

United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification

Performance Review and Assessment of Implementation System

4th Reporting and Review Cycle - 2010

Report for Norway

Table of Contents

- 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 COP decisions
 - Any other country-specific issues
- Best Practices
- Submission Form

General Information Section

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE REPORTING ENTITY	
Reporting country *	Norway
Name and surname of the person submitting the report *	Jon Heikki Aas
Affiliation and contact details *	jon.heikki.aas@mfa.no

Performance Indicators

Performance indicators are for measuring progress against the five operational objectives of The Strategy, in line with decision 3/COP.8. The year 2008 (the first year of the Strategy) serves as the baseline year.

Developed country Parties are requested to report on the following ten performance indicators out of the eighteen consolidated performance indicators presented in ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.1 and Add.2.

Reporting is guided by means of templates, one for each performance indicator. Within the templates, shaded areas contain information and explanatory texts and white areas are for reporting purposes and need to be filled in by developed country Parties with relevant quantitative data, selection of multiple choice boxes, or narrative information.

Operational Objective 1: Advocacy, awareness raising and education

CONS-O-1 for Outcome 1.1

Operational Objective 1: Advocacy, awareness raising and education

Performance indicator CONS-O-1 for Outcome 1.1

Number and size of information events organised 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 synergies 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 audience. The focus of the indicator is on information activities specifically dedicated to DLDD 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 national, subregional, regional and global level.

Data needed

Information on events/media specifically addressing DLDD and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity. Attendance lists of events (meetings, workshops, seminars), programmes/projects' documents, estimate of target audience for major media events (campaigns, radio and television programmes, etc.). Events organised and media produced by the UNCCD NFP or organised/produced by third parties not directly reporting to the Convention (TV channels, newspaper editors, etc.) shall be considered.

Data sources (indicative only)

International and national media (newspapers) advertising the events at national and local level, the Internet, the organisers of the events, programmes/projects' final reports.

Check the glossary for

'NFP', 'ICT', 'Information events', 'Media products', 'STIs', 'CSOs'

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

Media products have been grouped into: (a) Paper media products (articles, press releases, leaflets, flyers, brochures and comics, etc.); (b) radio and television programmes; (c) other ICT (websites, CDs, DVD, etc.).

Overall Target

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

Number of information events

Year	Number of information events	Estimated number of participants in the information events
2008	0	
2009	0	
2010		
2011		
2012		
2013		
2014		
2015		
2016		
2017		
2018		

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

Media products have been grouped into: (a) Paper media products (articles, press releases, leaflets, flyers, brochures and comics, etc.); (b) radio and television programmes; (c) other ICT (websites, CDs, DVD, etc.).

Year	Stakeholder	Paper media products	Radio and TV	other ICT
2008	Public at Large	0	0	0
	Civil society organizations	0	0	0
	Science and technology institutions	0	0	0
2009	Public at Large	0	0	0
	Civil society organizations	0	0	0
	Science and technology institutions	0	0	0
2010	Public at Large			
	Civil society organizations			
	Science and technology institutions			
2011	Public at Large			
	Civil society organizations			
	Science and technology institutions			
2012	Public at Large			
	Civil society organizations			
	Science and technology institutions			
2013	Public at Large			
	Civil society organizations			
	Science and technology institutions			

2014	Public at Large			
	Civil society organizations			
	Science and technology institutions			
2015	Public at Large			
	Civil society organizations			
	Science and technology institutions			
2016	Public at Large			
	Civil society organizations			
	Science and technology institutions			
2017	Public at Large			
	Civil society organizations			
	Science and technology institutions			
2018	Public at Large			
	Civil society organizations			
	Science and technology institutions			

Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above (add as many rows as necessary). If reporting online, you may also upload relevant documents.

No answer provided

Attachments:

none

National contribution to the target

On the basis of the information you have provided above, estimate the proportion (%) of the population in your country which is informed about DLDD and DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity at the time of reporting.

Estimated share of total country population =

0 %

Question marked as 'No answer'.

