

**United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification**  
**Performance Review and Assessment of Implementation System**

**Fourth UNCCD reporting cycle, 2010–2011 leg**  
**Report for Italy**

# Table of contents

- Impact indicators
  - Strategic Objectives 1, 2 and 3
    - General information on impact indicators on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3
    - Core indicator S-(1/2/3): Poverty Rate
      - Reporting on the indicator
      - Interpretation of indicator status/trend and policy implications
      - Feedback
    - Core indicator S-5: Land Cover Status
      - Reporting on land cover
        - Reporting on the indicator
          - Land Cover Type #1 — Artificial surfaces
          - Land Cover Type #2 — Agricultural areas
          - Land Cover Type #3 — Agro forestry areas
          - Land Cover Type #4 — Wetlands
          - Land Cover Type #5 — Water bodies
        - Interpretation of indicator status/trend and policy implications
        - Feedback
      - Reporting on land productivity
      - Feedback
    - Additional indicators on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3
  - Strategic Objective 4
    - Indicator SO-4-3
    - Indicator SO-4-6
    - Indicator SO-4-7
- Performance Indicators
  - Operational Objective 1: Advocacy, awareness raising and education
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-1 for Outcome 1.1
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-3 for Outcome 1.3
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-4 for Outcome 1.3
  - Operational Objective 2: Policy framework
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-5 for Outcomes 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-7 for Outcome 2.5
  - Operational Objective 3: Science, technology and knowledge
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-8 for Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-9 for Outcome 3.1 and 3.2
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-10 for Outcome 3.3 and 3.4
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-11 for Outcome 3.5
  - Operational Objective 4: Capacity building
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-13 for Outcomes 4.1 and 4.2
  - Operational Objective 5: Financing and technology transfer
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-14 for Outcome 5.1
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-16 for Outcome 5.2
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-17 for Outcome 5.3
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-18 for Outcome 5.5
- Standard Financial Annex
- Programme and Project Sheets
- Additional Information
  - Reporting process-related issues
  - Accommodation of specific requests within COP decisions
  - Reporting on the implementation of NAP

- Human resources
- Financial resources
- Any other country-specific issues
- Submission form

## General information section

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE REPORTING ENTITY	
Reporting country	Italy
Name and surname of the person submitting the report	Pier Francesco Zazo
Affiliation and contact details	dgcs.ambiente@esteri.it

# Affected Country Parties

## Impact indicators

### Strategic Objectives 1, 2 and 3

Following [decision 17/COP.9](#), affected country Parties are requested to report on two mandatory impact indicators (i.e.: proportion of population living below the poverty line and land cover status), through the associated metrics identified during the iterative process for the refinement of the set of impact indicators (i.e.: poverty rate, land cover and land productivity).

Affected country Parties might also decide to report on the remaining nine impact indicators provisionally accepted by the COP (see [decision 17/COP.9](#)) but considered optional for inclusion in reports.

Alternative indicators considered more suitable than the provisionally accepted indicators may also be reported on. The condition for reporting on alternative indicators is that these fit into the underlying logic of measuring progress against strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 of the Strategy.

Reporting is guided by means of templates, one for each of the two mandatory indicators, plus one generic reporting template for the remaining nine impact indicators and alternative indicators. Detailed reporting guidelines are available for the two mandatory impact indicators.

### General information on impact indicators on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3

---

#### Definition of affected areas

***Does your National Action Programme (NAP) identify areas of the country which are affected by Desertification, Land Degradation and Drought (DLDD)?***

No

***If no, does any other national planning document identify areas of the country which are affected by DLDD?***

Yes

***Please specify the national document that identifies areas affected by DLDD in your country.***

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
Perini L., Salvati L., Zitti M., Sorrenti S., Ceccarelli T	2008	La desertificazione in Italia. Processi, indicatori, vulnerabilità del territorio	Bonanno Editore	---

***Please specify which areas of the country are considered as affected by DLDD (e.g. name of relevant provinces, states and districts):***

Affected areas are in the all country but according to the definition reported below the following regions have more than 30% of the territory above the threshold: Sicily, Sardinia, Apulia, Molise, Marche.

***Please specify the estimated total number of square kilometres of the national territory occupied by areas affected by DLDD:***

48961 km<sup>2</sup>

***Please specify the percentage of the national land area occupied by areas affected by DLDD:***

16 %

***Please specify the definition used to identify areas affected by DLDD in your country:***

“Rural areas where, because of environmental and management conditions, the land is most sensitive to desertification processes.

The sensitivity of land is the degree to which a land system is exposed to desertification processes ( erosion, salinization, loss of O.M., deforestation, soil sealing) due to natural and/or anthropogenic pressures.

Municipalities and administrative regions are considered affected if more than 30% of their rural areas is

above the threshold of the Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA) Index used to identify "very sensitive" areas."

The total surface of affected areas in the regions above the threshold (Sicily, Sardinia, Apulia, Molise and Marche) is 51279 sq km.

**Please specify what methods were used to identify areas affected by DLDD in your country:**

The adopted methodology is inspired by the one developed in the framework of the MEDALUS project (Mediterranean Desertification And Land Use). Sensitivity to the desertification of the different spatial homogeneous units is defined by an index of sensitivity to the Desertification obtained from the geometrical average of four indexes of the soil quality, climate and vegetation, land management are estimated as the geometric mean of the different scores for each considered variable (<http://www.kcl.ac.uk/projects/desertlinks/downloads/publicdownloads/ESA%20Manual.pdf>). The scores of each thematic indicator ranges from 1 (the lowest contribution to land sensitivity to degradation) to 2 (the highest contribution to sensitivity to degradation). ESAI was subsequently estimated in each i-th spatial unit and j-th year as the geometric mean of the four partial indicators. The ESAI score ranges from 1 (the lowest land sensitivity to degradation) to 2 (the highest sensitivity to degradation). According to the obtained ESAI values, four classes of land sensitivity were identified that reflect the most used classification thresholds: (i) areas unaffected by LD, (ii) areas potentially affected, (iii) 'fragile' areas, and (iv) affected areas (ESAI > 1.4)

**References:**

Basso, F., Bove, E., Dumontet, S., Ferrara, A., Pisante, M., Quaranta, G., et al. (2000). Evaluating environmental sensitivity at the basin scale through the use of geographic information systems and remotely sensed data: an example covering the Agri basin e Southern Italy. *Catena*, 40, 19e35.

**If available, please provide the geographic datasets which show the areas affected by DLDD.**

Ideally, the data should be provided as a shapefile or raster (Geotiff) format with geographic coordinates on the WGS84 datum (The file should have a maximum size of 25MB). If the raw data are not available please provide a map showing the extent of areas affected by DLDD. Ideally, the map should have a scale of less than 1:250,000 and be provided in a Tiff format (The file should have a maximum size of 25MB). To facilitate understanding of the map provided, please explain clearly what can be seen in the map (resolution of map, year of the map, land cover classes and corresponding colours, borders etc)

*No files attached.*

---

## Definition of rural areas

**Does any national planning document define rural areas in your country?**

Yes

**Please specify the national document that defines rural areas in your country.**

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
Regione Siciliana	2009	Programma di sviluppo rurale Sicilia 2007-2013	---	<a href="http://www.reterurale.it/regioni">http://www.reterurale.it/regioni</a>
Regione Sardegna	2007	Programma di sviluppo rurale 2007-2013	---	<a href="http://www.reterurale.it/regioni">http://www.reterurale.it/regioni</a>
Regione Puglia	2008	Programma di sviluppo rurale 2007-2013	---	<a href="http://www.reterurale.it/regioni">http://www.reterurale.it/regioni</a>
Regione Marche	2007	Programma di sviluppo rurale 2007-2013	---	<a href="http://www.reterurale.it/regioni">http://www.reterurale.it/regioni</a>

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
Regione Basilicata	2008	Programma di sviluppo rurale 2007-2013	---	<a href="http://www.reterurale.it/regioni">http://www.reterurale.it/regioni</a>

**Please state the national definition of rural areas in your country:**

The municipality is classified as rural if the population density is less than 150 people per square kilometer

## Human population estimates

**Please state estimates of the human population living in the national area of your country, in rural areas of your country and areas affected by DLDD in your country.**

Include details on the methodology used to establish these estimates.

Year	Number of people living in the national area	Number of people living in rural areas	Number of people living in affected areas	Method used	Was every region (or equivalent sub-national unit) of your country covered in the assessment?	Please state the approximate proportion of the national human population surveyed during the assessment
2000	---	---	---	---	---	---
2001	---	---	---	---	---	---
2002	56993742	12017550	4280051	Nationwide census	Yes	100%
2003	57321070	11958144	4225748	Nationwide census	Yes	100%
2004	57888245	11879049	4204638	Nationwide census	Yes	100%
2005	58462375	11679445	4138147	Nationwide census	Yes	100%
2006	58751711	11721207	4111135	Nationwide census	Yes	100%
2007	59131287	11645882	4081043	Nationwide census	Yes	100%
2008	59619290	11558129	4103349	Nationwide census	Yes	100%
2009	60045068	11493871	4070853	Nationwide census	Yes	100%
2010	60340328	11410372	4030297	Nationwide census	Yes	100%
2011	60626442	11332873	3974796	Nationwide census	Yes	100%

**Please specify the sources used to extract the information provided above.**

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
ISTAT	2011	Bilancio demografico	---	http://demo.istat.it/

### Core indicator S-(1/2/3): Poverty Rate

UNCCD Strategic Objective(s) for which the indicator applies

Strategic Objective 1: To improve the living conditions of affected populations

UNCCD Core indicator S-(1/2/3)

Improvement in the livelihoods of people potentially impacted by the process of desertification/land degradation and drought

Name of the indicator

Proportion of population living below the poverty line

Metric

Poverty Rate

Purpose of the indicator

To measure and monitor changes in poverty, as a proxy for human well-being. This can be used to identify deprived livelihoods, assess the impacts of desertification and assess progress made by the Parties in combating desertification.

Understanding of the indicator

The **poverty line** describes an absolute threshold below which people are considered to be poor. The **poverty rate** describes the percentage of the human population living below the poverty line. Ideally, Parties report the poverty rate for affected areas using the rural poverty line (poverty line specific to rural areas). In addition, the rural poverty line should be used to report the poverty rate in rural areas. In the absence of the rural poverty line, the national poverty line should be used to report the poverty rate in affected and rural areas or, if these are not available, in the country as a whole. Finally, if no poverty lines are available, the generic poverty line of US\$ 2.00/capita/day should be used to assess poverty rates.

Data needed

Size of human population, a poverty line and the number of people falling below the poverty line.

Relevant terms in the glossary

'absolute poverty', 'absolute poverty line', 'consumption', 'consumption survey', 'currency', 'data', 'data analysis', 'data source', 'desertification/land degradation and drought (DLDD)', 'ecosystem services', 'e-SMART', 'expert knowledge', 'income', 'income survey', 'indicator', 'indicator metadata', 'metric', 'national poverty line', 'national poverty rate', 'nationwide census', 'non stratified random survey' 'population census', 'poverty line', 'relative poverty' 'relative poverty lines', 'rural poverty line', 'rural poverty rate', 'stratified random sampling' 'stratified random survey'.

### Reporting on the indicator

#### Rural poverty line

***Does your country have a poverty line that is specific to rural areas (rural poverty line)?***

No

***If yes, please state the rural poverty line in your country for the most recent years and the method used to define the rural poverty line.***

Please choose the method category which best represents that used in the assessment

*No answer required.*

***Please specify the sources used to extract the information provided above.***

*No answer required.*

***If yes, please state the number of people and the percentage of the population living below the rural poverty line in affected areas.***

Furthermore, please state the method used to assess the poverty rate in affected areas and the proportion of the

population included in the assessment.

*No answer required.*

***If yes, please state the number of people and the percentage of the population living below the rural poverty line in rural areas.***

Furthermore, please state the method used to assess the poverty rate in rural areas and the proportion of the population included in the assessment.

*No answer required.*

***Please specify the sources used to extract the information provided above.***

*No answer required.*

## **National poverty line**

If data related to the rural poverty line was provided, please **do not** respond to this section.

***If no rural poverty line is available, does your country have a national poverty line?***

**Yes**

***If yes, please state the national poverty line in your country for the most recent years and the method used to define the national poverty line.***

Please choose the method category which best represents that used in the assessment.

