,5,6,7	21 Number of agro-	Use the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA) typology of			-	-	-

	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	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					
1,5,6,7	22. Number of people who will potentially benefit from plans, once finalised, for the scaling up of strategies	Indicate the potential number of both women and men			-	-	-
All, except 2	23. Number of technologies /NRM practices field tested (phase II)	Under "field testing" means that research has moved from focused development to broader testing and this testing is underway under conditions intended to duplicate those encountered by potential users of the new technology. This might be in the actual facilities (fields) of potential users, or it might be in a facility set up to duplicate those conditions.			7	7	10
1,5,6,7	24. Number of agro-ecosystems for which innovations (technologies, policies, practices, integrative approaches) and options for improvement at system level have been developed and are being field tested (Phase II)	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 where field testing is underway			-	-	-
1,5,6,7	25. % of above innovations/approaches/options that are targeted at decreasing inequality between men and women				-	-	-
1,5,6,7	26. Number of published research outputs from CRP utilised in targeted agro-				-	-	-

ecosystems							
All, except 2	27. Number of technologies/NRM practices released by public and private sector partners globally (phase III)	In the case of crop research that developed a new variety, e.g., the variety must have passed through any required approval process, and seed of the new variety should be available for multiplication. The technology should have proven benefits and be as ready for use as it can be as it emerges from the research and testing process. Technologies made available for transfer should be only those made available in the current reporting year. Any technology made available in a previous year should not be included.			10	12	12
POLICIES IN VARIOUS STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT							
All	28. Numbers of Policies/ Regulations/ Administrative Procedures Analyzed (Stage 1)	Number of agricultural enabling environment policies / regulations / administrative procedures in the areas of agricultural resource, food, market standards & regulation, public investment, natural resource or water management and climate change adaptation/mitigation as it relates to agriculture that underwent the first stage of the policy reform process i.e. analysis (review of existing policy / regulation / administrative procedure and/or proposal of new policy / regulations / administrative procedures). Please count the highest stage completed during the reporting year – don't double count for the same policy.					
All	29. Number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation (Stage 2) that underwent the second stage of the policy reform process. The second stage includes public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure.					
All	30. Number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures presented for legislation (Stage 3)	: ... underwent the third stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/decree to improve the policy environment for smallholder-based agriculture.)					
All	31. Number of policies / regulations / administrative	: ...underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process (official approval (legislation/decree) of new or revised policy /					

	procedures prepared passed/approved (Stage 4)	regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority).					
All	32. Number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures passed for which implementation has begun (Stage 5)	: ...completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority)			3	2	2
OUTCOMES ON THE GROUND							
All	33. Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of CRP research	Indicate the regions where this is occurring and whether the application of technologies is on a new or continuing area			BEANS: (new area in 2012) PL1: 134,632 ha in ESA PL4: 1200 ha in E Africa PL6: 5000 ha	PL1: 200,000 ha PL4: 2000 ha PL6: 7000 ha	PL6: 8000 ha PL7: 1000 ha
All	34. Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of CRP research	Indicate the regions where this is occurring and whether the application of technologies is on a new or continuing area and indicate: 34 (a) number of women farmers concerned 34(b) number of male farmers concerned			BEANS: new reach in 2012 PL1: 34. a) 1,814,893 women 34.b) 1,091,552 men PL4: 34. a) 13,143 women 34. b) 8,780 men	PL1: 34a) 1,800,000 34b) 1,000,000 PL4: 34a) 15,000 34b) 10,000	

Annex 2: Performance indicators for gender mainstreaming with targets defined

Performance Indicator	CRP performance approaches requirements	CRP performance meets requirements	CRP performance exceeds requirements
1. Gender inequality targets defined	Sex-disaggregated social data is being collected and used to diagnose important gender-related constraints in at least one of the CRP's main target populations	Sex-disaggregated social data collected and used to diagnose important gender-related constraints in at least one of the CRP's main target populations And The CRP has defined and collected baseline data on the main dimensions of gender inequality in the CRP's main target populations relevant to its expected outcomes (IDOs)	Sex-disaggregated social data collected and used to diagnose important gender-related constraints in at least one of the CRP's main target populations 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) CRP targets changes in levels of gender inequality to which the CRP is or plans to contribute, with related numbers of men and women beneficiaries in main target populations
2. Institutional architecture for integration of gender is in place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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&E system has protocol for tracking progress on integration of gender in research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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&E system has protocol for tracking progress on integration of gender in research <p>A CRP plan approved for capacity development in gender analysis</p>	<p>CRP scientists and managers with responsibility for gender in the CRP's outputs are appointed, have written TORS and funds allocated to support their interaction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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&E system has protocol for tracking progress on integration of gender in research <p>A CRP plan approved for capacity development in gender analysis</p> <p>The CRP uses feedback provided by its M&E system to improve its integration of gender into research</p>

Annex 3: CRP Financial Reporting Templates – as per the attached Excel file

1. Report L101 - Annual CRP Financial Summary – by CG Participant
2. Report L102 – Cumulative CRP Financial Summary – CG Participant
3. Report L111 - CRP Annual Finance Plan Summary (by Center, Windows 1 and 2)
4. Report L121 - CRP Expenditure by natural classification- by CG Center
5. Report L131 – CRP Expenditure by Theme
6. Report L201 - CRP Bilateral Grants Summary - by CG Center
7. Report L211 - CRP Partnerships Report- by CG Center
8. Report L401 - CRP Funding Statement – Windows 1 and 2

Report Description L101
 Name of Report CRP Cumulative Financial Summary
 Reporting Line Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
 Frequency/Period Every 6 months

Report L101

Period 01 July 2012 - 31 December 2012 **CRP : Grain legumes**

(a) Cumulative budget per annual financial plans

(b) Actual Expenses - Cumulative

(c) Variance - Cumulative

Centers	(a) Cumulative budget per annual financial plans					(b) Actual Expenses - Cumulative					(c) Variance - Cumulative				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
CIAT	1,540	-	4,976	-	6,516	1,407	-	3,380	-	4,787	133	-	1,596	-	1,729
ICARDA	1,604	369	1,891	-	3,864	1,235	257	739	-	2,231	369	112	1,152	-	1,633
ICRISAT	4,087	6,476	6,719	-	17,282	3,002	4,626	4,799	-	12,427	1,085	1,850	1,920	-	4,855
IITA	2,880	1,504	2,401	-	6,785	1,823	782	2,254	-	4,859	1,057	722	147	-	1,926
GCP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	10,111	8,349	15,987	-	34,447	7,467	5,665	11,172	-	24,304	2,644	2,684	4,815	-	10,143
Percentage	29%	24%	46%	0%	100%	31%	23%	46%	-	100%	26%	26%	47%	0%	100%

