

# **United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification**

**Performance Review and Assessment of Implementation System**

**4th Reporting and Review Cycle - 2010**

**Report for Sierra Leone**

# Table of Contents

- Performance Indicators
  - Operational Objective 1: Advocacy, awareness raising and education
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-1 for Outcome 1.1
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-3 for Outcome 1.3
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-4 for Outcome 1.3
  - Operational Objective 2: Policy framework
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-5 for Outcomes 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-7 for Outcome 2.5
  - Operational Objective 3: Science, technology and knowledge
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-8 for Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-9 for Outcome 3.1 and 3.2
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-10 for Outcome 3.3 and 3.4
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-11 for Outcome 3.5
  - Operational Objective 4: Capacity building
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-13 for Outcomes 4.1 and 4.2
  - Operational Objective 5: Financing and technology transfer
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-14 for Outcome 5.1
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-16 for Outcome 5.2
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-17 for Outcome 5.3
    - Performance indicator CONS-O-18 for Outcome 5.5
- Standard Financial Annex
- Programme and Project Sheets
- Additional Information
  - Reporting process-related issues
  - Accommodation of specific requests within COP decisions
  - Reporting on the implementation of NAP
    - Human resources
    - Financial resources
  - Any other country-specific issues
- Best Practices
- Submission Form

## General Information Section

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE REPORTING ENTITY	
Reporting country *	Sierra Leone
Name and surname of the person submitting the report *	Stephen Cyril James Jusu
Affiliation and contact details *	environ@hotmail.com

# Performance Indicators

## C. 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.

Affected country Parties are requested to report on the following fourteen 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 affected country Parties with relevant quantitative data, selection of multiple choice boxes, or narrative information.

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

---

### Performance indicator 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 organized on the subject of DLDD and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity, and audience reached by media addressing DLDD and DLDD synergies.*

*Understanding of the indicator*

*At the national and local 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 affected country Parties by reporting on Convention-related communication strategies at 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 organized and media produced by the UNCCD NFP or organized/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 organizers of the events, programmes/projects' final reports.*

*Check the glossary for*

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

*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	3	1000
2009	3	2000
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	300	400	10
	Civil society organizations	100	100	10
	Science and technology institutions	30	40	10
2009	Public at Large	600	800	20
	Civil society organizations	200	200	20
	Science and technology institutions	60	80	20
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.

- **Environmental Protection Department (Ministry of Lands, Country Planning and the Environment), Sierra Leone Environmental Protection Agency Report 2010**

### **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 =

**14 %**

### **Qualitative assessment**

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

**Yes**

### **Performance indicator 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 CSOs and science and technology institutions 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 programmes/projects are valid tools for the engagement of, and receiving contributions from, CSOs and STIs at the field level. Other reporting entities will complement the information provided by affected country Parties by reporting on the involvement of CSOs and STIs at 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 organizations involved in the 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'*

*Overall target*

*A steady growth in the participation of CSOs and science and technology institutions in the Convention processes is recorded 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.***

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of CSOs involved in DLDD-related programmes/projects</b>	<b>Number of STIs involved in DLDD-related programmes/projects</b>
2008	4	6
2009	5	6
2010		
2011		
2012		
2013		
2014		
2015		
2016		
2017		
2018		

---

**Question marked as 'No answer'.**

***Sources of information***

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?

**Yes**

**Qualitative assessment**

Specify the reasons for the increasing and/or decreasing trend of the participation of CSOs and STIs to DLDD-related programmes/projects. (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance )

		Not important	Important	Very important
X	Increased networking and collaboration opportunities			X
X	Increased access to information and to national and/or international financing opportunities		X	
X	Increased willingness of the government in working with CSOs			X
X	Increased interest of donors in working with CSOs		X	
X	Strengthened organizational, project management and fund-raising capacity of CSOs	X		
X	Increased funding opportunities requiring partnership with the STIs		X	
X	Strengthened organizational, project management and fund-raising capacity of the STIs			X
	Other			

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

**No answer provided**

**Reasons for decreasing for CSOs**

		Not important	Important	Very important
X	Costly participatory processes		X	
X	Low organizational, fund-raising and project management capacity of CSOs		X	
X	Government policies and/or the legal environment do not foster the engagement of CSOs	X		
X	Diminishing funding	X		
	Other			