<b>Year</b>	<b>National poverty line (value)</b>	<b>Currency</b>	<b>Method used</b>
2000	---	---	---
2001	---	---	---
2002	---	---	---
2003	---	---	---
2004	---	---	---
2005	---	---	---
2006	---	---	---
2007	---	---	---
2008	17	EUR	Consumption survey
2009	17	EUR	Consumption survey
2010	17	EUR	Consumption survey
2011	17	EUR	Consumption survey

***Please specify the sources used to extract the information provided above.***

<b>Author</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Publication title</b>	<b>Publisher</b>	<b>Website address</b>
ISTAT	2012	La povertà in Italia	---	<a href="http://www.istat.it/it/files/2012/07/Poverta2011.pdf">http://www.istat.it/it/files/2012/07/Poverta2011.pdf</a>
ISTAT	2010	La povertà in Italia	---	---

***Please state the number of people and the percentage of the population living below the national poverty line in affected areas.***

<b>Year</b>	<b>Affected areas</b>
-------------	-----------------------



	Number of people	Percentage of population	Method of poverty assessment	Approximate proportion of the human population living in affected areas surveyed during the poverty assessment
2000	---	---	---	---
2001	---	---	---	---
2002	---	---	---	---
2003	---	---	---	---
2004	---	---	---	---
2005	---	---	---	---
2006	---	---	---	---
2007	---	---	---	---
2008	---	---	---	---
2009	---	---	---	---
2010	---	---	---	---
2011	---	---	---	---

***Please state the number of people and the percentage of the population living below the national poverty line in rural areas.***

Year	Rural areas			
	Number of people	Percentage of population	Method of poverty assessment	Approximate proportion of the human population living in rural areas surveyed during the poverty assessment
2000	---	---	---	---
2001	---	---	---	---
2002	---	---	---	---
2003	---	---	---	---
2004	---	---	---	---
2005	---	---	---	---
2006	---	---	---	---
2007	---	---	---	---
2008	---	---	---	---
2009	---	---	---	---
2010	---	---	---	---
2011	---	---	---	---

***If neither of these is available, please state the percentage of the population living below the national poverty line in the country as a whole.***

Year	Country			
	Number of people	Percentage of population	Method of poverty assessment	Approximate proportion of the national human population surveyed during the poverty assessment
2000	---	---	---	---
2001	---	---	---	---
2002	---	---	---	---
2003	---	---	---	---
2004	---	---	---	---
2005	---	---	---	---
2006	---	---	---	---
2007	---	---	---	---
2008	2893000	5	Stratified random survey	5%
2009	3074000	5	Stratified random survey	5%
2010	3129000	5	Stratified random survey	5%
2011	3415000	6	Stratified random survey	5%

*Please specify the sources used to extract the information provided above.*

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
ISTAT	2012	La povertà in Italia	---	<a href="http://www.istat.it/it/files/2012/07/Poverta2011.pdf">http://www.istat.it/it/files/2012/07/Poverta2011.pdf</a>
ISTAT	2010	La povertà in Italia	---	---

### International poverty line

If data related to the rural poverty line or to the national poverty line was provided, please **do not** respond to this section.

*If neither the rural poverty line nor the national poverty line are available, please state the number of people and the percentage of the population living below the international poverty line (US\$ 2.00/capita/day) in affected areas.*

Year	Affected areas			
	Number of people	Percentage of population	Method of poverty assessment	Approximate proportion of the human population living in affected areas surveyed during the poverty assessment
2000	---	---	---	---
2001	---	---	---	---
2002	---	---	---	---

Year	Affected areas			
	Number of people	Percentage of population	Method of poverty assessment	Approximate proportion of the human population living in affected areas surveyed during the poverty assessment
2003	---	---	---	---
2004	---	---	---	---
2005	---	---	---	---
2006	---	---	---	---
2007	---	---	---	---
2008	---	---	---	---
2009	---	---	---	---
2010	---	---	---	---
2011	---	---	Expert opinion	---

***If there is no national poverty line, please state the number of people and the percentage of the population living below the international poverty line (US\$ 2.00/capita/day) in rural areas.***

Year	Rural areas			
	Number of people	Percentage of population	Method of poverty assessment	Approximate proportion of the human population living in rural areas surveyed during the poverty assessment
2000	---	---	---	---
2001	---	---	---	---
2002	---	---	---	---
2003	---	---	---	---
2004	---	---	---	---
2005	---	---	---	---
2006	---	---	---	---
2007	---	---	---	---
2008	---	---	---	---
2009	---	---	---	---
2010	---	---	---	---
2011	---	---	---	---

***If neither of these is available, please state the percentage of the population living below the international poverty line (US\$ 2.00/capita/day) in the country as a whole.***

Year	Country

	Number of people	Percentage of population	Method of poverty assessment	Approximate proportion of the national human population surveyed during the poverty assessment
2000	---	---	---	---
2001	---	---	---	---
2002	---	---	---	---
2003	---	---	---	---
2004	---	---	---	---
2005	---	---	---	---
2006	---	---	---	---
2007	---	---	---	---
2008	---	---	---	---
2009	---	---	---	---
2010	---	---	---	---
2011	---	---	---	---

*Please specify the sources used to extract the information provided above.*

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
---	---	---	---	---

### Contact details

General information on the national contact person for this indicator

**Name and surname**

Anna Luise

**Institution**

ISPRA

**Address**

Via Vitaliano Brancati 48, Roma

**Email**

anna.luise@isprambiente.it

**Telephone**

+39 06 3048 2553

### Interpretation of indicator status/trend and policy implications

#### Poverty in affected areas

**Did you provide data on poverty in affected areas?**

No

**If yes, please state whether you provided data for more than one year.**

No answer required.

***If no, do you see a pattern in the data?***

*No answer required.*

***Please explain the pattern emerging from the data and how it relates to DLDD.***

*No answer required.*

***If yes, does the poverty rate in affected areas change over time?***

*No answer required.*

***If no, please explain possible reasons why the poverty rate in affected areas does not change over time.***

*No answer required.*

***If yes, does the poverty rate in affected areas increase or decrease?***

*No answer required.*

***Please explain the pattern emerging from the data.***

*No answer required.*

***Is there a functional relationship between DLDD and the poverty rate in affected areas?***

*No answer required.*

***Please describe how DLDD affects the poverty rate in affected areas.***

*No answer required.*

***If DLDD does not affect the poverty rate in affected areas, please describe the other factor(s) responsible for changes in the poverty rate in affected areas.***

*No answer required.*

***Please upload a graph showing the percentage of human population below the poverty line in affected areas, covering all years for which data are provided in section "Poverty Rate" / sub-section "Reporting on the indicator".***

The graph should be provided as jpg or pdf with a maximum file size of 2MB

*No answer required.*

***To facilitate understanding please explain clearly what can be seen in the diagram (keys, classes, etc).***

*No answer required.*

---

## **Poverty in rural areas**

***Did you provide data on poverty in rural areas?***

**No**

***If yes, please state whether you provided data for more than one year.***

*No answer required.*

***If no, do you see a pattern in the data?***

*No answer required.*

***Please explain the pattern emerging from the data and how it relates to DLDD.***

*No answer required.*

***If yes, does the poverty rate in rural areas change over time?***

*No answer required.*

***If no, please explain possible reasons why the poverty rate in rural areas does not change over time.***

*No answer required.*

***If yes, does the poverty rate in rural areas increase or decrease?***

*No answer required.*

**Please explain the pattern emerging from the data.**

*No answer required.*

**Is there a functional relationship between DLDD and the poverty rate in rural areas?**

*No answer required.*

**Please describe how DLDD affects the poverty rate in rural areas.**

*No answer required.*

**If DLDD does not affect the poverty rate in rural areas, please describe the other factor(s) responsible for changes in the poverty rate in rural areas.**

*No answer required.*

**Please upload a graph showing the percentage of human population below the poverty line in rural areas, covering all years for which data are provided in section "Poverty Rate" / sub-section "Reporting on the indicator".**

The graph should be provided as jpg or pdf with a maximum file size of 2MB

*No answer required.*

**To facilitate understanding please explain clearly what can be seen in the diagram (keys, classes, etc).**

*No answer required.*

**Please state the actions and policies that you currently have in place or any that will be implemented in the future to address the implications of the indicator trend or lack thereof for addressing DLDD in your country.**

*No answer required.*

---

## **Poverty at the national level**

If data was provided for either affected or rural areas, please **do not** respond to this section.

**Did you provide data on poverty at the national level?**

**Yes**

**If yes, please state whether you provided data for more than one year.**

**Yes**

**If no, do you see a pattern in the data?**

*No answer required.*

**Please explain the pattern emerging from the data and how it relates to DLDD.**

*No answer required.*

**If yes, does the poverty rate at national level change over time?**

**No**

**If no, please explain possible reasons why the poverty rate at national level does not change over time.**

In 2011, absolute poverty is substantially stable compared to 2010, both nationally and in the individual geographic areas.

The incidence of absolute poverty among households with the reference person not occupied (from 5.9% to 6.6%), in particular if it is retired from work (from 4.7% to 5.4%), and in the absence of income from work, at least one member is looking for employment (8, 5% to 16.5%) increased in 2011. A decline was also observed among households headed by a person with a low professional level (worker, from 6.4% to 7.5%) and with low level of education (with at most a grade 8, 3% to 9.4%, with the permission of middle school from 5.1% to 6.2%). Finally, the condition of couples with one child (from 2.9% to 4%), particularly if under 18 years old (from 3.9% to 5.7%) is deteriorating in respect to previous years.

**If yes, does the poverty rate at national level increase or decrease?**

*No answer required.*

**Please explain the pattern emerging from the data.**

*No answer required.*

**Is there a functional relationship between DLDD and the poverty rate at the national level?**

**No**

**Please describe how DLDD affects the poverty rate at the national level.**

*No answer required.*

**If DLDD does not affect the poverty rate at the national level, please describe the other factor(s) responsible for changes in the poverty rate at the national level.**

*No answer provided.*

**Please upload a graph showing the percentage of the national population below the poverty line, covering all years for which data are provided in section "Reporting on the indicator".**

The graph should be provided as jpg or pdf with a maximum file size of 2MB

*No files attached.*

**To facilitate understanding please explain clearly what can be seen in the diagram (keys, classes, etc).**

*No answer provided.*

**Please state the actions and policies that you currently have in place or any that will be implemented in the future to address the implications of the indicator trend or lack thereof for addressing DLDD in your country.**

Available data on absolute ( and relative) poverty in sub national areas show that the regions most affected have also poverty rates higher than national average.

North Center South Italy

Year 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011

people x 1000 982 1.096 539 491 1.608 1.828 3.129 3.415

% 3,6 4,0 4,6 4,1 7,7 8,8 5,2 5,7

There are no specific data about rural or affected areas poverty rates but it is well documented the correlation between poverty and extension of affected areas.

Aggiungere altro.....

.....

---

## Feedback

---

### Report on specific COP requests – iterative process on indicators

Decision 13/COP.9 (paragraphs 2, 3 and 4) and decision 17/COP.9 envisage an iterative process to refine the set of performance and impact indicators. As a tool to implement this iterative process, affected country Parties can provide here their suggestions and recommendations for improvement. Using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 = (no, not at all) and 5 = (yes, very much), please rate the indicator. Please write any comments related to your assessment under the column "remarks".

Assessment Criteria (e-SMART)	Score	Remarks
Relevant – Does the indicator provide information about changes in primary processes unambiguously related to DLDD and UNCCD implementation?	0	more detailed analysis are necessary to address poverty and DLDD
Relevant – Is the indicator relevant for DLDD national planning purposes, including monitoring of the National Action Programme (NAP)?	4	---
Relevant – Can policymakers easily understand the indicator?	5	---

Assessment Criteria (e-SMART)	Score	Remarks
Specific – Is the indicator based on well-understood and generally accepted conceptual models of the system to which it is applied so that changes in its value will have clear meaning regarding the process of concern?	4	---
Specific – Is the requested spatial scale (national vs. affected areas) of the indicator appropriate for its monitoring purposes?	0	---
Measurable – Are the definitions of the indicator and its constitutive elements clear and not ambiguous?	1	---
Measurable – Are the proposed methodologies for the measurement of this indicator sufficiently clear to ensure reliable data?	2	---
Time-bound – Is the indicator sensitive enough to detect important changes but not so sensitive that signals are masked by natural variability?	2	---
Time-bound – Can the indicator detect changes at the required temporal and spatial scales and are the up-scaling / cross-scaling rules clear?	2	---
Achievable – Are reliable data and monitoring systems available to assess trends and is data collection a relatively straightforward process?	4	---
Achievable – Is the frequency of data collection in line with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the UNCCD?	0	---
Economic – Is the indicator cost-effective? Is the cost of data collection affordable and worthwhile? (consider any required cost for personnel, capital but also, recurring costs)	4	---

### Core indicator S-5: Land Cover Status

UNCCD Strategic Objective(s) for which the indicator applies  
Strategic Objective 2: To improve the condition of ecosystems

UNCCD Core indicator S-5

Maintenance of or increases in ecosystem function, including net primary productivity

Name of the indicator

Land cover status

Metric

Land cover / land productivity

Purpose of the indicator

The purpose of this indicator is to measure and monitor changes in land cover and land productivity. This can be used to indicate land degradation in terms of long-term loss of ecosystem primary productivity, and assess the progress made in maintaining or improving the condition of ecosystems.

Understanding of the indicator

Land cover reflects the (bio) physical dimension of the earth's surface. This can indicate the land's ability to sustain human activity and land use. Ideally, parties should provide data on the area of each land cover type, the percentage of the total national area covered by each land cover type and any patterns and trends over time. Where available, data should also be provided on the net primary productivity of each land cover type, to give some indication of the total productive capacity of the land.

Data needed

Total national land area, classification of land cover types, the total area of each land cover type (square km) and the total area of each land cover type as a percentage of the total national land area.



Relevant terms in the glossary

'aerial photo', 'data', 'data analysis', 'data source', 'desertification/land degradation and drought (DLDD)', 'Enhanced Vegetation Index (EVI)', 'e-SMART', 'expert knowledge', 'field survey', 'Fraction of photosynthetically active radiation absorbed by vegetation (FAPAR)', 'Global Inventory Modeling and Mapping Studies (GIMMS)', 'ground-truthing', 'indicator', 'land cover', 'Land Cover Classification System (LCCS)', 'land productivity', 'metric', 'minimum mapping unit (MMU)', 'Net primary productivity (NPP)', 'Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI)', 'Rainfall Use Efficiency (RUE)', 'remote sensing', 'satellite image', 'spatial resolution', 'temporal resolution'

## Reporting on land cover

### Reporting on the indicator

Land Cover Type #1 — Artificial surfaces

---

Land cover type

#### **Name**

**Artificial surfaces**

---

Methodology and data availability

***Please provide the definition used for this land cover type for each year between 2000 and 2011 for which land cover data are available.***

If available, LCCS should be used as land cover classification system.