Report Description

L106

Report L106

Name of Report
Reporting Line
Frequency/Period

CRP Annual Funding Summary
Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
Every 6 months

Period 1 July 2012 - 31 December 2012

CRP

Grain legumes

PART 1 - Annual FINANCE PLAN (Totals for Windows 1 and 2 combined)

Approved Level for Year - Initial Approval -
Approved Level for Year - Final Amount -

PART 2 - Funding Summary for Year

CRP 2012 Actual Funding

Name of the Donor	Window 1	Window 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Total Funding
AATF			-	(7)	(7)
AFESD			-	24	24
African Wildlife Foundation			-	5	5
Aga Khan Foundation			-	3	3
AGRA			-	31	31
ARC			-	4	4
ASARECA			-	10	10
Australia			41	116	157
AVRDC			-	36	36
BBSRC			-	24	24
Belgium			-	1	1
Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation			4,440	-	4,440
Canada			-	54	54
CARE, Malawi			-	7	7
European Commission			627	283	910
CFC			-	289	289
CGIAR			-	2	2
CHINA			40	-	40
CIAT			-	191	191
CIDA			-	1,690	1,690
CIMMYT			-	152	152
CIP			-	21	21
CORAF/WECARD			-	21	21
FAO			-	53	53
FARA, Ghana			-	57	57
Fiduciaria Bogota			-	18	18
GCP			-	1,038	1,038
Graduate Fellowship training			-	2	2
ICRISAT			-	549	549
IER, Mali			-	2	2
IFAD			-	270	270
IFPRI			-	1	1
IITA			-	90	90
ILRI			-	32	32
India			216	1,677	1,893
IRAN			-	14	14
IRELAND			-	407	407
ISDB			-	10	10
Japan			-	168	168
JIRCAS			-	51	51
Kuwait Fund			-	15	15
McKnight			-	212	212
Netherlands			-	122	122
Nigeria			-	24	24
OFID			-	82	82
OSAKA			-	5	5
PHILLIPPINES			-	95	95
Portugal			-	16	16
PURDUE University			-	87	87
SDC			-	588	588
SWITZERLAND			-	8	8
Tottori University			-	-	-
UF			-	18	18
UNIDO			-	0	0
University of Saskatchewan			-	10	10
USAID			289	1,793	2,082
Wegeningen university			-	702	702
Zambia Aflatoxin Research & Mitigation			12	-	12
Totals for CRP	-	-	5,665	11,172	16,837

Report Description L111

Name of Report CRP Annual Financial Summary
 Reporting Line Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
 Frequency/Period Every 6 months

Report L111

Period 01 July 2012 - 31 December 2012

Centers	(a) CRP2012 Fin plan approved budget					(b) CRP 2012 Expenditure					(c) Variance this Year				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total Funding
CIAT	1,540	-	4,976	-	6,516	1,407	-	3,380	-	4,787	133	-	1,596	-	1,729
ICARDA	1,604	369	1,891	-	3,864	1,235	257	739	-	2,231	369	112	1,152	-	1,633
ICRISAT	4,087	6,476	6,719	-	17,282	3,002	4,626	4,799	-	12,427	1,085	1,850	1,920	-	4,855
IITA	2,880	1,504	2,401	-	6,785	1,823	782	2,254	-	4,859	1,057	722	147	-	1,926
GCP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	10,111	8,349	15,987	-	34,447	7,467	5,665	11,172	-	24,304	2,644	2,684	4,815	-	10,143
Percentage	29%	24%	46%	0%	100%	31%	23%	46%	0%	100%	26%	26%	47%	0%	100%

Report Description L121
Name of Report CRP Financial Report - Expenditure by natural classification (by Center)
Reporting Line Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
Frequency/Period Every 6 months

Report L121

Period 01 July 2012 - 31 December 2012

CIAT	Annual budget					Actual Expenses - This year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 & 2 funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 & 2 funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 & 2 funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
Personnel	660	-	1,742	-	2,402	644	-	633	-	1,277	16	-	1,109	-	1,125
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Collaborator Costs - Others	-	-	1,074	-	1,074	-	-	1,146	-	1,146	-	-	(72)	-	(72)
Supplies and Services	487	-	912	-	1,399	474	-	680	-	1,154	13	-	232	-	245
Operational Travel	31	-	545	-	576	31	-	545	-	576	-	-	-	-	-
Depreciation	127	-	192	-	319	43	-	79	-	122	84	-	113	-	197
Sub-total of Direct Costs	1,305	-	4,465	-	5,770	1,192	-	3,083	-	4,275	113	-	1,382	-	1,495
Indirect Costs	235	-	511	-	746	215	-	297	-	512	20	-	214	-	234
Total - all Costs	1,540	-	4,976	-	6,516	1,407	-	3,380	-	4,787	133	-	1,596	-	1,729

ICARDA	Annual budget					Actual Expenses - This year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 & 2 funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 & 2 funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 & 2 funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
Personnel	760	130	658	-	1,548	655	114	229	-	998	105	16	429	-	550
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Collaborator Costs - Others	100	50	254	-	404	-	27	149	-	176	100	23	105	-	228
Supplies and Services	360	75	408	-	843	350	49	210	-	609	10	26	198	-	234
Operational Travel	85	70	332	-	487	24	29	73	-	126	61	41	259	-	361
Depreciation	32	-	122	-	154	-	-	15	-	15	32	-	107	-	139
Sub-total of Direct Costs	1,337	325	1,774	-	3,436	1,029	219	676	-	1,924	308	106	1,098	-	1,512
Indirect Costs	267	44	117	-	428	206	38	63	-	307	61	6	54	-	121
Total - all Costs	1,604	369	1,891	-	3,864	1,235	257	739	-	2,231	369	112	1,152	-	1,633

ICRISAT	Annual budget					Actual Expenses - This year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 & 2 funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 & 2 funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 & 2 funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
Personnel	1,427	1,021	1,443	-	3,891	839	729	1,031	-	2,599	588	292	412	-	1,292
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	-	2,549	81	-	2,631	-	1,821	58	-	1,879	-	728	23	-	752
Collaborator Costs - Others	152	938	787	-	1,877	152	670	562	-	1,384	-	268	225	-	493
Supplies and Services	1,342	953	2,414	-	4,709	1,183	681	1,724	-	3,588	159	272	690	-	1,121
Operational Travel	373	161	367	-	901	112	115	262	-	489	261	46	105	-	412
Depreciation	216	448	752	-	1,416	199	320	537	-	1,056	17	128	215	-	360
Sub-total of Direct Costs	3,510	6,070	5,844	-	15,424	2,485	4,336	4,174	-	10,995	1,025	1,734	1,670	-	4,429
Indirect Costs	577	406	875	-	1,858	517	290	625	-	1,432	60	116	250	-	426
Total - all Costs	4,087	6,476	6,719	-	17,282	3,002	4,626	4,799	-	12,427	1,085	1,850	1,920	-	4,855