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

**No answer provided**

**Reasons for decreasing for STIs**

		Not important	Important	Very important
X	DLDD topics are not prioritized by national STIs		X	
X	Low organizational, fund-raising and project management capacity of STIs		X	
X	Decreased networking opportunities at national and international level			X
X	Diminishing funding		X	

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)****No answer provided****Performance indicator CONS-O-4 for Outcome 1.3***Operational Objective 1: Advocacy, awareness raising and education**Performance indicator CONS-O-4 for Outcome 1.3**Number and type of DLDD-related initiatives of CSOs and science and technology institutions 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 affected country Parties by reporting on the involvement of CSOs and STIs at 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’.*

*Overall target*

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

**Number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by CSOs formal education</b>	<b>Number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by CSOs non-formal education</b>	<b>Number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by STIs formal education</b>	<b>Number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by STIs non-formal education</b>
2008	1	2	6	2
2009	2	10	6	2
2010				
2011				
2012				
2013				
2014				
2015				



2016			
2017			
2018			

### 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.

- **Environmental Protection Department (Ministry of Lands, Country Planning and the Environment), SLEPA**

### 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?

**Yes**

### 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)

	Not important	Important	Very important
X Increased access to funding			X
X Increased awareness of DLDD-related problems and of the need for action			X
X Increased knowledge of DLDD-related topics and enhanced skills of trainers/teachers		X	
X Government policies are more supportive of education initiatives			X
X International donors are more supportive of education-focussed initiatives.			X
Other			

### Other (specify) (max 30 words)

**No answer provided**

### Reasons for decreasing for CSOs

	Not important	Important	Very important
X Lack of financial resources			X
X Insufficient awareness and knowledge by national CSOs of DLDD-related issues	X		
X Limited capillary presence of national CSOs at the grass-root level		X	
Other			

### Other (specify) (max 30 words)

**No answer provided**

**Reasons for decreasing for STIs**

		<b>Not important</b>	<b>Important</b>	<b>Very important</b>
X	Lack of financial resources			X
X	National STIs are more focussed on research activities than on education and training		X	
	Other			

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

**No answer provided**

## Operational Objective 2: Policy framework

---

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

*Operational Objective 2: Policy framework*

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

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

*Understanding of the indicator*

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

*Data needed*

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

*Data sources (indicative only)*

*UNCCD NFP.*

*Check the glossary for*

*'Finalized', 'NAP', 'NFP', 'driver', 'barrier', 'integrated investment framework', 'baseline'*

*Overall target*

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

---

### **NAP Adoption and Revision**

Had your country already adopted a NAP prior to The Strategy?

**Yes**

**If yes, has your country revised the NAP in alignment with The Strategy?**

**No**

**If you have revised the NAP in alignment with The Strategy, specify the date of its approval.**

**No answer provided**

**If you have not revised the NAP in alignment with The Strategy, specify why the process was not initiated. (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance)**

		Not important	Important	Very Important
X	Not a priority for the government	X		
X	Lack of capacities		X	
X	Lack of financial resources			X

X	Understaffing		X	
X	Lack of time	X		
X	Poor internal coordination among relevant ministries			X
	Other			

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

**No answer provided**

**If your country had no NAP adopted prior to The Strategy, have you formulated an aligned NAP after The Strategy's adoption in 2008?**

**No answer provided**

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

**No answer provided**

**If at the time of reporting you have not formulated a NAP aligned to The Strategy specify why the process was not initiated. (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance)**

	Not important	Important	Very Important
Not a priority for the government			
Lack of capacities			
Lack of financial resources			
Understaffing			
Lack of time			
Poor internal coordination among relevant ministries			
Other			

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

**No answer provided**

**The questions below apply only to those countries having a NAP aligned to The Strategy**

If you have a NAP, is it supported by biophysical and socio-economic baseline information?