Year	Definition of land cover type
2000	Urban fabric, Industrial, commercial and transport units, Mine, dump and construction sites Artificial non-agricultural vegetated areas.
2001	---
2002	---
2003	---
2004	---
2005	---
2006	Urban fabric, Industrial, commercial and transport units, Mine, dump and construction sites Artificial non-agricultural vegetated areas.
2007	---
2008	---
2009	---
2010	---
2011	---

***Please state the methodology used to produce land cover data in your country for the most recent years and the availability of associated images.***

Where remote sensing was used, state the respective year and month in which remote sensing was carried out to derive images.

---

Item 1

**Year:**  
2000

**Method used:**  
Remote sensing

**If field survey was used, please specify the percentage of country surface sampled:**  
100%

**If field survey was used, were the surveys extrapolated to the entire country?**  
---

**If remote sensing was used, identify the type and answer the following questions:**  
Satellite image

**Classification:**  
---

**Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:**  
25m

**Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:**  
365days

**Please specify the minimum mapping unit (MMU) of the image:**  
50000m

**Please specify the year that the photo was captured:**  
1999

**Please specify the month that the image was captured:**  
May

**Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:**  
100%

**Ground truthing conducted?**  
Yes

**If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:**  
99%

**High resolution verification?**  
Yes

**If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:**  
94%

**Expert opinion?**  
No

**Please specify how accurate the map was judged by the experts:**  
---

**Please specify the number of experts involved:**  
---

*Please specify the sources used to extract the information provided above.*

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
European Environment Agency	2000	IMAGE2000	---	<a href="http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/image2000">http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/image2000</a>
European Environment Agency	2006	IMAGE2006	---	<a href="http://sia.eionet.europa.eu/CLC2006">http://sia.eionet.europa.eu/CLC2006</a>

Indicator data

**For the years available, please provide the total area covered (in square kilometres) and the proportion of the total national area covered by this land cover type.**

Year	square km	% of total
2000	14392	5%
2001	---	---%
2002	---	---%
2003	---	---%
2004	---	---%
2005	---	---%
2006	14874	5%
2007	---	---%
2008	---	---%
2009	---	---%
2010	---	---%
2011	---	---%

***Please provide the geographic datasets which underpin the land cover information provided.***

Ideally, the data should be provided as a shapefile or raster (Geotiff) format with geographic coordinates on the WGS84 datum. If the raw data are not available please provide a map showing the extent of each land cover type listed. Ideally, the map should have a scale of less than 1:250,000 and be provided in a Tiff format.

*No files attached.*

***To facilitate understanding of the map provided, please explain clearly what can be seen in the map (resolution of map, year of the map, land cover classes and corresponding colours, borders, etc).***

*No answer provided.*

---

Contact details

General information on the national contact person for this indicator

***Name and surname***

**Ines Marinosci**

***Institution***

**ISPRA**

***Address***

**Via Vitaliano Brancati 48, 00144 Roma, Italy**

***Email***

**ines.marinosci@isprambiente.it**

***Telephone***

**+39 06 50072429**

---

Land Cover Type #2 — Agricultural areas

Land cover type

***Name***

**Agricultural areas**

**Please provide the definition used for this land cover type for each year between 2000 and 2011 for which land cover data are available.**

If available, LCCS should be used as land cover classification system.

Year	Definition of land cover type
2000	Nonirrigated arable land Perm. irrigated land Rice fields Vineyards Fruit trees and berry plantations Olive groves Pastures Annual crops associated with permanent crops Complex cultivation patterns Land principally occupied by agriculture with significant areas of natural vegetation Agro f
2001	---
2002	---
2003	---
2004	---
2005	---
2006	Nonirrigated arable land Perm. irrigated land Rice fields Vineyards Fruit trees and berry plantations Olive groves Pastures Annual crops associated with permanent crops Complex cultivation patterns Land principally occupied by agriculture with significant areas of natural vegetation Agro f
2007	---
2008	---
2009	---
2010	---
2011	---

**Please state the methodology used to produce land cover data in your country for the most recent years and the availability of associated images.**

Where remote sensing was used, state the respective year and month in which remote sensing was carried out to derive images.

Item 1

**Year:**  
2000

**Method used:**  
Remote sensing

**If field survey was used, please specify the percentage of country surface sampled:**  
---

**If field survey was used, were the surveys extrapolated to the entire country?**  
---

**If remote sensing was used, identify the type and answer the following questions:**  
Satellite image

**Classification:**  
Manual

**Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:**  
25m

**Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:**  
365days

**Please specify the minimum mapping unit (MMU) of the image:**  
50000m

**Please specify the year that the photo was captured:**  
1999

**Please specify the month that the image was captured:**  
May

**Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:**  
100%

**Ground truthing conducted?**  
Yes

**If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:**  
99%

**High resolution verification?**  
Yes

**If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:**  
95%

**Expert opinion?**  
No

**Please specify how accurate the map was judged by the experts:**  
---

**Please specify the number of experts involved:**  
---

*Please specify the sources used to extract the information provided above.*

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
European Environment Agency	---	IMAGE2000	---	<a href="http://image2000.jrc.ec.europa.eu/">http://image2000.jrc.ec.europa.eu/</a>
European Environment Agency	---	IMAGE2006	---	<a href="http://sia.eionet.europa.eu/CLC2006/">http://sia.eionet.europa.eu/CLC2006/</a>

Indicator data

*For the years available, please provide the total area covered (in square kilometres) and the proportion of the total national area covered by this land cover type.*

Year	square km	% of total
2000	157676	52%

Year	square km	% of total
2001	---	---%
2002	---	---%
2003	---	---%
2004	---	---%
2005	---	---%
2006	157274	49%
2007	---	---%
2008	---	---%
2009	---	---%
2010	---	---%
2011	---	---%

***Please provide the geographic datasets which underpin the land cover information provided.***

Ideally, the data should be provided as a shapefile or raster (Geotiff) format with geographic coordinates on the WGS84 datum. If the raw data are not available please provide a map showing the extent of each land cover type listed. Ideally, the map should have a scale of less than 1:250,000 and be provided in a Tiff format.

*No files attached.*

***To facilitate understanding of the map provided, please explain clearly what can be seen in the map (resolution of map, year of the map, land cover classes and corresponding colours, borders, etc).***

*No answer provided.*

---

Contact details

General information on the national contact person for this indicator

***Name and surname***

**Ines Marinosci**

***Institution***

**ISPRA**

***Address***

**Via Vitaliano Brancati 48, 00144 Roma, Italy**

***Email***

**ines.marinosci@isprambiente.it**

***Telephone***

**+39 06 50072429**

---

Land Cover Type #3 — Agro forestry areas

Land cover type

***Name***

**Agro forestry areas**

**Please provide the definition used for this land cover type for each year between 2000 and 2011 for which land cover data are available.**

If available, LCCS should be used as land cover classification system.

Year	Definition of land cover type
2000	Broad-leaved forest Coniferous forest Mixed forest Natural grasslands Moors and heathland Sclerophyllous vegetation Transitional woodland-shrub Beaches, dunes, sands Bare rocks Sparsely vegetated areas Burnt areas Glaciers and perpetual snow
2001	---
2002	---
2003	---
2004	---
2005	---
2006	Broad-leaved forest Coniferous forest Mixed forest Natural grasslands Moors and heathland Sclerophyllous vegetation Transitional woodland-shrub Beaches, dunes, sands Bare rocks Sparsely vegetated areas Burnt areas Glaciers and perpetual snow
2007	---
2008	---
2009	---
2010	---
2011	---

**Please state the methodology used to produce land cover data in your country for the most recent years and the availability of associated images.**

Where remote sensing was used, state the respective year and month in which remote sensing was carried out to derive images.

Item 1

**Year:**

2000

**Method used:**

Remote sensing

**If field survey was used, please specify the percentage of country surface sampled:**

---

**If field survey was used, were the surveys extrapolated to the entire country?**

---

**If remote sensing was used, identify the type and answer the following questions:**

Satellite image

**Classification:**

Manual

**Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:**

25m

**Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:**

365days

**Please specify the minimum mapping unit (MMU) of the image:**

50000m

**Please specify the year that the photo was captured:**

1999

**Please specify the month that the image was captured:**

May

**Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:**

100%

**Ground truthing conducted?**

Yes

**If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:**

99%

**High resolution verification?**

Yes

**If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:**

95%

**Expert opinion?**

No

**Please specify how accurate the map was judged by the experts:**

---

**Please specify the number of experts involved:**

---

**Please specify the sources used to extract the information provided above.**

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
European Environment Agency	2000	---	---	<a href="http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/image2000">http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/image2000</a>
European Environment Agency	2006	---	---	<a href="http://sia.eionet.europa.eu/CLC2006">http://sia.eionet.europa.eu/CLC2006</a>

Indicator data

**For the years available, please provide the total area covered (in square kilometres) and the proportion of the**



**total national area covered by this land cover type.**

Year	square km	% of total
2000	125403	41%
2001	---	---%
2002	---	---%
2003	---	---%
2004	---	---%
2005	---	---%
2006	125298	41%
2007	---	---%
2008	---	---%
2009	---	---%
2010	---	---%
2011	---	---%

**Please provide the geographic datasets which underpin the land cover information provided.**

Ideally, the data should be provided as a shapefile or raster (Geotiff) format with geographic coordinates on the WGS84 datum. If the raw data are not available please provide a map showing the extent of each land cover type listed. Ideally, the map should have a scale of less than 1:250,000 and be provided in a Tiff format.

*No files attached.*

**To facilitate understanding of the map provided, please explain clearly what can be seen in the map (resolution of map, year of the map, land cover classes and corresponding colours, borders, etc).**

*No answer provided.*

---

Contact details

General information on the national contact person for this indicator

**Name and surname**

**Ines Marinosci**

**Institution**

**ISPRA**

**Address**

**Via Vitaliano Brancati 48, 00144 Roma, Italy**

**Email**

**ines.marinosci@isprambiente.it**

**Telephone**

**+39 06 50072429**

---

Land Cover Type #4 — Wetlands

---

Land cover type

**Name****Wetlands**

Methodology and data availability

**Please provide the definition used for this land cover type for each year between 2000 and 2011 for which land cover data are available.**

If available, LCCS should be used as land cover classification system.

Year	Definition of land cover type
2000	Inland wetlands, Coastal wetland
2001	---
2002	---
2003	---
2004	---
2005	---
2006	Inland wetlands, Coastal wetland
2007	---
2008	---
2009	---
2010	---
2011	---

**Please state the methodology used to produce land cover data in your country for the most recent years and the availability of associated images.**

Where remote sensing was used, state the respective year and month in which remote sensing was carried out to derive images.

*Item 1*

**Year:**

2000

**Method used:**

Remote sensing

**If field survey was used, please specify the percentage of country surface sampled:**

100%

**If field survey was used, were the surveys extrapolated to the entire country?**

Yes

**If remote sensing was used, identify the type and answer the following questions:**

Satellite image

**Classification:**

Manual

**Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:**

25m

**Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:**

365days

**Please specify the minimum mapping unit (MMU) of the image:**

50000m

**Please specify the year that the photo was captured:**  
1999

**Please specify the month that the image was captured:**  
May

**Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:**  
100%

**Ground truthing conducted?**  
Yes

**If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:**  
99%

**High resolution verification?**  
Yes

**If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:**  
95%

**Expert opinion?**  
No

**Please specify how accurate the map was judged by the experts:**  
---

**Please specify the number of experts involved:**  
---

*Please specify the sources used to extract the information provided above.*

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
European Environment Agency	2000	IMAGE2000	---	<a href="http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/image2000">http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/image2000</a>
European Environment Agency	2006	IMAGE2006	---	<a href="http://sia.eionet.europa.eu/CLC2006">http://sia.eionet.europa.eu/CLC2006</a>

Indicator data

*For the years available, please provide the total area covered (in square kilometres) and the proportion of the total national area covered by this land cover type.*

Year	square km	% of total
2000	674	0%
2001	---	---%
2002	---	---%
2003	---	---%
2004	---	---%
2005	---	---%
2006	668	0%
2007	---	---%
2008	---	---%
2009	---	---%

Year	square km	% of total
2010	---	---%
2011	---	---%

**Please provide the geographic datasets which underpin the land cover information provided.**

Ideally, the data should be provided as a shapefile or raster (Geotiff) format with geographic coordinates on the WGS84 datum. If the raw data are not available please provide a map showing the extent of each land cover type listed. Ideally, the map should have a scale of less than 1:250,000 and be provided in a Tiff format.

*No files attached.*

**To facilitate understanding of the map provided, please explain clearly what can be seen in the map (resolution of map, year of the map, land cover classes and corresponding colours, borders, etc).**

*No answer provided.*

Contact details

General information on the national contact person for this indicator

**Name and surname**

**Ines Marinosci**

**Institution**

**ISPRA**

**Address**

**Via Vitaliano Brancati 48, 00144 Roma, Italy**

**Email**

**ines.marinosci@isprambiente.it**

**Telephone**

**+39 06 50072429**

Land Cover Type #5 — Water bodies

Land cover type

**Name**

**Water bodies**

Methodology and data availability

**Please provide the definition used for this land cover type for each year between 2000 and 2011 for which land cover data are available.**

If available, LCCS should be used as land cover classification system.

Year	Definition of land cover type
2000	Inland waters
2001	---
2002	---
2003	---
2004	---

Year	Definition of land cover type
2005	---
2006	Inland waters
2007	---
2008	---
2009	---
2010	---
2011	---

**Please state the methodology used to produce land cover data in your country for the most recent years and the availability of associated images.**

Where remote sensing was used, state the respective year and month in which remote sensing was carried out to derive images.