Report Description L121

Name of Report CRP Financial Report - Expenditure by natural classification (by Center)
 Reporting Line Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
 Frequency/Period Every 6 months

Report L121

Period 01 July 2012 - 31 December 2012

IITA	Annual budget					Actual Expenses - This year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 & 2 funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 & 2 funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 & 2 funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
Personnel	879	406	603	-	1,888	454	217	573	-	1,244	425	189	30	-	644
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	177	-	81	-	258	-	-	40	-	40	177	-	41	-	218
Collaborator Costs - Others	289	184	385	-	858	-	96	348	-	444	289	88	37	-	414
Supplies and Services	772	526	728	-	2,026	1,010	225	680	-	1,915	(238)	301	48	-	111
Operational Travel	234	119	227	-	580	77	90	192	-	359	157	29	35	-	221
Depreciation	100	123	85	-	308	10	60	94	-	164	90	63	(9)	-	144
Sub-total of Direct Costs	2,451	1,358	2,109	-	5,918	1,551	688	1,927	-	4,166	900	670	182	-	1,752
Indirect Costs	429	146	292	-	867	272	94	327	-	693	157	52	(35)	-	174
Total - all Costs	2,880	1,504	2,401	-	6,785	1,823	782	2,254	-	4,859	1,057	722	147	-	1,926

GCP	Annual budget					Actual Expenses - This year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 & 2 funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 & 2 funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 & 2 funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
Personnel	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Collaborator Costs - Others	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies and Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Operational Travel	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Depreciation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sub-total of Direct Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Indirect Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total - all Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Totals for CRP	Annual budget					Actual Expenses - This year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 & 2 funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 & 2 funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 & 2 funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
Personnel	3,726	1,557	4,446	-	9,729	2,592	1,060	2,465	-	6,117	1,134	497	1,980	-	3,611
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	177	2,549	162	-	2,889	-	1,821	98	-	1,919	177	728	64	-	970
Collaborator Costs - Others	541	1,172	2,500	-	4,213	152	793	2,205	-	3,150	389	379	295	-	1,063
Supplies and Services	2,961	1,554	4,462	-	8,977	3,018	955	3,294	-	7,267	(56)	599	1,168	-	1,711
Operational Travel	723	350	1,471	-	2,544	244	234	1,072	-	1,550	479	116	399	-	994
Depreciation	475	571	1,151	-	2,197	252	380	725	-	1,357	223	191	426	-	840
Sub-total of Direct Costs	8,603	7,753	14,192	-	30,548	6,258	5,243	9,859	-	21,360	2,346	2,510	4,332	-	9,188
Indirect Costs	1,508	596	1,795	-	3,899	1,209	422	1,313	-	2,944	298	174	483	-	955
Total - all Costs	10,111	8,349	15,987	-	34,447	7,467	5,665	11,172	-	24,304	2,644	2,684	4,815	-	10,143

Report Description	L131
Name of Report	CRP Themes Report (by Center, and Funding Source)
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months

CIAT	Annual Budget					Actual Expenses - This year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding
	PL 1 Drought and low-phosphorus tolerant common bean, cowpea and soybean	863	-	3,323	-	4,186	788	-	2,457	-	3,245	75	-	866	-
PL2 Heat tolerant chickpea, common bean, faba bean and lentil	169	-	271	-	440	155	-	184	-	339	14	-	87	-	101
PL 3 Short-duration, drought tolerant and aflatoxin-free groundnut	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL 4 High nitrogen-fixing chickpea, common bean, faba bean and soybean	508	-	1,382	-	1,890	464	-	739	-	1,203	44	-	643	-	687
PL 5 Insect-smart chickpea, cowpea and pigeonpea production systems	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL 6 Extra-early chickpea and lentil varieties	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL 7 Herbicide tolerant, machine-harvestable chickpea, faba bean, lentil varieties	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL 8 Hybrid pigeonpea	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender Strategies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total – all Costs	1,540	-	4,976	-	6,516	1,407	-	3,380	-	4,787	133	-	1,596	-	1,729

ICARDA	Annual Budget					(a) Actual Expenses - This year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding
PL 1 Socio-economics studies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL2 Germplasm evaluation and pre-breeding	415	86	415	-	916	320	51	136	-	507	95	35	279	-	409
PL 3 Developing heat & drought tolerant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL 4 Developing high nitrogen fixing	188	75	118	-	381	115	51	11	-	177	73	24	107	-	204
PL 5 Insect-smart chickpea, cowpea and pigeonpea production systems	126	65	65	-	256	67	50	-	-	117	59	15	65	-	139
PL 6 Extra-early chickpea and lentil varieties	463	65	716	-	1,244	381	54	465	-	900	82	11	251	-	344
PL 7 Herbicide tolerant, machine-harvestable chickpea, faba bean, lentil varieties	412	78	577	-	1,067	352	51	127	-	530	60	27	450	-	537
PL 8 Grain Legume seed system	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL 9 Hybrid pigeonpea	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender Strategies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total – all Costs	1,604	369	1,891	-	3,864	1,235	257	739	-	2,231	369	112	1,152	-	1,633

Report Description	L131
Name of Report	CRP Themes Report (by Center, and Funding Source)
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months

Period 01 July 2012 - 31 December 2012

ICRISAT	Annual Budget					(a) Actual Expenses - This year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding
PL 1 Drought and low-phosphorus tolerant common bean, cowpea and soybean	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL2 Heat tolerant chickpea, common bean, faba bean and lentil	335	648	672	-	1,655	299	463	480	-	1,242	36	185	192	-	413
PL 3 Short-duration, drought tolerant and aflatoxin-free groundnut	1,173	2,267	2,352	-	5,791	1,049	1,619	1,680	-	4,348	124	648	672	-	1,443
PL 4 High nitrogen-fixing chickpea, common bean, faba bean and soybean	101	194	202	-	497	88	139	144	-	371	13	55	58	-	126
PL 5 Insect-smart chickpea, cowpea and pigeonpea production systems	402	777	806	-	1,985	359	555	576	-	1,490	43	222	230	-	495
PL 6 Extra-early chickpea and lentil varieties	335	648	672	-	1,655	299	463	480	-	1,242	36	185	192	-	413
PL 7 Herbicide tolerant, machine-harvestable chickpea, faba bean, lentil varieties	335	648	672	-	1,655	299	463	480	-	1,242	36	185	192	-	413
PL 8 Hybrid pigeonpea	568	1,101	1,142	-	2,811	509	786	816	-	2,111	59	315	326	-	700
CRP Management/Coordination	737	-	-	-	737	10	-	-	-	10	727	-	-	-	727
Gender Strategies	101	194	202	-	497	90	138	143	-	371	11	56	59	-	126
Total – all Costs	4,087	6,476	6,719	-	17,282	3,002	4,626	4,799	-	12,427	1,085	1,850	1,920	-	4,855

