

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

Fourth UNCCD reporting cycle, 2010–2011 leg
Report for Uganda

Table of contents

- Impact indicators
 - Strategic Objectives 1, 2 and 3
 - General information on impact indicators on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3
 - Core indicator S-(1/2/3): Poverty Rate
 - Reporting on the indicator
 - Interpretation of indicator status/trend and policy implications
 - Feedback
 - Core indicator S-5: Land Cover Status
 - Reporting on land cover
 - Reporting on the indicator
 - Land Cover Type #1 — Low vegetation cover
 - Land Cover Type #2 — Medium vegetation cover
 - Land Cover Type #3 — High vegetation cover
 - Land Cover Type #4 — Very high vegetation cover
 - Interpretation of indicator status/trend and policy implications
 - Feedback
 - Reporting on land productivity
 - Feedback
 - Additional indicators on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3
 - Strategic Objective 4
 - Indicator SO-4-3
 - Indicator SO-4-6
 - Indicator SO-4-7
- Performance Indicators
 - Operational Objective 1: Advocacy, awareness raising and education
 - Performance indicator CONS-O-1 for Outcome 1.1
 - Performance indicator CONS-O-3 for Outcome 1.3
 - Performance indicator CONS-O-4 for Outcome 1.3
 - Operational Objective 2: Policy framework
 - Performance indicator CONS-O-5 for Outcomes 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3
 - Performance indicator CONS-O-7 for Outcome 2.5
 - Operational Objective 3: Science, technology and knowledge
 - Performance indicator CONS-O-8 for Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2
 - Performance indicator CONS-O-9 for Outcome 3.1 and 3.2
 - Performance indicator CONS-O-10 for Outcome 3.3 and 3.4
 - Performance indicator CONS-O-11 for Outcome 3.5
 - Operational Objective 4: Capacity building
 - Performance indicator CONS-O-13 for Outcomes 4.1 and 4.2
 - Operational Objective 5: Financing and technology transfer
 - Performance indicator CONS-O-14 for Outcome 5.1
 - Performance indicator CONS-O-16 for Outcome 5.2
 - Performance indicator CONS-O-17 for Outcome 5.3
 - Performance indicator CONS-O-18 for Outcome 5.5
- Standard Financial Annex
 - Financial Commitment #1 — National Livestock Productivity Improvement Project (NLPIP)
 - Financial Commitment #2 — Farm Income Enhancement and Forest Conservation (FIEFOC) Project
 - Financial Commitment #3 — Sustainable Land Management (SLM)
 - Financial Commitment #4 — Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management Activities in Six Cattle Corridor Districts of Uganda
 - Financial Commitment #5 — Enabling Environment for SLM to overcome land degradation in the

- Uganda cattle corridor Districts.
 - Financial Commitment #10 — Water for Production
- Programme and Project Sheets
 - Programme/Project #1 — National Livestock Productivity Improvement Project (NLPIP)
 - Programme/Project #2 — Farm Income Enhancement and Forest Conservation(FIEFOC) Project
 - Programme/Project #3 — Sustainable Land Management (SLM)
 - Programme/Project #4 — Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management Activities in Six Cattle Corridor Districts of Uganda
 - Programme/Project #5 — Enabling Environment for SLM to overcome land degradation in the Uganda cattle corridor Districts.
 - Programme/Project #10 — Water for Production
- Additional Information
 - Reporting process-related issues
 - Accommodation of specific requests within COP decisions
 - Reporting on the implementation of NAP
 - Human resources
 - Financial resources
 - Any other country-specific issues
- Submission form

General information section

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE REPORTING ENTITY	
Reporting country	Uganda
Name and surname of the person submitting the report	Stephen Muwaya
Affiliation and contact details	smuwaya@yahoo.com

Affected Country Parties

Impact indicators

Strategic Objectives 1, 2 and 3

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

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

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

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

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

Definition of affected areas

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

Yes

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

Cattle corridor (southwest-northeast diagonal); eastern and southwestern highlands; Lake Victoria crescent (central region); and northern Uganda covering about 50 districts (approximately 44% of the country's land area).