*Item 1*

**Year:**

2000

**Method used:**

Remote sensing

**If field survey was used, please specify the percentage of country surface sampled:**

---

**If field survey was used, were the surveys extrapolated to the entire country?**

---

**If remote sensing was used, identify the type and answer the following questions:**

Satellite image

**Classification:**

Manual

**Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:**

25m

**Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:**

365days

**Please specify the minimum mapping unit (MMU) of the image:**

50000m

**Please specify the year that the photo was captured:**

1999

**Please specify the month that the image was captured:**

May

**Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:**

100%

**Ground truthing conducted?**

Yes

**If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:**

99%

**High resolution verification?**

Yes

**If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:**

95%

**Expert opinion?**

No  
**Please specify how accurate the map was judged by the experts:**  
 ---  
**Please specify the number of experts involved:**  
 ---

**Please specify the sources used to extract the information provided above.**

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
European Environment Agency	2000	IMAGE2000	---	<a href="http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/image2000">http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/image2000</a>
European Environment Agency	2006	IMAGE2006	---	<a href="http://sia.eionet.europa.eu/CLC2006">http://sia.eionet.europa.eu/CLC2006</a>

Indicator data

**For the years available, please provide the total area covered (in square kilometres) and the proportion of the total national area covered by this land cover type.**

Year	square km	% of total
2000	3140	1%
2001	---	---%
2002	---	---%
2003	---	---%
2004	---	---%
2005	---	---%
2006	3171	1%
2007	---	---%
2008	---	---%
2009	---	---%
2010	---	---%
2011	---	---%

**Please provide the geographic datasets which underpin the land cover information provided.**

Ideally, the data should be provided as a shapefile or raster (Geotiff) format with geographic coordinates on the WGS84 datum. If the raw data are not available please provide a map showing the extent of each land cover type listed. Ideally, the map should have a scale of less than 1:250,000 and be provided in a Tiff format.

*No files attached.*

**To facilitate understanding of the map provided, please explain clearly what can be seen in the map (resolution of map, year of the map, land cover classes and corresponding colours, borders, etc).**

*No answer provided.*

Contact details

General information on the national contact person for this indicator

**Name and surname**

Ines Marinosci

**Institution**

ISPRA

**Address**

Via Vitaliano Brancati 48, 00144 Roma, Italy

**Email**

ines.marinosci@isprambiente.it

**Telephone**

+39 06 50072429

---

**Interpretation of indicator status/trend and policy implications**

---

Interpretation of the indicator

**Did you provide data for more than one year?**

Yes

**If no, do you see a pattern in the data related to affected areas?**

No answer required.

**Please explain the pattern emerging from the data and how it relates to DLDD.**

No answer required.

**Does the indicator change over time?**

No

**If no, please explain possible reasons why the indicator does not change over time**

The reported land cover status indicator is derived from the CORINE land cover considering the following five classes: Artificial areas, Agricultural areas, Forest and semi-natural areas, Wetlands, Water bodies(inland). The classes Agricultural areas and Forest and semi natural areas are subdivided in the CORINE data base respectively into ten and twelve subclasses. Because of their relevance for the analysis of DLDD they have been analyzed and no significant change has been identified at national scale.

1)At national scale all the changes 2000-2006 are 0,2%, and the changes from agricultural to artificial areas are 0,15% (much less than the European average 0,6%).

2) Analyzing the land cover change specifically into the affected areas the change from agriculture to artificial areas is about 0,4%.

2) Although the spatial resolution for the detection of land cover changes (50000 sq meters) is sufficient to identify changes in the affected areas mapped with a spatial resolution of 1000000 sq. meters , more specific and detailed analysis should be used to identify local changes linked to DLDD.

**If yes, is there a functional relationship between the indicator and DLDD?**

No answer required.

**If DLDD does not affect the indicator, please describe the other factor(s) responsible for changes in the indicator value over time.**

No answer required.

**Please describe how DLDD affects the indicator.**

*No answer required.*

**Does the extent of affected areas increase or decrease?**

*No answer required.*

**Please explain the pattern emerging from the data.**

*No answer required.*

**Please upload any graphs showing the temporal pattern/trend in the indicator over time, covering all years for which data is available.**

The graph should be provided as jpg or pdf with a maximum file size of 2MB. To facilitate understanding please explain clearly what can be seen in the diagrams (keys, classes, resolutions etc.)

*No files attached.*

**Please state the actions and policies that you currently have in place or any that will be implemented in the future to address the implications of the indicator trend or lack thereof for addressing DLDD in your country.**

**Although the country is affected by desertification it is not yet possible to quantify the impacts of DLDD on ecosystem services as defined by the Millennium Ecosystem assessment. Current policies are oriented to rural development addressing the improvement of land productivity in the agriculture and forestry sectors. Improvement of water use and conservation is also a priority of current policies developed within the framework of the European Union implementation activities.**

---

## Feedback

Report on specific COP requests – iterative process on indicators

Decision 13/COP.9 (paragraphs 2, 3 and 4) and decision 17/COP.9 envisage an iterative process to refine the set of performance and impact indicators. As a tool to implement this iterative process, affected country Parties can provide here their suggestions and recommendations for improvement. Using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 = (no, not at all) and 5 = (yes, very much), please rate the indicator. Please write any comments related to your assessment under the column “remarks”.

Assessment Criteria (e-SMART)	Score	Remarks
Relevant – Does the indicator provide information about changes in primary processes unambiguously related to DLDD and UNCCD implementation?	2	---
Relevant – Is the indicator relevant for DLDD national planning purposes, including monitoring of the National Action Programme (NAP)?	0	---
Relevant – Can policymakers easily understand the indicator?	3	---
Specific – Is the indicator based on well-understood and generally accepted conceptual models of the system to which it is applied so that changes in its value will have clear meaning regarding the process of concern?	3	---
Specific – Is the requested spatial scale (national vs. affected areas) of the indicator appropriate for its monitoring purposes?	0	---
Measurable – Are the definitions of the indicator and its constitutive elements clear and not ambiguous?	4	---
Measurable – Are the proposed methodologies for the measurement of this indicator sufficiently clear to ensure reliable data?	0	---



Assessment Criteria (e-SMART)	Score	Remarks
Time-bound – Is the indicator sensitive enough to detect important changes but not so sensitive that signals are masked by natural variability?	4	---
Time-bound – Can the indicator detect changes at the required temporal and spatial scales and are the up-scaling / cross-scaling rules clear?	0	---
Achievable – Are reliable data and monitoring systems available to assess trends and is data collection a relatively straightforward process?	0	---
Achievable – Is the frequency of data collection in line with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the UNCCD?	0	---
Economic – Is the indicator cost-effective? Is the cost of data collection affordable and worthwhile? (consider any required cost for personnel, capital but also, recurring costs)	4	---

## Reporting on land productivity

Do not reply to this section if you provided no data on land cover.

### Reporting on the indicator

Do not reply to this section if you provided no data on land cover.

**Question marked as 'Skipped'.**

**Please, state the methods used to estimate land productivity in your country.**

*No answer provided.*

**Please state the net primary productivity (NPP) (in kgC ha<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>) for each land cover type described in section “Land Cover Status” / sub-section “Methodology and data availability”:**

Year (2000-2011)	Land cover type	NPP (kgC ha <sup>-1</sup> year <sup>-1</sup> )
---	---	---

**For the land cover types described in section “Land Cover Status” / sub-section “Methodology and data availability”, please state whether you have data on NDVI, FAPAR, EVI or others and also state the respective value.**

Year (2000-2011)	Land cover type	Value	Data type
---	---	---	---

**If Others, please specify:**

*No answer required.*

**Please specify the sources used to extract the information provided above.**

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
---	---	---	---	---

**Please provide the geographic datasets which underpin the land productivity information provided.**

Ideally, the data should be provided as a shapefile or raster (Geotiff) format with geographic coordinates on the WGS84 datum. If the raw data are not available please provide a map showing the extent of each land cover type listed. Ideally, the map should have a scale of less than 1:250,000 and be provided in a Tiff format.

*No files attached.*

**To facilitate understanding of the map provided, please explain clearly what can be seen in the map**

*(resolution of map, year of the map, land cover classes and corresponding colours, borders, etc).*

*No answer provided.*

## **Interpretation of the indicator**

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

***Did you provide data for more than one year?***

*No answer provided.*

***If no, do you see a pattern in the data related to affected areas?***

*No answer required.*

***Please explain the pattern emerging from the data and how it relates to DLDD.***

*No answer required.*

***Does the indicator change over time?***

*No answer required.*

***If no, please explain possible reasons why the indicator does not change over time***

*No answer required.*

***If yes, is there a functional relationship between the indicator and DLDD?***

*No answer required.*

***If DLDD does not affect the indicator, please describe the other factor(s) responsible for changes in the indicator value over time.***

*No answer required.*

***Please describe how DLDD affects the indicator.***

*No answer required.*

***Does the extent of affected areas increase or decrease?***

*No answer required.*

***Please explain the pattern emerging from the data.***

*No answer required.*

***Please upload any graphs showing the temporal pattern/trend in the indicator over time, covering all years for which data is available.***

The graph should be provided as jpg or pdf with a maximum file size of 2MB. To facilitate understanding please explain clearly what can be seen in the diagrams (keys, classes, resolutions etc.)

*No answer required.*

***Please state the actions and policies that you currently have in place or any that will be implemented in the future to address the implications of the indicator trend or lack thereof for addressing DLDD in your country.***

*No answer provided.*

## **Feedback**

### **Report on specific COP requests – iterative process on indicators**

Decision 13/COP.9 (paragraphs 2, 3 and 4) and decision 17/COP.9 envisage an iterative process to refine the set of performance and impact indicators. As a tool to implement this iterative process, affected country Parties can provide here their suggestions and recommendations for improvement. Using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 = (no, not at all) and 5 = (yes, very much), please rate the indicator. Please write any comments related to your assessment under the column "remarks".

<b>Assessment Criteria (e-SMART)</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
Relevant – Does the indicator provide information about changes in primary processes unambiguously related to DLDD and UNCCD implementation?	0	---
Relevant – Is the indicator relevant for DLDD national planning purposes, including monitoring of the National Action Programme (NAP)?	0	---
Relevant – Can policymakers easily understand the indicator?	0	---
Specific – Is the indicator based on well-understood and generally accepted conceptual models of the system to which it is applied so that changes in its value will have clear meaning regarding the process of concern?	---	---
Specific – Is the requested spatial scale (national vs. affected areas) of the indicator appropriate for its monitoring purposes?	0	---
Measurable – Are the definitions of the indicator and its constitutive elements clear and not ambiguous?	5	---
Measurable – Are the proposed methodologies for the measurement of this indicator sufficiently clear to ensure reliable data?	4	---
Time-bound – Is the indicator sensitive enough to detect important changes but not so sensitive that signals are masked by natural variability?	0	---
Time-bound – Can the indicator detect changes at the required temporal and spatial scales and are the up-scaling / cross-scaling rules clear?	0	---
Achievable – Are reliable data and monitoring systems available to assess trends and is data collection a relatively straightforward process?	0	---
Achievable – Is the frequency of data collection in line with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the UNCCD?	0	---
Economic – Is the indicator cost-effective? Is the cost of data collection affordable and worthwhile? (consider any required cost for personnel, capital but also, recurring costs)	4	---

### **Additional indicators on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3**

This reporting template can be used to report on the nine impact indicators provisionally accepted by the COP (see decision 17/COP.9) but considered optional for inclusion in reports by affected country Parties. Detailed reporting guidelines have not been developed for these nine optional impact indicators, but a description of the indicators and associated metrics can be found in Orr, B.J. 2011. “Scientific review of the UNCCD provisionally accepted set of impact indicators to measure the implementation of strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3.” White Paper Version 1. Available from [http://www.unccd.int/en/programmes/Science/Monitoring-Assessment/Documents/White%20paper\\_Scientific%20review%20set%20of%20indicators\\_Ver1.pdf](http://www.unccd.int/en/programmes/Science/Monitoring-Assessment/Documents/White%20paper_Scientific%20review%20set%20of%20indicators_Ver1.pdf)

Alternative indicators considered more suitable than the provisionally accepted indicators may also be reported on using this template. The condition for reporting on alternative indicators is that these fit into the underlying logic of measuring progress against strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 of the Strategy.

#### **Purpose of the indicators**

<b>Water availability per capita</b>	“To measure and monitor changes in access to water sources for the population. This can be used to assess the impacts of DLDD, and mitigation efforts, on water resources”
<b>Change in land use</b>	“To measure and monitor changes in the productive or protective uses of the land resource. This can be used to assess sustainability of land use.”

<b>Food consumption per capita</b>	“To measure and monitor changes in nutritional status. This can act as an indicator of both well-being and the availability of ecosystem services.”
<b>Capacity of soils to sustain agro-pastoral use</b>	“To measure and monitor changes in the status of soil health. This can be used to assess the impacts of DLDD, and mitigation efforts, on soil health.”
<b>Degree of land degradation</b>	“To measure and monitor changes in the extent and severity of land degradation. This can be used to assess the impact of agreements and programs to address land degradation and reclaim degraded lands.”
<b>Plant and animal biodiversity</b>	“To measure and monitor changes in the status of biodiversity relative to a ‘pristine’ baseline. This can be used as an indicator for overall environmental sustainability and used to assess the impacts of DLDD, and interventions, on enhancing biodiversity.”
<b>Drought index</b>	“Acts as an indicator for characterising sensitive and desertification-affected areas. This can be used to monitor the climatic conditions affecting water availability as a driving force of DLDD, provide early warnings of drought and assess severity and actions.”
<b>Carbon stocks above and below ground</b>	“To measure and monitor changes in above and below ground stocks as a global benefit. This can be used to assess the impacts of DLDD, and mitigation efforts on carbon stocks.”
<b>Land under Sustainable Land Management (SLM)</b>	“To act as a surrogate for measuring and monitoring a number of global benefits: (a) Climate regulation and carbon sequestration; (b) Vegetation cover and composition; and (c) Water retention and the regional hydrologic balance.”