IITA	Annual Budget					(a) Actual Expenses - This year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding
PL 1 Drought and low-phosphorus tolerant common bean, cowpea and soybean	1,263	994	698	-	2,955	726	516	677	-	1,919	537	478	21	-	1,036
PL2 Heat tolerant chickpea, common bean, faba bean and lentil	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL 3 Short-duration, drought tolerant and aflatoxin-free groundnut	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL 4 High nitrogen-fixing chickpea, common bean, faba bean and soybean	851	312	1,090	-	2,253	527	148	1,099	-	1,774	324	164	(9)	-	479
PL 5 Insect-smart chickpea, cowpea and pigeonpea production systems	586	158	493	-	1,237	398	86	361	-	845	188	72	132	-	392
PL 6 Extra-early chickpea and lentil varieties	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL 7 Herbicide tolerant, machine-harvestable chickpea, faba bean, lentil varieties	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL 8 Hybrid pigeonpea	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender Strategies	180	40	120	-	340	172	32	117	-	321	8	8	3	-	19
Total – all Costs	2,880	1,504	2,401	-	6,785	1,823	782	2,254	-	4,859	1,057	722	147	-	1,926

Report Description	L131
Name of Report	CRP Themes Report (by Center, and Funding Source)
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months

Period 01 July 2012 - 31 December 2012

GCP	Annual Budget					(a) Actual Expenses - This year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding
PL 1 Drought and low-phosphorus tolerant common bean, cowpea and soybean	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL2 Heat tolerant chickpea, common bean, faba bean and lentil	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL 3 Short-duration, drought tolerant and aflatoxin-free groundnut	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL 4 High nitrogen-fixing chickpea, common bean, faba bean and soybean	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL 5 Insect-smart chickpea, cowpea and pigeonpea production systems	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL 6 Extra-early chickpea and lentil varieties	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL 7 Herbicide tolerant, machine-harvestable chickpea, faba bean, lentil varieties	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PL 8 Hybrid pigeonpea	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender Strategies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total – all Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Summary Report - by Theme	Annual Budget					(a) Actual Expenses - This year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding
PL 1 Drought and low-phosphorus tolerant common bean, cowpea and soybean	2,126	994	4,021	-	7,141	1,514	516	3,134	-	5,164	612	478	887	-	1,977
PL2 Heat tolerant chickpea, common bean, faba bean and lentil	919	734	1,358	-	3,011	774	514	800	-	2,088	145	220	558	-	923
PL 3 Short-duration, drought tolerant and aflatoxin-free groundnut	1,173	2,267	2,352	-	5,791	1,049	1,619	1,680	-	4,348	124	648	672	-	1,443
PL 4 High nitrogen-fixing chickpea, common bean, faba bean and soybean	1,648	581	2,792	-	5,021	1,194	338	1,993	-	3,525	454	243	799	-	1,496
PL 5 Insect-smart chickpea, cowpea and pigeonpea production systems	1,114	1,000	1,364	-	3,478	824	691	937	-	2,452	290	309	427	-	1,026
PL 6 Extra-early chickpea and lentil varieties	798	713	1,388	-	2,899	680	517	945	-	2,142	118	196	443	-	757
PL 7 Herbicide tolerant, machine-harvestable chickpea, faba bean, lentil varieties	747	726	1,249	-	2,722	651	514	607	-	1,772	96	212	642	-	950
PL 8 Hybrid pigeonpea	568	1,101	1,142	-	2,811	509	786	816	-	2,111	59	315	326	-	700
CRP Management/Coordination	737	-	-	-	737	10	-	-	-	10	727	-	-	-	727
Gender Strategies	281	234	322	-	837	262	170	260	-	692	19	64	62	-	145
Total – all Costs	10,111	8,349	15,987	-	34,447	7,467	5,665	11,172	-	24,304	2,644	2,684	4,815	-	10,143

Report Description	L201	Report L201
Name of Report	CRP Financial Report - Bilateral Grants (by Center)	
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office	
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months	

CRP Nr Grain legumes

Period 01 July 2012 - 31 December 2012

Total All CRP		Expenditure		
		Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	Window 3			
	Australia	41	41	-
	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation	5,973	4,440	1,533
	CHINA	55	40	15
	European Commission	880	627	253
	India	328	216	112
	USAID	908	289	619
	Zambia Aflatoxin Research & Mitigation	164	12	152
	Sub total	8,349	5,665	2,684
	Bilateral			
	AATF	11	(7)	18
	AFESD	84	24	60
	African Wildlife Foundation	10	5	5
	Aga Khan Foundation	4	3	1
	AGRA	43	31	12
	ARC	23	4	19
	ASARECA	14	10	4
	Australia	401	116	285
	AVRDC	36	36	-
	BBSRC	75	24	51
	Belgium	-	1	(1)
	Canada	60	54	6
	CARE, Malawi	10	7	3
	European Commission	799	283	516
	CFC	301	289	12
	CGIAR	12	2	10
	CIAT	245	191	55
	CIDA	1,874	1,690	184
	CIMMYT	213	152	61
	CIP	20	21	(1)
	CORAF/WE CARD	25	21	4
	FAO	74	53	21
	FARA, Ghana	80	57	23
	Fiduciaria Bogota	67	18	49
	GCP	1,573	1,038	535
	Graduate Fellowship training	4	2	2
	ICRISAT	922	549	373
	IER, Mali	3	2	1
	IFAD	389	270	119
	IFPRI	8	1	7
	IITA	91	90	1
	ILRI	45	32	13
	India	2,348	1,677	671
	IRAN	107	14	93
	IRELAND	570	407	163
	ISDB	8	10	(2)
	Japan	180	168	12
	JIRCAS	58	51	7
	Kuwait Fund	63	15	48
	McKnight	368	212	156
	Netherlands	216	122	94
	Nigeria	39	24	15
	OFID	119	82	37
	OSAKA	9	5	4
	PHILLIPPINES	133	95	38
	Portugal	38	16	22
	PURDUE University	92	87	5
	SDC	937	588	349
	SWITZERLAND	11	8	3
	Tottori University	16	-	16
	UF	53	18	35
	UNIDO	-	0	(0)
	University of Saskatchewan	34	10	24
	USAID	2,328	1,793	535
	Wegeningen university	744	702	42
	Sub total	15,987	11,172	4,814
	Totals for CRP	24,336	16,837	7,498