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

42515 km²

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

22 %

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

Areas bearing the greatest impacts of land degradation, with land use trends showing an increase in deforestation, reduced fallow periods, overgrazing, bush-burning, etc. Areas that experience low and erratic rainfall patterns, high temperatures and drought is a recurrent phenomenon. Areas often associated with poverty and the need for improved land management systems to increase food security. Poor households unable to invest in soil and water conservation measures. Fragile highland ecosystems showing substantial increase in cultivated areas associated with unsustainable population growth leading to increased soil erosion and lack fallow strips and soil bunds or terraces. Inherently low soil fertility and nutrient depletion; extensive drainage and decrease of wetlands. High temperatures and intense rainstorms subjecting the soils to climate induced degradation.

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

The F-cover which is the fraction of green vegetation covering a unit area of horizontal soil was derived from the NDVI images downloaded from the AMSED eStation base at the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) in Uganda.

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

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

Attachments:

None.

Definition of rural areas

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

Yes

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

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS)	2012	Compendium of Statistical Concepts and Definitions, 4th Edition	UBOS	www.ubos.org

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

An area that lacks most, if not all, of the facilities/ amenities found in the urban areas. The population tends to be scattered.

Human population estimates

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

Include details on the methodology used to establish these estimates.

Year	Number of people living in the national area	Number of people living in rural areas	Number of people living in affected areas	Method used	Was every region (or equivalent sub-national unit) of your country covered in the assessment?	Please state the approximate proportion of the national human population surveyed during the assessment
2000	---	---	---	---	---	---
2001	---	---	---	---	---	---
2002	24000000	---	---	Nationwide census	Yes	100%
2003	25000000	---	---	Nationwide census	Yes	100%

Year	Number of people living in the national area	Number of people living in rural areas	Number of people living in affected areas	Method used	Was every region (or equivalent sub-national unit) of your country covered in the assessment?	Please state the approximate proportion of the national human population surveyed during the assessment
2004	26000000	---	---	Nationwide census	Yes	100%
2005	27000000	---	---	Nationwide census	Yes	100%
2006	28000000	---	---	Nationwide census	Yes	100%
2007	29000000	---	---	Nationwide census	Yes	100%
2008	30000000	---	---	Nationwide census	Yes	100%
2009	33000000	---	---	Nationwide census	Yes	100%
2010	34000000	---	---	Nationwide census	Yes	100%
2011	35000000	---	---	Nationwide census	Yes	100%

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

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS)	2007	Projections of Demographic Trends in Uganda, 2007-2017	UBOS	www.ubos.org

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

UNCCD Strategic Objective(s) for which the indicator applies

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

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

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

Name of the indicator

Proportion of population living below the poverty line

Metric

Poverty Rate

Purpose of the indicator

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Relevant terms in the glossary

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

Reporting on the indicator

Rural poverty line

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

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

No answer provided.

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

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

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

No answer required.

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

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

National poverty line

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

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

Yes

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

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

Year	National poverty line (value)	Currency	Method used
2000	---	---	---
2001	---	---	---
2002	1	USD	Income survey
2003	1	USD	Income survey
2004	1	USD	Income survey
2005	1	USD	Income survey
2006	1	USD	Income survey
2007	1	USD	Income survey
2008	1	USD	Income survey
2009	1	USD	Income survey
2010	1	USD	Income survey
2011	1	USD	Income survey

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

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS)	2010	Uganda National Household Survey 2009/10, Socioeconomic Module, Abridged Report	UBOS	www.ubos.org

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

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

Year	Affected areas			
	Number of people	Percentage of population	Method of poverty assessment	Approximate proportion of the human population living in affected areas surveyed during the poverty assessment
2011	---	---	---	---