Qualitative assessment

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

No answer provided

CONS-O-3 for Outcome 1.3

Operational Objective 1: Advocacy, awareness raising and education

Performance indicator CONS-O-3 for Outcome 1.3

Number of civil society organisations (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 civil society organizations (CSOs) and science and technology institutions (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 DLDD-related 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 national, subregional, regional and global level; in particular, the secretariat and the GM will report on the involvement of CSOs and STIs at the institutional level.

Data needed

The specification of the CSOs and STIs involved in the DLDD-related programmes/projects 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'

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

Overall Target

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

In the PPSs you have specified the number of CSOs and the number of STIs involved in each programme/project. 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
2008	1	0
2009	1	0
2010		
2011		
2012		
2013		
2014		
2015		
2016		
2017		
2018		

Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. Programme and project sheets (PPSs) submitted to UNCCD

No answer required

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

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. (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance)

Reasons for increasing

	Not important	Important	Very important
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) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Reasons for decreasing for CSOs

	Not important	Important	Very important
Engagement of CSOs is not a priority for the government			
Worsening of networking and collaboration linkages with CSOs			
Diminishing funding availability			
Other			

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

Very few CSOs involved in drylands work. All relevant CSOs involved as it is.

Reasons for decreasing for STIs

	Not important	Important	Very important
Engagement of STIs is not a priority for the government			
Decreasing interest of national STIs in DLDD- related topics			
Diminishing funding availability			
Other			

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

Very few STIs involved in drylands work. All relevant STIs involved as it is.

Performance indicator CONS-O-4 for Outcome 1.3

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

Understanding of the indicator

The indicator measures the number and type of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by CSOs and STIs in the education sector at the national level. 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. A distinction is made between activities carried out in the formal education sector and in the non-formal education sector. 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 national, subregional, regional and global level.

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.

Only initiatives in the field of education (formal and non-formal) 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', 'Formal education', 'Non-formal education'.

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

Overall target

A steady growth in the number of DLDD-related education initiatives undertaken by CSOs and STIs along the implementation period of The Strategy

Number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by CSOs and STIs

Year	CSOs formal education	CSOs non-formal education	STIs formal education	STIs non-formal education
2008	0	0	0	0
2009	0	0	0	0
2010				
2011				
2012				
2013				
2014				
2015				
2016				
2017				
2018				

Question marked as 'No answer'.

Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above (add as many rows as necessary). If reporting online, you may also upload relevant documents.

No answer provided

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

Qualitative assessment

Specify the reasons for the increasing and/or decreasing trend of DLDD-related education initiatives undertaken by CSOs and STIs. (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance)

Reasons for increasing

	Not important	Important	Very important
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) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Reasons for decreasing for CSOs

	Not important	Important	Very important
Insufficient awareness and knowledge by national CSOs of DLDD-related issues			
Decreasing networking and collaboration opportunities			
Diminishing funding availability			
Other			

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Reasons for decreasing for STIs

	Not important	Important	Very important
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) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Operational Objective 2: Policy framework

Performance indicator CONS-O-6 for Outcome 2.4

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 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.

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 are to be considered.

Only agreements under implementation at the time of reporting shall be considered.

Data sources (indicative only)

Relevant national ministries

Check the glossary for

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

A distinction shall be made between those agreements which relate to integrated investment frameworks and those which do not.

Overall target

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

Number of partnership agreements concluded by your country with affected country Parties and under implementation at the time of reporting

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
2008	0	0	0
2009	0	0	0
2010			
2011			
2012			
2013			
2014			

2015		
2016		
2017		
2018		

List the affected country (ies) with whom your country has one or more partnership agreement(s) under implementation at the time of reporting (add as many rows as necessary)

No answer provided

Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above (add as many rows as necessary). If reporting online, you may also upload relevant documents.

No answer provided

Attachments:

none

National contribution to the target

At the time of reporting, has your country plans for concluding one or more partnership agreement(s) within the framework of the Convention with one or more affected country Party (ies)?

No

If yes, when?

