

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

**Fourth UNCCD reporting cycle, 2010–2011 leg**

**Report as Developed Country Party**

**Japan**

**Region: No region**

## Table of contents

- Impact indicators
  - Strategic Objective 4
    - Indicator SO-4-2
    - Indicator SO-4-6
    - Indicator SO-4-7
- Performance Indicators
  - Operational Objective 1: Advocacy, awareness raising and education
    - CONS-O-1 for Outcome 1.1
    - CONS-O-3 for Outcome 1.3
    - CONS-O-4 for Outcome 1.3
  - Operational Objective 2: Policy framework
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-6 for Outcome 2.4
    - 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-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-15 for Outcome 5.2
- Standard Financial Annex
- Programme and Project Sheets
- Additional Information
  - Reporting process-related issues
  - Accommodation of specific requests within decisions by the Conference of the Parties
  - Any other country-specific issues
- Submission form

## General information section

| <b>GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE REPORTING ENTITY</b>   |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Reporting country                                    | Japan                       |
| Name and surname of the person submitting the report | Atsushi Suginaka            |
| Affiliation and contact details                      | atsushi.suginaka@mofa.go.jp |

# Developed Country Parties

## Impact indicators

### Strategic Objective 4

#### Indicator SO-4-2

Strategic Objective 4

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

**Impact indicator SO-4-2 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)

The share of bilateral official development assistance (BODA) supplied for Convention-related activities

#### Understanding of the indicator

It provides an indication of the financial resources supplied by developed country Parties for DLDD-related investments and other Convention-related activities as part of their bilateral development cooperation.

#### Data needed

- Official development assistance (ODA) from OECD/DAC member countries
- BODA marked with UNCCD Rio Markers
- DLDD-related programmes and projects using bilateral DFIs
- Convention-related financial commitments through bilateral DFIs

#### Data sources (indicative only)

- PRAIS (financial annexes and CONS-O-15)
- FIELD (financial data, funding trends) (to be used when data is not available in the PRAIS system, and/or for cross referencing and validity checks)
- OECD Creditor Reporting System (to be used when data is not available in the PRAIS system, and/or for cross referencing and validity checks)
- CRIC performance reviews of OO5 and analyses of financial flows
- Relevant databases and publications on bilateral DFIs and other 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

Official Development Assistance

---

### Nominal amount (USD) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives

*Item 1*

**Year**

2010

**Level**

Country

**Country, subregion or region**

63

**Amount**

270150000

*Item 2*

**Year**

2010

**Level**

Region

**Country, subregion or region**

|                               |
|-------------------------------|
| 3<br><b>Amount</b><br>1820000 |
|-------------------------------|

|  |
|--|
| <i>Item 3</i><br><b>Year</b><br>2010<br><b>Level</b><br>Global<br><b>Country, subregion or region</b><br>---<br><b>Amount</b><br>1890000 |
|--|

|  |
|--|
| <i>Item 4</i><br><b>Year</b><br>2011<br><b>Level</b><br>Country<br><b>Country, subregion or region</b><br>43<br><b>Amount</b><br>574590000 |
|--|

|  |
|--|
| <i>Item 5</i><br><b>Year</b><br>2011<br><b>Level</b><br>Region<br><b>Country, subregion or region</b><br>2<br><b>Amount</b><br>1180000 |
|--|

|  |
|--|
| <i>Item 6</i><br><b>Year</b><br>2011<br><b>Level</b><br>Global<br><b>Country, subregion or region</b><br>---<br><b>Amount</b><br>8920000 |
|--|

### Nominal amount (USD) of bilateral Official Development Assistance

|   |
|---|
| <i>Item 1</i><br><b>Year</b><br>2010<br><b>Level</b><br>Country |
|---|

**Country, subregion or region**

145

**Amount**

5617380000

*Item 2***Year**

2010

**Level**

Region

**Country, subregion or region**

13

**Amount**

157900000

*Item 3***Year**

2010

**Level**

Global

**Country, subregion or region**

---

**Amount**

1562140000

*Item 4***Year**

2011

**Level**

Country

**Country, subregion or region**

142

**Amount**

4537880000

*Item 5***Year**

2011

**Level**

Region

**Country, subregion or region**

14

**Amount**

268880000

*Item 6***Year**

2011

**Level**

Global

**Country, subregion or region**

---

**Amount**

1785490000

## Sources of information

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

- **Ministry of Foreign Affairs**

### Attachments:

*None.*

## 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 |
|-----------|-------------|
|-----------|-------------|

| 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.*

#### **Attachments:**

*None.*

#### **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 | very poor           | very poor      | very poor         | very poor      | very poor   |
| 2011 | very poor           | very poor      | very poor         | very poor      | very poor   |