CIAT		Expenditure		
		Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	Window 3			
	Donor 1	-	-	-
	Donor 2	-	-	-
	Sub total	-	-	-
	Bilateral			
	McKnight	235	117	118
	GCP	401	201	200
	Fiduciaria Bogota	67	18	49
	UF	53	18	35
	IRAN	107	14	93
	IITA	91	90	1
	BBSRC	75	24	51
	CIDA	1,874	1,690	184
	SDC	937	588	349
	CIP	20	21	(1)
	ICRISAT	893	520	373
	USAID	223	79	144
	Sub total	4,976	3,380	1,596
	Totals for CRP	4,976	3,380	1,596

Report Description	L201	Report L201
Name of Report	CRP Financial Report - Bilateral Grants (by Center)	
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office	
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months	

CRP Nr Grain legumes

Period **01 July 2012 - 31 December 2012**

ICARDA		Expenditure		
		Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	Window 3			
	India	328	216	112
	Australia	41	41	-
	Sub total	369	257	112
	Bilateral			
	AFESD	84	24	60
	Australia	401	116	285
	CGIAR	12	2	10
	ARC	23	4	19
	European Commission	687	203	484
	CIAT	239	190	49
	IFAD	103	66	37
	IFPRI	8	1	7
	ISDB	8	10	(2)
	Kuwait Fund	63	15	48
	OFID	119	82	37
	Portugal	38	16	22
	Netherlands	56	-	56
	University of Saskatchewan	34	10	24
	Tottori University	16	-	16
	Sub total	1,891	739	1,152
	Totals for CRP	2,260	996	1,264

ICRISAT		Expenditure		
		Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	Window 3			
	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation	5,367	3,834	1,533
	CHINA	55	40	15
	European Commission	880	627	253
	USAID	174	125	49
	Sub total	6,476	4,626	1,850
	Bilateral			
	Aga Khan Foundation	4	3	1
	AGRA	43	31	12
	ASARECA	14	10	4
	CANADA	11	8	3
	CARE, Malawi	10	7	3
	CIMMYT	175	125	50
	European Commission	112	80	32
	FAO	74	53	21
	FARA, Ghana	80	57	23
	GCP	1,172	837	335
	IER, Mali	3	2	1
	IFAD	286	204	82
	India	2,348	1,677	671
	IRELAND	570	407	163
	McKnight	133	95	38
	NETHERLANDS	99	71	28
	PHILIPPINES	133	95	38
	SWITZERLAND	11	8	3
	USAID	1,441	1,029	412
	Sub total	6,719	4,799	1,920
	Totals for CRP	13,195	9,425	3,770

IITA		Expenditure		
		Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	Window 3			
	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation	606	606	-
	Zambia Aflatoxin Research & Mitigation	164	12	152
	USAID	734	164	570
	Sub total	1,504	782	722
	Bilateral			
	AATF	11	(7)	18
	Belgium	-	1	(1)
	Canada	49	46	3
	CFC	301	289	12
	Japan	180	168	12
	Netherlands	61	51	10
	Nigeria	39	24	15
	USAID	664	685	(21)
	PURDUE University	92	87	5
	Wegeningen university	744	702	42
	OSAKA	9	5	4
	AVRDC	36	36	-
	ILRI	45	32	13
	JIRCAS	58	51	7
	UNIDO	-	0	(0)
	CORAF/WE CARD	25	21	4
	African Wildlife Foundation	10	5	5
	CIAT	6	1	6
	CIMMYT	38	27	11
	ICRISAT	29	29	-
	Graduate Fellowship training	4	2	2
	Sub total	2,401	2,254	147
	Totals for CRP	3,905	3,036	869

Report Description	L201	Report L201
Name of Report	CRP Financial Report - Bilateral Grants (by Center)	
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office	
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months	

CRP Nr Grain legumes

Period **01 July 2012 - 31 December 2012**

GCP		Expenditure		
		Annual Budget	Actual Expenses this Year	Variance
	Window 3			
	Donor 1	-	-	-
	Sub total	-	-	-
	Bilateral			
	Donor 1	-	-	-
	Sub total	-	-	-
	Totals for CRP	-	-	-

Report Description **L211**
 Name of Report: CRP Grain Legumes : Partnerships Report
 Reporting Line: Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
 Frequency/Period: Every 6 months