**No**

**If you have a NAP, does it assess DLDD drivers?**

**No**

**If you have a NAP, does it assess the barriers to sustainable land management?**

**No**

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

**No answer provided**

**If you have a NAP, has it been included into an integrated investment framework?**

**No**

**If you have a NAP, has it been integrated into national development planning and relevant sectoral and investment plans and policies?**

**No**

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

**No answer provided**

**Did you refer to the Guidelines on the alignment of action programmes with The Strategy as proposed in ICCD/COP(9)/2/Add.1 while developing or reviewing your action plan?**

No

---

**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**

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

2012-13

---

**Qualitative assessment**

Has the formulation and/or alignment of the NAP been supported by external assistance?

Yes

**If yes, did you receive assistance from one or more of the following institutions? (more than one box can be ticked)**

- GM
- GEF

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

Technical Support

**Identify the major difficulties experienced in the formulation/alignment process (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).**

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

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

**No answer provided**

---

**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 at the national level which foster the introduction of or strengthen the mutually reinforcing measures among the three Rio Conventions. The assumption is that the higher the number of enabling instruments in place, the higher the possibility of achieving synergies in implementation. This information will be complemented by the reporting of other reporting entities on synergistic processes at the subregional, regional and global level.

#### *Data needed*

Planning/programming documents and legislative/regulatory documents.

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.

Check the glossary for

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

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

---

#### **Are you implementing joint planning/programming initiatives for the three Rio Conventions?**

**No**

**If yes, specify the type of joint initiative(s) (tick as many boxes as necessary)**

**No answer provided**

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

**No answer provided**

---

#### **Do operational mechanisms for joint implementation or mutual reinforcement exist in your country?**

**No**

**If yes, specify the type of mechanism(s) (tick as many boxes as necessary)**

**No answer provided**

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

**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**

#### **Attachments:**

none

---

#### **National contribution to the target**

If your country is not implementing joint planning/programming or does not have operational mechanisms in place at the time of reporting, when do you plan to have something ensuring synergies in place?

**2012-13**

---

**Qualitative assessment**

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

**No**

***If yes, by which Convention? (more than one box can be ticked)***

**No answer provided**

***Identify the major difficulties experienced to establish synergistic planning/programming or mechanisms for joint implementation (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).***

		Not important	Important	Very Important
X	Not a priority for the government	X		
X	Lack of capacities	X		
X	Lack of financial resources			X
X	Understaffing		X	
X	Lack of time	X		
X	Poor internal coordination among relevant ministries			X
	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*

*At the national level, the indicator measures the monitoring potential of the country by quantifying the number of monitoring systems established and supported. These monitoring systems may be specifically 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 during the implementation of The Strategy and beyond. This information will be complemented by the reporting of other reporting entities on UNCCD-relevant monitoring systems established and supported at the subregional, regional and global level.*

*Data needed*

*Information on monitoring systems established within the national Ministries or other bodies/institutions.*

*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, programme/project management units, other non-governmental initiatives.*

*Check the glossary for*

*'monitoring system', 'vulnerability'*

*Overall target*

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

---

***Is a monitoring system for DLDD established at the national level?***

**No**

***If yes, specify whether this system is: Functional***

**No answer provided**

***If yes, specify whether this system is: Regularly Updated***

**No answer provided**

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

**Yes**

***List any monitoring system available at the sub- national level that can contribute to the UNCCD reporting (add as many rows as necessary).***

- **Environmental and Social Impact Assessment Monitoring System**

---

**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**

If your country does not have a national monitoring system partially or totally dedicated to DLDD in place at the time of reporting, do you plan to initiate one?

Yes

**If yes, when?**

2012-13

**Qualitative assessment**

For those countries not having a national monitoring system totally or partially dedicated to DLDD, 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
X Financial constraints			X
X Lack of capacities		X	
X Human resources constraints		X	
X Lack of coordination among relevant ministries and unclear attribution of responsibilities			X
X Lack of coordination among donor-led programme/project interventions			X
X Existing initiatives are too fragmented; cannot be realistically coordinated under one umbrella.			X
X Existing national and/or sub-national monitoring systems use different methodologies and cannot be realistically harmonised	X		
Other			

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

No answer provided

**For those countries having a national monitoring system totally or partially dedicated to DLDD, how is the system maintained? (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance)**

	Not important	Important	Very important
X By means of national resources			X
X By means of external support	X		
X No maintenance is possible due to limited professional capacities	X		
X No maintenance is possible due to limited financial resources			X
Other			

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

No answer provided

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

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

*Understanding of the indicator*

The indicator measures the use of biophysical and socio-economic information at the national level in defining a commonly agreed core set of impact indicators for the UNCCD and in monitoring progress against these indicators using harmonized methodologies.