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

Year	Rural areas			
	Number of people	Percentage of population	Method of poverty assessment	Approximate proportion of the human population living in rural areas surveyed during the poverty assessment
2000	---	---	---	---
2001	---	---	---	---
2002	9310000	39	Stratified random survey	20%
2003	---	---	---	---
2004	---	---	---	---
2005	7870000	34	Stratified random survey	20%
2006	---	---	---	---
2007	---	---	---	---
2008	---	---	---	---
2009	7100000	27	Stratified random survey	20%
2010	---	---	---	---
2011	---	---	---	---

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

Year	Country			
	Number of people	Percentage of population	Method of poverty assessment	Approximate proportion of the national human population surveyed during the poverty assessment
2000	---	---	---	---
2001	---	---	---	---
2002	---	---	---	---
2003	---	---	---	---
2004	---	---	---	---

Year	Country			
	Number of people	Percentage of population	Method of poverty assessment	Approximate proportion of the national human population surveyed during the poverty assessment
2005	---	---	---	---
2006	---	---	---	---
2007	---	---	---	---
2008	---	---	---	---
2009	---	---	---	---
2010	---	---	---	---
2011	---	---	---	---

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

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS)	2010	Uganda National Household Survey 2009/10, Socioeconomic Module, Abridged Report	UBOS	www.ubos.org

International poverty line

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

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

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

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

Year	Affected areas			
	Number of people	Percentage of population	Method of poverty assessment	Approximate proportion of the human population living in affected areas surveyed during the poverty assessment
2010	---	---	---	---
2011	---	---	---	---

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

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

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

Year	Country			
	Number of people	Percentage of population	Method of poverty assessment	Approximate proportion of the national human population surveyed during the poverty assessment
2000	---	---	---	---
2001	---	---	---	---
2002	---	---	---	---
2003	---	---	---	---
2004	---	---	---	---
2005	---	---	---	---

Year	Country			
	Number of people	Percentage of population	Method of poverty assessment	Approximate proportion of the national human population surveyed during the poverty assessment
2006	---	---	---	---
2007	---	---	---	---
2008	---	---	---	---
2009	---	---	---	---
2010	---	---	---	---
2011	---	---	---	---

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

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

Contact details

General information on the national contact person for this indicator

Name and surname

Mr. Godfrey Nabongo

Institution

Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS)

Address

**Manager, Communication and Public Relations,
Plot 9 Colville Street
P.O. Box 7186, Kampala, Uganda.**

Email

godfrey.nabongo@ubos.org

Telephone

Tel. +256 414 706000; +256 711 706137; +256 772 369579 (mob)

Interpretation of indicator status/trend and policy implications

Poverty in affected areas

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

Did you provide data on poverty in affected areas?

No answer provided.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

Please explain the pattern emerging from the data.

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

Poverty in rural areas

Did you provide data on poverty in rural areas?

Yes

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

Yes

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

Yes

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

No answer required.

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

Decrease

Please explain the pattern emerging from the data.

The pattern is such that in rural areas, the percentage of people in poverty declined from 34.2 percent to 27.2 percent, corresponding to a decline in the number of rural people in poverty from 7.87 million to 7.10 million in 2005/06 and 2009/10 respectively-though the change is not statistically significant.

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

Yes

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

DLDD is both a cause and effect of rural poverty. The high dependency of rural population on natural resources makes the rural communities more vulnerable and exposes them to the DLDD impacts such as:

- (i) Declining soil productivity - resulting from loss of vital nutrients being lost hence increasing extent and frequency of xerophytic species and leading to reduced pastures and crop yields and hence food insecurity, in turn causing malnutrition, starvation and frequent food emergencies;
- (ii) Vegetation cover loss – many places, especially at watering points, along livestock paths and on hilltops in the drylands are now bare following overgrazing, frequent seasonal fires and woodfuel harvesting, leading to scarcity of feed, energy and biodiversity resources impacting on food security, loss of income, inter-communal conflict and loss of livelihoods;
- (iii) Reduced water availability and quality – degraded land and widespread siltation of water bodies and courses causes downstream sedimentation and flooding reducing available water volumes in water bodies and water quality which significantly affect food security and health of rural populations;
- (iv) Drought - The largely rain-fed agricultural dependant rural population faces serious impacts caused by agricultural drought where food security and rural incomes are massively impacted leading to high economic and social cost.