None delivered.

## Strategic Objective 4

### Indicator SO-4-3

Strategic Objective 4

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

**Impact indicator SO-4-3 for 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)

Percentage change in the domestic financial commitment to the implementation of the Convention

Understanding of the indicator

It provides an indication of the trend in the supply of public finance for DLDD-related investments and other Convention-related activities by affected developing country Parties.

Data needed

- DLDD-related programmes and projects (co-)financed through domestic public budgets
- Contribution by domestic public sources to investments and other initiatives to advance SLM
- Convention-related financial commitments by affected developing country Parties

Data sources (indicative only)

- PRAIS (financial annexes)
- CRIC performance reviews of OO5 and analyses of financial flows
- Relevant country-level studies to inform the IFS process (to be used when data is not available in the PRAIS system, and/or for cross referencing and validity checks)
- Inventories of SLM funding opportunities and/or investments
- Relevant databases and publications of authoritative entities (to be used when data is not available in the PRAIS system, and/or for cross referencing and validity checks)

Check the glossary for

Integrated financing strategy; integrated investment framework

**Nominal amount (USD) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives made from domestic public budgets (i.e. national or sub-national)**

Year	Nominal amount (USD)
2010	0
2011	0

**Sources of information**

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- **no financial commitment has been made for the implementation of the Convention in the reporting years.**

*No files attached.*

**Indicator SO-4-6**

Strategic Objective 4

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

**Impact indicator SO-4-6 for expected impact 4.2** (Enabling policy environments are improved for UNCCD implementation at all levels)

Number and type of legal and regulatory frameworks, economic incentives or other mechanisms securing or facilitating the transfer of funds for the implementation of the Convention at all levels.

Understanding of the indicator

It provides a measure of the efforts made by Convention stakeholders to facilitate the implementation of the Convention.

Data needed

- Laws and regulations
- Economic and financial measures (e.g. fiscal rules, tax benefits, credit lines and borrowing rules, etc.)
- Cooperation frameworks (e.g. agreements, memoranda of understanding, contracts, etc.)
- Sectoral policies (e.g. trade, marketing, property rights, business development, etc.)
- Convention-specific mechanisms

Data sources (indicative only)

- Public records of Convention stakeholders
- Relevant databases and publications and other authoritative entities (to be used when data is not available in the PRAIS system, and/or for cross referencing and validity checks)
- PRAIS (CONS-O-6, CONS-O-14, CONS-O-18)

Check the glossary for  
Incentive

**Number of mechanisms in place in the country to facilitate the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Convention, by type**

Year	Laws and regulations	Economic and financial incentives	Cooperation frameworks	Sectoral policies
2010	0	0	0	0
2011	0	0	0	0

---

## Qualitative assessment

### Description of mechanisms

Mechanism	Description
A - Laws and regulations	---
B - Economic and financial incentives	---
C - Cooperation frameworks	---
D - Sectoral policies	---

### Geographical level of application

	International	Regional	Subregional	National	Local
A					
B					
C					
D					

---

## Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

*No answer provided.*

*No files attached.*

---

## Indicator SO-4-7

Strategic Objective 4

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

**Impact indicator SO-4-7 for expected impact 4.2** (Enabling policy environments are improved for UNCCD implementation at all levels)

Clear entrusting of institutional responsibilities for UNCCD implementation, at all levels

Understanding of the indicator

It provides an indication of the effectiveness of institutional arrangements for the implementation of the Convention with regard to the resource mobilization process

Data needed

- Evidence of institutional arrangements, instruments and mechanisms that facilitate resource mobilization, or the lack thereof
- Best practices in resource mobilization

Data sources (indicative only)

- Public records of Convention stakeholders
- Relevant databases and publications of authoritative entities
- PRAIS (Best Practices on finance and resource mobilization)

Check the glossary for  
N.A.

---

## Institutional set up, responsibilities, and arrangements to facilitate the implementation of the

## Convention

Year	International level	Regional level	Subregional level	National level	Local level
2010	good	fair	---	poor	fair
2011	good	fair	---	poor	fair

---

## Qualitative assessment

### *Description of institutional arrangements*

Level	Description
A - International	---
B - Regional	---
C - Subregional	---
D - National	---
E - Local	---

---

## Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

*No answer provided.*

*No files attached.*

# Performance Indicators

## Operational Objective 1: Advocacy, awareness raising and education

### Performance indicator CONS-O-1 for Outcome 1.1

Number and size of information events organized on the subject of DLDD and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity, and audience reached by media addressing DLDD and DLDD synergies.

#### Understanding of the indicator

At the national level, the indicator measures the performance of Convention-related communication strategies, in particular whether DLDD issues and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity are being communicated and if so, whether the communication is considered to be effective. Effectiveness is assessed through the appraisal of the media campaigns carried out; the assumption is that the stronger the media campaigns on DLDD issues and synergies, the higher the probability of passing the messages on to the target audiences. The focus of the indicator is on information activities specifically dedicated to DLDD issues and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity. Other reporting entities will complement the information provided by affected country Parties by reporting on Convention-related communication strategies at the subregional, regional and global levels.

#### Data needed

- Information on events/media specifically addressing DLDD and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity.
- Only events organized by major national DLDD stakeholders about which NFPs have been informed should be considered.
- Only the media products from the five most important national TV/radio channels and the five most relevant national newspapers should be considered.

#### Data sources (indicative only)

Attendance list of events (meetings, workshops, seminars), programme/project documents, major national media (TV/radio channels, newspapers), the Internet, organizers of events.

#### Check the glossary for

'NFP', 'Information events', 'Media products', 'National communication strategy', 'Participant'

#### Check the reporting manual for

'How can the number of information events and estimated number of participants in information events be determined?', 'How can the number of media products be determined?', 'How can the proportion of the population which is informed about DLDD and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity be estimated?'

#### Overall target

By 2018, 30 per cent of the global population is informed about DLDD and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity.

---

### Number of information events

Year	Number of information events	Estimated number of participants in the information events
2010	0	0
2011	2	100

---

### Estimated number of persons reached by media products and by key stakeholders

#### Number of media products made public

Year	Newspapers	Radio and TV
2010	2	3
2011	3	3



---

## Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- **Personal information**

*No files attached.*

---

## National contribution to the target

On the basis of your best knowledge, estimate the proportion (%) of the population in your country which is informed about DLDD and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity at the time of reporting?

### ***Estimated share of total country population***

5 %

---

## Qualitative assessment

***Is the information you have provided on communication processes part of a national communication strategy addressing environmental issues?***

***Is there a national communication strategy addressing DLDD and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity?***

No

***If yes, does the implementation of the national communication strategy complement the implementation of the UNCCD Comprehensive Communication Strategy?***

*No answer required.*

***If no, is your country implementing the UNCCD Comprehensive Communication Strategy?***

No

***Is your country implementing activities relating to the United Nations Decade for Deserts and the Fight Against Desertification (UNDDD)?***

No

---

## Performance indicator CONS-O-3 for Outcome 1.3

Number of civil society organizations (CSOs) and science and technology institutions (STIs) participating in the Convention processes.

Understanding of the indicator

At the national level, the indicator measures the level of participation of CSOs and STIs in DLDD-related programmes and projects. The indicator will outline whether the active involvement of these stakeholders in country-based initiatives increases over time and whether programmes/projects are valid tools for the engagement of, and receiving contributions from, CSOs and STIs at the field level. Other reporting entities will complement the information provided by affected country Parties by reporting on the involvement of CSOs and STIs at the subregional, regional and global levels; additionally, the secretariat and the GM will report on the involvement of CSOs and STIs at the institutional level.

Data needed

A list of the organizations involved in the programmes/projects in the reporting country as reported in the PPSs.

Data sources (indicative only)

PPSs submitted to the UNCCD as part of the reporting exercise.

Check the glossary for

'STIs', 'CSOs', 'PPS', 'Convention processes'

Check the reporting manual for

'Which CSOs involved in DLDD-related programmes/projects should be counted?'

Overall target

A steady growth in the participation of CSOs and STIs in the Convention processes is recorded along the implementation period of The Strategy.

---

### Number of CSOs/STIs involved in each programme/project in the country

In the PPSs you have specified the number of CSOs and the number of STIs involved in each programme/project in your country. Add these numbers and give the totals by year in the table below.

Year	Number of CSOs involved in DLDD-related programmes/projects	Number of STIs involved in DLDD-related programmes/projects
2010	0	0
2011	0	0

**Provide the names of these organizations.**

Name
---

---

### National contribution to the target

**At the time of reporting, is your government undertaking concrete initiatives to increase the participation of CSOs and STIs in DLDD-related programmes and projects?**

No

**If yes, provide a short description of actions taken at the national level to promote participation by CSOs and STIs in the Convention processes**

*No answer required.*

---

### Qualitative assessment

Specify the reasons for the increasing and/or decreasing trend of the participation of CSOs and STIs to DLDD-related programmes/projects.

#### **Reasons for increasing**

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

Reason	Level of importance
Increased networking and collaboration opportunities	---
Increased access to information and to national and/or international financing opportunities	---
Increased willingness of the government in working with CSOs	---
Increased interest of donors in working with CSOs	---
Strengthened organizational, project management and fund-raising capacity of CSOs	---
Increased funding opportunities requiring partnership with the STIs	---
Strengthened organizational, project management and fund-raising capacity of the STIs	---
Other	---

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

### **Reasons for decreasing for CSOs**

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

<b>Reason</b>	<b>Level of importance</b>
Costly participatory processes	3
Low organizational, fund-raising and project management capacity of CSOs	2
Government policies and/or the legal environment do not foster the engagement of CSOs	3
Diminishing funding	5
Other	---

#### **Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

### **Reasons for decreasing for STIs**

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

<b>Reason</b>	<b>Level of importance</b>
DLDD topics are not prioritized by national STIs	4
Low organizational, fund-raising and project management capacity of STIs	1
Decreased networking opportunities at national and international level	1
Diminishing funding	5
Other	---

#### **Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

---

### **Performance indicator CONS-O-4 for Outcome 1.3**

Number and type of DLDD-related initiatives of civil society organizations (CSOs) and science and technology institutions (STIs) in the field of education.

#### Understanding of the indicator

At the national level, the indicator measures the number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by CSOs and STIs in the education sector. The assumption is that the higher the number of DLDD-related education initiatives undertaken by these stakeholders, the stronger their interest in addressing DLDD problems. This indicator focuses on “education” because “awareness” and “advocacy” are already measured through indicators CONS-O-1 and CONS-O-2, respectively. Other reporting entities will complement the information provided by affected country Parties by reporting on the involvement of CSOs and STIs at the subregional, regional and global levels.

#### Data needed

- Information on initiatives undertaken in the field of education that may be found in: written communications by CSOs and STIs to the NFP; contractual and/or programme/project-related documents; records of academic bodies and their curricula; and Internet resources made available by CSOs and STIs.
- Only initiatives in the field of education taken in the country and directly relating to DLDD issues are to be considered.

#### Data sources (indicative only)

CSOs and STIs operating in the country.

#### Check the glossary for

‘CSOs’, ‘STIs’, ‘NFP’, Education initiatives’

#### Check the reporting manual for

‘Which CSOs involved in DLDD-related education initiatives should be counted?’

## Overall target

A steady growth in the number of DLDD-related education initiatives undertaken by CSOs and science and technology institutions is recorded along the implementation period of The Strategy.

## Number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by CSOs/STIs

Year	Number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by CSOs	Number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by STIs
2010	0	0
2011	0	1

## Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- **Personal information**

*No files attached.*

## National contribution to the target

***At the time of reporting, is your government undertaking concrete initiatives to increase the delivery of DLDD-related initiatives in the education sector by CSOs and STIs?***

**No**

***If yes, provide a short description of actions taken at the national level to increase the number of DLDD-related initiatives of CSOs and STIs in the field of education***

*No answer required.*

## Qualitative assessment

Specify the reasons for the increasing and/or decreasing trend of DLDD-related education initiatives undertaken by CSOs and STIs.

### ***Reasons for increasing***

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

Reason	Level of importance
Increased access to funding	---
Increased awareness of DLDD-related problems and of the need for action	---
Increased knowledge of DLDD-related topics and enhanced skills of trainers/teachers	---
Government policies are more supportive of education initiatives	---
International donors are more supportive of education-focussed initiatives.	---
Other	---

### ***Other (specify)***

*No answer provided.*

### ***Reasons for decreasing for CSOs***

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

Reason	Level of importance
--------	---------------------

Reason	Level of importance
Lack of financial resources	4
Insufficient awareness and knowledge by national CSOs of DLDD-related issues	2
Limited capillary presence of national CSOs at the grass-root level	4
Other	---

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

**Reasons for decreasing for STIs**

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

Reason	Level of importance
Lack of financial resources	5
National STIs are more focussed on research activities than on education and training	3
Other	---

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

## Operational Objective 2: Policy framework

### Performance indicator CONS-O-5 for Outcomes 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3

Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities to have finalized the formulation/revision of NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs aligned to The Strategy, taking into account biophysical and socio-economic information, national planning and policies, and integration into investment frameworks.

#### Understanding of the indicator

At the national level, the indicator measures the performance of affected country Parties in formulating or revising their NAPs in alignment with The Strategy. While providing information on this process, the indicator also outlines whether: (a) the analysis of DLDD drivers, barriers to possible solutions, and measures that may eventually overcome these barriers, has been carried out; (b) the alignment process has been supported by biophysical and socio-economic baseline information; (c) the action programmes have been included in integrated investment frameworks; and (d) the action programmes have been integrated with other existing national plans and policies. The indicator will inform on the extent to which Parties have responded to decision 3/COP.8, paragraph 45, and on the feasibility of assessing the progress of The Strategy over its implementation period (2008–2018). Subregional and regional reporting entities will complement the information provided by affected country Parties by reporting on formulation or revision of SRAPs and RAPs in alignment with The Strategy.