No answer provided

If yes and if known at the time of reporting, with which affected country (ies)?(add as many rows as necessary) (if not known, leave the reply empty)

No answer provided

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

No

If yes, by whom?(more than one box can be ticked)

No answer provided

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

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 (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).

	Not important	Important	Very important
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 (specify) (max 30 words)

Not applicable, as Norway has channeled funds for UNCCD implementation through multilateral channels

Performance indicator CONS-O-7 for Outcome 2.5

Operational Objective 2: Policy framework

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 level.

Data needed

Planning/programming documents, information from partnership agreements and programmes/projects.

Only operational mechanisms which have the achievement of joint implementation, synergies, convergence, and the introduction or strengthening of reinforcing measures among the Rio Conventions clearly stated in their objectives shall be considered under this indicator.

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”

For an indicative list of activities by Parties to promote synergies among the Rio Conventions, refer to [target=' blank'>UNEP/CBD /COP/DC/IX/16, Annex II](#)

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 <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf>

Number of enabling instruments established in affected country Parties with the technical and/or financial support of your country

Year	Joint planning/programming initiatives	Operational mechanisms for joint implementation or mutual reinforcement
2008	0	0
2009	0	0
2010		
2011		
2012		

2013		
2014		
2015		
2016		
2017		
2018		

According to the information you have provided above, if you have supported the establishment of one or more enabling instrument(s), answer the questions below.

Specify the type of joint initiative(s) and/or of mechanism(s) supported (tick as many boxes as necessary)

Joint planning/programming initiatives

No answer provided

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Operational mechanisms for joint implementation or mutual reinforcement

No answer provided

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Specify the framework(s) within which the above support was provided (tick as many boxes as necessary)

No answer provided

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Specify the type of support provided (tick as many boxes as necessary)

No answer provided

List the name(s) of the beneficiary affected country (ies) and/or UNCCD subregion(s)/region(s) (add as many rows as necessary)

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?

Yes

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

No answer provided

Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above (add as many rows as necessary). If reporting online, you may also upload relevant documents.

No answer provided

Attachments:

none

National contribution to the target

At the time of reporting, has your country plans for providing support to one or more affected country Party (ies) and/or UNCCD subregion(s)/region(s) for the establishment of instruments fostering synergies among the three Rio conventions?

No

If yes, when?

No answer provided

If yes and if known at the time of reporting, to which affected country (ies) and/or subregion(s)/region(s)?(add as many rows as necessary)(if not known leave the reply empty)

No answer provided

Qualitative assessment

For those developed countries who have supported the establishment of synergistic planning/programming or mechanisms for joint implementation in affected countries and/or subregion(s)/region(s), identify the major difficulties experienced in the establishment process (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).

	Not important	Important	Very important
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) (max 30 words)

Not applicable

For those developed countries who have not supported the establishment 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. (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance)

	Not important	Important	Very important
Not a development cooperation priority			
Insufficient financial resources			
The fostering of synergistic instruments shall be pursued at supra-national level not by individual (developed) countries			
Other			

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Operational Objective 3: Science, technology and knowledge

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

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 established and supported at their respective geographical levels. These monitoring systems may be specifically or partially (in the case of environmental monitoring systems) dedicated to UNCCD reporting. 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 whose establishment 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 level.

Data needed

Information on monitoring systems established within the national Ministries or other bodies/institutions in affected country Parties, UNCCD subregions/regions.

Programmes/projects' documents, fiches and summary sheets, programmes/projects' interim or final reports.

Only those monitoring systems storing all or most of the information needed for reporting to the UNCCD shall be considered.

Data sources (indicative only)

Relevant national ministries, programmes/projects documents or reports, other non-governmental initiatives.

Check the glossary for

'monitoring system', 'vulnerability' ('vulnerability is referred to in the definition of '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

Number of monitoring systems established in affected country Parties and/or UNCCD subregions/regions with the technical and/or financial support of your country

Year	Monitoring systems for DLDD	Environmental monitoring systems not specific to DLDD but that may contribute to UNCCD reporting
2008	0	0
2009	0	0
2010		
2011		
2012		
2013		
2014		
2015		

2016		
2017		
2018		

According to the information you have provided above, if you have supported the establishment of one or more monitoring system(s), answer the questions below.