## 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.*

## Attachments:

*None.*



## Performance Indicators

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

#### 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.

#### Countries being both 'affected' and 'developed' only report on this indicator as 'affected'

##### 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 developed country Parties by reporting on Convention-related communication strategies at 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 the major national DLDD stakeholders about which NFPs have been informed should be considered.
- Media products in the five most important national TV/radio channels and the five most relevant national newspapers

##### 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 the 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 | 78                           | 3869   |
| 2011 | 60                           | 2985   |

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

##### Number of media products made public

| Year | Newspapers | Radio and TV |
|------|------------|--------------|
| 2010 | 0          | 0            |

| Year | Newspapers | Radio and TV |
|------|------------|--------------|
| 2011 | 0          | 0            |

### Sources of information

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

- Ministry of Environment (MOE), Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), Arid Land Research Center, Tottori University

### Attachments:

None.

### 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**

*No answer provided.*

### Qualitative assessment

***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

***Is your country providing financial and technical support for the elaboration and implementation of the UNDDD programme?***

No

### CONS-O-3 for Outcome 1.3

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

#### **Countries being both 'affected' and 'developed' only report on this indicator as 'affected'**

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 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 developed country Parties by reporting on the involvement of CSOs and STIs at the national, 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 well as in the affected countries as reported in the PPSs

**Data sources (indicative only)**

- Information on CSOs and STIs involved in the DLDD-related programmes and projects in the reporting country;  
- 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 civil society organizations (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 DLDD-related programmes/projects**

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

Provide also the number of CSOs and STIs involved in programme/projects in reporting country.

| Year | Number of CSOs involved in DLDD-related programmes/projects |                      | Number of STIs involved in DLDD-related programmes/projects |                      |
|------|---|----------------------|---|----------------------|
|      | In affected countries                                       | In reporting country | In affected countries                                       | In reporting country |
| 2010 | ---   | 2                    | ---   | 15                   |
| 2011 | ---   | 1                    | ---   | 16                   |

**Specify the names of these organizations, indicating whether they are involved in programmes/projects in affected countries or the reporting country.**

| Programme/project location | Name   |
|----------------------------|--|
| ---                        | The Japanese Association for Arid Land Studies                     |
| ---                        | The Japanese Association of Sand Dune Research                     |
| ---                        | The Japanese Association of Revegetation Technology                |
| ---                        | The Japanese Society of Soil Physics                               |
| ---                        | The Society of Agricultural Meteorology of Japan                   |
| ---                        | The Japanese Society of Irrigation, Drainage and Rural Engineering |
| ---                        | The Japanese Forest Society  |
| ---                        | The Crop Science Society of Japan                                  |
| ---                        | The Ecological Society of Japan                                    |
| ---                        | The Meteorological Society of Japan                                |
| ---                        | The Japanese Society of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition           |
| ---                        | The Association of Japanese Geographers                            |

## 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 project?***

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 implemented in your country.

### ***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 with CSOs | ---                 |
| Increased networking and collaboration opportunities with STIs | ---                 |
| Increased interest of the government in working with CSOs      | ---                 |
| Increased interest of the government in working with STIs      | ---                 |
| Strengthened lobbying capacity of CSOs                         | ---                 |
| Strengthened lobbying capacity of STIs                         | ---                 |
| Increased availability of funding at national level            | ---                 |
| 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 |
|--|---------------------|
| Engagement of CSOs is not a priority for the government      | ---                 |
| Worsening of networking and collaboration linkages with CSOs | ---                 |
| Diminishing funding availability                             | ---                 |
| 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 |
|---|---------------------|
| Engagement of STIs is not a priority for the government | ---                 |

| Reason   | Level of importance |
|--|---------------------|
| Decreasing interest of national STIs in DLDD- related topics | ---                 |
| Diminishing funding availability                             | ---                 |
| Other  | ---                 |

**Other (specify)***No answer provided.***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.

**Countries being both ‘affected’ and ‘developed’ only report on this indicator as ‘affected’**

## 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 developed country Parties by reporting on the involvement of CSOs and STIs at the national, 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, 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 civil society organizations (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

**DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by CSOs and STIs**

| Year | CSOs | STIs |
|------|------|------|
| 2010 | 9    | 0    |
| 2011 | 9    | 0    |

**Sources of information**

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

- **Ministry of Environment (MOE)**

**Attachments:**

None.

