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Item 4 (a)

Milestones

- **2007**: COP 8 Adoption of The Strategy
- **2008**: COP 9 Decision 17
- **2009**: 16-17 Dec. Indicator refinement Workshop
- **2010**: COP 10 Progress Report
- **2011**: CST S-3 1st report against performance
- **2012**: Revised set of impact indicators
- **2013**: CRIC 9 1st report against performance

Activities

- **Preliminary studies**
- **Scientific peer review**

Iterative process (1st iteration)

- **Reporting**
- **Pilot**

Assessment and further refinement

Application by countries
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1: To improve the living conditions of affected populations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core indicator S-1:</strong> Decrease in the number of people negatively impacted by the process of desertification/land degradation and drought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core indicator S-2:</strong> Increase in the proportion of households living above the poverty line in affected areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core indicator S-3:</strong> Reduction in the proportion of the population below the minimum level of dietary energy consumption in affected areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Water availability per capita in affected areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Change in land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Proportion of the population in affected areas living above the poverty line*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2: To improve the condition of ecosystems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core indicator S-4:</strong> Reduction in the total area affected by desertification/land degradation and drought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core indicator S-5:</strong> Increases in net primary productivity in affected areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Change in land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Level of land degradation (including salinization, water and wind erosion, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Plant and animal biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. The aridity index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Land cover status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3: To generate global benefits through effective implementation of UNCCD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core indicator S-6:</strong> Increases in carbon stocks (soil and plant biomass) in affected areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core indicator S-7:</strong> Areas of forest, agricultural and aquaculture ecosystems under sustainable management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Plant and animal biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Proportion of the population in affected areas living above the poverty line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Decision 17/COP9 (Annex) (UNCCCD 2009)
The document review was sent to +70 technical experts, leading to a “zero” draft of the white paper.
Indicator evaluation criteria*

- Does the indicator provide information about changes in important processes?
- Is the indicator sensitive enough to detect important changes but not so sensitive that signals are masked by natural variability?
- Can the indicator detect changes at the appropriate temporal and spatial scale without being overwhelmed by variability?

* Based on MA criteria originally development by the (NRC 2000)
Indicator evaluation criteria*

- Is the indicator based on well-understood and generally *accepted conceptual models* of the system to which it is applied?
- Are *reliable data available* to assess trends and is data collection a relatively straightforward process?
- Are *monitoring systems in place* for the underlying data needed to calculate the indicator?
- Can *policymakers easily understand* the indicator?

* Based on MA criteria originally development by the (NRC 2000)
After written reviews by experts from all over the world, 41 of the top DLDD physical and social scientists converged on Bonn, Germany to discuss, debate and refine the impact indicators.
Scientific review of the UNCCD provisionally accepted set of impact indicators to measure the implementation of strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3

Summary

Development of this document (hereafter referred to as the “white paper”) follows decision 17/COP.9 of the ninth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 9) of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), requesting the Committee on Science and Technology to develop proposals for consideration at COP 11, for the refinement of the set of the provisionally accepted impact indicators being developed to “…measure progress on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 of the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention 2008–2018 (The Strategy)”. It responds to the Synthesis and Recommendations resulting from the UNCCD 1st Scientific Conference, primarily to provide a scientific foundation for this refinement process and to maximize possible synergies with other programmes pursuing related goals. It is a synthesis of a participatory, formative and iterative process involving over 64 technical experts from the scientific community between September 2010 and January 2011.
Committee on Science and Technology
Second special session
Bonn, 16–18 February 2011

Scientific review of the UNCCD provisionally accepted set of impact indicators to measure the implementation of strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3