Specify the framework(s) within which the above support was provided (tick as many boxes as necessary)

No answer provided

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Specify the type of support provided

No answer provided

List the name(s) of the beneficiary affected country (ies) and/or subregion(s)/region(s) (add as many rows as necessary)

No answer provided

To the best of your knowledge, how many of the monitoring systems you originally supported are still functional and regularly updated?

Number

No answer provided

Has your country supported the establishment of one or more monitoring system(s), partially or totally dedicated to DLDD, before 2008?

No

If yes, list the name(s) of the beneficiary affected country (ies) and/or subregion(s)/region(s) (add as many rows as necessary)

No answer provided

Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above (add as many rows as necessary). If reporting online, you may also upload relevant documents.

No answer provided

Attachments:

none

National contribution to the target

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

No

If yes, when?

No answer provided

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 provided

Qualitative assessment

For those developed countries who have supported the establishment of a monitoring system partially or totally dedicated to DLDD, at national and/or subregional/regional level, identify the major difficulties experienced in the establishment process (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).

	Not important	Important	Very Important
Lack of coordination among relevant ministries of the recipient country (ies) in determining the system's hosting and operationalisation 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) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

For those developed countries who have not supported the establishment of a monitoring system partially or totally dedicated to DLDD, at national and/or subregional/regional level, identify the reasons that prevented the delivery of this type of support. (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance)

	Not important	Important	Very Important
Lack of financial resources			
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) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Performance indicator CONS-O-11 for Outcome 3.5

Operational Objective 3: Science, technology and knowledge

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

The indicator measures the presence at the national level 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 level.

Data needed

Information from websites.

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

Data sources (indicative only)

Relevant organisations at the national level, relevant national ministries hosting knowledge-sharing systems and networks within their websites.

Check the glossary for
'knowledge-sharing system', 'PRAIS'

Question marked as 'No answer'.

List any DLDD-relevant 'knowledge-sharing system' at the country level you are aware of, providing an Internet link and estimated number of users per year (add as many rows as necessary)

Name of the system

No answer provided

Internet link

No answer provided

Estimated number of users per year

No answer provided

Operational Objective 4: Capacity building

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

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 major 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 environmental monitoring systems, accessing new financing mechanisms). The information provided by developed country Parties will be complemented by the reporting of other entities on existing UNCCD-related capacity-building initiatives at the national, subregional, regional and global level.

Data needed

Information on DLDD-related capacity building initiatives.

Only major capacity-building plans/programmes/projects are to be considered.

Data sources (indicative only)

PPSs submitted to UNCCD as part of the reporting exercise

Programmes/projects' documents, fiches and summary sheets, 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

'NCSA', 'PPS'

Overall target

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

Number of DLDD-related capacity building initiatives supported

Identify, if any, relevant programmes and projects through the PPSs and check corresponding programmes/projects' documents, fiches and summary sheets, and interim or final reports, to extract the information needed for completing the table below

Year	NCSA-generated	Other initiatives
2008		2
2009		2
2010		
2011		
2012		
2013		
2014		
2015		

2016		
2017		
2018		

List the affected country (ies) and/or subregions/regions where the above quantified DLDD-related capacity building initiatives have been supported (add as many rows as necessary)

- World

Sources of information

No answer provided

Attachments:

none

National contribution to the target

At the time of reporting, has your country plans for providing support to one or more affected country Party (ies) and/or UNCCD regions/subregions for the implementation of DLDD-specific capacity building plans, programmes or projects?

Yes

If yes, when?

2010-11

If yes and if known at the time of reporting, to which affected country (ies)/subregion/region?(add as many rows as necessary)(if not known leave the reply empty)

No answer provided

Qualitative assessment

For those developed countries who 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 (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).