## 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 networking and collaboration opportunities with CSOs  | ---                 |
| Increased networking and collaboration opportunities with STIs  | ---                 |
| Increased availability of funding at the national level for supporting education-related initiatives                                      | ---                 |
| Increased awareness of DLDD-related problems and of the need for action   | ---                 |
| Increased knowledge of DLDD-related topics and enhanced capacities of national STIs/CSOs in delivering DLDD-related education initiatives | ---                 |
| Government policies are more supportive of education 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 |
|--|---------------------|
| Insufficient awareness and knowledge by national CSOs of DLDD-related issues | ---                 |
| Decreasing networking and collaboration opportunities                        | ---                 |
| Diminishing funding availability   | ---                 |
| 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 |
|--|------------|
| National science and technology institutions are more focussed on research activities than on education and training | ---        |
| Decreasing networking and collaboration opportunities  | ---        |
| Diminishing funding availability   | ---        |
| Other  | ---        |

**Other (specify)***No answer provided.***Operational Objective 2: Policy framework****Performance indicator CONS-O-6 for Outcome 2.4**

Number of partnership agreements established within the framework of the Convention between developed country Parties/United Nations and IGOs and affected country Parties.

## Understanding of the indicator

The indicator measures the existence of policy-enabling environments by quantifying the number of partnership agreements established between developed country Parties on one side and affected country Parties on the other, on a bilateral basis but always and only within the framework of UNCCD. Partnership agreements allow the mainstreaming of UNCCD objectives and SLM interventions into the development cooperation programmes and projects of developed country Parties; they also provide affected country Parties with a regular flow of resources according to written terms and conditions. The assumption is that the higher the number of partnerships agreements on which affected country Parties may count, the higher their chance of relying on diverse resources to tackle the objectives of the Convention. UN organizations and IGOs will complement the information provided by developed country Parties by reporting on partnership agreements established with affected country Parties on a multilateral basis. As a result of COP 10, developed country Parties have additional opportunities to provide complementary information on partnership agreements established under frameworks other than the UNCCD but nevertheless in line with the Convention goals and/or in support of the NAPs of affected country Parties (see section on complementary information).

## Data needed

- Records of partnership agreements concluded in a written form. Only partnership agreements directly relating to the UNCCD and concluded within the framework of the Convention, and those established under other frameworks, are to be considered.
- Only agreements under implementation during the reporting period should be considered.

## Data sources (indicative only)

Relevant national ministries

## Check the glossary for

'partnership agreement', 'integrated investment framework', 'IFS'

## Overall target

By 2014, at least two UNCCD-related partnership agreements are active in each affected country Party.

**Number of partnership agreements**

Number of partnership agreements concluded by your country with affected country Parties established under the framework of UNCCD under implementation during the reporting period.

| Year | Relating to integrated investment frameworks established within the IFS devised by the GM | Relating to integrated investment frameworks established within other integrated financing strategies | NOT relating to integrated investment frameworks |
|------|---|---|--|
|      |   |   |  |

| Year | Relating to integrated investment frameworks established within the IFS devised by the GM | Relating to integrated investment frameworks established within other integrated financing strategies | NOT relating to integrated investment frameworks |
|------|---|---|--|
| 2010 | 0   | 0   | 7  |
| 2011 | 0   | 0   | 8  |

### Affected country(ies) and/or UNCCD subregion(s) and region(s) with which your country has partnership agreements

List the affected country(ies) and/or UNCCD subregion(s) and region(s) with which your country has one or more partnership agreement(s) under implementation during the reporting period.

- China
- Mongolia
- Republic of Korea

### Sources of information

List the partnership agreements concluded by your country with affected countries and specify whether they were established within the UNCCD framework or some other framework (and in the case of latter, specify which one).

| Partnership agreement   | Framework |
|---|-----------|
| Tripartite Environment Ministers Meeting among China, Japan and Korea (TEMM)  | ---       |
| Memorandum of Cooperation between the Ministry of Environment of Japan and the Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism of Mongolia on Environmental Cooperation | ---       |
| Other Academic Exchange Agreements  | ---       |

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

- MOE, MEXT  
[Reference]  
TEMM: <http://www.temm.org/>  
MOE: [http://www.env.go.jp/press/file\\_view.php?serial=18786&hou\\_id=14562](http://www.env.go.jp/press/file_view.php?serial=18786&hou_id=14562)

### Attachments:

None.

### National contribution to the target

Does your country have plans for concluding one or more partnership agreement(s) within the framework of the Convention with one or more affected country Party(ies)?