Summary

Development of this document (hereafter referred to as the “white paper”) follows decision 17/COP.9 of the ninth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 9) of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), requesting the Committee on Science and Technology to develop proposals for consideration at COP 11, for the refinement of the set of the provisionally accepted impact indicators being developed to “…measure progress on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 of the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention 2008–2018 (The Strategy)”. It responds to the Synthesis and Recommendations resulting from the UNCCD 1st Scientific Conference, primarily to provide a scientific foundation for this refinement process and to maximize possible synergies with other programmes pursuing related goals. It is a synthesis of a participatory, formative and iterative process involving over 64 technical experts from the scientific community between September 2010 and January 2011.
Inputs were obtained during the Second Special Session of the Committee on Science and Technology (16-18 February 2011, Bonn, Germany)
Committee on Science and Technology

Report of the Committee on Science and Technology on its second special session, held in Bonn from 16 to 18 February 2011
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Public comment via an eForum

http://eforum.unccd.int
Pilot Tracking Exercise inputs
The Pilot

- This report presents results and conclusions from a Pilot exercise undertaken to assess the experience of affected country Parties to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) with reporting on impact indicators under the Convention’s Performance Review and Assessment of the Implementation System (PRAIS).

- The Pilot took place between July and October 2011, with participation from the following countries: Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, China, Colombia, Mexico, Portugal, Senegal, Spain, South Africa and Tunisia.
Pilot evaluation approach

Sources

- Analysis of the completed indicator reporting templates supplied by participating countries.
- Analysis of e-SMART indicator assessments supplied by participating countries.
- Analysis of national pilot study reports following a provided template.

Criteria

- Evidence of whether a Party reported on the indicator or not;
- Link between the metric reported and the purpose of the indicator;
- Link between each metric and its relevance to national priorities;
- Time series – assessed the use and availability of time series data.
The good news...

- Overall, the indicators as a set were considered generally effective in assessing progress of the Convention in addressing DLDD and relevant to national priorities.
- Similarly, during the conclusion, Parties were very positive about their capacity to report on the indicators.
- This was confirmed by the results which, based on the criteria, indicate the level of reporting for most indicators was satisfactory or higher.
And the not-so-good…

- However, when assessing the indicators individually, doubts and problems were raised by the Pilot countries as to their effectiveness and relevance.

- In addition, during the Pilot, not all Parties reported on all indicators (primarily those that were non-mandatory).

- The exact reasons for the low level of reporting by some Parties on some indicators remain insufficiently understood.
## Summary of the Piloting Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the indicator</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Armenia</th>
<th>Colombia</th>
<th>Senegal</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
<th>Spain / Portugal</th>
<th>Tunisia</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>% Parties with at least a minimum reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Water availability per capita</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Change in land use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Proportion of the population living above the relative poverty line</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Food consumption per capita</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Capacity of soils to sustain agro-pastoral use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Degree of land degradation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Plant and animal biodiversity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII Drought index</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX Land cover status</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Carbon stocks above and below ground</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI Land under Sustainable Land Management (SLM)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

- Allow flexibility in reporting on non-mandatory indicators
- Improve understanding of indicators as a set
- Improve understanding and application of definition of affected areas
- Improve guidance available to assist Parties with reporting
- Undertake further research relating to reporting patterns
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Item 4 (a) of the provisional agenda
Advice on how best to measure progress on strategic objectives 1, 2, and 3 of The Strategy
The development and implementation of impact indicators related to the measurement of strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 of The Strategy

Report on the refinement of the set of impact indicators on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3

Note by the secretariat

Summary

This document is a summary of the results of the scientific peer review process recommended in decision 17/COP.9 of the ninth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 9) of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), requesting the Committee on Science and Technology (CST) to develop proposals for consideration at COP 11, for the refinement of the set of the provisionally accepted impact indicators being developed to "measure progress on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 of the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention 2008–2018 (The Strategy)." It is a synthesis of a participatory, formative and iterative scientific peer-review process involving input from 164 technical experts from the scientific community between September 2010 and May 2011. At its tenth session, the CST may wish to review and recommend for adoption to the COP the conclusions and recommendations herein, which are drawn from the proposals made by the technical experts in the white paper resulting from the participatory peer-review process, which were presented at the CST-S2 (ICC/CST(S-2)/INF.1), summarized for consideration by the COP (ICC/CST(S-2)/9) and updated with contributions drawn from public comment (ICC/COP(10)/CST/INF.1).
Core principles