	Not important	Important	Very Important
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) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

For those developed countries who 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. (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance)

	Not important	Important	Very Important
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) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Operational Objective 5: Financing and technology transfer

Performance indicator CONS-O-14 for Outcome 5.1

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 integrated financing strategies, include the leverage of 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 desertification and land degradation, 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 integrated financing strategies promoted by diverse international institutions. The information provided by developed country Parties will be complemented by the reporting of other reporting entities on the establishment of integrated investment frameworks at national, subregional and regional level.

Data needed

Investment frameworks documents.

Only investment frameworks prepared along the guidelines devised within integrated financing strategies shall be considered.

A distinction shall be made between integrated investment frameworks established within the IFS devised by the GM and those established within other integrated financing strategies

Data sources (indicative only)

Relevant national ministries, programmes/projects documents

Check the glossary for

'IFS', 'NAP' 'leveraging', 'integrated investment framework'

Overall target

By 2014, at least 50 per cent of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities to have developed integrated investment frameworks.

Number of integrated investment frameworks whose establishment in one or more affected country Party(ies) and/or UNCCD subregion(s)/region(s) has been supported by your country

Year	Integrated investment frameworks established within the IFS devised by the GM	Integrated investment frameworks established within other integrated financing strategies
2008	8	
2009	8	
2010		
2011		
2012		
2013		
2014		
2015		
2016		

2017		
2018		

According to the information you have provided above, if you have supported the establishment of one or more integrated investment framework(s), answer the questions below.

Specify the framework(s) within which the above support was provided (tick as many boxes as necessary)

- UNCCD-related initiative

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Specify the type of support provided

Mainly financial

List the name(s) of the beneficiary country (ies) and/or subregion(s)/region(s) (add as many rows as necessary)

- Asia
- Africa

Has your country supported the development of one or more integrated investment framework(s), before 2008?

No

If yes, list the name(s) of the beneficiary country (ies) and/or subregion(s)/region(s) (add as many rows as necessary)

No answer provided

Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above (add as many rows as necessary). If reporting online, you may also upload relevant documents.

No answer provided

Attachments:

none

National contribution to the target

At the time of reporting, has your country plans for providing support to one or more affected country Party (ies) and/or UNCCD regions/subregions for the development of integrated investment frameworks?

Yes

If yes, when?

2010-11

If yes, and if known at the time of reporting, in which affected country (ies) and/or subregions/regions?(add as many rows as necessary)(if not known leave the reply empty)

No answer provided

Qualitative assessment

For those developed countries who have supported the development of one or more integrated investment framework(s) at national and/or subregional/regional level, identify the major difficulties experienced in the development process (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).

	Not important	Important	Very Important
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) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

For those developed countries who have not supported the development of an integrated investment framework at national and/or subregional/regional level, identify the reasons that prevented the delivery of this type of support. (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance)

	Not important	Important	Very Important
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) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Performance indicator CONS-O-15 for Outcome 5.2

Operational Objective 5: Financing and technology transfer

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 and total amounts disbursed within DLDD-related programmes and projects supporting affected country Parties.

Data sources (indicative only)

SFAs submitted to UNCCD as part of the reporting exercise.

Programmes/projects accounts.

Only programmes/projects where the reporting developed country Party has made a financial contribution shall be considered

Check the glossary for

'SFA', 'currency'

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

Biennium	Amounts committed	Estimate of amounts disbursed
2008-2009	---	NOK106504000
2010-2011		

2012-2013		
2014-2015		
2016-2017		

Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above (add as many rows as necessary). If reporting online, you may also upload relevant documents.

- **Unfortunately due to unforeseen capacity constraints in the run-up to the reporting deadline. It has been impossible for Norway to provide Standard Financial Annexes or Programme and Project Sheets.**

Attachments:

none

Qualitative Assessment

From 2012 onwards, identify the reasons for the increasing or decreasing trend of financial resources made available to affected country Parties to combat DLDD (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).