#### Data needed

- UNCCD NAP. Only a NAP formally approved by the relevant governmental authorities is to be considered as 'finalized'
- Other relevant planning documents

#### Data sources (indicative only)

UNCCD NFP.

#### Check the glossary for

'Finalized', 'NAP', 'NFP', 'driver', 'integrated investment framework', 'baseline', 'NAP formulation', 'NAP adoption', 'NAP alignment', 'Formulation of an aligned NAP'

#### Overall target

By 2014, at least 80 per cent of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities have formulated/ revised a NAP/SRAP/RAP aligned to The Strategy.

## NAP Adoption and Revision

**Had your country already adopted a NAP prior to The Strategy, i.e. before 31.12.2007?**

Yes

**If your country had adopted a NAP prior to The Strategy, i.e. before 31.12.2007, specify the date of its approval.**

*No answer provided.*

**If your country had adopted a NAP prior to The Strategy, has it revised the NAP in alignment with The Strategy, i.e. after 1.1.2008?**

No

**If your country has revised the NAP in alignment with The Strategy, i.e. after 1.1.2008, specify the date of its approval.**

*No answer required.*

**If your country has not revised the NAP in alignment with The Strategy, specify why the process was not initiated.**

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

Reason	Level of importance
Not a priority for the government	2
Lack of capacities	0
Lack of financial resources	5
Understaffing	2
Lack of time	1
Poor internal coordination among relevant ministries	3
Other	---

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

**If your country had no NAP prior to The Strategy, has it formulated an aligned NAP after The Strategy's adoption, i.e. after 1.1 2008?**

*No answer required.*

**If yes, specify the date of its approval.**

*No answer required.*

**If your country has some specific issues with regard to the characteristics of the NAP and/or the status of its implementation, particularly in how they relate to its alignment with The Strategy, describe them briefly.**

*No answer provided.*

**If your country did not have a NAP by the end of the reporting period, specify why the process was not initiated.**

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

*No answer required.*

**Other (specify)**

*No answer required.*

---

**For countries having a NAP aligned to The Strategy**

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

**Is your country's NAP supported by biophysical and socio-economic baseline information?**

*No answer provided.*

**Does your country's NAP assess DLDD drivers?**

*No answer provided.*

**Does your country's NAP assess the barriers to sustainable land management?**

*No answer provided.*

**If yes, does it include recommendations to remove these barriers?**

*No answer required.*

**Has your country's NAP been included in an integrated investment framework?**

*No answer provided.*

**Has your country's NAP been integrated into national development planning and relevant sectoral and investment plans and policies?**

*No answer provided.*

**If yes, has the NAP been integrated into your country's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper?**

*No answer required.*

**Did your country refer to the guidelines on the alignment of action programmes with The Strategy as proposed in ICCD/COP(9)/2/Add.1 while revising the NAP to be in alignment with The Strategy or while formulating an aligned NAP?**

*No answer provided.*

---

## Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- Focal Point Archives

*No files attached.*

---

## National contribution to the target

**If your country did not have a NAP aligned to The Strategy by the end of the reporting period, when do you plan to have it completed?**

*No answer provided.*

**If you do not have an approved NAP aligned to The Strategy at the time of reporting, when do you plan to have it developed and approved?**

---

## Qualitative assessment

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

**Has the revision of the NAP to be in alignment with The Strategy or the formulation of an aligned NAP been supported by external assistance?**

*No answer provided.*

**If yes, did you receive assistance from one or more of the following institutions?**

*No answer required.*

**If yes, which type of assistance did you receive?**

*No answer required.*

**Identify the major difficulties experienced in the process of revising the NAP to be in alignment with The Strategy or in formulating an aligned NAP.**

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

Reason	Level of importance
Not a priority for the government	---
Poor availability of biophysical and socio-economic baseline information	---
Existing investment frameworks are not fully compatible with the NAP	---
Streamlining the NAP into existing plans and policies is too time-consuming	---
Other	---

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

---

**Performance indicator CONS-O-7 for Outcome 2.5**

Number of initiatives for synergistic planning/programming of the three Rio Conventions or mechanisms for joint implementation, at all levels.

Understanding of the indicator

At the national level, the indicator measures the existence of synergistic processes through the number of instruments (i.e. joint planning/programming and/or operational mechanisms) in place which foster the introduction of, or strengthen the mutually reinforcing measures among, the three Rio Conventions. The assumption is that the higher the number of enabling instruments in place, the higher the possibility of achieving synergies in implementation. This information will be complemented by the reporting of other reporting entities on synergistic processes at the subregional, regional and global levels.

Data needed

- Planning/programming documents and legislative/regulatory documents.
- Information on operational mechanisms explicitly aimed at achieving joint implementation, synergies and convergence, as well as at introducing or strengthening reinforcing measures among the Rio Conventions.

Data sources (indicative only)

Relevant national ministries.

Check the glossary for

'Joint planning/programming initiatives', 'Operational mechanisms for joint implementation or mutual reinforcement'

Check the reporting manual for

'Which synergistic instruments should be included?', 'Indicative list of activities by Parties to promote synergies among the Rio Conventions'

Overall target

By 2014, each affected country Party has either one joint national plan in place or functional mechanism(s) to ensure synergies among the three Rio Conventions.

---

**Was your country implementing joint planning/programming initiatives for the three Rio Conventions in the reporting period?**

**No**

**If yes, specify the type of joint initiative(s)**

*No answer required.*

**Other (specify)**

*No answer required.*

---



**Did operational mechanisms for joint implementation or mutual reinforcement exist in your country during the reporting period?**

No

**If yes, specify the type of mechanism(s)**

No answer required.

**Other (specify)**

No answer required.

---

### Sources of information

List the synergistic instruments referred to above.

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- Personal information

No files attached.

---

### National contribution to the target

**If your country was not implementing joint planning/programming or did not have operational mechanisms in place by the end of the last reporting period, when do you plan to have synergistic instruments in place?**

No answer provided.

---

### Qualitative assessment

**Has the establishment of synergistic processes for joint implementation of the Rio Conventions at national level been supported by the institutions of the Rio Conventions?**

No

**If yes, by the institutions of which Convention?**

No answer required.

**Identify the major difficulties experienced in establishing synergistic planning/programming or mechanisms for joint implementation.**

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

Reason	Level of importance
Not a priority for the government	2
Lack of capacities	0
Lack of financial resources	5
Understaffing	3
Lack of time	1
Poor internal coordination among relevant ministries	3
Other	---

**Other (specify)**

No answer provided.

---

### Operational Objective 3: Science, technology and knowledge

## Performance indicator CONS-O-8 for Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2

Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities to have established and supported a national/subregional/regional monitoring system for DLDD

### Understanding of the indicator

At the national level, the indicator measures the monitoring potential of the country by quantifying the number of monitoring systems established and supported. These monitoring systems may be specifically dedicated to DLDD or may partially cover it. The indicator will inform on the extent to which it is realistic to expect more regular and coherent reporting by affected country Parties during the implementation of The Strategy and beyond. This information will be complemented by the reporting of other reporting entities on UNCCD-relevant monitoring systems established and supported at the subregional, regional and global levels.

### Data needed

- Information on monitoring systems established within the national ministries or other bodies/institutions
- Programme/project documents and interim or final reports

### Data sources (indicative only)

Relevant national ministries, programme/project management units, other non-governmental sources.

### Check the glossary for

'monitoring system', 'monitoring system specifically dedicated to DLDD', 'monitoring system partially covering DLDD'

### Check the reporting manual for

'Can a monitoring system that is not an environmental monitoring system, but which accounts for the socio-economic aspects of DLDD, be considered a DLDD monitoring system?', 'Can a meteorological monitoring system be considered a DLDD monitoring system?'

### Overall target

By 2018, at least 60 per cent of affected country Parties, subregional and regional reporting entities have established and supported national monitoring systems for DLDD.

---

## Is a monitoring system specifically dedicated to DLDD established at the national level?

**No**

***If yes, specify whether this system is functional***

*No answer required.*

***If yes, specify whether this system is regularly updated***

*No answer required.*

***If no DLDD-specific monitoring system is in place, is a monitoring system partially covering DLDD established at the national level?***

**Yes**

***List any monitoring system available at the sub-national level that can contribute to the UNCCD reporting.***

***List the main features of the monitoring system available at the national level, in particular those that can contribute to UNCCD reporting.***

- Climatic data
- Agricultural productivity
- Protected areas
- Land use - land cover (Corine Land Cover)
- Population in rural areas
- Poverty

---

## Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- **ISPRA, Annuario dei dati ambientali (Yearly Handbook of Environmental Data), 2012**

No files attached.

---

## National contribution to the target

***If your country did not have a national monitoring system specifically dedicated to DLDD or partially covering DLDD in place by the end of the reporting period, do you plan to initiate one?***

**No**

***If yes, when?***

*No answer required.*

---

## Qualitative assessment

***For those countries not having a national monitoring system specifically dedicated to DLDD or partially covering DLDD, identify the major difficulties experienced in the establishment process.***

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

Reason	Level of importance
Financial constraints	5
Lack of capacities	2
Human resources constraints	5
Lack of coordination among relevant ministries and unclear attribution of responsibilities	4
Lack of coordination among donor-led programme/project interventions	0
Existing initiatives are too fragmented; cannot be realistically coordinated under one umbrella	4
Existing national and/or sub-national monitoring systems use different methodologies and cannot be realistically harmonized	3
Other	---

***Other (specify)***

*No answer provided.*

***For those countries having a national monitoring system specifically dedicated to DLDD or partially covering DLDD, how is the system maintained?***

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

Reason	Level of importance
By means of national resources	---
By means of external support	---
No maintenance is possible due to limited professional capacities	---
No maintenance is possible due to limited financial resources	---
Other	---

***Other (specify)***

*No answer provided.*

---

### **Performance indicator CONS-O-9 for Outcome 3.1 and 3.2**

Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities reporting to the Convention along revised reporting guidelines on the basis of agreed indicators

#### Understanding of the indicator

At the national level, the indicator measures the use of biophysical and socio-economic information in defining a commonly agreed core set of impact indicators for the UNCCD and in monitoring progress against these indicators using harmonized methodologies. The indicator will inform to what extent it is possible to compile a comparable and global assessment of UNCCD impact. Subregional and regional reporting entities will complement the information provided by affected country Parties by reporting on the use of impact indicators at the subregional and regional levels, if and when impact indicators for these levels will be commonly agreed upon by the Conference of the Parties.

#### Data needed

- Reports to the UNCCD by affected country Parties in 2012 and 2016.
- The information to report on this indicator will be compiled by affected country Parties every four years when reporting on the strategic objectives that require biophysical and socio-economic information (i.e. SO1, SO2 and SO3). **Reporting on this indicator is due in 2012 and in 2016 only.**

#### Data sources (indicative only)

UNCCD NFP

Check the glossary for

'NFP'

#### Overall target

By 2018, at least 90 per cent of affected country Parties, subregional and regional reporting entities report to the Convention in compliance with the new reporting guidelines.

---

### **Has your country reported on the two impact indicators considered by decision 13/COP.9 to be the minimum reporting requirement?**

Yes

---

### **Number of impact indicators for strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 your country has reported on in 2012 and 2016**

**2012**

2

**2016**

---

### **While reporting on impact indicators, did you refer to the reporting guidelines, i.e. using the common baselines and methodologies defined by the CST?**

Yes

---

### **Sources of information**

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- **Corine Land Cover**
- **National Static Survey on Poverty, 2012**
- **Perini L., Salvati L., Zitti M., Sorrenti S., Ceccarelli T., 2008. La desertificazione in Italia. Processi, indicatori, vulnerabilita' del territorio. Bonanno Editore**

*No files attached.*

---

## National contribution to the target

***If in 2012 your country has not reported on some or all of the impact indicators for the UNCCD, do you plan to do so in 2016?***

*No answer provided.*

***If in 2012 your country has not complied with the reporting guidelines, i.e. using the common baselines and methodologies defined by the CST, do you plan to do so in 2016?***

*No answer provided.*

---

### Performance indicator CONS-O-10 for Outcome 3.3 and 3.4

Number of revised NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs reflecting knowledge of DLDD drivers and their interactions, and of the interaction of DLDD with climate change and biodiversity

Understanding of the indicator

The indicator measures knowledge-transfer processes from the theoretical to the operational level. This is done through an assessment carried out by affected country Parties (self-assessment) of the levels of traditional and scientific knowledge reflected in their NAPs. The assumption is that NAPs based on sound scientific and traditional knowledge will propose more significant and effective strategies and activities for implementation at the national level, and will, ultimately, perform better than those NAPs that do not take into account available knowledge on DLDD and DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity. The indicator will inform to what extent UNCCD implementation is likely to achieve meaningful results. Subregional and regional reporting entities will complement the information provided by affected country Parties by reporting on the assessment of their SRAPs and RAPs.

Data needed

- NAP aligned to The Strategy
- Scientific literature consulted for the formulation/revision of the NAP

Data sources (indicative only)

UNCCD NFP

Check the glossary for

'NAP', 'NAP adoption', 'NAP alignment', 'NAP formulation', 'formulation of an aligned NAP', 'NFP', 'driver', 'drought', 'drought preparedness, including mitigation'

***As this indicator is meant to contribute to the country's self-assessment of its aligned NAP, countries not having a NAP or not having revised their NAP in alignment with The Strategy do NOT report on this indicator.***

Overall target

By 2018, at least 70 per cent of revised NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs have successfully gone through a quality self-assessment.

