

United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification

Performance Review and Assessment of Implementation System

4th Reporting and Review Cycle - 2010

Report for Suriname

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
 - Financial Commitment #1 — The project which was funded is the Capacity building in and mainstreaming of Sustainable Landmanagement in Suriname project
- Programme and Project Sheets
 - Programme/Project #1 — Capacity building in and mainstreaming of Sustainable Landmanagement in Suriname project
- 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
 - Best Practice #1 — Reversing the trend of reduced soil fertility, reduced yields and threatened livelihoods by restoring the natural balance of the soil through the use of compost and natural pesticides.~~~
- Submission Form

General Information Section

| GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE REPORTING ENTITY | |
|--|-------------|
| Reporting country * | Suriname |
| Name and surname of the person submitting the report * | Haidy Aroma |

Affiliation and contact details *

milieu_atm@yahoo.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 | 0 | 0 |
| 2009 | 0 | 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 | | | |
| | Civil society organizations | | | |
| | Science and technology institutions | | | |
| 2009 | Public at Large | | 1 | 2 |
| | Civil society organizations | | | |
| | Science and technology institutions | | | |
| 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.

- **Current UNCCD National Focal Point**

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 =

25 %

Qualitative assessment

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

No

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.

| Year | Number of CSOs involved in DLDD-related programmes/projects | Number of STIs involved in DLDD-related programmes/projects |
|------|---|---|
| 2008 | 1 | 1 |
| 2009 | 1 | |
| 2010 | | |
| 2011 | | |
| 2012 | | |
| 2013 | | |
| 2014 | | |
| 2015 | | |
| 2016 | | |
| 2017 | | |
| 2018 | | |

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

Other (specify) (max 30 words)
not relevant

Reasons for decreasing for CSOs

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

Other (specify) (max 30 words)
not relevant

Reasons for decreasing for STIs

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

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

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

| Year | Number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by CSOs formal education | Number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by CSOs non-formal education | Number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by STIs formal education | Number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by STIs non-formal education |
|-------------|---|---|---|---|
| 2008 | | | | |
| 2009 | | | 1 | 9 |
| 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.

- not relevant

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)

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

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

The trend of DLDD - related education initiatives is neither increasing nor decreasing but stationary.

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)

Not applicable

Reasons for decreasing for STIs

| | | Not important | Important | Very important |
|---|---|---------------|-----------|----------------|
| X | Lack of financial resources | | X | |
| | National STIs are more focussed on research activities than on education and training | | | |
| | Other | | | |

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

Not applicable

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/revise a NAP/SRAP/RAP aligned to The Strategy.

NAP Adoption and Revision

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

No

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

No answer provided

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 |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-----------|----------------|
| 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

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

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

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

The formulation of the nap was not completed due to a lack of funding.

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 answer provided

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

No answer provided

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

No answer provided

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 answer provided

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

No answer provided

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

No answer 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 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.

- **Current UNCCD National Focal Point**

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?

No

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

No answer provided

If yes, which type of assistance did you receive?

No answer provided

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

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

Lack of funding

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?

Yes

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

- **Other**

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

Through the development of a NCSA strategy and actionplan where the national priorities for regarding the implementation of each convention are identified.

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.

- **NCSA strategy and actionplan**

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?

No plan exists yet

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 |
|---|--|---------------|-----------|----------------|
| | Not a priority for the government | | | |
| | Lack of capacities | | | |
| X | Lack of financial resources | | X | |
| | Understaffing | | | |
| X | Lack of time | | X | |
| X | Poor internal coordination among relevant ministries | | X | |
| | Other | | | |

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

Not applicable

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?

No

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

- not applicable
-

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.

- not applicable

Attachments:

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 |
|---|---|---------------|-----------|----------------|
| | Financial constraints | | | |
| X | Lack of capacities | | | X |
| X | Human resources constraints | | | X |
| X | Lack of coordination among relevant ministries and unclear attribution of responsibilities | | | X |
| | Lack of coordination among donor-led programme/project interventions | | | |
| X | Existing initiatives are too fragmented; cannot be realistically coordinated under one umbrella. | | X | |
| | Existing national and/or sub-national monitoring systems use different methodologies and cannot be realistically harmonised | | | |
| | Other | | | |

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

not relevant

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 |
|---|---|---------------|-----------|----------------|
| | By means of national resources | | | |
| | By means of external support | | | |
| | No maintenance is possible due to limited professional capacities | | | |
| | No maintenance is possible due to limited financial resources | | | |
| X | Other | | | |

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

not relevant

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

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?