*No answer provided.*

If yes, when?

*No answer required.*

If yes and if known, with which affected country(ies) and/or UNCCD subregion(s) and region(s)?

*No answer required.*

### Qualitative assessment



***If any, has the conclusion of partnership agreement(s) been facilitated by Convention-related institutions?***

**No**

***If yes, by whom?***

*No answer required.*

***Other (specify)***

*No answer required.*

### **Identify the major difficulties experienced in the process**

Identify the major difficulties experienced in the conclusion of partnership agreements with affected country Parties within the framework of the Convention, and of their relation to integrated investment frameworks.

| <b>Reason</b>   | <b>Level of importance</b> |
|---|----------------------------|
| Not a priority for the government to conclude partnerships  | ---                        |
| It is not a priority for the beneficiary's side   | ---                        |
| Other environment-related policy frameworks than the UNCCD are more suitable and/or conducive for establishing partnerships | ---                        |
| Linking the partnership to existing investment frameworks is too time-consuming   | ---                        |
| Other   | ---                        |

***Other (specify)***

*No answer provided.*

### **Complementary information**

***Number of partnership agreements established under frameworks other than UNCCD under implementation during the reporting period***

| <b>Year</b> | <b>Number</b> |
|-------------|---------------|
| 2010        | ---           |
| 2011        | ---           |

***List the affected country(ies) and/or UNCCD subregion(s) and region(s) with which your country has one or more such partnership agreement(s) under implementation during the reporting period.***

*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

The indicator measures the existence of synergistic processes through the number of instruments (i.e. joint planning/programming and/or operational mechanisms) in place in affected country Parties and/or at subregional/regional level which foster the introduction of, or strengthen the mutually reinforcing measures among, the three Rio Conventions, and whose establishment has been supported (technically and/or financially) by developed country Parties either within the framework of UNCCD or of other initiatives. The assumption is that the higher the number of enabling instruments in place, the higher the possibility of achieving synergies in implementation. The information provided by developed country Parties will be complemented by the reporting of other entities on synergistic processes at the national, subregional, regional and global levels.

**Data needed**

- Planning/programming documents; information from partnership agreements and programmes/projects
- 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, partnership agreements, programmes/projects reports

**Check the glossary for**

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

**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

**Number of enabling instruments established****Number of synergistic instruments implemented**

Number of synergistic instruments implemented in affected country Parties with the technical and/or financial support of your country during the reporting period

| Year | Joint planning/programming initiatives | Operational mechanisms for joint implementation or mutual reinforcement |
|------|--|---|
| 2010 | 0                                      | 0   |
| 2011 | 0                                      | 0   |

**Specify the type of joint initiative(s) and/or of mechanism(s) supported**

If you supported the implementation of one or more synergistic instrument(s) in affected country(ies) during the reporting period, please reply to the questions below.

**Joint planning/programming initiatives**

*No answer provided.*

**Other (specify)**

*No answer required.*

**Operational mechanisms for joint implementation or mutual reinforcement**

*No answer provided.*

**Other (specify)**

*No answer required.*

**Specify the framework(s) within which the above support was provided**

*No answer provided.*

**Other (specify)**

*No answer required.*

**Specify the type of support provided**

*No answer provided.*

---

**List the name(s) of the beneficiary affected country(ies) and/or UNCCD subregion(s)/region(s)**

*No answer provided.*

---

**Are there instruments in place at the national level allowing a coordinated positioning of your country with respect to the three Rio conventions?**

*No answer provided.*

**Yes, but for only two of the Rio Conventions, namely:**

*No answer required.*

---

**Sources of information**

**List the names of the synergistic instruments described above.**

*No answer provided.*

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

*No answer provided.*

**Attachments:**

*None.*

---

**National contribution to the target**

**Does your country have plans for providing support to one or more affected country Party(ies) and/or UNCCD subregion(s)/region(s) for the implementation of synergistic instruments?**

*No answer provided.*

**If yes, when?**

*No answer required.*

**If yes and if known, to which affected country(ies) and/or subregion(s)/region(s)?**

*No answer required.*

---

**Qualitative assessment**

**Identify the major difficulties experienced in the process**

For those developed countries **which have supported** the implementation of synergistic planning/programming or mechanisms for joint implementation in affected countries and/or subregion(s)/region(s), identify the major difficulties experienced in this process.