The indicator will inform to what extent it is possible to compile a comparable and global assessment of UNCCD impact.

Subregional and regional reporting entities will complement the information provided by affected country Parties by reporting on the use of impact indicators at the subregional and regional levels, if and when impact indicators for these levels will be commonly agreed upon by the Conference of the Parties.

*Data needed*

Reports to the UNCCD by affected country Parties in 2012 and 2016.

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

*Data sources (indicative only)*

UNCCD NFP.

Check the glossary for

'NFP'

*Overall target*

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

---

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

No answer required for this indicator in the 2010 reporting cycle

---

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

2012

No answer required for this indicator in the 2010 reporting cycle

**2016**

No answer required for this indicator in the 2010 reporting cycle

---

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

No answer required for this indicator in the 2010 reporting cycle

---

**Sources of information**

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

No answer required for this indicator in the 2010 reporting cycle

---

**National contribution to the target**

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

No answer required for this indicator in the 2010 reporting cycle

**If in 2012 your country has not complied with the reporting guidelines, i.e. using the common baselines and**

**methodologies defined by the CST, when do you plan to do so?**

No answer required for this indicator in the 2010 reporting cycle

---

**Qualitative assessment**

Identify the major difficulties experienced in reporting against the impact indicators:

No answer required for this indicator in the 2010 reporting cycle

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

No answer required for this indicator in the 2010 reporting cycle

---

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

*Operational Objective 3: Science, technology and knowledge*

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

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

*Understanding of the indicator*

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

*Data needed*

*NAP aligned to The Strategy.*

*Scientific literature consulted for the development of the NAP.*

*Data sources (indicative only)*

*UNCCD NFP.*

*Check the glossary for*

*'NAP', 'NFP', 'driver'*

*Countries not having a NAP or not having aligned their NAP to The Strategy do not report on this indicator.*

*The below questions are meant to guide the country's self-assessment of its aligned NAP.*

*Overall target*

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

---

**Countries not having a NAP or not having aligned their NAP to The Strategy do not report on this indicator.**

The below questions are meant to guide the country's self-assessment of its aligned NAP.

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

**Yes**

**If yes, specify upon which type of knowledge it is based (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).**

- **Expert knowledge**

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

**No answer provided**

**In your NAP, is the analysis of the interaction between drought mitigation and restoration of degraded land and climate change mitigation/ adaptation or biodiversity conservation knowledge-based?**

Yes

**If yes, specify upon which type of knowledge it is based (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).**

- Expert knowledge

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

**No answer provided**

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

Yes

**Attachments:**

none

---

### **Sources of information**

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above:

UNCCD National Action Programme.

*No answer required*

---

### **National contribution to the target**

If in your NAP, DLDD drivers, their interactions, and the interaction of DLDD with climate change and biodiversity, are not analyzed on the basis of relevant scientific, expert and/or traditional knowledge, such that the self-assessment process is not fully successful, when do you expect to adjust your NAP so that it can successfully go through the self-assessment?

**2012-13**

---

### **Qualitative assessment**

If your NAP has not been developed taking into account relevant scientific and/or traditional knowledge, identify the reasons (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).

		<b>Not important</b>	<b>Important</b>	<b>Very important</b>
X	Relevant scientific literature is not available			X
	Relevant traditional or expert knowledge is not available			
X	Lack of financial resources to mobilise the necessary knowledge			X
X	Poor coordination among the relevant ministries prevented an internal pooling of knowledge/expertise			X
	Relevant ministries could not contribute due to lack of time			
	Relevant ministries could not contribute due to lack of staff			
	Other			

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

**No answer provided**

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

*Check the glossary for*

*'knowledge-sharing system', 'PRAIS'*

---

**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**

none

**Internet Link**

none

**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*

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

#### *Data needed*

*Information on DLDD-related capacity building initiatives.*

*Only major capacity-building plans/programmes/projects mentioned in the PPSs 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 implement DLDD specific capacity building plans or programs or projects.*