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

No answer required.

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

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

Attachments:

- [Poverty Level Trends chart.JPG](#), 19.4 kB

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

Explanation in the legend of the map.

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

1. The Strategic Investment Framework for SLM (2010-2020);
2. The Agriculture sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan 2010-2014;
3. The Land Use Policy (2007);
4. The Renewable Energy Investment Plan (2009).

Poverty at the national level

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

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

Did you provide data on poverty at the national level?

No answer provided.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

Please explain the pattern emerging from the data.

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

Feedback

Report on specific COP requests – iterative process on indicators

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

Assessment Criteria (e-SMART)	Score	Remarks
Relevant – Does the indicator provide information about changes in primary processes unambiguously related to DLDD and UNCCD implementation?	4	Indicator provides information relating to livelihoods and possible impacts of DLDD.
Relevant – Is the indicator relevant for DLDD national planning purposes, including monitoring of the National Action Programme (NAP)?	4	Poverty levels directly related to ability to access resources and use them sustainably.

Assessment Criteria (e-SMART)	Score	Remarks
Relevant – Can policymakers easily understand the indicator?	2	Policy makers do not understand how the indicator relates to biophysical changes.
Specific – Is the indicator based on well-understood and generally accepted conceptual models of the system to which it is applied so that changes in its value will have clear meaning regarding the process of concern?	3	Poverty and DLDD trends have clear conceptual models and can be easily correlated.
Specific – Is the requested spatial scale (national vs. affected areas) of the indicator appropriate for its monitoring purposes?	3	It is appropriate but may not bring out the different circumstances relating to the indicator.
Measurable – Are the definitions of the indicator and its constitutive elements clear and not ambiguous?	5	They are very clear.
Measurable – Are the proposed methodologies for the measurement of this indicator sufficiently clear to ensure reliable data?	5	The national census method that was used is a reliable methodology for the indicator.
Time-bound – Is the indicator sensitive enough to detect important changes but not so sensitive that signals are masked by natural variability?	4	The indicator is sensitive enough to detect important changes but can be masked as there are other causes of poverty apart from DLDD.
Time-bound – Can the indicator detect changes at the required temporal and spatial scales and are the up-scaling / cross-scaling rules clear?	4	Trend in the indicator and those of DLDD can be very well correlated but are not certain of the up-scaling/ cross-scaling rules.
Achievable – Are reliable data and monitoring systems available to assess trends and is data collection a relatively straightforward process?	4	Data and monitoring systems are available and data collection straight forward, but costly.
Achievable – Is the frequency of data collection in line with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the UNCCD?	2	Frequency of data collection is not in line with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the UNCCD.
Economic – Is the indicator cost-effective? Is the cost of data collection affordable and worthwhile? (consider any required cost for personnel, capital but also, recurring costs)	2	Primary data collection on the indicator is costly but Government has already integrated the indicator into national statistical data collection system and regularly funds the national census.

Core indicator S-5: Land Cover Status

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

UNCCD Core indicator S-5

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

Name of the indicator

Land cover status

Metric

Land cover / land productivity

Purpose of the indicator

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

made in maintaining or improving the condition of ecosystems.

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Relevant terms in the glossary

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

Reporting on land cover

Reporting on the indicator

Land Cover Type #1 — Low vegetation cover

Land cover type

Name

Low vegetation cover

Methodology and data availability

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

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

Year	Definition of land cover type
2000	---
2001	---
2002	---
2003	---
2004	---
2005	---
2006	---
2007	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction ranging from 0%-25%
2008	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction ranging from 0%-25%
2009	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction ranging from 0%-25%
2010	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction ranging from 0%-25%
2011	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction ranging from 0%-25%

Please state the methodology used to produce land cover data in your country for the most recent years and

the availability of associated images.