| Reason   | Level of importance |
|--|---------------------|
| Lack of coordination among relevant ministries of the recipient country(ies) | ---                 |
| Human and/or financial resources constraints of the recipient country(ies)   | ---                 |
| Lack of support and/or guidance by the Rio Conventions' institutions         | ---                 |
| Other  | ---                 |

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

**Identify the reasons that prevented the delivery of this type of support**

For those developed countries **which have not supported** the implementation of synergistic planning/programming or mechanisms for joint implementation in affected countries and/or subregion(s)/region(s), identify the reasons that prevented the delivery of this type of support.

| Reason  | Level of importance |
|---|---------------------|
| Not a development cooperation priority  | ---                 |
| Insufficient financial resources  | ---                 |
| Support to synergistic instruments should be pursued at the international level and not by individual (developed) countries | ---                 |
| Other   | ---                 |

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

**Complementary information**

**Was your country implementing joint planning/programming initiatives for the three Rio Conventions during 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.*

**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                                | ---                 |
| Lack of financial resources specially dedicated for this purpose | ---                 |
| Understaffing  | ---                 |
| Lack of time   | ---                 |
| Poor internal coordination among relevant ministries             | ---                 |
| 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

The indicator measures the monitoring potential of affected countries, subregional and regional entities by quantifying the number of monitoring systems supported by developed countries at their respective geographical levels. 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, subregional and regional entities during the implementation of The Strategy and beyond. Developed country Parties are requested to report on monitoring systems they have supported (technically and/or financially) either within the framework of UNCCD or of other initiatives and within the timeframe of the reporting period. The information provided by developed country Parties will be complemented by the reporting of other 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 in affected country Parties and UNCCD subregions/regions.
- Programme/project documents and interim or final reports.

## Data sources (indicative only)

Relevant national ministries, programme/project documents or reports, 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

'Which monitoring systems should be reported and accounted for?', 'Can a monitoring system that is not an environmental monitoring system, but 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?', 'How do you count the number of supported monitoring systems in use?'

## 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.

**Monitoring systems**

***Number of monitoring systems in affected country Parties and/or UNCCD subregions/regions that obtained the technical and/or financial support of your country during the reporting period.***

| Year | Monitoring systems specifically dedicated to DLDD | Monitoring systems partially covering DLDD |
|------|---|--|
| 2010 | 1   | 9  |
| 2011 | 1   | 5  |

**Specify the framework(s) within which the above support was provided**

- Other

**Other (specify)**

**Bilateral ODA of Japan**

**Specify the type of support provided.**

Mainly technical

**List the name(s) of the beneficiary affected country(ies) and/or subregion(s)/region(s) and related monitoring systems.**

- Algeria
- Guatemala
- Brazil
- Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
- Colombia
- Ecuador
- Peru
- Pakistan
- Syrian Arab Republic

**Monitoring systems:**

| Country              | Monitoring system  |
|----------------------|--|
| Algeria              | Project for Capacity Development of Environmental Monitoring(Phase 2)  |
| Guatemala            | International Course on Rainforest Monitoring  |
| Brazil               | Utilization of ALOS Images to Support Protection of the Brazilian Amazon Forest and Combat against Illegal Deforestation |
| Brazil               | Environmental Monitoring Project for Baixada Santista Metropolitan Region  |
| Brazil               | International Course on Rainforest Monitoring  |
| Bolivia              | International Course on Rainforest Monitoring  |
| Colombia             | International Course on Rainforest Monitoring  |
| Ecuador              | International Course on Rainforest Monitoring  |
| Peru                 | International Course on Rainforest Monitoring  |
| Pakistan             | Technical Cooperation for Establishment of Environmental Monitoring System   |
| Syrian Arab Republic | Capacity Development of Environmental Monitoring Phase II  |

**To the best of your knowledge, how many of the monitoring systems you supported since 2008 are still in use (i.e. functional and regularly updated)?**

*No answer provided.*

**Has your country supported one or more monitoring system(s) in affected country(ies) and/or subregion(s)/region(s) before 2008?**

Yes

**If yes, list the name(s) of the beneficiary affected country(ies) and/or UNCCD subregion(s)/region(s)**

- Algeria
- Indonesia

- Pakistan
- Syrian Arab Republic
- Mexico
- Brazil

---

## Sources of information

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

- Ministry of Foreign Affairs

### Attachments:

None.

---

## National contribution to the target

***At the time of reporting, does your country have plans for providing support to one or more affected country Party(ies) and/or UNCCD regions/subregions for monitoring systems relating to DLDD?***

*No answer provided.*

### ***If yes, when?***

*No answer required.*

***If yes and if known at the time of reporting, to which affected country(ies) and/or subregions/regions?***

Add as many rows as necessary; if not known leave the reply empty.

