

**Contribution to the Ad Hoc Working Group on improving procedures
communication of information as well as the quality and the format of reports
submitted to the Conference of the Parties
by Turkmenistan (Focal Point Mr. Muhamet Durikov)**

Affected country parties

1. Generally, we found HG is a useful tool, nevertheless some repetitions in questions are confusing and led to more effort to keep the information logical sequence.
2. It should be mentioned that some formulation of questions HG was adapted by NCB to make it more understandable for some experts.
3. We also believe that having different HG for countries implementing NAP and for those which have not developed it yet would be helpful exercise as it should focus at different objectives, problems and lessons learnt. HG is adaptable documents and therefore is could be used by all regions.
4. ---
5. Speaking of Turkmenistan, it is true that some questions in HG did not receive the same level of consideration due to the following reasons:
 - Formulation of the questions was very complicated
 - Some questions were not relevant for the conditions of country
 - Some information was difficult to access
6. Seven thematic topics defined in Decision 1/COP.5 sufficiently represent main issues in implementation of the Convention.
7. –
8. Despite, the need of application of social indicators is understood, in Turkmenistan no research on social aspects in regard to desertification was conducted in Turkmenistan. Nevertheless, within some projects simple indicators for civil participation are introduced for monitoring of project impact. To introduce social indicators at the broader scale methodology, training, experience exchange are needed.
9. Insufficient reporting is one of consequences of lack of mechanism of cooperation between CST and countries. There are some reasons such as: 1) one invitee can not participate at the CST meetings and plenary sessions which led to lack of understanding of the decisions made, 2) lack of feedback between CST and Focal Point as well as designated CST experts. There is a need to update roster list of experts regularly.
10. In countries like Turkmenistan where NCB is represented by scientific institution there is not problem to involve scientific community to the process of national reporting. In some countries a problem of “monopolization” of national reporting process could occur. In this case representation of scientists of all necessary domains should be secured.
11. Wide use of impact indicators should be supported by the respective research and activities in the country. No institution so far is using impact indicators for combating land degradation measures.

Organization of reporting process

19. We consider that peer-reviewing of national report is adequate action as it is responsibility of country which should draw the lessons. It is should be advised that compilation of summary by Secretariat would not serve as only a summary but also give

some general evaluation by both aspects, methodology of national report and content of national report.

20. ---

21. We consider that 4 years period between reporting is adequate as it gives a chance to track impact.

22. Three months from the moments of financial support is sufficient, but due to the delay with financial support the period often shortens to two or one month how it happened in Central Asia this year where we had only one month for reporting which affected the quality.

23. To address the problem of lack of figure in the report it could be advisable to optimize the country profile by including more questions on land degradation.

24. The problem of predictable and timely financing is a repeating problem from report to report. It should be addressed by certain internal interventions in Secretariat.

25. It is highly advisable to organize few days intensive training for 2-3 designated persons from each country of sub-regions prior to reporting process in order to explain the methodology of national report.

26. Validation workshops are helpful tool as it allows to inform the stakeholders about the progress and to receive a comprehensive evaluation from their site.

27. Joint Subregional reports would be a helpful tool to have information how the subregion acts to implement the Convention and how one country could learn from another. Such reports should be a summary of national reports of subregion but provides analytical information what is done at the subregional level. In case of Central Asia there is no subregional organizations so it could be advisable to create a temporary mechanism of subregional coordination during reporting period most probably at the basis of already existing programs or other initiatives.

28. Regional meeting prior CRIC are necessary, but we believe that such meetings should not be limited to report hearing but yield rather in general conclusions on progress on regions in compare to previous report.

29. In order to include national report to the national environmental information system such system should be available in the country. For example, in Turkmenistan there is State Commission on implementation of country's obligations under UN environmental conventions and programs functions under the Ministry of Nature Protection. National report is submitted to the State Commission.

Procedures for communication on information

30. It is difficult to judge the necessity of specific guidelines for other entities as we do not have any contact nor information from these entities.

31. To our knowledge COP does not demand any information from Central Asian countries beside of the National reports.

32. Consolidation of provisions of COP decisions would be a helpful tool for Secretariat and as well as for the Parties.

33. Impact assessment methodology is an important tool to be applied for monitoring and evaluation of Convention implementation. Nevertheless, UNCCD Secretariat does not promote the provision of such methodology. It could be advisable to search for possibilities to provide information at web-site on such methodology, to deliver such information directly to Focal Points or to use UNCCD meetings back-to-back with training sessions on impact assessment.
34. Absence of expiration date does not create big problems for the country Party. Nevertheless, it would be correct be during COP session to prepare information on consistency of old and new decisions.
35. To coordinate the activities of two subsidiary bodies such as CRIC and CST, the mandate with specific functions and task of both should be available to the Parties. It refers, in particular, to CST functions whose communication with country Parties must be strengthened.
36. It is often observed that management of COP sessions are not always effective in regard to timing. Many sessions in the beginning are dedicated to introductory kinds of discussion and only at the end more substantive issues are discussed. We could advise in this respect to dedicate each session to a few main issues and to hold the discussion along the lines of these main topics. All documentation on sessions should include only decisions and discussions which fall into topics.

Country profile

37. We consider that both aspects, state off desertification and impact of measures, are not addressed in a comprehensive way. Both of them should be more elaborated in a Country profiles.
38. In some case the distinguishing the date between national subnational levels is needed to evaluate the scope of activities conducted.
39. The country profile should has the same format for any country but it should be a chance to adapt it in some cases by the need of the country.
40. We thing that there is no need in a Country profile to expand descriptive data as it should serve as a quantitative summary of the National report.
41. As Country profile has been introduced for the National report – 2006 there was no possibility to use it as monitoring or planning tool. There are however a chance to use it jointly with National report for monitoring of the Convention realization.
42. ---
43. We consider that results of country profiles should available at UNCCD web-site in order to use it as complimentary data to other monitoring tools.
44. ---
45. To compose country profile the experts of different areas are involved. However, we believe that there is no need for calling a steering committee to drive the process. A steering committee has been working at reviewing National report which includes the country profile.

46. We believe that benchmarks and indicators should be rather used during implementation of NAP and not to during reporting process. If comprehensive methodology on application benchmarks and indicators are provided to country Parties and the country will start gradually to introduce this approach there will be no need in designing a special guidelines on such indicators for reporting exercise. If the country did not use indicators during the activities it will be impossible to apply such indicators only in reporting period.