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

Item 1

Year:

2007

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

365days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2007

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

May

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

Item 2

Year:

2008

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

365days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2008

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

May

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

Item 3

Year:

2009

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

365days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2009

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

May

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

Item 4

Year:

2010

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

305days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2010

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

March

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

Item 5

Year:

2011

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

365days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2010

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

May

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

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

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
National Environment Management Authority	2012	NEMA AMESD eStation	NEMA	www.menaug.org

Indicator data

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

Year	square km	% of total
2000	---	---%
2001	---	---%
2002	---	---%
2003	---	---%
2004	---	---%
2005	---	---%
2006	---	---%
2007	2790	1.44%
2008	13069	6.76%
2009	3501	1.81%
2010	16669	8.59%
2011	6115	3.13%

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

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

Attachments:

- [Attachments 2012 10 14.zip](#), 575.72 kB
- [FCOVER2009.tif](#), 7.9 MB
- [FCOVER2010.tif](#), 8.04 MB

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

The maps attached cover all the four vegetation cover classes i.e. low, medium, high and very high vegetation cover classes for the period 2007-2011. They were captured during the month of May when vegetation growth is at climax. The borders indicated in grey colour on the maps are district administrative boundaries.

Contact details

General information on the national contact person for this indicator

Name and surname

Dr. Gorretti Kitutu Kimono

Institution

National Environment Management Authority (Uganda)

Address

P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda

Email

gkitutu@nemaug.org

Telephone

Tel. +256-414-251065 (off); Tel. +256-772-620368 (mob)

Land Cover Type #2 — Medium vegetation cover

Land cover type

Name**Medium vegetation cover**

Methodology and data availability

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

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

Year	Definition of land cover type
2000	N/A
2001	N/A
2002	N/A
2003	N/A
2004	N/A
2005	N/A
2006	N/A
2007	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction ranging from 26%-50%
2008	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction ranging from 26%-50%
2009	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction ranging from 26%-50%
2010	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction ranging from 26%-50%
2011	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction ranging from 26%-50%

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

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

*Item 1***Year:**

2007

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

365days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2007

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

May

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

Item 2

Year:

2008

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

365days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2008

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

May

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

Item 3

Year:

2009

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

365days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2009

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

May

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

Item 4

Year:

2010

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

305days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2010

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

March

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

Item 5

Year:

2011

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

365days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2011

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

May

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

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

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
National Environment Management Authority	2012	NEMA AMESD eStation	NEMA	www.menau.org

Indicator data

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

Year	square km	% of total
2000	0	0%
2001	0	0%
2002	0	0%
2003	0	0%
2004	0	0%

Year	square km	% of total
2005	0	0%
2006	---	---%
2007	14157	7.31%
2008	16509	8.54%
2009	21038	10.87%
2010	84425	43.50%
2011	20148	10.30%

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

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

Attachments:

- [Attachments_2012_10_14.zip](#), 575.72 kB
- [FCOVER2009.tif](#), 7.9 MB
- [FCOVER2010.tif](#), 8.04 MB

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

The maps attached cover all the four vegetation cover classes i.e. low, medium, high and very high vegetation cover classes for the period 2007-2011. They were captured during the month of May when vegetation growth is at climax. The borders indicated in gray colour on the maps are district administrative boundaries.