*No answer required.*

---

## Qualitative assessment

***For those developed countries which have supported (a) monitoring system(s) relating to DLDD at national and/or subregional/regional level, identify the major difficulties experienced in this 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 |
|--|---------------------|
| Lack of coordination among relevant ministries of the recipient country(ies) in determining the system's hosting and operationalization responsibilities | ---                 |
| Human and/or financial resources constraints of the recipient country(ies) for the maintenance of the system   | ---                 |
| Time-consuming establishment of regular data flows for feeding the system  | ---                 |
| Other  | ---                 |

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

*No answer provided.*

***For those developed countries which have not supported a monitoring system relating to DLDD at national and/or subregional/regional level, identify the reasons that prevented the delivery of this type of support.***

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 | ---                 |

| Reason  | Level of importance |
|---|---------------------|
| Not requested by affected and/or subregional regional entities                                | ---                 |
| Uncertainty of the type of data and information to be stored in the system for DLDD reporting | ---                 |
| 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 websites.

## Check the glossary for

'knowledge-sharing system', 'PRAIS'

## Check the reporting manual for

'How can you determine 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.**

*Item 1***Name of the system**

Arid Land Research Center Web Site

**Internet link**

<http://www.alrc.tottori-u.ac.jp/index.html>

**Estimated number of users per year**

447254

**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

The indicator measures the presence of DLDD-related capacity-building processes implemented in affected country Parties and/or at subregional/regional level through the quantification of existing DLDD-related capacity-building initiatives supported by developed country Parties. The indicator will inform to what extent affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities 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). The information provided by developed country Parties will be complemented by the reporting of other entities on capacity-building initiatives at the national, subregional, regional and global levels.

#### Data needed

- Information on DLDD-related capacity-building initiatives.
- Only capacity-building plans/programmes/projects mentioned in the PPS 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 supported DLDD-related capacity-building initiatives

*Number of supported DLDD-related capacity-building initiatives implemented during the reporting period in affected countries, subregions or regions*

| Year | NCSA-generated | Other initiatives |
|------|----------------|-------------------|
| 2010 | 0              | 75                |
| 2011 | 0              | 62                |

*Provide relevant information about the size, scope, effectiveness and status of initiatives supported.*

*No answer provided.*

**List the affected country(ies) and/or UNCCD subregions/regions where the DLDD-related capacity-building initiatives have been supported.**

- Cameroon
- Ethiopia
- Kenya
- Sudan
- Madagascar
- Mozambique
- Sao Tome and Principe
- Burkina Faso
- Cape Verde
- Senegal

- Algeria
- Egypt
- Iran (Islamic Republic of)
- Jordan
- China
- Mongolia
- India
- Pakistan
- Syrian Arab Republic
- Belize
- Costa Rica
- El Salvador
- Guatemala
- Honduras
- Mexico
- Nicaragua
- Panama
- Argentina
- Brazil
- Chile
- Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
- Colombia
- Ecuador
- Peru
- Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
- Dominican Republic
- Palestine

---

## Sources of information

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

- Ministry of Foreign Affairs

### Attachments:

*None.*

---

## National contribution to the target

*At the time of reporting, does your country have plans for providing support to one or more affected country Party(ies) and/or UNCCD region(s)/subregion(s) for the implementation of DLDD-specific capacity-building plans, programmes or projects?*

*No answer provided.*

*If yes, when?*

*No answer required.*

*If yes and if known at the time of reporting, to which affected country(ies)/subregion(s)/region(s)?*

*No answer required.*

---

## Qualitative assessment

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

*Identify the major difficulties experienced in the process*

For those developed countries which have supported DLDD-specific capacity-building plans, programmes or projects at national and/or subregional/regional level, identify the major difficulties experienced in the process.

| Reason  | Level of importance |
|---|---------------------|
| Insufficient cooperation from the beneficiaries' side   | ---                 |
| Lack of mainstreaming of the plans, programmes or projects into DLDD-related national planning and policies                     | ---                 |
| Shortcoming of the plans, programmes or projects in terms of capacity building recipients, content, logistic arrangements, etc. | ---                 |
| Other   | ---                 |

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

**Identify the reasons that prevented the delivery of this type of support**

For those developed countries which have not supported DLDD-specific capacity-building plans, programmes or projects at national and/or subregional/regional level, identify the reasons that prevented the delivery of this type of support.