Sources of information

UNCCD NAP formulated taking account of, or revised in alignment with, The Strategy.

---

### Assessment of the aligned NAP

***In your NAP, is the identification of biophysical and socio-economic drivers, and of their interaction, knowledge-based?***

**Yes**

***If yes, specify upon which type of knowledge it is based***

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

Type of knowledge	Level of importance
Scientific literature	4
Expert knowledge	4

Type of knowledge	Level of importance
Traditional knowledge	2

***If yes, specify upon which type of knowledge it is based***

***If based on scientific literature, list the main reference literature consulted (add as many rows as needed). If reporting online, you may also upload relevant documents.***

- SINANET (National Environmental Database), ANPA
- Idrogeological Database, DSTN

*No files attached.*

***In your NAP, is the analysis of the interaction between DLDD and climate change or biodiversity knowledge-based?***

**No**

***If yes, specify upon which type of knowledge it is based.***

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

*No answer required.*

***If yes, specify upon which type of knowledge it is based.***

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

***If based on scientific literature, list the main reference literature consulted (add as many rows as needed). If reporting online, you may also upload relevant documents.***

*No answer required.*

***Is drought policy and drought preparedness, including mitigation, analyzed and/or reflected in some of the actions outlined in the NAP?***

**No**

***If drought policy and drought preparedness, including mitigation, are not analyzed and/or reflected in some of the actions outlined in the NAP, when do you plan to do so?***

**No plan exists yet**

## **National contribution to the target**

***If in your NAP, DLDD drivers, their interactions, and the interaction of DLDD with climate change and biodiversity are not analyzed on the basis of relevant scientific, expert and/or traditional knowledge, when do you plan to do so?***

**No plans exist yet**

## **Qualitative assessment**

***If your NAP has not been developed taking into account relevant scientific and/or traditional knowledge, identify the reasons.***

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

Reason	Level of importance
Relevant scientific literature is not available	0
Relevant traditional or expert knowledge is not available	0
Lack of financial resources to mobilise the necessary knowledge	4

Reason	Level of importance
Poor coordination among the relevant ministries prevented an internal pooling of knowledge/expertise	4
Relevant ministries could not contribute due to lack of time	3
Relevant ministries could not contribute due to lack of staff	4
Other	---

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

**Performance indicator CONS-O-11 for Outcome 3.5**

Type, number and users of DLDD-relevant knowledge-sharing systems at the global, regional, subregional and national levels described on the Convention website

Understanding of the indicator

At the national level, the indicator measures the presence of DLDD-related knowledge-sharing processes, through the quantification of the type and number of existing knowledge-sharing systems. Effectiveness of these systems is measured through quantification of their user-base. The indicator will inform to what extent scientific and traditional knowledge, including best practices, are available to and sufficiently shared with end-users. This information will be complemented by the reporting of other reporting entities on existing UNCCD-relevant knowledge-sharing systems at the subregional, regional and global levels.

Data needed

- Information from websites.
- Only DLDD-relevant knowledge-sharing systems and networks shall be considered.

Data sources (indicative only)

Relevant organizations and ministries hosting knowledge-sharing systems and networks within their website

Check the glossary for

'knowledge-sharing system', 'PRAIS'

Check the reporting manual for

'How can you provide the number of users in a knowledge-sharing system?'

Overall target

By 2010 the Convention website has been restructured and includes a thematic database on knowledge-sharing systems as part of the PRAIS.

**Knowledge-sharing systems**

**List any DLDD-relevant 'knowledge-sharing system' in your country you are aware of, providing an Internet link and estimated number of users per year.**

<p><i>Item 1</i></p> <p><b>Name of the system</b></p> <p>---</p> <p><b>Internet link</b></p> <p>---</p> <p><b>Estimated number of users per year</b></p> <p>---</p>
---

**List any DLDD-relevant 'knowledge-sharing system' in your country you are aware of, providing an Internet link and estimated number of users per year.**

Add as many rows as necessary.

---

## Operational Objective 4: Capacity building

### Performance indicator CONS-O-13 for Outcomes 4.1 and 4.2

Number of countries, subregional and regional reporting entities engaged in building capacity to combat DLDD on the basis of NCSA or other methodologies and instruments

#### Understanding of the indicator

At the national level, the indicator measures the presence of capacity-building processes through the quantification of existing DLDD-related capacity-building initiatives. The indicator will inform to what extent affected country Parties may be expected to meet their obligations foreseen by the Convention, including forthcoming ones (i.e. new reporting requirements, establishment of monitoring systems, accessing new financing mechanisms). This information will be complemented by the reporting of other reporting entities on capacity-building initiatives at the subregional, regional and global levels.

#### Data needed

- Information on DLDD-related capacity-building initiatives; only programmes/projects mentioned in the PPSs that have DLDD-related capacity-building as a major objective are to be considered.

#### Data sources (indicative only)

- PPSs submitted to UNCCD as part of the reporting exercise
- Programme/project documents and interim or final reports of those programmes and projects identified through the PPSs as having DLDD-related capacity-building as a major objective

#### Check the glossary for

'capacity-building', 'capacity development', 'capacity-building initiative', 'NCSA', 'PPS'

#### Check the reporting manual for

'What can be considered as a programme or project that has DLDD-related capacity-building as a major objective?'

#### Overall target

By 2014, at least 90 per cent of affected country Parties, subregional and regional reporting entities implement DLDD-specific capacity-building plans or programmes/projects.

---

### Number of DLDD-related capacity-building initiatives implemented

Year	NCSA-generated	Other initiatives
2010	0	0
2011	0	0

**Provide relevant information on the size, scope, effectiveness and status of the initiatives reported.**

*No answer provided.*

---

### Has your country assessed DLDD-related capacity-building needs at the national level?

**No**

**If yes, within the framework of which initiative?**

*No answer required.*

**Other (specify)**

*No answer required.*

**If yes, has your country assessed the necessary resources for addressing capacity-building needs?**

*No answer required.*

**If yes, are these resource requirements included in an investment framework?**



No answer required.

---

## Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- **Survey**

No files attached.

---

## National contribution to the target

***If at the time of reporting there are no DLDD-specific capacity-building plans, programmes or projects implemented in your country, when do you plan to have something in place?***

**No plans exist yet**

---

## Qualitative assessment

***Has your country received assistance from one or more of the following institutions to build capacities to combat DLDD?***

*No answer provided.*

***If yes, which type of assistance have you received?***

*No answer required.*

---

## Operational Objective 5: Financing and technology transfer

### Performance indicator CONS-O-14 for Outcome 5.1

Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities whose investment frameworks, established within the IFS devised by the GM or within other IFSs, reflect leveraging national, bilateral and multilateral resources for combating desertification and land degradation

Understanding of the indicator

At the national level, the indicator measures the presence of integrated financing processes allowing the leverage of national, bilateral and multilateral resources for combating desertification and land degradation, through the quantification of investment frameworks developed by country Parties within the IFS devised by the GM or other IFSs promoted by diverse international institutions. This information will be complemented by the reporting of other reporting entities on the establishment of IIFs at national, subregional and regional levels.

Data needed

- Investment framework documents.
- Only investment frameworks prepared along the guidelines devised within IFSs shall be considered.

Data sources (indicative only)

Relevant national ministries

Check the glossary for

'IFS', 'NAP', 'leveraging', 'IIF'

Overall target

By 2014, at least 50 per cent of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities have developed IIFs.

---

## Had your country developed an IIF by the end of the reporting period?

**No**

***If yes, specify when it was developed.***

*No answer required.*

**Is your country's IIF based on the NAP?**

No answer required.

**If based on the NAP, who assisted in its development?**

No answer required.

**Other (specify)**

No answer required.

**If assisted, which type of assistance did you receive?**

No answer required.

**If assisted by the GM, was it devised within the IFS?**

No answer required.

**If your country has an IIF based on the NAP, does this framework allow for the leveraging of national, bilateral and multilateral resources for combating DLDD?**

No answer required.

**Did your country receive assistance from the GM in exploring non-traditional and innovative channels of financial resources?**

No answer provided.

**Short overview of the progress in implementing the IIF**

Provide a short overview of the progress in implementing the IIF in your country, in particular as it relates to its functionality and efficiency in leveraging the funding necessary for implementing the Convention.

No answer provided.

---

**Sources of information**

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- Survey among stakeholders

No files attached.

---

**National contribution to the target**

**If your country had not developed an IIF by the end of the reporting period, do you plan to do it?**

No

**If yes, when?**

No answer required.

---

**Qualitative assessment**

**Identify the major difficulties experienced in developing an IIF.**

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

Reason	Level of importance
Financial constraints	4
Human resources constraints	3
Lack of coordination among relevant ministries and unclear attribution of responsibilities	4
Lack of coordination among those providing support	---

Reason	Level of importance
National bilateral and multilateral resources are too diverse; cannot be realistically coordinated under one umbrella.	1
Other	---

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

---

**Performance indicator CONS-O-16 for Outcome 5.2**

Degree of adequacy, timeliness and predictability of financial resources made available by developed country Parties to combat DLDD

Understanding of the indicator

This is a qualitative indicator requiring the perception-based assessment by developing affected country Parties of the adequacy, timeliness and predictability of bilateral contributions received from developed country Parties for the implementation of the Convention. “Adequate”, “timely” and “predictable” resources are frequently referred to in The Strategy as being necessary to ensure proper planning and effective implementation. Subregional and regional reporting entities will complement the information provided by affected country Parties by reporting on their perception-based assessments.

Data needed

-

Data sources (indicative only)

-

Check the glossary for

-

**Only affected country Parties entitled to receive assistance under the UNCCD are requested to report on this indicator.**

Refer your assessment to the following biennium only:

~~- In 2010, biennium 2008–2009~~

- In 2012, biennium 2010–2011

Overall target

No target has been set for this indicator.

---

**Bilateral assistance received**

How would you rate the bilateral assistance received within the framework of UNCCD for the implementation of The Strategy and of the Convention?

**Question marked as 'Skipped'.**

***Adequacy of bilateral assistance***

*No answer provided.*

***Timeliness of bilateral assistance***

*No answer provided.*

***Predictability of bilateral assistance***

*No answer provided.*

***Provide narrative justification on your above rating***

*No answer provided.*

***Additional information on any other impacting aspects***

If relevant, provide additional information on whether there are any other aspects beyond adequacy, timeliness and predictability of financial support made available by developed country Parties to combat DLDD which impact proper planning and effective implementation of the Convention in your country.

*No answer provided.*

### **Qualitative assessment**

**Question marked as 'Skipped'.**

***Did you receive assistance in raising resources from bilateral donors?***

*No answer provided.*

***If yes, from whom?***

*No answer required.*

***Other (specify)***

*No answer required.*

***Has the level of adequacy, timeliness and predictability of bilateral assistance constrained your country's performance in planning and implementation with respect to UNCCD?***

*No answer provided.*

---

### **Performance indicator CONS-O-17 for Outcome 5.3**

Number of DLDD-related project proposals successfully submitted for financing to international financial institutions, facilities and funds, including the GEF

Understanding of the indicator

At the national level, the indicator measures the capacity of fund-raising through the quantification of project proposals successfully submitted for funding to the various financing organizations. The indicator will inform to what extent affected country Parties make increasing efforts to mobilize resources. This information will be complemented by the reporting of other reporting entities on the fund-raising efforts at national, subregional and regional levels.

Data needed

Information contained in the PPSs and SFAs submitted to UNCCD.

Data sources (indicative only)

- PPSs and SFAs submitted to UNCCD as part of the reporting exercise.
- The PPS requires specification of the project 'status' thus it allows the identification of relevant projects to be considered by this indicator and the monitoring of their approval status.
- The SFA requires the specification of amounts committed to approved projects.

Check the glossary for

'PPS', 'SFA', 'project proposals', 'currency', 'successfully submitted proposals'

Overall target

A steady growth in the number of DLDD-related successfully submitted project proposals is recorded along the implementation period of The Strategy.

Sources of information

PPSs and SFAs

---

### **Number of project proposals submitted (pipeline) and ongoing, by biennium**

**Question marked as 'Skipped'.**

<b>Biennium</b>	<b>Submitted (pipeline)</b>	<b>Ongoing</b>
2010–2011	---	---

---

### **Amount of funds raised, by biennium**

**Question marked as 'Skipped'.**

You can find the amount of funds raised for the ongoing projects in the corresponding SFAs. Sum these amounts and give the total in the below table.

Biennium	Currency	Total amount
2010–2011	---	---

**National contribution to the target**

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

**According to the information provided above, do you think that your country is mobilizing enough resources from international financial institutions, facilities and funds through successfully submitted project proposals?**

*No answer provided.*

**If no, does your country plan to increase its efforts in presenting project proposals to international financial institutions, facilities and funds?**

*No answer required.*

**What percentage of financing used for the implementation of DLDD-related programmes and projects comes from national sources, and what percentage from international sources?**

Source	%
National sources	---
International sources	---

**Qualitative assessment**

Identify the reasons for the increasing or decreasing trend of project proposals successfully submitted to international financial institutions, facilities and funds.