- In order to strengthen the scientific foundation and operational potential of the impact indicator set, a number of core principles were identified in the participatory scientific peer review process.
- These were reviewed during the CST-S2 and discussed in both the public comment period and the pilot tracking exercise.
- These core principles are detailed in ICCD/COP(10)/CST/2 (paragraphs 51-52).
Core principles

a) Conceptual framework
b) Adaptability
c) Refined indicator set hierarchy and logic
d) Refined indicators and potential metrics
e) Operationally delineated affected areas

f) Harmonization
g) Sensitivity to DLDD
h) Readiness
i) Gender disaggregation
j) Mechanism to help ensure national relevance
k) Continued scientific peer-review
Amended DPSIR framework integrated with ecosystem services provisions

Adapted from MA 2005; LADA 2010; GEF KM:Land 2010;
Indicator set hierarchy and logic

Refining the structure of indicator set hierarchy makes it possible to distinguish *what* to measure (general indicators) and *how* it should be measured (metrics/proxies)

**Before:**

I. Strategic Objectives
   a. Core indicators
      i. Provisional Indicators

**After:**

I. Strategic objectives
   a. Core indicators
      i. General indicators
         1. Metrics/proxies

ICCD/COP(10)/CST/2 (paragraphs 22-25)
## Indicator set refinements

### Proposed refinements to decision 17/COP.9, annex I

(Impact indicators for reporting on strategic objectives 1, 2, and 3 of The Strategy) *(see Annex I)*

### Proposed revisions to decision 17/COP.9, annex I, including metrics/proxies to be considered for testing and/or further assessment/development

#### Strategic objective 1: To improve the living conditions of affected populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core indicator</th>
<th>General indicators</th>
<th>Metrics/proxies</th>
<th>Degree of expert agreement</th>
<th>Readiness for testing*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-(1/2/3): Improvement in the livelihoods of people potentially impacted by the process of DLDD</td>
<td>III Proportion of the population living above the relative poverty line</td>
<td>Rural poverty rate**</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I Water availability per capita</td>
<td>Percentage of population with access to (safe) drinking water</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water availability and use</td>
<td>Low***</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV Food consumption per capita</td>
<td>Proportion of chronically undernourished children under the age of 5 in rural areas**</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strategic objective 2: To improve the condition of ecosystems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core indicator</th>
<th>General indicators</th>
<th>Metrics/proxies</th>
<th>Degree of expert agreement</th>
<th>Readiness for testing*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-4: Reduction in the total area affected by DLDD</td>
<td>VI Degree of land degradation</td>
<td>A less complex version of Level of land degradation + Trends in seasonal precipitation</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII Drought index</td>
<td>Trends in WMO Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI) (a meteorological drought index)</td>
<td>(new)</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V Capacity of soils to sustain agro-pastoral use</td>
<td>GLADIS “Soil Health Status”</td>
<td>(new)</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II Change in land use</td>
<td>Land use (in support of deriving (a) VI Land degradation and (b) XI Land under SLM, and also in interpreting (c) IX Land cover status)</td>
<td>Low***</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ICCD/COP(10)/CST/2 (page 13, following paragraphs 26 & 27)*
## Indicator set refinements