---

### **Number of DLDD-related capacity building initiatives undertaken**

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

<b>Year</b>	<b>NCSA-generated</b>	<b>Other initiatives</b>
2008	3	
2009		
2010		
2011		
2012		
2013		
2014		
2015		
2016		

2017		
2018		

---

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

Yes

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

- NCSA

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

**No answer provided**

**If yes, do you have assessed the necessary resources for addressing capacity building needs?**

Yes

**Are these resource requirements included into an investment framework?**

No

---

**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.

- **National Capacity Self-Assessment for Global Environmental Management in Sierra Leone Report (September 2006)**

**Attachments:**

none

---

**National contribution to the target**

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

**2012-13**

---

**Qualitative assessment**

Have you received assistance from one or more of the following institutions to build capacities to combat DLDD? (more than one box can be ticked)

- GM
- GEF

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

- Technical support
- Financial support

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

*Understanding of the indicator*

*At the national level, the indicator measures the presence of integrated financing processes allowing the leverage of national, bilateral and multilateral resources for combating desertification and land degradation, through the quantification of investment frameworks developed by country Parties within the IFS devised by the GM or other integrated financing strategies promoted by diverse international institutions. This information 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.*

*Data sources (indicative only)*

*Relevant national ministries.*

*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 have developed integrated investment frameworks.*

---

**Has your country developed an integrated investment framework?**

**No**

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

**No answer provided**

**The questions below apply only to those countries which have an integrated investment framework.**

**Is your integrated investment framework based on the NAP?**

**No answer provided**

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

**No answer provided**

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

**No answer provided**

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

**No answer provided**

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

**No answer provided**

**If your country has an integrated investment framework based on the NAP, is this framework concretely allowing the leverage of national, bilateral and multilateral resources for combating DLDD?**

**No answer provided**



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**

If your country has not developed an integrated investment framework at the time of reporting, do you plan to do it?

**Yes**

**If yes, when?**

**2010-11**

**Qualitative assessment**

Identify the major difficulties experienced in developing an integrated investment framework (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).

		Not important	Important	Very Important
X	Financial constraints			X
X	Human resources constraints		X	
X	Lack of coordination among relevant ministries and unclear attribution of responsibilities			X
X	Lack of coordination among those providing support		X	
X	National, bilateral and multilateral resources are too diverse; cannot be realistically coordinated under one umbrella.			X
	Other			

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

**No answer provided**

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

*Operational Objective 5: Financing and technology transfer*

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

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

*Understanding of the indicator*

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

*Data needed*

-

Data sources (indicative only)

-

Check the glossary for

-

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

Overall target

No target has been set for this indicator

---

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

Adequacy of bilateral assistance

**Not adequate**

**Timeliness of bilateral assistance**

**Not timely**

**Predictability of bilateral assistance**

**Not predictable**

**Provide narrative justification on your above rating (max 100 words)**

Bilateral assistance received are inadequate, untimely and unpredictable. This coupled with the lack of human technical competence working on CCD obligations within the government agencies, local organisations and academic institutions have grossly affected the pace of the implementation of the conventions obligations and implementation of its strategy. There is also lack of professionally trained staff to undertake and implement the activities of Sustainable Forest Management Conservation and Sustainable Land Management effectively in response to the implementation of the obligations of convention to combat desertification. Mostly, resources (financial, human, materials) provided are untimely and uncertain.

---

**Qualitative assessment**

Did you receive assistance in raising resources from bilateral donors?

**Yes**

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

- GM
- GEF

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

**No answer provided**

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

**Yes**

---

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

*Operational Objective 5: Financing and technology transfer*

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

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

*Understanding of the indicator*

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

#### Data needed

Information contained in the PPSs and SFAs submitted to UNCCD.

#### Data sources (indicative only)

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

The PPS requires specification of the project 'status' thus it allows the identification of relevant projects to be considered by this indicator and the monitoring of their approval status.

The SFA requires the specification of amounts committed to approved projects.