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

**Reasons for increasing**

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

Reason	Level of importance
Easier and more transparent application procedures	---
Increased capacities of national stakeholders to prepare applications	---
Major natural hazards occurred at the national level considerably increased the level of resources made available by the international community	---
Access to funding is increasingly facilitated by third parties such as the private sector	---
Existence of a financing strategy (IFS or others)	---
Other	---

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

**Reasons for decreasing**

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

Reason	Level of importance
Financing opportunities are not publicized enough, lack of access to necessary information	---
Complicated application procedures, the level of complexity being worsened by the different requirements of the various donors	---
Limited financial resources are made available for DLDD-related programmes/projects, and lack of DLDD-specific allocations within donors' portfolio.	---
Other	---

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

**Performance indicator CONS-O-18 for Outcome 5.5**

Amount of financial resources and type of incentives which have enabled access to technology by affected country Parties

Understanding of the indicator

The indicator measures whether access to technology is facilitated by means of financial resources or economic and policy incentives. At the national level, the indicator will inform to what extent an enabling environment for technology transfer has been created and whether sufficient resources are dedicated to technology transfer. Subregional and regional reporting entities will complement the information provided by affected country Parties by reporting on financial resources and type of incentives which have enabled access to technology at the subregional and regional levels.

Data needed

- Budgets of relevant programmes and projects
- Information on policy/regulatory, financial and fiscal incentives. Incentives facilitating access to technology are those established and implemented at the national level, and not necessarily only within the framework of DLDD-related cooperation.

Data sources (indicative only)

- Financial documents of programmes and projects submitted as PPSs to the UNCCD as part of the reporting exercise
- National policy, regulatory and economic/financial documents

Check the glossary for

'technology transfer', 'technical support', 'incentive', 'PPS'

Check the reporting manual for

'How to disaggregate the amounts by year?', 'How to measure the effectiveness of technology transfer initiatives?'

Overall targets

- A steady growth in the financial resources allocated to facilitate access to technology by affected country Parties is recorded along the implementation period of The Strategy.
- A steady growth in the number of economic and policy incentives reported upon is recorded along the implementation period of The Strategy.

**Estimate of amounts allocated to facilitate access to material and to knowledge aid (technology transfer)**

Year	Currency	Amount
2010	---	---
2011	---	---

**Estimate of amounts allocated to facilitate access to material and to knowledge aid (technology transfer)**

**Has your country established incentives intended to facilitate access to technology?**

No

**If yes, specify which types of incentives.**

No answer required.

**Provide a short overview of specific aspects and the nature of technology transfer in your country, in particular in relation to those aspects where there is a need to increase the level of technology transfer.**

No answer provided.

---

## Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- Survey among stakeholders

No files attached.

---

## National contribution to the target

**According to the information provided above, do you think that enough resources are allocated through DLDD-related programmes and projects to facilitate access to technology by your country?**

No

**If your country has no incentives in place or if existing incentives to facilitate the creation of an enabling environment for technology transfer do not prove to be effective, are you planning to enforce additional measures?**

No

**If yes, when?**

No answer required.

---

## Qualitative assessment

**If existing incentives do not prove to be effective, identify possible reasons.**

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

Reason	Level of importance
Policy or regulatory incentives are not enforced	4
There are not enough resources to apply financial or fiscal incentives	3
The national financial and credit systems (banks, credit agencies, etc) are not supportive	4
Other	---

**Other (specify)**

No answer provided.

**Identify the reasons for the increasing trend of financial resources allocated through DLDD-related programmes and projects to facilitate access to technology.**

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

Reason	Level of importance
Access facilitated by the spreading of IT	5
More appropriate technologies available	4

Reason	Level of importance
Appropriateness of government incentives	5
Other	---

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

**Identify the reasons for decreasing trend of financial resources allocated through DLDD-related programmes and projects to facilitate access to technology.**

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

Reason	Level of importance
Technology sustainability is poor; technologies do not represent viable investments	3
Lack of fixed infrastructure for accessing technologies (those created on an ad hoc basis disappear once the support ends)	3
Lack of capacities for operation and maintenance of technologies	3
Lack of enabling policy and regulatory environments	4
Other	---

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*



## Standard Financial Annex

The CRIC has recommended that financial reporting be based on a standard financial reporting format to be used by affected country Parties and their development partners. It also indicated that emphasis in reports should be put on financial matters and also on an analysis of the impact of the activities undertaken (ICCD/CRIC(8)/5).

The purpose of the SFA is to consolidate information on resources mobilized by affected country Parties and their development partners under the framework of relevant strategies and action programmes. It facilitates the aggregation of data on financial commitments, financial flows and resources available by all relevant funding sources for activities related to the implementation of the Convention. It also helps minimize double counting in financial statistics (ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.4).

The SFA is to be used by each country Party and other reporting entities to list all financial commitments they have made during the reporting period in support of institutions, programmes, projects, as well as other relevant initiatives undertaken at national or international level for the implementation of the Convention.

More specifically, for each relevant financial commitment or allocation made in the reporting period, the SFA requires a minimum set of data grouped as follows:

- a. Identification, i.e. data required to identify the reporting entity, the funding source and the activity financed;
- b. Basic data, i.e. data specifying the amount and type of financial commitment made, as well as the recipient country, region, and/or organization, and the funding period, if applicable;
- c. Classification, i.e. categorization of the funded activity according to the Rio Markers for desertification, and the UNCCD Relevant Activity Codes (RACs).

The compilation of the SFA is guided by means of a template, which responds to the recommendations of CRIC 7, and builds on the GM methodological guide for financial reporting presented to CRIC 6 as part of the report of the intergovernmental Ad Hoc Working Group to improve the procedures for communication of information.

Within the template, shaded areas contain information and explanatory texts, while white areas are for reporting purposes and need to be filled in by the reporting entities with relevant data or narrative information.

Decision 13/COP.9, paragraph 8, invites country Parties and other reporting entities to refer to common terminology and definitions. Therefore, these guidelines should be read in conjunction with the comprehensive glossary of performance indicators for the review of implementation of The Strategy and Best Practices, common to all reporting entities and contained in a separate document (ICCD/CRIC(9)/13).

**None delivered.**

## Programme and Project Sheets

Programme and Project Sheets (PPS) are used to provide more detailed information on programmes or projects undertaken or completed in the reporting period. This includes programmes and projects in the pipeline, as well as final proposals submitted for funding to internal or external funding sources. All country Parties and other reporting entities involved in the financing, coordination or implementation of relevant programmes and projects are requested to prepare a PPS for each of them, and to attach them to their official report to the UNCCD.

The compilation of the PPS is guided by means of a template. These templates are intended to collect a minimum set of qualitative and quantitative data to facilitate the analysis of funding and investment flows, and the production of better financial statistics related to UNCCD implementation (ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.4), with a view to enabling the CRIC to undertake an objective review of progress in the implementation of the Convention and The Strategy. The PPS also facilitate the computation of certain performance and impact indicators .

A distinctive feature of the PPS is that it allows country Parties and other reporting entities to specify which strategic and operational objectives of The Strategy are targeted by each programme or project. In addition, it allows for individual programme or project components to be categorized using the Rio Markers for desertification and Relevant Activity Codes (RACs).

Furthermore, the PPS can be used to indicate whether the objectives of other Rio Conventions (i.e. the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity, UNCBD – and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, UNFCCC) are also addressed by the programme or project. This is done through the use of the biodiversity and climate change Rio Markers, respectively.

The PPS offers an opportunity to increase the visibility of relevant programmes and projects, thereby creating the conditions for a better sharing of experiences and lessons, as well as the transfer of knowledge in general. It also favours collaboration and networking by facilitating the identification of potential synergies.

Lastly, the PPS also allows country Parties and other reporting entities to provide a narrative description of the expected or achieved results. This information will facilitate the qualitative assessment of progress in the implementation of The Strategy, including on returns on investment. The CRIC will use the analysis of financial information originating from the PPS to assess results, performance and impacts.

To minimize the reporting burden and avoid discrepancies in the information annexed to the reports of different entities, it is recommended that project partners identify the most suitable ways to coordinate among themselves the preparation of PPS to ensure that consistent data are reported for the same projects. It would also be advisable to compile just one PPS for large “umbrella” programmes, instead of separate PPS for each small project stemming from them.

**None delivered.**

## Additional Information

The section on additional information is meant to provide an instrument of flexibility in the reporting exercise as well as to enrich the knowledge base of the CRIC on concrete issues faced by affected country Parties and consequently to make more targeted and specific recommendations to the COP. It allows affected country Parties to comment or report upon issues that are not covered elsewhere but that are nevertheless of importance at the national level or within the framework of the implementation of The Strategy and the Convention.

The additional information section allows feedback to be received on the reporting process and on the implementation of NAPs as well as lessons learnt, problems, constraints and bottlenecks faced in terms of human and financial resources. It is also meant to accommodate ad hoc COP requests for reporting on specific topics or new reporting requirements deriving from COP deliberations that may supersede existing ones and imply changes in implementation.

The proposed template for reporting is adjusted to the mandate of affected country Parties within the framework of the Convention, as requested by decision 13/COP.9, paragraph 17.

### Reporting process-related issues

---

#### Financial resources

***Could your country count on sufficient financial resources to meet UNCCD reporting obligations?***

No

***Which options provided by the GEF Financing for Enabling Activities under the UNCCD did your country choose to apply for?***

None

***Amount received (USD)***

No answer required.

***Did your country experience difficulties in applying for and accessing the GEF funding?***

No

***If yes, describe the difficulties experienced.***

No answer required.

***Provide an estimate of the amount invested from your country's national budget into the UNCCD reporting process.***

0 Euro

---

#### Human resources and knowledge

***How many people were involved in your country in the UNCCD reporting process?***

15 people

***Estimate the total number of person/day dedicated by these persons to the UNCCD reporting process:***

120 person/day

***Could your country count on sufficient technical and scientific knowledge to meet UNCCD reporting obligations?***

Yes

***If no, describe the main reasons and the difficulties encountered.***

No answer required.

---

#### Coordination, participation and consultation

***Was coordination with the relevant implementing agencies satisfactory in order to apply for necessary funds?***

***Was coordination at the national level with the relevant line ministries satisfactory in order to***

**comprehensively and coherently report?**

Yes

**Was a participatory or consultative approach applied to involve all relevant stakeholders in the reporting process?**

---

**Validation meeting, subregional and regional processes**

**Was a validation meeting held as a part of the reporting process?**

No

**Did your country actively cooperate with the entities entrusted with preparing the subregional and regional reports (SRAP / RAP reports) ?**

Yes

---

**PRAIS portal**

**If you are reporting online, did you receive sufficient training on access and utilization of the PRAIS portal?**

**Did you experience difficulties with access and utilization of the PRAIS portal?**

Yes

**If you experienced difficulties, identify the reasons.**

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

Reason	Level of importance
Slow internet access	4
Complexity of the system	4
Difficulties in getting access credentials	2
Other	5

**Other (specify)**

Many indicators should'nt applicable to developed AND affected country parties, specifically those related to financial resources for domestic activities.

---

**Accommodation of specific requests within COP decisions**

---

**Report on specific COP requests – iterative process on indicators**

Decision 13/COP.9, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, envisages an iterative process to refine the set of performance and impact indicators. As a tool to implement this iterative process, affected country Parties can provide here their suggestions and recommendations for improvement.

**Performance indicators**

Tick the cells only if you have experienced difficulties in reporting on one, or more, performance indicator(s). Indicate against which of the e-SMART criteria the indicator(s) need(s) to be improved.

	economic	Specific	Measurable	Achievable	Relevant	Time-bound
CONS-O-1			X	X		
CONS-O-3				X		
CONS-O-4				X		
CONS-O-5						

CONS-O-7						
CONS-O-8			X			
CONS-O-9			X			
CONS-O-10			X			
CONS-O-11			X			
CONS-O-13						
CONS-O-14				X		
CONS-O-16					X	
CONS-O-17					X	
CONS-O-18					X	

### **Impact indicators**

Tick the cells only if you have experienced difficulties in reporting on one, or more, impact indicator(s). Indicate against which of the e-SMART criteria the indicator(s) need(s) to be improved.

	economic	Specific	Measurable	Achievable	Relevant	Time-bound
SO4-3						
SO4-4						
SO4-6						
SO4-7						

## **Reporting on the implementation of NAP**

**Which is the percentage of activities included in the NAP that are currently implemented?**

31-60%

*If you experienced difficulties in NAP implementation (i.e. the percentage is below 30%), provide description of concrete measures being taken or suggestions for measures to be taken to foster NAP implementation:*

*No answer required.*

### **Human resources**

**Lessons learnt (report on the 2 most important only)**

1. Involvement of local scientists as well as local decision makers is a crucial issue.
2. Central Institution helps local activities financing their starts and ensuring technical and scientific advise.

**Problems, constraints and bottlenecks currently faced by your country (report on the 2 most important only)**

1. Lack coordination among relevant stakeholders and financing institutions at appropriate level (in Italy, environmental issues are in charge of administrative regions; contradictions between sectoral policies.

2. Public awareness on DLDD issues.

---

## Financial resources

---

### Lessons learnt (report on the 2 most important only)

1. Sectoral financial instruments should be coordinated, primarily agricultural and environmental ones.
2. A network of scientists and technical experts could support local activities.

---

### Problems, constraints and bottlenecks currently faced by your country (report on the 2 most important only)

1. DLDD phenomena are not recognised by political decision makers.
2. *No answer provided.*

---

## Any other country-specific issues

---

### Any other country-specific issues

*Has your country any specific issue to bring to the attention of the Conference of the Parties?*

Yes

*If yes, please specify under which of the following broad categories it can be classified.*

**Category**

Policy; legislative; institutional framework

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

**Narrative description**

*No answer provided.*

**Category**

Capacity-building and awareness-raising

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

**Narrative description**

*No answer provided.*

**Category**

DLDD and SLM monitoring and assessment/research

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

**Narrative description**

*No answer provided.*

## Submission form

Submission form	
Name of the reporting officer *	Pierfrancesco Zazo
Date of submission *	12 Oct 2012
Signature	
Name of the authorizing officer	Pierfrancesco Zazo
Date of authorization	12 Oct 2012
Signature	



© UNCCD