| Reason  | Level of importance |
|---|---------------------|
| Lack of financial resources   | ---                 |
| Not requested by affected and/or subregional regional entities  | ---                 |
| Lack of clarity from the recipient government(s) side on how to concretely capitalise on the built capacities | ---                 |
| Other   | ---                 |

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

## 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 IFSSs, reflect leveraging national, bilateral and multilateral resources for combating desertification and land degradation

#### Understanding of the indicator

The indicator measures the presence of integrated financing processes allowing the leverage of national, bilateral and multilateral resources for combating DLDD, through the quantification of investment frameworks financially and/or technically supported by developed country Parties in affected countries and/or in subregions/regions. Investment frameworks may be those developed within the IFS devised by the GM or other IFSSs promoted by international institutions. The information provided by developed country Parties will be complemented by the reporting of other reporting entities on IIFs at national, subregional and regional levels.

#### Data needed

- Investment framework documents.
- Only investment frameworks prepared along the guidelines devised within IFSSs shall be considered.
- A distinction shall be made between IIFs established within the IFS devised by the GM and those established within other IFSSs.

Data sources (indicative only)  
Relevant national ministries, programme/project documents

Check the glossary for  
'IFS', 'NAP' 'leveraging', 'IIF'

Check the reporting manual for  
'Which IIFs should be reported and accounted for?', 'How can you determine the number of IIFs that have been developed?'

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

### Number of IIFs in affected country Parties and/or UNCCD subregions/regions that have been supported by your country during the reporting period.

According to the information you provide in the first field, if your country has supported one or more IIF(s), please reply to the following questions.

| Year | Integrated investment frameworks established within the IFS devised by the GM | Integrated investment frameworks established within other integrated financing strategies |
|------|---|---|
| 2010 | 0   | 0   |
| 2011 | 0   | 0   |

**Specify the framework(s) within which the above support was provided.**

*No answer provided.*

**Other (specify)**

*No answer required.*

**Specify the type of support provided**

*No answer provided.*

**List the name(s) of the beneficiary country(ies) and/or subregion(s)/region(s) and related IIFs.**

*No answer provided.*

**Related IIFs:**

| Country, subregion or region | IIF |
|------------------------------|-----|
| ---                          | --- |

**To the best of your knowledge, how many of the IIFs you have supported since 2008 are still in use?**

*No answer provided.*

### Development of Integrated investment frameworks

**Has your country supported one or more IIF(s) before 2008?**

*No answer provided.*

**If yes, list the name(s) of the beneficiary country(ies) and/or subregion(s)/region(s).**

*No answer required.*

### Sources of information

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

*No answer provided.*

**Attachments:**

None.

**National contribution to the target**

**At the time of reporting, does your country have plans for providing support to one or more affected country Party(ies) and/or UNCCD regions/subregions for their IIFs?**

*No answer provided.*

**If yes, when?**

*No answer required.*

**If yes, and if known at the time of reporting, in which affected country(ies) and/or subregions/regions?**

If not known leave the reply empty.

*No answer required.*

**Qualitative assessment**

**Identify the major difficulties experienced in the development process**

For those developed countries which have supported one or more IIF(s) at national and/or subregional/regional levels, identify the major difficulties experienced in the process.

| Reason   | Level of importance |
|--|---------------------|
| Lack of coordination among relevant ministries of the recipient country(ies) for the provision of needed technical and financial information | ---                 |
| National bilateral and multilateral resources are too diverse; cannot be realistically coordinated under one umbrella                        | ---                 |
| Other  | ---                 |

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

**Identify the reasons that prevented the delivery of this type of support**

For those developed countries which have not supported an IIF at national and/or subregional/regional levels, identify the reasons that prevented the delivery of this type of support.

| Reason  | Level of importance |
|---|---------------------|
| Lack of financial resources                                       | ---                 |
| Not requested by affected and/or subregional or regional entities | ---                 |
| Exercise is too time-consuming compared to the advantages offered | ---                 |
| Other   | ---                 |

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

**Performance indicator CONS-O-15 for Outcome 5.2**

Amount of financial resources made available by developed country Parties to combat DLDD

Understanding of the indicator

The indicator measures the performance of the bilateral contribution process through quantification of the flow of financial resources from developed country Parties to affected country Parties for the implementation of the

Convention, in compliance of the obligation foreseen by article 6 of the Convention, paragraph (b). The level of performance will indicate whether financial resources contributed by developed country Parties in the reporting period are substantial enough. Only developed country Parties report on this indicator.

#### Data needed

Total amounts committed within DLDD-related programmes and projects supporting affected country Parties.