No answer provided

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

No answer provided

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?

No answer provided

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

No answer provided

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?

No answer provided

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?

No plans exist yet

Qualitative assessment

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

| | Not important | Important | Very important |
|--|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Relevant scientific literature is not available | | | |
| Relevant traditional or expert knowledge is not available | | | |
| Lack of financial resources to mobilise the necessary knowledge | | | |
| Poor coordination among the relevant ministries prevented an internal pooling of knowledge/expertise | | | |
| 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)

not relevant

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

There is no system available

Internet Link

not relevant

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

| Year | NCSA-generated | Other initiatives |
|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 2008 | 1 | 1 |
| 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)

Within the Sustainable Landmanagement project DDLDD- related capacity building needs have been identified

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

No

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.

- **NCSA Strategy and Action plan**

Attachments:

- 4 NCSA Cross-Cutting Analysis.pdf
 - 5 NCSA Capacity Development Action Plan.pdf
 - SLM project document.pdf
-

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)

- **GEF**

If yes, which type of assistance have you received?

- **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

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.

- not relevant

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

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

not relevant

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)

No answer provided

Qualitative assessment

Did you receive assistance in raising resources from bilateral donors?

No

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

No answer provided

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?

No

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 | 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 | USD480795 |
| 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 | | | |
| | Increased capacities of national stakeholders to prepare applications | | | |
| X | Major natural hazards occurred at the national level considerably increased the level of resources made available by the international community | | | |
| | Access to funding is increasingly facilitated by third parties such as the private sector | | | |
| | Existence of a financing strategy (IFS or others) | | | |
| X | Other | | | |

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

Access to funding is increasingly facilitated by multilateral donors

Reasons for decreasing

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

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

not relevant

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

| Year | Technical support – material aid | Technical support – knowledge aid |
|------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 2008 | USD0 | USD0 |
| 2009 | 0 USD | 0 USD |
| 2010 | | |
| 2011 | | |
| 2012 | | |
| 2013 | | |
| 2014 | | |
| 2015 | | |
| 2016 | | |
| 2017 | | |
| 2018 | | |

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.

- not relevant

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?

No

If yes, when?

No answer provided

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

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

not relevant

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 |
|---|---|---------------|-----------|----------------|
| | Access facilitated by the spreading of IT | | | |
| | More appropriate technologies available | | | |
| | Appropriateness of government incentives | | | |
| X | Other | | | |

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

not relevant

Reasons for decreasing

| | | Not important | Important | Very Important |
|---|--|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| | Technology sustainability is poor; technologies do not represent viable investments | | | |
| | Lack of fixed infrastructure for accessing technologies (those created on an ad hoc basis disappear once the support ends) | | | |
| 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)**not relevant**

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.

Financial Commitment #1 — The project which was funded is the Capacity building in and mainstreaming of Sustainable Landmanagement in Suriname project

Reporting Entity

Enter the name of the country or organization submitting the official report to the UNCCD to which the financial commitment will be attached in the form of a consolidated Standard Financial Annex

- **Suriname - Central Government Institutions**

Other

- **For Suriname the reporting entity will be the Ministry of Labour, Technological development and Environment which is the UNCCD Focal Point**
-

Funding Organization

Enter the full name and acronym (if applicable) of the organization that has made the financial commitment

- **Suriname - Central Government Institutions**

Other

- **The non-governmental funding organization: the Global Environment Facility**

Name of activity funded

Enter the name or title of the activity, project, programme, organization or initiative funded with this financial commitment

The project which was funded is the Capacity building in and mainstreaming of Sustainable Landmanagement in Suriname project

Identification code

Enter the Identification Code (ID), number or acronym given to the activity funded (if known)

PIMS 3417

Recipient Country(ies) or (sub) region(s)

Enter the name of the country(ies), subregion(s) or region(s) in which the activity is taking place or is due to take place.

Indicate "Global" if the activity is of global scale or has no specific geographical focus

- **Americas**
 - **South America**
 - **Suriname**
-

Recipient Organization(s)

Enter the full name and acronym of the organization(s) to which the funds have been or will be transferred to

- **Suriname - Central Government Institutions**
-

Other

No answer provided

Executing Agency(ies)

Enter the full name and acronym of the Agency(ies) or Organization(s) that is/are in charge of the execution of the activity

- **The Ministry of Environment**
-

Commitment date (dd/mm/yyyy)

Enter the date at which the financial commitment has been formally approved by the extending organization (e.g.