#### Check the glossary for

'PPS', 'SFA', 'Project proposals', 'currency', 'Successfully submitted proposals'

#### Overall target

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

---

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

Biennium	submitted (pipeline)	ongoing
2008-2009		1
2010-2011		
2012-2013		
2014-2015		
2016-2017		

---

### Amount of funds raised, by biennium

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

Biennium	Total amount
2008-2009	USD400000
2010-2011	
2012-2013	
2014-2015	
2016-2017	

---

### Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above: Programme and Project Sheets and Standard Financial Annexes

No answer required

---

### National contribution to the target

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

No

***If no, do you plan to increase the country's efforts in presenting project proposals to international financial institutions, facilities and funds?***

Yes

---

**Qualitative assessment**

Identify the reasons for the increasing or decreasing trend of project proposals successfully submitted to international financial institutions, facilities and funds (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).

Reasons for increasing

		Not important	Important	Very Important
X	Easier and more transparent application procedures	X		
X	Increased capacities of national stakeholders to prepare applications	X		
X	Major natural hazards occurred at the national level considerably increased the level of resources made available by the international community	X		
X	Access to funding is increasingly facilitated by third parties such as the private sector	X		
	Existence of a financing strategy (IFS or others)			
	Other			

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

**No answer provided**

**Reasons for decreasing**

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

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

**No answer provided**

---

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

*Operational Objective 5: Financing and technology transfer*

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

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

#### *Understanding of the indicator*

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

#### *Data needed*

##### *Budgets of relevant programmes and projects*

*Information on policy/regulatory, financial and fiscal incentives. Incentives facilitating access to technology shall be those established and implemented at the national level, not necessarily within the framework of DLDD-related cooperation.*

#### *Data sources (indicative only)*

*Financial documents of programmes and projects submitted as PPSs to the UNCCD as part of the reporting exercise.*

*National policy, regulatory and economic/financial documents.*

*Check the glossary for*

*'technical support', 'incentive', 'PPS'*

*Check the programmes and projects financial documents (budgets) and extract amounts allocated to: (1) technical support – material aid (equipment, hardware and software, machineries, etc); and (2) technical support – knowledge aid (technical assistance and advisory services). Add these amounts to provide totals in the table below.*

*Refer to the programmes and projects submitted as PPSs to the UNCCD and their relating budgets*

#### *Overall targets*

*A steady growth in the financial resources allocated to facilitate access to technology by affected country Parties is recorded along the implementation period of The Strategy.*

*A steady growth in the number of economic and policy incentives reported upon is recorded along the implementation period of The Strategy.*

---

#### ***Estimate of amounts allocated to facilitate technology transfer***

Check the programmes and projects financial documents (budgets) and extract amounts allocated to: (1) technical support – material aid (equipment, hardware and software, machineries, etc); and (2) technical support – knowledge aid (technical assistance and advisory services). Add these amounts to provide totals in the table below.

Refer to the programmes and projects submitted as PPSs to the UNCCD and their relating budgets

<b>Year</b>	<b>Technical support – material aid</b>	<b>Technical support – knowledge aid</b>
2008		
2009		
2010		
2011		
2012		
2013		
2014		
2015		
2016		
2017		

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

No

**If yes, specify which types of incentives (more than one box can be ticked)**

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.

- Environmental Protection Department (MLCPE), Sierra Leone Environmental Protection Agency

**Attachments:**

none

**National contribution to the target**

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

No

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

Yes

**If yes, when?**

2010-11

**Qualitative assessment**

If existing incentives do not prove to be effective, identify possible reasons (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).

	Not important	Important	Very Important
X Policy or regulatory incentives are not enforced			X
X There are not enough resources to apply financial or fiscal incentives		X	
X The national financial and credit systems (banks, credit agencies, etc) are not supportive		X	
Other			

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

No answer provided

**Identify the reasons for the increasing or decreasing trend of financial resources allocated through DLDD-related programmes and projects to facilitate access to technology (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).**

**Reasons for increasing**

	Not important	Important	Very Important
X Access facilitated by the spreading of IT			X
X More appropriate technologies available		X	

X	Appropriateness of government incentives			X
	Other			

**Other (specify) (max 30 words)**

**No answer provided**

**Reasons for decreasing**

		Not important	Important	Very Important
X	Technology sustainability is poor; technologies do not represent viable investments			X
X	Lack of fixed infrastructure for accessing technologies (those created on an ad hoc basis disappear once the support ends)			X
X	Lack of capacities for operation and maintenance of technologies		X	
X	Lack of enabling policy and regulatory environments			X
	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 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:*

*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 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 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 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 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 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.*

*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 affected country Parties and consequently to make more targeted and specific recommendations to the COP. It allows affected country Parties to comment or report upon issues that are not covered elsewhere but that are nevertheless of importance at the national level or within the framework of the implementation of The Strategy and the Convention.