**Proposed revisions to decision 17/COP 9, annex I, including metrics/proxies to be considered for testing and/or further assessment/development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core indicators (with proposed revisions)</th>
<th>General indicators</th>
<th>Metrics/proxies (operational approaches proposed for testing, where ready, and further assessment/development where not)</th>
<th>Degree of expert agreement</th>
<th>Readiness for testing*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core indicator S-5:</strong> Maintenance of or increases in ecosystem function, including net primary productivity</td>
<td><strong>IX Land cover status</strong></td>
<td>Land cover**</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land productivity</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VII Plant and animal biodiversity***</td>
<td>Crop and livestock diversity (agro-biodiversity)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trends in abundance and distribution of selected species</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil biodiversity</td>
<td>(new)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic objective 3: To generate global benefits through effective implementation of the UNCCD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core indicator S-6: Increases in carbon stocks (soil and plant biomass)</th>
<th>X Carbon stocks above and below ground</th>
<th>Above ground organic carbon stocks</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Below ground organic carbon stocks</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core indicator S-7: Areas of forest, agricultural and aquaculture ecosystems under sustainable management</th>
<th>XI Land under SLM</th>
<th>Land under SLM + general indicator VII Plant and animal biodiversity (secondary role) + II Change in land use</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V Capacity of soils to sustain agro-pastoral use</td>
<td>GLADIS “Soil Health Status”</td>
<td>(new)</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Readiness scheme: Green = ready for testing. Yellow = requires fine tuning. Red = requires further development.

** Though named slightly differently, the operational definition of this indicator is very similar to that given by Berry et al., 2009.**

*** As a stand-alone metric/proxy, there was limited or divided support for this metric/proxy. However, if used in support of another indicator, the agreement was much higher.

**** Also a secondary indicator under core indicator S-7.

**ICCD/COP(10)/CST/2 (page 14, following paragraphs 26 & 27)**
Affected areas

- Affected areas are not fixed in place and time, especially under conditions of climate change.
- The definitions of affected areas and affected countries are generic and do not provide country Parties with prescriptive criteria for the demarcation of affected areas at the national level.
- This calls for making indicator measurement and affected area delineation operationally distinct.

ICCD/COP(10)/CST/INF.1 (paragraphs 22-25)
Mechanism for national relevance

- For global monitoring to be effective and useful within country Parties, national and even sub-national relevance of the information provided from the indicator set is paramount – and this varies from country to country.

- Over 40% of the comments and questions received from delegates during the CST-S2 (February 2011, Bonn) focused on how the impact indicator set would capture “the voice of the farmer”.

ICCD/COP(10)/CST/INF.1 (paragraph 33)
Mechanism for national relevance

- This suggests that efforts to monitor the impacts of the Convention across the country Parties in a unified way must include both a minimum set of indicators and metrics and a mechanism for the global system to account for local/sub-national/national realities that may involve indicators not listed in the minimum set.

ICCD/COP(10)/CST/2 (paragraphs 34-37)
ICCD/COP(10)/CST/INF.1 (paragraphs 32-35)
Challenges of indicator scale and sensitivity and stakeholder participation and representation
Examples


Steps 1 & 2: Stakeholder platform identification and baseline assessment
Step 3: Indicator selection, ranking and weighting
Step 4: Data collection for each indicator and action
Step 5 & 6: Integrating indicator data and weights, and reassessment of the actions.
Open challenges

- The **gender dimension** of DLDD is something not yet explicitly addressed in the definition of impact indicators: it will be necessary to build **gender disaggregation** into data collection, analysis and reporting approaches.

- **Cross-boundary data variation** (known as map edge faults) will be an issue in the future.

- Many technical experts asked a form of the following question: "Technically speaking, how (by what methods, and by whom) will the national information reported to the UNCCD be analyzed, integrated, and interpreted?"

  ICCD/COP(10)/CST/INF.1 (paragraphs 36-48)
Way forward

- The iterative and participatory scientific peer review has addressed major issues and generated considerable momentum towards turning the concepts of monitoring and assessment into an operational reality.
- The pilot tracking exercise has been an excellent start to this operations phase – demonstrating the feasibility of reporting impact indicator data.
- This transition from concepts to operations requires its own kind of technical advice and capacity building to ensure relevance and operational success.
How?