15/01/2011)

01/01/2008

Currency/Amount committed

Indicate the currency denomination of the financial commitment (e.g. EUR, USD, YN, etc.). Enter the total amount of money committed as a numeric field, showing the entire figure (e.g. enter 1500000 to indicate 1.5 million). Do not use abbreviations, symbols or decimals

480795 US Dollar

Type of funding

Indicate the type of funding provided through the financial commitment (e.g. grant, concessional loan, basket funding,

Grant

Start date (dd/mm/yyyy)

Enter the date at which the funding has been or is expected to be made available to the recipient organization (e.g.

15/01/2011)

01/01/2008

Completion date (dd/mm/yyyy)

Enter the date at which the funding has been or is expected to be utilized by the recipient organization (e.g. 15/01/2011), if applicable

30/06/2012

Duration (no. of months)

Indicate the period covered by this funding, if applicable, expressed in number of months (numeric field. Do not use abbreviations, symbols or decimals)

24

Rio Marker for desertification

Assign the appropriate Rio Marker for desertification to the funded activity by ticking only one of the boxes below (refer to the Rio Markers guidance note for more information, examples and instructions)

2

Relevant Activity Code(s) (RACs)

Indicate all the Relevant Activity Codes (RACs) that may apply to the funded activity (refer to the RACs guidance note for more information, examples and instructions). Add as many rows as necessary.

- **2 Capacity Development and Planning**
 - **2.1 Advocacy and Awareness Raising**
 - **2.1.1 Public Awareness Campaigns**
 - **2.2 Enabling Activities**
 - **2.2.1 Capacity-Building**
 - **2.2.13 Resource Mobilization**
 - **2.2.4 Action Programmes**
 - **2.2.6 Governance and Legislation**
 - **2.2.7 Mainstreaming**
 - **2.2.8 Partnership Building**
-

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.

- **Capacity building in and mainstreaming of Sustainable Landmanagement produc**

Attachments:

- SLM project document.pdf

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.

Programme/Project #1 — Capacity building in and mainstreaming of Sustainable Landmanagement in Suriname project

Title

Enter the Programme/Project title, and sub-title if applicable

Capacity building in and mainstreaming of Sustainable Landmanagement in Suriname project

Organization(s)

Enter the full name and acronym of the reporting organization

- **Suriname - Central Government Institutions**

Other

No answer provided

Role of the Organization(s) in the Programme/Project

Indicate the role of the reporting organization in the Programme /Project (e.g. funding agency, implementing agency, etc.)

Executing Agency

Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and Science & Technology Institutions (STIs)

Enter the name(s) of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), including Non-Governmental Organizations, research institutions and-or Science & Technology Institutions (STIs) involved in the Programme/Project. Note: This information should be taken into account in the computation of performance indicator no. CONS-O-3.

- **not available**
-

Beneficiary Country(ies) or Sub Region(s)

Enter the name of the Country(ies), Subregion(s) and/or Region(s) benefiting from the Programme/Project. Indicate "Global" in the absence of a specific geographical focus

- **Suriname**
 - **South America**
 - **Americas**
-

Target Area size / administrative unit

Indicate the total area expressed in number of hectares (numeric field. Do not use abbreviations, symbols or decimals). Also indicate the administrative unit targeted in the project area, if known, by the Programme/Project

Area Size

16400000 Hectares

Administrative Unit

PMU SLM project

Target Group

Enter the different stakeholders, such as individuals, groups, or organizations, positively affected through their involvement in the implementation of an initiative/project/programme

- **- government organizations**
 - **NGO's**
 - **private sector**
 - **Science and Technology institute**
 - **public at large**
-

Beneficiaries

Enter the total number of people benefitting from the Programme/Project, if known (numeric field. Do not use abbreviations, symbols or decimals)

400000

Identification Code

Enter the Programme/Project identification code (ID) or number, given by the relevant extending agency (if applicable)

PIMS 3417

Status

Indicate the status of the Programme/Project at the time of completing this form.

Ongoing

Start date (dd/mm/yyyy)

Indicate the date at which the Programme/Project started or is due to start, if known (e.g. 15/01/2011)

24/01/2010

Completion date (dd/mm/yyyy)

Indicate the date at which the Programme/Project was completed or is due to be completed, if known (e.g. 15/01/2011)

30/06/2012

Programme/Project co-financing**Source**

Provide the full name and acronym of all co-financing organisations

- Suriname - Central Government Institutions

Other

Co-financing government institution: Ministry of Labour, Techological development and Environment

Currency, Amount

For each co-financing, indicate the currency denomination used (e.g. EUR, USD, YEN, etc.)