#### Data sources (indicative only)

- SFAs submitted to UNCCD as part of the reporting exercise.
- Only programmes/projects where the reporting developed country Party has made a financial contribution shall be considered.

Check the glossary for  
'SFA', 'currency', 'RACs'

Check the reporting manual for  
'What thematic areas should be considered?'

#### Overall target

-

### Amounts made available to affected country Parties through DLDD-related programmes and projects

Refer to the programmes and projects submitted as SFAs to the UNCCD and for which your country has made a financial commitment. Sum the amounts committed by your country during the reporting period and give the total in the table below.

| Biennium  | Currency | Amounts committed |
|-----------|----------|-------------------|
| 2010–2011 | USD      | 858550000         |

### Sources of information

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

- **Ministry of Foreign Affairs**

#### Attachments:

*None.*

### Qualitative assessment

Identify the reasons for the increasing or decreasing trend of financial resources made available to affected country Parties to combat DLDD.

#### 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 availability of national resources for development cooperation in general | ---                 |
| Improved profile of UNCCD at the global level, including monitoring of performance  | ---                 |
| Increased prioritization of UNCCD by developed country Parties                      | ---                 |
| 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 |
|---|---------------------|
| Less national resources dedicated to development cooperation in general | ---                 |
| Other development cooperation frameworks are more attractive than UNCCD | ---                 |
| Other   | ---                 |

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

**Complementary information**

***If available, provide information on amounts made available to multilateral organizations through DLDD-related programmes and projects.***

| Bienium   | Currency | Amounts committed |
|-----------|----------|-------------------|
| 2010–2011 | ---      | ---               |

## 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 country Parties and consequently to make more targeted and specific recommendations to the COP. It allows country Parties to comment or report upon issues that are not covered elsewhere but that are nevertheless of importance 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. 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 developed country Parties within the framework of the Convention, as requested by decision 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?*

Yes

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

0 ---

---

### Human resources and knowledge

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

3 people

*Estimate the total number of person-days dedicated by these persons to the UNCCD reporting process*

3 person-days

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

Yes

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

No answer required.

---

### Coordination, participation and consultation

*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?*

No

---

### Validation meeting

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

No

---

### 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                       | ---                 |
| Complexity of the system                   | ---                 |
| Difficulties in getting access credentials | 3                   |
| Other                                      | 0                   |

***Other (specify)***

*No answer provided.*

## Accommodation of specific requests within decisions by the Conference of the Parties

### Reporting 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, developed country Parties can provide their suggestions and recommendations for improvement here.

#### ***Performance indicators***

Tick the cells only if you have experienced difficulties in reporting on one or more performance indicator(s). When doing so, place the tick mark under the e-SMART criterion for which the difficulty occurred.

|           | economic | Specific | Measurable | Achievable | Relevant | Time-bound |
|-----------|----------|----------|------------|------------|----------|------------|
| CONS-O-1  | X        |          |            |            |          |            |
| CONS-O-3  | X        |          |            |            |          |            |
| CONS-O-4  | X        |          |            |            |          |            |
| CONS-O-6  | X        |          |            |            |          |            |
| CONS-O-7  | X        |          |            | X          |          |            |
| CONS-O-8  | X        |          |            |            |          |            |
| CONS-O-11 | X        |          |            |            |          |            |
| CONS-O-13 | X        |          |            |            |          |            |
| CONS-O-14 | X        |          |            | X          |          |            |
| CONS-O-15 |          |          |            |            |          |            |

#### ***Impact indicators***

Tick the cells only if you have experienced difficulties in reporting on one or more impact indicator(s). When doing so, place the tick mark under the e-SMART criterion for which the difficulty occurred.

|       | economic | Specific | Measurable | Achievable | Relevant | Time-bound |
|-------|----------|----------|------------|------------|----------|------------|
| SO4-2 | X        |          |            |            |          |            |
| SO4-4 |          |          |            | X          |          |            |

|       |   |  |   |  |  |  |
|-------|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| SO4-6 | X |  |   |  |  |  |
| SO4-7 |   |  | X |  |  |  |

## 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?**

No

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

*No answer required.*

## Submission form

| Submission form                 |                   |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| Name of the reporting officer * | Yoshiko Horiguchi |
| Date of submission *            | 15 Mar 2013       |
| Signature                       |                   |
|                                 |                   |
| Name of the authorizing officer | Atsushi Suginaka  |
| Date of authorization           | 12 Mar 2013       |
| Signature                       |                   |



© UNCCD