Report L211

Period **01 July 2012 - 31 December 2012**

		Annual Budget						Actual Expenses - This Year					Unspent Budget				
Center	Institute	Country	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
CIAT	Selian Agricultural Research Institute - SARI	Tanzania, United Republic Of	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	(1)	-	(1)
	Agricultural Research Institute - ARI UYOLE	Tanzania, United Republic Of	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	8	-	-	(8)	-	(8)
	Southern Agricultural Research Institute - SARI	Ethiopia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	4	-	-	(4)	-	(4)
	Kenya Agricultural Research Institute - KARI	Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	(6)	-	(6)
	Farm Concern International - FCI	Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	(5)	-	(5)
	Kenya Agricultural Research Institute - KARI	Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	7	-	-	(7)	-	(7)
	Southern Agricultural Research Institute - SARI	Ethiopia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	20	-	-	(20)	-	(20)
	DR&SS - The Department of Research and Specialist Services in the Ministry of Agriculture, Mechanisation and Irrigation Development	Zimbabwe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	UFCS - Uriri Farmers Cooperative Society	Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	4	-	-	(4)	-	(4)
	Appropriate Rural Development Agriculture Programme - ARDAP	Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	(1)	-	(1)
	Butere District Federaaion of Soybean Farmers Groups - BUFESOFAG	Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	20	-	-	(20)	-	(20)
	ISABU Burundi: Ecabren	Burundi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	(1)	-	(1)
	PNL-INERA Mulungu DRC: Ecabren	Mulungu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	12	-	-	(12)	-	(12)
	Fofifa Madagascar: Ecabren	Madagascar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	(5)	-	(5)
	EIAR Melkasa: Ecabren	Melkasa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	(6)	-	(6)
	RAB Rwanda: Ecabren	Rwanda	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	-	14	-	-	(14)	-	(14)
	NFNC Zambia: Sabrn ; Nutrition Activities	Zambia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	(5)	-	(5)
	ARI-Uyole Tanzania: Sabrn	Tanzania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	7	-	-	(7)	-	(7)
	Malawi: Sabrn	Malawi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23	-	23	-	-	(23)	-	(23)
	IIAM Mozambique Sabrn	Mozambique	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	15	-	-	(15)	-	(15)
	SARI Tanzania - Ecabren Nutrition	Tanzania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22	-	22	-	-	(22)	-	(22)
	Swaziland: Sabrn	Swaziland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	12	-	-	(12)	-	(12)
	ARC South Africa - Sabrn	South Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	8	-	-	(8)	-	(8)
	Zambia: Sabrn	Zambia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24	-	24	-	-	(24)	-	(24)
	Zimbabwe: Sabrn	Zimbabwe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	-	31	-	-	(31)	-	(31)
	Angola: Sabrn	Angola	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	-	31	-	-	(31)	-	(31)
	Burkina Faso: Wecabren	Burkina	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	10	-	-	(10)	-	(10)
	INERA Burkina Faso: Wecabren	Burkina	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21	-	21	-	-	(21)	-	(21)
	ISABU-Burundi: Ecabren	Burundi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	(5)	-	(5)
	Bambui Cameroon	Cameroon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25	-	25	-	-	(25)	-	(25)
	Ekona Cameroon	Cameroon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	12	-	-	(12)	-	(12)
	Foumbot Cameroon	Cameroon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28	-	28	-	-	(28)	-	(28)
	IRAD Cameroon Wecabren	Cameroon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	20	-	-	(20)	-	(20)
	Nkolbisson Cameroon	Cameroon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	9	-	-	(9)	-	(9)
	ICRA Central Africa Republic - Wecabren	Central Africa Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	-	26	-	-	(26)	-	(26)
	Central African Republic - Wecabren	Central African Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	(5)	-	(5)
	Congo Brazaville - Wecabren	Congo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30	-	30	-	-	(30)	-	(30)
	INERA Kipopo: Lubumbashi - Sabrn	Congo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	-	31	-	-	(31)	-	(31)
	INERA-Kipopo DR Congo - Sabrn	Congo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28	-	28	-	-	(28)	-	(28)
	CRI Ghana: Wecabren	Ghana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	-	14	-	-	(14)	-	(14)
	IRAG Guinea Conakry - Wecabren	Guinea	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	-	26	-	-	(26)	-	(26)
	KARI Kakamega - Ecabren	Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38	-	38	-	-	(38)	-	(38)
	KARI-Katamani - Nutrition Activities	Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	(6)	-	(6)
	Lesotho - Sabrn	Lesotho	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	-	16	-	-	(16)	-	(16)
	FOFIFA Madagascar - Ecabren	Madagascar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	20	-	-	(20)	-	(20)
	Malawi: Sabrn	Malawi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	10	-	-	(10)	-	(10)
	Mali - Wecabren	Mali	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23	-	23	-	-	(23)	-	(23)
	IFR/CRRA Mali - Wecabren	Mali	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	-	26	-	-	(26)	-	(26)
	Mozambique: Sabrn	Mozambique	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	(5)	-	(5)
	RAB Rwanda - Ecabren	Rwanda	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33	-	33	-	-	(33)	-	(33)
	Senegal: Wecabren	Senegal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21	-	21	-	-	(21)	-	(21)
	South Africa	South Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41	-	41	-	-	(41)	-	(41)
	Swaziland	Swaziland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36	-	36	-	-	(36)	-	(36)
	ARI-Uyole Mbeya	Tanzania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	12	-	-	(12)	-	(12)
	SARI Tanzania - Ecabren	Tanzania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	20	-	-	(20)	-	(20)
			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	-	18	-	-	(18)	-	(18)

Report Description L211
 Name of Report: CRP Grain legumes : Partnerships Report
 Reporting Line: Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
 Frequency/Period: Every 6 months

Report L211

Period	01 July 2012 - 31 December 2012						Annual Budget				Actual Expenses - This Year				Unspent Budget			
	Southern Tanzania - Sabrn	Tanzania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	11	-	-	(11)	-	(11)		
	Tanzania - Sabrn	Tanzania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	17	-	-	(17)	-	(17)		
	ITRA Togo - Wecabren	Togo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36	36	-	-	(36)	-	(36)		
	Mulungu DRC - Ecabren	Uganda	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	17	-	-	(17)	-	(17)		
	NACCRI-Uganda - Ecabren	Uganda	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27	27	-	-	(27)	-	(27)		
	Zambia: Sabrn	Zambia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	59	59	-	-	(59)	-	(59)		
	Zimbabwe: Sabrn	Zimbabwe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	66	66	-	-	(66)	-	(66)		
	KARI Embu: Ecabren	Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	6	-	-	(6)	-	(6)		
	KARI Kisii: Ecabren	Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	6	-	-	(6)	-	(6)		
		Sub-total for center	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,146	1,146	-	-	(1,146)	-	(1,146)		
ICARDA																		
	Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute	Bangladesh	-	-	70	-	70	-	-	70	70	-	-	-	-	-		
	Nepal Agricultural Research Council	Nepal	-	-	74	-	74	-	-	39	39	-	-	35	-	35		
	ICAR	India	-	10	15	-	25	-	10	25	35	-	-	(10)	-	(10)		
	IARI	India	-	20	15	-	35	-	17	15	32	-	3	-	-	3		
	INRA Morocco	Morocco	-	20	80	-	100	-	-	-	-	-	20	80	-	100		
		Sub-total for center	-	50	254	-	304	-	27	149	176	-	23	105	-	128		
ICRISAT																		
	BARC, Bangladesh	Bangladesh	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	4	4	-	-	2	-	2		
	DGR, Junagadh	India	-	-	13	-	13	-	-	9	9	-	-	4	-	4		
	TNAU, Coimbatore	India	-	-	48	-	48	-	-	34	34	-	-	14	-	14		
	JAU, Junagadh	India	-	-	7	-	7	-	-	5	5	-	-	2	-	2		
	ANGRAU, Hyderabad	India	-	-	7	-	7	-	-	5	5	-	-	2	-	2		
	CIAT	Tanzania	-	-	48	-	48	-	-	34	34	-	-	14	-	14		
	CIMMYT	Tanzania	-	-	35	-	35	-	-	25	25	-	-	10	-	10		
	DRD, Tanzania	Tanzania	-	-	13	-	13	-	-	9	9	-	-	4	-	4		
	DARS, Malawi	Malawi	-	-	8	-	8	-	-	6	6	-	-	2	-	2		
	Zari, Zambia	Zambia	-	-	8	-	8	-	-	6	6	-	-	2	-	2		
	BGI	China	122	-	-	-	122	-	122	-	122	-	-	-	-	-		
	KARI	India	30	-	-	-	30	-	30	-	30	-	-	-	-	-		
	Sahabhagi Vikash Abhiyan	India	-	-	10	-	10	-	-	7	7	-	-	3	-	3		
	LOKSEBAK	India	-	-	9	-	9	-	-	6	6	-	-	2	-	2		
	Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK)	India	-	-	7	-	7	-	-	5	5	-	-	2	-	2		
	People Forum	India	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	0	-	0		
	Vietnam Academy of Agricultural Service (VAAS)	Vietnam	-	-	34	-	34	-	-	24	24	-	-	10	-	10		
	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF)	India	-	-	34	-	34	-	-	24	24	-	-	10	-	10		
	National Agricultural Research Council (NARC)	Nepal	-	-	34	-	34	-	-	24	24	-	-	10	-	10		
	Jharkhand Tribal Development Society (JTDS)	India	-	-	25	-	25	-	-	18	18	-	-	7	-	7		
	Mitigating Poverty in Western Rajasthan (MPOWER)	India	-	-	21	-	21	-	-	15	15	-	-	6	-	6		
	Rajmata Vijayaraje Scindia Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya (RKSKV)	India	-	-	21	-	21	-	-	15	15	-	-	6	-	6		
	The Bureau of Agricultural Research (BAR)	Philippines	-	-	15	-	15	-	-	11	11	-	-	4	-	4		
	Nalendiele Research Station (NRS)	Tanzania	-	-	54	-	54	-	-	38	38	-	-	15	-	15		
	ISRA	Senegal	-	-	45	-	45	-	-	32	32	-	-	13	-	13		
	EIAR	Ethiopia	-	-	82	-	82	-	-	58	58	-	-	23	-	23		
	North Carolina State University	North Carolina	-	-	25	-	25	-	-	18	18	-	-	7	-	7		
	ISRA	Senegal	-	-	23	-	23	-	-	16	16	-	-	6	-	6		
	JNKVV, JABALPUR	India	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	2	2	-	-	1	-	1		
	BHU, VARANASI	India	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	2	2	-	-	1	-	1		
	IARI, NEW DELHI	India	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	2	2	-	-	1	-	1		
	PAU, LUDHIANA	India	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	2	2	-	-	1	-	1		
	HAU, HISSAR	India	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	2	2	-	-	1	-	1		
	Tuskegee University	Malawi	-	-	75	-	75	-	-	54	54	-	-	21	-	21		
	NARI	Tanzania	-	80	-	-	80	-	57	-	57	-	23	-	-	23		
	LZARDI	Tanzania	-	80	-	-	80	-	57	-	57	-	23	-	-	23		
	NaSSARI	Tanzania	-	80	-	-	80	-	57	-	57	-	23	-	-	23		
	NEGETTA	Tanzania	-	-	80	-	80	-	-	57	57	-	-	23	-	23		
	Acharya N.G.Ranga Agricultural University (ANGRAU)	India	-	28	-	-	28	-	20	-	20	-	8	-	-	8		
	University of Agricultural Sciences UAS (Dharwad))	India	-	22	-	-	22	-	16	-	16	-	6	-	-	6		
	University of Agricultural Sciences UAS (Raichur)	India	-	14	-	-	14	-	10	-	10	-	4	-	-	4		
	University of Agricultural Sciences UAS (Bangalore)	India	-	7	-	-	7	-	5	-	5	-	2	-	-	2		