Indicate the amount of funding provided by each co-financing organisation (numeric field. Do not use abbreviations, symbols or decimals)

400000 US Dollar

Source

Provide the full name and acronym of all co-financing organisations

No answer provided

Other

Co-financing non- governmental organization: Ground and Landinformation system Institute

Currency, Amount

For each co-financing, indicate the currency denomination used (e.g. EUR, USD, YEN, etc.)

Indicate the amount of funding provided by each co-financing organisation (numeric field. Do not use abbreviations, symbols or decimals)

547763 US Dollar

UN Conventions' Rio Markers

Assign the appropriate Rio Marker to the Programme/Project (refer to the Rio Markers guidance note for more information, examples and instructions)

UNCCD

2

UNFCCC adaptation

0

UNFCCC mitigation

0

CBD

0

Strategic objectives

Indicate which strategic objective of the UNCCD 10-Year Strategy is addressed by the Programme/Project

- 4
-

Operational objectives

Indicate which operational objective of the UNCCD 10-Year Strategy is addressed by the Programme/Project

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

Programme/Project Objectives

Indicate the objectives pursued by the Programme/Project, as specified in the related documentation, choosing from the list of purpose codes provided in document (add Quick Reference Guide document title and reference code (please see footnotes above). The OECD list of purpose is also available at the following link : http://www.oecd.org/document/21/0,3343,en_2649_34447_1914325_1_1_1_1,00.html.

- 400 MULTISECTOR/CROSS-CUTTING
- 410 General environmental protection
- 41010 Environmental policy and administrative management

Programme/Project Components

Programme/Project Components

Indicate the specific Programme/Project components, if known, as specified in the related documentation.

Note: This information should be taken into account in the computation of performance indicator no. CONS-O-18.

- capacity building
- mainstreaming of desertification innational development plans
- awareness raising
- mobilization of resources
- adapative management

Currency, Amount

Indicate the currency denomination (e.g. EUR, USD, YEN, etc.)

Indicate the amount allocated to each Programme/Project component (numeric field. Do not use abbreviations, symbols or decimals)

480795 US Dollar

Rio Marker for desertification

Assign the appropriate Rio Marker for desertification to each Programme/Project component (refer to the [Rio Markers guidance note](#) for more information, examples and instructions)

2

Relevant Activity Codes (RACs)

Indicate all the Relevant Activity Codes (RACs) that may apply to the Programme/Project components (refer to the [RACs guidance note](#) for more information, examples and instructions)

- 2 Capacity Development and Planning
- 2.1 Advocacy and Awareness Raising
- 2.1.1 Public Awareness Campaigns
- 2.2 Enabling Activities
- 2.2.1 Capacity-Building
- 2.2.13 Resource Mobilization
- 2.2.4 Action Programmes
- 2.2.6 Governance and Legislation
- 2.2.7 Mainstreaming
- 2.2.8 Partnership Building

Expected or achieved results

Provide information on the results achieved or expected from the implementation of the Programme/Project (max 100 words).

- - increased national awareness of sustainable landmanagement
- completion of the national actionprogramme
- improved institutional cooperation
- a mid- term financial plan to finance actions described in the national actionprogrammes

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.

- **Capacity building in and mainstreaming of Sustainable Landmanagement in Suriname projectdocument**

Attachments:

none

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?

No

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

0 US Dollar

Human resources

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

Number of people

3

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?

No

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

No

Participation and consultation

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

No

Validation meeting

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

No

Subregional and regional processes

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

No

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.

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

Reporting on the implementation of NAP

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

0%

Human resources

Lessons learnt (report on the 2 most important only)

1

A lack of sufficient individual capacity and slow decision- making process can be a constraint for an effective projectpreparation (e.g. national PM sollicitation,selection and contracting)

-

2

A long administrative procedure within the Ministry for arriving at contracts for implementation of projetactivities, therefore a better a-priori agreement on role and responsibility of consultant should be reached before drafting an actual contract

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

1

- Insufficient capacity on individual and policy level

2

- Long administrative procedures and slow decision-making process within the government

Financial resources

Lessons learnt (report on the 2 most important only)

1

- Low government budget which makes it difficult to reserve a special amount for desertification

2

- Weak knowledge on desertification at relevant stakeholders can make it difficult to mobilize financial resources.