	Not important	Important	Very Important
Increased availability of national resources for development cooperation in general			
Improved profile of UNCCD at the global level, including monitoring of performance			
Increased prioritisation of UNCCD by developed country Parties			
Other			

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Reasons for decreasing

	Not important	Important	Very Important
Less national resources dedicated to development cooperation in general			
Other development cooperation frameworks are more attractive than UNCCD			
Other			

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Standard Financial Annex

D. 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 Standard Financial Annex (SFA) is to consolidate information on resources mobilised 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 minimise 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:

Identification, i.e. data required to identify the reporting entity, the funding source and the activity financed;

Basic data, i.e. data specifying the amount and type of financial commitment made, as well as the recipient country, region, and/or organisation, and the funding period, if applicable;

Classification, i.e. categorisation 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 presented in a separate document.

Programme and Project Sheets

E. Programme and Project Sheet

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 categorised 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 UN Convention on Biological Diversity, CBD – and the UN 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 minimise 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.

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

Additional Information

F. 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 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.

No answer provided

Human resources

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

Number of people

4

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

Number of person/day

No answer provided

Knowledge

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

Yes

Participation and consultation

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

Yes

Validation meeting

Was a validation meeting held as a tool to integrate stakeholders in the reporting process?

No

PRAIS portal

Did you make use of the training on access and utilisation of the PRAIS portal?

No

Identify the difficulties of online reporting, if any (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).

		Not important	Important	Very Important
X	Slow internet access		X	
	Complexity of the system			
	Difficulties in getting access credentials			
	Other			

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Accommodation of specific requests within COP decisions

Report on specific COP requests – iterative process on indicators

Decision 13/COP.9, paragraphs 2, 3 and 24, envisages an iterative process to refine the set of performance indicators provisionally adopted by the same decision. As a tool to implement this iterative process, affected country Parties can provide here their suggestions and recommendations for improvement.

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

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

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.

Category

No answer provided

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Narrative description

No answer provided

Best Practices

G. Best practices

According to decision 13/COP.9, Annex V, UNCCD best practices shall be collected according to seven themes: 1. SLM technologies, including adaptation; 2. Capacity building and awareness raising; 3. DLDD and SLM monitoring and assessment/research; 4. Knowledge management and decision support; 5. Policy, legislative, institutional framework; 6. Funding/resource mobilisation; 7. Participation, collaboration and networking.

While themes 2 to 7 represent different elements of the enabling environment needed for the implementation and dissemination/up-scaling of sustainable land management (SLM) technologies (indirect impact), theme 1 comprises all actions on the ground that have a direct impact on desertification, land degradation and drought mitigation.

In particular, as specified in document ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.5, paragraph 12, theme 1 'SLM technologies, including adaptation' refers to SLM technologies that directly contribute to the prevention, mitigation and rehabilitation of desertification and land degradation on cropland, grazing land and woodland, with the aim of improving the livelihoods of affected populations and conserving ecosystem services. Successful implementation of SLM technologies is the base for achieving strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 of The Strategy. Theme 1 also integrates five of the strategic areas defined by decision 8/COP.4, namely: (a) sustainable land use management, including water, soil and vegetation in affected areas; (b) sustainable use and management of rangelands; (c) development of sustainable agricultural and ranching production systems; (d) development of new and renewable energy sources; and (e) launching of reforestation/afforestation programmes/ intensification of soil conservation programmes.

ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.5 provides definitions for 'practice', 'good practice' and 'best practice'. These definitions are included in the common glossary that shall be referred to by Parties and other reporting entities while reporting to UNCCD, according to decision 13/COP.9, paragraph 8.

The template for reporting is based on the general structure for the documentation of best practices contained in ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.5, paragraphs 40 to 43; it is tailored to the documentation of best practices related to theme 1 'SLM technologies, including adaptation'.

When reporting on best practices implemented in affected country Parties, developed country Parties are expected to have contacted and coordinated with the corresponding UNCCD NFP, to ensure coherence and lack of duplication in reporting on the practice.

Submission Form

Submission Form	
Name of the Reporting Officer *	Jon Heikki Aas
Date of Submission *	11/12/2010 11:56:21 AM
Signature	
Name of the Authorizing Officer	Bjørn Brede Hansen
Date of Authorization	12/11/2010
Signature	