Report Description **L211**
 Name of Report: CRP Grain legumes : Partnerships Report
 Reporting Line: Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
 Frequency/Period: Every 6 months

Report L211

Period	01 July 2012 - 31 December 2012	Annual Budget						Actual Expenses - This Year				Unspent Budget				
Tamil Nadu Agricultural University (TNAU)	India	-	36	-	-	36	25	-	-	25	-	10	-	-	10	
Orissa	India	-	38	-	-	38	27	-	-	27	-	11	-	-	11	
BAU - Bihar	India	-	32	-	-	32	23	-	-	23	-	9	-	-	9	
Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute (BARI)	Bangladesh	-	35	-	-	35	25	-	-	25	-	10	-	-	10	
International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)	Nigeria	-	1,447	-	-	1,447	1,033	-	-	1,033	-	413	-	-	413	
Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT)	Colombia	-	1,103	-	-	1,103	788	-	-	788	-	315	-	-	315	
EIAR - Ethiopia	Ethiopia	-	50	-	-	50	36	-	-	36	-	14	-	-	14	
Egerton University - Kenya	Kenya	-	36	-	-	36	26	-	-	26	-	10	-	-	10	
IIAM - Mozambique	Mozambique	-	16	-	-	16	12	-	-	12	-	5	-	-	5	
SARI	Tanzania	-	31	-	-	31	22	-	-	22	-	9	-	-	9	
IARI	Tanzania	-	11	-	-	11	8	-	-	8	-	3	-	-	3	
NARI	Tanzania	-	37	-	-	37	27	-	-	27	-	11	-	-	11	
LZARDI-UKIRIGURU	Tanzania	-	46	-	-	46	33	-	-	33	-	13	-	-	13	
Uganda (NaSARRI of NARO)	Uganda	-	38	-	-	38	27	-	-	27	-	11	-	-	11	
Uganda (Ngetta ZARDI)	Uganda	-	76	-	-	76	54	-	-	54	-	22	-	-	22	
WCA - Burkina Faso		-	16	-	-	16	12	-	-	12	-	5	-	-	5	
WCA - EUCORD, Mali	Mali	-	6	-	-	6	4	-	-	4	-	2	-	-	2	
WCA - IER	Mali	-	10	-	-	10	7	-	-	7	-	3	-	-	3	
AOPP Mali	Mali	-	6	-	-	6	4	-	-	4	-	2	-	-	2	
WAKROFO Mali	Mali	-	2	-	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	
PLAN MALI - FO Mali	Mali	-	2	-	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	
SAHEL 21 - FO Mali	Mali	-	2	-	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	
WCA - FASOKABA, Mali:	Mali	-	5	-	-	5	4	-	-	4	-	1	-	-	1	
WCA - IAR Nigeria:	Nigeria	-	10	-	-	10	7	-	-	7	-	3	-	-	3	
WCA - INRAN	Nigeria	-	19	-	-	19	13	-	-	13	-	5	-	-	5	
WADACHE de HANKOURA, Niger	Niger	-	3	-	-	3	2	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	1	
ARUNA DA DUNIA, Niger	Niger	-	3	-	-	3	2	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	1	
GANI YAKORI JI-FO, Niger	Niger	-	3	-	-	3	2	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	1	
WCA - JARDA, Nigeria	Nigeria	-	6	-	-	6	4	-	-	4	-	2	-	-	2	
WCA - GSRDI, Nigeria	Nigeria	-	5	-	-	5	4	-	-	4	-	1	-	-	1	
WCA -KTARDA:	Nigeria	-	11	-	-	11	8	-	-	8	-	3	-	-	3	
WCA -KNARDA:	Nigeria	-	11	-	-	11	8	-	-	8	-	3	-	-	3	
Ghana -SARI	Nigeria	-	20	-	-	20	14	-	-	14	-	6	-	-	6	
Senegal - ISRA	Nigeria	-	8	-	-	8	6	-	-	6	-	2	-	-	2	
PANJAB University	Chandigarh	-	-	6	-	6	4	-	-	4	-	-	2	-	2	
SOKINE UNIVERSITY	Tanzania	-	-	2	-	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	
DRD	Tanzania	-	-	32	-	32	23	-	-	23	-	-	9	-	9	
NASFAM	Malawi	-	-	7	-	7	5	-	-	5	-	-	2	-	2	
ARS-AnanthapuR	India	-	-	2	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	
AF-Ananthapur	India	-	-	2	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	
ARS Nandyal	India	-	-	2	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	0	
ARS Tandur	India	-	-	2	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	0	
JTDS-Ranchi	India	-	-	3	-	3	2	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	
UAS-Dharwad	India	-	-	2	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	0	
ARS-Gulbarga	India	-	-	2	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	
OTELP-Bhubhan	India	-	-	2	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	
JNKVV-Jabal	India	-	-	2	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	0	
RVSKVV-Gwalior	India	-	-	2	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	0	
TNAU-Coimbat	India	-	-	2	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	0	
ARS-Tindivanam	India	-	-	2	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	0	
BAU-Ranchi	India	-	-	3	-	3	2	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	
	Sub-total for center		152	3,487	868	-	4,507	152	2,491	620	3,263	-	996	248	-	1,244
IITA	Borno State Agric Development Project (BOSADP)	Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	4	-	(4)	-	(4)	
	College of Agriculture & Natural Resource	Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	129	-	129	-	-	(129)	-	(129)	
	Association of Church Development Project (ACDEP)	Ghana	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	12	-	-	(12)	-	(12)	
	Centro Internacional De Agricultura Tropical (CIAT)	Colombia	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	20	-	-	(20)	-	(20)	
	ICRISAT	Colombia	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	20	-	-	(20)	-	(20)	
	Compte Resources (INRAN)	Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	(2)	-	(2)	
	Dedza DADO	Malawi	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	(1)	-	(1)	
	DAES Salima	Malawi	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	(1)	-	(1)	
	DAO Lilongwe	Malawi	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	(1)	-	(1)	