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

1

Low government budget to reserve an special amount for desertification

2

Insufficient knowledge about desertification within relevant stakeholders can make it difficult to mobilize resources

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

Funding/resource mobilization

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

Funding for the resource mobilization for the implementation of national action programmes

Narrative description

No narrative description available

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'.

Best Practice #1 — Reversing the trend of reduced soil fertility, reduced yields and threatened livelihoods by restoring the natural balance of the soil through the use of compost and natural pesticides.~~~

Property rights

Clarify if the technology described in the template, or a part of it, is covered by property rights:

Yes

If yes, please provide relevant information on the holder of the rights.

(max 100 words)

TBI, Suriname www.tbisuriname.sr

Section 1. Context of the best practice: frame conditions (natural and human environment)

Title of the best practice

Reversing the trend of reduced soil fertility, reduced yields and threatened livelihoods by restoring the natural balance of the soil through the use of compost and natural pesticides.

Location (if available, also include a map)

Suriname, district Saramacca

Attachments:

none

If the location has well defined boundaries, specify its extension in hectares

Hectares (ha)

363600

Estimated population living in the location

Number of people

16135

Prevailing land use within the specified location

- Cropland
- Human settlement

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Brief description of the natural environment within the specified location

Climate: (max 50 words)

Existing fauna and flora in this location are birds namely toucan and mash jay and primary tropical forest. Traditionally a lot of small- size agricultural familyfarms have been established. Recently large-scale agricultural projects are developed mainly aimed at the production of banana and rice.

Soil: (max 50 words)

Soil in this location is very fertile but due to the use of synthetic fertilizers the fertility has reduced. Soil consist of 50 - 70% of clay and less than 2% of sand.

Topography: (max 50 words)

Location is situated lies halfway the Atlantic coast in the north of Suriname.

Prevailing socio-economic conditions of those living in the location and/or nearby

Income level: (max 50 words)

Information about the income level in this location is not available.

Main income sources: (max 50 words)

The main income sources are agriculture, horticulture and petroleum extraction.

Land tenure and land use rights: (max 50 words)

rights of ownership

Short description of the best practice

max 250 words

The farmers in horticulture are using a biological method to control the effects of pests and diseases occurring during the harvesting of crops. This biological method implies that a seedextract of *Crotalaria striata* or Smooth rattlebox, a herbaceous plant, is dissolved in a certain proportion of water. This mixture is then poured around the crops every two weeks. This method does not kill the pests, namely nematodes, but supresses them enough so that the crops can grow well. Another biological pesticide is the use of extracts of tobaccoleaves to kill plant louses.

On the basis of which criteria and/or indicator(s) (not related to The Strategy) the proposed practice and corresponding technology has been considered as 'best'?

max 100 words

- sustainability
- environmental friendly
- food safety

Section 2. Problems addressed (direct and indirect causes) and objectives of the best practice

With respect to DLDD, the best practice directly contributes to:

- Prevention
 - Mitigation
 - Rehabilitation
-

Main problems addressed by the best practice

(max 50 words)

- The problem that this best practice addresses is the reduction of soil fertility due to the use of synthetic fertilizers which causes a scarce crop production. The objective is to assist small farmers in the transition to competitive organic horticulture and the development of a sustainable agro supply chain.
-

Outline specific land degradation problems addressed by the best practice

max 100 words

- reduction of soil fertility
 - damage to soil quality
-

Specify the objectives of the best practice

(max 50 words)

- The objective is to assist small farmers in the transition to competitive organic horticulture and the development of a sustainable agro supply chain.
-

Section 3. Activities

Brief description of main activities, by objective

Objective 1

(max 50 words)

- pest/disease - pesticide
 1. plant louse seed extract of smooth rattlebox or neem
 2. round worm extract of tobacco leaves
 3. cucumber moth neem extract/ dissolved soap
 4. beetle flour solution

Objective 2

(max 50 words)

- pest/disease - pesticide
 1. white beans mite flour solution
 2. mite neem extract
 3. spring beetle extract of bitterwood/ quassia or tobacco
 4. stemborer soapsolution
 5. gall midge soapsolution

Objective 3

(max 50 words)

- Abovementioned pests are common for crops such as paprika, pepper, lettuce, tomatoes, cabbage, chinese cabbage, soup greens, beans, black-eyed peas, cucumber.