Contact details

General information on the national contact person for this indicator

Name and surname

Dr. Mary Goretti Kitutu

Institution

National Environment Management Authority (NEMA)

Address

**P.O. Box 22255,
Kampala,
Uganda**

Email

gkitutu@nemaug.org

Telephone

+256-414-251065 (Off)/ +256-772-620368

Land Cover Type #3 — High vegetation cover

Land cover type

Name

High vegetation cover

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

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

Year	Definition of land cover type
2000	---
2001	---
2002	---
2003	---
2004	---
2005	---
2006	---
2007	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction ranging from 51%-75%
2008	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction ranging from 51%-75%
2009	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction ranging from 51%-75%
2010	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction ranging from 51%-75%
2011	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction ranging from 51%-75%

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

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

Item 1

Year:

2007

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

365days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2007

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

May

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

Item 2

Year:

2008

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

365days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2008

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

May

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

Item 3

Year:

2009

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

365days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2009

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

May

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

Item 4

Year:

2010

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

305days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2010

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

March

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

Item 5

Year:

2011

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

365days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2011

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

May

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

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

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
National Environment Management Authority	2012	NEMA AMESD eStation	NEMA	www.nemaug.org

Indicator data

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

Year	square km	% of total
2000	---	---%
2001	---	---%
2002	---	---%
2003	---	---%
2004	---	---%
2005	---	---%
2006	---	---%
2007	104648	54.03%
2008	81991	42.41%
2009	108593	56.12%
2010	74420	38.35%

Year	square km	% of total
2011	95629	48.90%

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

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

Attachments:

- [Attachments_2012_10_14.zip](#), 575.72 kB
- [FCOVER2009.tif](#), 7.9 MB
- [FCOVER2010.tif](#), 8.04 MB

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

The maps attached cover all the four vegetation cover classes i.e. low, medium, high and very high vegetation cover classes for the period 2007-2011. They were captured during the month of May when vegetation growth is at climax. The borders indicated in grey colour on the maps are district administrative boundaries.

Contact details

General information on the national contact person for this indicator

Name and surname

Dr. Mary Gorretti Kitutu

Institution

National Environment Management Authority

Address

**P.O. Box 22255,
Kampala,
Uganda.**

Email

gkitutu@nemaug.org

Telephone

+256-414-251065 (off); +256-772-620368 (mob)

Land Cover Type #4 — Very high vegetation cover

Land cover type

Name

Very high vegetation cover

Methodology and data availability

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

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

Year	Definition of land cover type
2000	---
2001	---

Year	Definition of land cover type
2002	---
2003	---
2004	---
2005	---
2006	---
2007	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction above 75%
2008	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction above 75%
2009	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction above 75%
2010	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction above 75%
2011	This is the land cover type with vegetation cover fraction above 75%

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

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

Item 1

Year:

2007

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

365days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2007

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

May

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

Item 2

Year:

2008

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

365days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2008

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

May

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

Item 3

Year:

2009

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

365days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2009

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

May

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

Item 4

Year:

2010

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

305days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2010

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

March

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

No

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

75%

Please specify the number of experts involved:

1

Item 5

Year:

2011

Method used:

Remote sensing

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

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

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Automated

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

90m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

365days

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

90m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2011

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

May

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

No
If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:
 ---%
High resolution verification?
 No
If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:
 ---%
Expert opinion?
 Yes
Please specify how accurate the map was judged by the experts:
 75%
Please specify the number of experts involved:
 1

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

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
National Environment Management Authority	2012	NEMA AMESD eStation	NEMA	www.nemaug.org

Indicator data

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

Year	square km	% of total
2000	---	---%
2001	---	---%
2002	---	---%
2003	---	---%
2004	---	---%
2005	---	---%
2006	---	---%
2007	72075	37.22%
2008	81782	42.30%
2009	60376	31.20%
2010	18554	9.56%
2011	73682	37.67%

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

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

Attachments:

- [Attachments 2012 10 14.zip](#), 575.72 kB
- [FCOVER2009.tif](#), 7.9 MB
- [FCOVER2010.tif](#), 8.04 MB

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

The maps attached cover all the four vegetation cover classes i.e. low, medium, high and very high vegetation cover classes for the period 2007-2011. They were captured during the month of May when vegetation growth is at climax. The borders indicated in grey colour on the maps are district administrative boundaries.