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

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

## Reporting process-related issues

---

### **Financial resources**

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

**Yes**

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

**7000000 Sierra Leone Leone**

---

### **Human resources**

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

Number of people

**15**

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

Number of person/day

**3**

---

### **Knowledge**

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

**Yes**

---

### **Coordination**

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

**Yes**

**Was coordination at the national level with the relevant line ministries satisfactory in order to comprehensively and coherently report?**

**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?

**Yes**

---

***Subregional and regional processes***

Did your country actively contribute to the subregional and regional reporting processes?

**Yes**

---

***PRAIS portal***

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

**Yes**

## 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.

	<b>economic</b>	<b>Specific</b>	<b>Measurable</b>	<b>Achievable</b>	<b>Relevant</b>	<b>Time-bound</b>
CONS-O-1	X	X	X	X	X	X
CONS-O-3	X	X	X	X	X	X
CONS-O-4	X	X	X	X	X	X
CONS-O-5		X	X			
CONS-O-7						
CONS-O-8	X	X	X	X	X	X
CONS-O-9						
CONS-O-10		X	X	X	X	
CONS-O-11						
CONS-O-13	X	X	X	X	X	X
CONS-O-14		X	X	X	X	X
CONS-O-16		X	X	X	X	X
CONS-O-17		X	X	X	X	X
CONS-O-18		X	X	X	X	X

## Reporting on the implementation of NAP

---

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

1-30%

---

### Human resources

---

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

1

Effective activities in SLM require a dynamic approach that is able to respect interacting biophysical, social and economic factors affecting decision-making by farmers.

2

To address Sustainable Land Management (SLM) issues, the support and network are needed and these function very well despite typical of the different topographic areas. Further, scientific and organizational guidance, are needed and often resource and information as well.

---

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

1

Capacity building needs and human resource development, and low multi-sectoral commitment to the obligations and implementation of CCD strategy and programmes

2

Research and Development relate to the quality of research issues especially when institutional and individual capacities are weak. there is a problem of networking and information dissemination on UNCCD

---

### Financial resources

---

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

1

There is need to enlarge operational possibilities through local resource mobilisation and embark on private sector initiatives in the implementation of the obligations of the convention to combat desertification.

2

Creating National Trust Fund based on donations and voluntary contribution will help co-finance local initiatives of relevance to the implementation of UNCCD and inter-linking initiatives relevance to UNFCC and UNCBD.

---

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

1

Lack of access to financial resources to support stakeholders, research and increased awareness

2

Inadequate budgetary allocation by the GoSL to the environment department

## Any other country-specific issues

---

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

Yes

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

**Category**

Capacity-building and awareness-raising

*Other (specify) (max 30 words)*

**No answer provided**

**Narrative description**

There is lack of institutional management capacity, inadequate security of tenure, weak land administration system, weak policies and enforcement of laws relating to sustainable land management. There is very inadequate management and information services especially in the area of documentation and dissemination of information on UNCCD; low public awareness and stakeholder participation to know the relevance of the implementation of UNCCD obligations to their livelihoods and national prosperity, as well as weak collaboration and coordination mechanisms within and between stakeholders. Many communities are still not aware of the consequences of the loss of biodiversity, land degradation and climate change. Also, the database on capacity classification of land resources are obsolete, as well as poorly equipped GIS and cartographic systems to study land use and the implementation of the National Land Use Policy is lamed by the very low status of cadastre work. Building the capacity of staff in the SLM and other stakeholders will help monitor changes in vegetation status of the symptoms of land and forest degradation.

Allocations from the national budget are rarely sufficient to meet the obligations of the convention.

# 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 mobilization; 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'.*

# Submission Form

Submission Form	
Name of the Reporting Officer *	Braima Koroma
Date of Submission *	11/28/2010 8:54:53 AM
Signature	
Name of the Authorizing Officer	Steven Syril James Jusu
Date of Authorization	30/06/2010
Signature	