- Two synergistic components to address future technical needs and overcome practical challenges.
  - *ad hoc* Advisory Group of Technical Experts (AGTE), and,
  - A working group addressing cross-network operational challenges

- The advisory group (AGTE) would respond to **operational needs of a scientific nature**: technical challenges faced by Parties working to conduct monitoring and assessment and report on impact indicators.

- Another working group meets soon to address **cross-network operational challenges** (data interoperability, access, sharing, target setting).
Decision 19/COP.10

Advice on how best to measure progress on strategic objectives 1, 2, and 3 of The Strategy

The Conference of the Parties,

Bearing in mind the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008–2018) (The Strategy) adopted by decision 3/COP.8 and, in particular, the implementation framework of the Committee on Science and Technology,

Recalling the objectives of The Strategy and, in particular, strategic objective 1 on improving the living conditions of affected populations, strategic objective 2 on improving the condition of affected ecosystems, and strategic objective 3 on generating global benefits through effective implementation of the UNCCD,

Recalling decision 3/COP.8, paragraph 10, which requests the Committee on Science and Technology to provide advice to the Conference for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention on how best to measure progress on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3,

Recalling also decision 17/COP.9, which requests the Committee on Science and Technology to review the status of the iterative process for refining the provisionally accepted set of impact indicators during its sessions,

Noting documents ICCD/CST/S-2)/7, ICCD/CST(S-2)/8 and ICCD/CST(S-2)/INF.1, and the ensuing recommendations; made at the second special session of the Committee on Science and Technology contained in document ICCD/CST(S-2)/9,

Having reviewed document ICCD/COP(10)/CST/1 on the refinement of the set of impact indicators on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3, document ICCD/COP(10)/CST/3 on the workplan and reporting guidelines on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 for affected country Parties and document ICCD/COP(10)/CST/4-ICCD/CRCIC(10)/14 on guidelines for the preliminary analysis of information contained in reports from Parties and other reporting entities as far as it concerns strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3,

Taking note of document ICCD/COP(10)/CST/INF.1 on the scientific peer review for the refinement of the set of impact indicators on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3, document ICCD/COP(10)/CST/INF.2 on the pilot tracking exercises for the refinement of the set of impact indicators on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3, and document ICCD/COP(10)/CST/INF.6 containing the proposed methodological guide on the use of impact indicators to measure progress against strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3,

Noting also document ICCD/COP(10)/INF.9 on the revised glossary for the performance review and assessment of the implementation of the Convention as far as it concerns the terminology relating to strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3,

Noting decision 14/COP.10 on the iterative process relating to the assessment of implementation, including performance and impact indicators, methodology and the reporting procedures,
Decision 19

- Refinement of the set of impact indicators on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 … The COP:
  - Decides that the core principles identified in the participatory scientific peer review process and contained in document ICCD/COP(10)/CST/2 set the stage for the development of proposals to refine the set of impact indicators and associated methodologies based on national capacities and circumstances.
  - This presentation has outlined most of those core principals.
Decides to task the ad hoc advisory group of technical experts with addressing ... four fundamental issues for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its eleventh session.

For each of these, we have a breakout session planned that is designed to link your efforts to past work and “launch” you forward accordingly.

1: Affected Areas
2a: Global minimum set of impact indicators
2b: Nationally and locally relevant impact indicators
3: Integrating, analyzing and interpreting impact indicator information
Tentative timeframe

Further refinement by the AGTE

1st draft of working papers

Review within AGTE and 2nd draft

Open review

Final version

1st draft of COP recommendations

Parties consult.

Final doc

2nd meeting - virtual

3rd meeting – in person

4th meeting - virtual

5th meeting - virtual


21 Sept deadline for reporting

CST S-3 Progress report & STC Inputs

CRIC 11 1st reporting on impacts – side event

Deadline for COP 11 doc