Contact details

General information on the national contact person for this indicator

Name and surname

Dr. Mary Gorretti Kitutu

Institution

National Environment Management Authority

Address

**P.O. Box 22255,
Kampala, Uganda**

Email

gkitutu@nemaug.org

Telephone

+256-414-251065 (off); +256-772-620368

Interpretation of indicator status/trend and policy implications

Interpretation of the indicator

Did you provide data for more than one year?

Yes

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

Does the indicator change over time?

Yes

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

No answer required.

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

Yes

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

No answer required.

Please describe how DLDD affects the indicator.

There is continuous variation of F-cover from year to year depending on rainfall variability over the years. Generally, the percentage of high and very high F-cover increases during the high rainfall years. Correspondingly, the low and medium F-cover decreases over the same years.

While the proportion of very high and high vegetation cover types is consistently higher than the medium

and low vegetation cover types, there is a clearly declining trend in the proportion of very high and high vegetation cover types whereas the low and medium vegetation cover types are generally registering increasing trend.

This pattern is associated with increasing frequency of extreme weather events (dry spells, floods, etc), high rainfall variability and erratic rainfall patterns. In addition to the above factors, increasing vegetation cover loss and land degradation associated with high population growth rates contributes to the low recovery of vegetation cover as a result of decreasing soil productivity.

Does the extent of affected areas increase or decrease?

Increase

Please explain the pattern emerging from the data.

The years with longer dry spells registered higher percentages of low and medium vegetation cover types. Areas experiencing low productivity as a result of land degradation (vegetation loss, soil erosion and nutrient depletion) are increasing over the years.

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

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

Attachments:

- [FCOVER Trends Chart..JPG](#), 22.97 kB

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

1. The Strategic Investment Framework for SLM (2010-2020);
2. The Agriculture sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan 2010-2014;
3. The Land Use Policy (2007);
4. The Renewable Energy Investment Plan (2009).

Feedback

Report on specific COP requests – iterative process on indicators

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

Assessment Criteria (e-SMART)	Score	Remarks
Relevant – Does the indicator provide information about changes in primary processes unambiguously related to DLDD and UNCCD implementation?	4	Yes.
Relevant – Is the indicator relevant for DLDD national planning purposes, including monitoring of the National Action Programme (NAP)?	3	Some areas especially woodlands reflect high vegetation cover while there is a total lack of undergrowth with vast bare ground areas affected by erosion.
Relevant – Can policymakers easily understand the indicator?	4	The information can be easily packaged for the policy makers to understand the trend in vegetation cover and how it relates to DLDD.

Assessment Criteria (e-SMART)	Score	Remarks
Specific – Is the indicator based on well-understood and generally accepted conceptual models of the system to which it is applied so that changes in its value will have clear meaning regarding the process of concern?	5	There is a clear link between vegetation cover and DLDD.
Specific – Is the requested spatial scale (national vs. affected areas) of the indicator appropriate for its monitoring purposes?	3	Isolation of DLDD affected areas is a challenge and is usually an estimation.
Measurable – Are the definitions of the indicator and its constitutive elements clear and not ambiguous?	5	Definitions are quite clear.
Measurable – Are the proposed methodologies for the measurement of this indicator sufficiently clear to ensure reliable data?	3	In some cases the methodologies are difficult to deliver the required data are complex and expensive e.g. getting the NDVI values, NPP in kgC/ha/yr.
Time-bound – Is the indicator sensitive enough to detect important changes but not so sensitive that signals are masked by natural variability?	3	The indicator is sensitive enough to detect important changes but may not accurately reflect the DLDD levels.
Time-bound – Can the indicator detect changes at the required temporal and spatial scales and are the up-scaling / cross-scaling rules clear?	3	The indicator can detect changes in temporal and spatial scales but not very accurately depending on how DLDD manifests itself in a given area.
Achievable – Are reliable data and monitoring systems available to assess trends and is data collection a relatively straightforward process?	4	Some data is available but in some cases inadequate to accurately assess the DLDD trends.
Achievable – Is the frequency of data collection in line with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the UNCCD?	3	Current data collection depends on availability of resources and may not necessarily follow the reporting requirements of the UNCCD.
Economic – Is the indicator cost-effective? Is the cost of data collection affordable and worthwhile? (consider any required cost for personnel, capital but also, recurring costs)	3	The indicator could be cost effective if the number of local experts to collect and analyse the data is increased and adequately facilitated.