Report Description

L211

Name of Report: CRP Grain Legumes : Partnerships Report
 Reporting Line: Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
 Frequency/Period: Every 6 months

Report L211

Period	Annual Budget							Actual Expenses - This Year					Unspent Budget				
01 July 2012 - 31 December 2012																	
DARS	Malawi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	-	14	-	-	(14)	-	(14)
Agricultural Development (DFID)	Malawi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	9	-	(9)	-	-	(9)
Urban Agricultural Network	Ghana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	(3)	-	(3)
Institute of Agricultural Research (IAR)	Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22	-	22	-	-	(22)	-	(22)
IKURU SARL	Mozambique	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	(1)	-	(1)
INERA Station De Saria	Saria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	26	-	29	-	(3)	(26)	-	(29)
Kaduna State Agricultural Development Project (KADP)	Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	8	-	-	(8)	-	(8)
University of Agriculture, Makurdi	Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	9	-	(9)	-	-	(9)
National Cereals Research Institute (NCRI)	Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	5	-	(5)	-	-	(5)
SARI Pronaf	Ghana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	4	-	(4)	-	-	(4)
Sasakawa Global 2000	Congo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	-	17	-	-	(17)	-	(17)
Soil Research Institute (SRI)	Ghana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	15	-	-	(15)	-	(15)
IER	Mali	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	8	-	(8)	-	-	(8)
Savana Agricultural Research Institute (SARI)	Ghana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25	-	25	-	-	(25)	-	(25)
Bayero University, Kano	Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	(6)	-	(6)
Kano Agriculture Research Dev. Agency (KNARDA)	Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	5	-	(5)	-	-	(5)
Zona Cordinator	Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	7	-	(7)	-	-	(7)
Universiteit Gent	Belgium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22	-	-	22	-	(22)	-	-	(22)
Dev Alternative Inc	Zambia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	-	20	-	(20)	-	-	(20)
World Vision	Malawi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	(5)	-	(5)
UNP of Evangelica Presbyterian Dev. Relief Agency Church	Ghana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	4	-	-	(4)	-	(4)
Reagent of the University of California	USA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	4	-	-	(4)	-	(4)
Federal Reserve Bank of Newyork	USA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	12	-	-	(12)	-	(12)
Universiteit Laval	Canada	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36	-	36	-	-	(36)	-	(36)
Federal University of Technology, Minna	Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	(5)	-	(5)
	Sub-total for center	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	96	388	-	484	-	(96)	(388)	-	(484)
GCP		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
P1		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
P2		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Sub-total for center	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Summary Report - by CG Center		Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
Summary	CIAT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,146	-	1,146	-	-	(1,146)	-	(1,146)
	ICARDA	-	50	254	-	304	-	27	149	-	176	-	23	105	-	128
	ICRISAT	152	3,487	868	-	4,507	152	2,491	620	-	3,263	-	996	248	-	1,244
	IITA	-	-	-	-	-	-	96	388	-	484	-	(96)	(388)	-	(484)
	GCP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total - all centers	152	3,537	1,122	-	4,811	152	2,614	2,303	-	5,069	-	923	(1,181)	-	(258)

Report Description

Name of Report	CRP Funding Statement, Windows 1 and 2
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
Frequency/Period	Every 3 months

PART 1 - REPORT OF LEAD CENTER

Opening Balance - 1 July 2012		-
W1 Receipts from Consortium Office (actual dates)	-	
Total Receipts	-	-
W2 Receipts from Consortium Office (actual dates)	-	
Total Receipts	-	-
Transfers to CG Partners		
CIAT	-	
ICARDA	-	
IITA	-	
GCP	-	
ICRISAT	-	
Total Disbursements		-
Expenditure by Lead Center (ICRISAT)		3,002
Unliquidated Advances to ICRISAT Partners		-
Funds held - end of Period		3,002

PART 2 - REPORT OF CGIAR PARTNERS

Center	Funds held - start of Period	Transfers from Lead Center	Expenditure	Unliquidated Advances to Partners	Funds held - end of Period
CIAT	-	-	1,407	-	1,407
ICARDA	-	-	1,235	-	1,235
IITA	-	-	1,823	-	1,823
GCP	-	-	-	-	-
Totals	-	-	4,465	-	4,465

Notes

All figures illustrative only
 Amounts should be reported in USD 000's
 Report is for each financial year.
 Quarterly Reports during year are on a cumulative basis.

Report Description

Report L411

Name of Report CRP Funding Statement, Window 2
Reporting Line Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
Frequency/Period Every 6 months

Date Donor Currency USD

Year 1 - 2011

Receipts from Donors

_____ -

Transfers to Lead Center (via CO)
(if applicable)

Other Disbursements
CSP paid to Window 1

Funds held by Trustee - end of Period

_____ -

Year 2 - 2012

Receipts from Donors

_____ -

Transfers to Lead Center (via CO)

Other Disbursements

Funds held by Trustee - end of Period

_____ -

Notes