Objective 4

(max 50 words)

No answer provided

Short description of the technology

max 250 words

The farmers in horticulture are using a biological method to control the effects of pests and diseases occurring during the harvesting of crops. This biological method implies that a seedextract of *Crotalaria striata* or Smooth rattlebox, a herbaceous plant, is solved in a certain proportion of water.

Technical specifications of the technology - if any

max 250 words

No technical specifications available

Section 4. Institutions/actors involved (collaboration, participation, role of stakeholders)

Name and address of the institution developing the technology

Name

Caribbean Institute

Address

Caribbean Institute-Suriname

Hoekstraat, Paramaribo

Suriname

Was the technology developed in partnership?

No

If yes, list the partners:

No answer provided

Specify the framework within which the technology was promoted

- National initiative – non-government-led

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

not available

Was the participation of local stakeholders, including CSOs, fostered in the development of the technology

Yes

If yes, list local stakeholders involved:

- - farmers in horticulture
-

For the stakeholders listed above, specify their role in the design, introduction, use and maintenance of the technology, if any.

max 250 words

The farmers were trained in the principles of organic horticulture meaning they were provided with hands-on experimentation with new practices

Was the population living in the location and/or nearby involved in the development of the technology?

Yes

If yes, by means of what?

- Consultation

Other (specify) (max 30 words)

No answer provided

Section 5. Contribution to impact

Specify to which strategic objectives of The Strategy the technology contributes

(more than one box can be ticked)

- 1. To improve the living conditions of affected population
-

Describe on-site impacts (the major two impacts by category)

Production or productivity:

1. (max 50 words)

better crop yield

2. (max 50 words)

not available

Socio-economic level (including cultural level):

1. (max 50 words)

not available

2. (max 50 words)

not available

Environmental level:

1. (max 50 words)

not available

2. (max 50 words)

not available

Other (specify)

1. (max 50 words)

not available

2. (max 50 words)

not available

Describe the major two off-site (i.e. not occurring in the location but in the surrounding areas) impacts

1. (max 50 words)

not available

2. (max 50 words)

not available

Impact on biodiversity and climate change

In your opinion does the best practice/technology you have proposed positively impact on biodiversity conservation?

No

Explain the reasons:

max 250 words

not available

In your opinion does the best practice/technology you have proposed positively impact on climate change mitigation?

No

Explain the reasons:

max 250 words

not available

In your opinion does the best practice/technology you have proposed positively impact on climate change adaptation?

No answer provided

Explain the reasons:

max 250 words

No answer provided

Has a cost-benefit analysis been carried out?

No

If yes, summarize its main conclusions:

max 250 words

No answer provided

Section 6. Connection to other UNCCD themes

Specify if the technology relates to one or more of the other UNCCD themes

- DLDD and SLM monitoring and assessment/research
- Participation, collaboration and networking

Section 7. Adoption and replicability

Was the technology disseminated/introduced to other locations?

No

If yes, where? (add as many rows as necessary)

Location:

No answer provided

Were incentives to facilitate the take up of the technology provided?

No

If yes, specify which type of incentives

No answer provided

Can you identify the three main conditions that led to the success of the presented best practice/technology?

Examples of conditions leading to success may include: highly motivated local governments, farmers organized into well structured cooperatives, extremely favorable weather conditions, etc. For each 'condition of success' you are able to identify, specify whether in your opinion such condition is: (a) linked to the local context and thus cannot be replicated elsewhere; (b) replicable elsewhere with some level of adaptation; (c) replicable elsewhere with major adaptation.

1. (max 50 words)

highly motivated farmers

2. (max 50 words)

not available

3. (max 50 words)

not available

In your opinion, the best practice/technology you have proposed can be replicated, although with some level of adaptation, elsewhere?

Yes

If yes, at which level?

- Local

Section 8. Lessons learned

Related to human resources

(max 50 words)

- Since TBI-Suriname has a good working relationship with the Faculty of Technology, research findings can be incorporated in the curriculum to further develop human capacity in this field

Related to financial aspects

(max 50 words)

- not available

Related to technical aspects

(max 50 words)

- not available

Submission Form

| Submission Form | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Name of the Reporting Officer * | N.Plet/ J.Caupain |
| Date of Submission * | 12/10/2010 5:42:59 AM |
| Signature | |
| | |
| Name of the Authorizing Officer | Ministry of Environment |
| Date of Authorization | 06/12/2010 |
| Signature | |

