



## Regional meetings in preparation for COP 9

*Proposed impact indicators  
to assess progress against strategic objective 4  
of the Strategy*

Montevideo, Rome, Bangkok, Banja Luka, Tunis – June/July 2009



# Indicators' identification process

- Based on:
  - Expected impacts and indicators identified in The Strategy;
  - CRIC 7 recommendations (ICCD/CRIC(7)/5);
  - Advise by the CRIC/CST Bureaux, the IATF on reporting, and the GM.
- Guided by:
  - The e-SMART <sup>(1)</sup> criteria with limited emphasis on the 'economic' criterion;
  - Harmonization principles.

(1) economic – Specific – Measurable – Achievable – Relevant –Time-bound



# Strategic Objective 4

To mobilize resources to support implementation of the Convention through building effective partnerships between national and international actors

- Underlying rationale of SO4: assess whether institutional, policy and financial weaknesses represent a constraint to the mobilization of resources for UNCCD implementation.
- Two major components within SO4: ‘mobilization of resources’ and ‘effective partnerships’. They are reflected in two ‘expected impacts’.



# Expected impact 4.1

Increased financial, technical and technological resources are made available to affected developing country Parties, and where appropriate Central and Eastern European countries, to implement the Convention.

Proposed indicator in The Strategy: *‘Increase in the level and diversity of available funding for combating desertification/land degradation and mitigating the effects of drought’*.

## Analysis:

- Proposed indicator: conceptually correct but not sufficiently detailed.
- The assessment of investments flows requires quantitative indicators.
- The assessment of ‘diversity’ requires consideration of the different sources of funding.
- The ‘change’ captures the actual (increasing or decreasing) trend of funding.
- Needed: definition of ‘different sources’ and of ‘availability’.





# Definitions for expected impact 4.1

- Sources of funding:
  - Multilateral assistance.
  - Bilateral assistance.
  - Country (domestic) financial commitment.
  - Innovative sources.
  - Private sector and others.
  
- Availability:
  - Investments actually disbursed and/or committed within the reference period.



## 4.1 – Proposed impact indicators

- *SO4-1: % change of multilateral donor contributions for UNCCD-related activities.*
- *SO4-2: UNCCD share of Bilateral Official Development Assistance.*
- *SO4-3: % change of domestic financial commitment to UNCCD implementation.*
- *SO4-4: % change of contributions from innovative sources of finance for UNCCD-related activities.*
- *SO4-5: % change of private sector and other contributions for UNCCD-related activities.*



## 4.1 – Proposed indicators – Issues

- Several of the necessary information is in the Financial Annex  
⇒ reduced reporting burden + financial flows measured every two years.
- Quantification of investments carried out by stakeholders with no obligation to report to the Convention (SO4-5 and, partially, SO4-4) needs a study to be commissioned at every reporting cycle ⇒ costs implied.
- Harmonization with performance indicators successfully pursued (SO4-2 adds value to CONS-O-15 measuring the contributions by developed country Parties).
- Indicator refers to financial mobilization. Differentiation for technical and technological resources is still needed



# Expected impact 4.2

Enabling policy environments are improved for UNCCD implementation at all levels.

Proposed indicator in The Strategy: *‘Development policies and measures address desertification/land degradation and mitigation of the effects of drought’*.

## Analysis:

- Proposed indicator is not referring to the mobilization of resources or to the ‘enabling character’ of policies and measures. Overall, inappropriate.
- The expected impact overlaps with OO 2.4 (partnership agreements), 5.1 Investment Frameworks and 5.5 (type of incentives to have enabled access to technology). Findings from those OO performance indicators will cover some enabling policy mechanisms facilitating access to resources and enrich debate on SO 4.2.
- The assessment of SO 4.2 needs to focus therefore on additional mechanisms determining (i.e. facilitating or constraining) the mobilisation of resources.
- Secondly, and apart from mechanisms constraining or assisting in resource mobilization, institutional weaknesses are limiting factors to UNCCD successful implementation and therefore warrant reporting

# Definitions for expected impact 4.2

- Mechanisms.
  - Laws and regulations.
  - Economic and financial measures (incentives, fiscal rules, tax benefits, credit lines and borrowing rules, etc).
  - Cooperation frameworks (agreements, Memorandum of Understanding, contracts, etc.)
  - Sectoral policies (trade, marketing, property rights, business development, etc.)

*SO4-6: Number and type of legal and regulatory frameworks, economic incentives or other mechanisms securing or facilitating transfer of funds for the implementation of UNCCD, at all levels*



## 4.2 – Proposed impact indicators

- **Institutional weaknesses.**
  - Evident at regional and subregional level;
  - Assessable through the RBM framework for the subsidiary bodies of the COP, the secretariat and the GM.
  - Currently not assessed at all the other levels (local, national, inter-institutional).
- *SO4-7: Clear entrusting of institutional responsibilities for UNCCD implementation, at all levels.*



# Conclusions and Recommendations

- **Consequence of an agreed upon indicator system:**
  - Parties receive guidance on how to implement action programmes (alignment process)
  - GM and secretariat receive guidance on issues relating to financial resources mobilization and related policy issues
- **CRIC may wish to:**
  - Consider the proposed impact indicators (adoption by COP 9)
  - Global and national targets
  - Take into consideration financial implications (studies)
  - Request assistance from the JLG
  - Provide guidance on capacity building issues relating to SO 4