Reporting on land productivity

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

Reporting on the indicator

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

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

The DMP product presented below (in kgDM/ha/year) derived from NDVI image is oriented towards crop monitoring and yield estimation. This data obtained from the AMESD eStation at NEMA was used to monitor land productivity.

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

Year (2000-2011)	Land cover type	NPP (kgC ha ⁻¹ year ⁻¹)
2007	Low vegetation cover	70917
2007	Medium vegetation cover	184891
2007	High vegetation cover	261038
2007	Very high vegetation cover	264471
2009	Low vegetation cover	79194
2009	Medium vegetation cover	185926
2009	High vegetation cover	282947
2009	Very high vegetation cover	355313
2011	Low vegetation cover	1502226
2011	Medium vegetation cover	234338
2011	High vegetation cover	326118
2011	Very high vegetation cover	341730

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

Year (2000-2011)	Land cover type	Value	Data type
2007	Low vegetation cover	1	Others
2007	Medium vegetation cover	5	Others
2007	High vegetation cover	55	Others
2007	Very high vegetation cover	38	Others
2009	Low vegetation cover	2	Others
2009	Medium vegetation cover	11	Others
2009	High vegetation cover	57	Others
2009	Very high vegetation cover	31	Others
2011	Low vegetation cover	3	Others
2011	Medium vegetation cover	10	Others
2011	High vegetation cover	49	Others
2011	Very high vegetation cover	38	Others

If Others, please specify:

F-cover (Fraction of vegetation cover derived from NDVI image

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

Author	Year	Publication title	Publisher	Website address
National Environment Management Authority	2012	NEMA AMESD eStation	NEMA	www.nemaug.org

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

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

Attachments:

- [Attachments 2012 10 14\(1\).zip](#), 407.07 kB
- [Attachments 2012 10 14\(2\).zip](#), 212.78 kB

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

The explanation is provided in the legend.

Interpretation of the indicator

Did you provide data for more than one year?

Yes

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

Does the indicator change over time?

Yes

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

No answer required.

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

Yes

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

No answer required.

Please describe how DLDD affects the indicator.

Dry matter productivity is dependant on availability of moisture and soil nutrient status. DLDD therefore influences the available dry matter.

Does the extent of affected areas increase or decrease?

Increase

Please explain the pattern emerging from the data.

In general, it is clear that a big proportion of the country registers a high percentage extent of dry matter productivity. However, there is clearly a declining trend in the percentage of high DM productivity with a slight increase in the very high DM productivity category dominated by high tree cover and perennial vegetation. The stable percentage extent of DM productivity in the low and medium categories is associated with the predominantly grassland grazing areas and agricultural land in the marginal areas of the country.

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

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

Attachments:

- [DMP Trend chart.JPG](#), 20.44 kB

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

1. The Strategic Investment Framework for SLM (2010-2020);
2. The Agriculture sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan 2010-2014;
3. The Land Use Policy (2007);
4. The Renewable Energy Investment Plan (2009).

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

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

Assessment Criteria (e-SMART)	Score	Remarks
Relevant – Does the indicator provide information about changes in primary processes unambiguously related to DLDD and UNCCD implementation?	4	Yes. Dry matter production relates to availability of moisture and soil nutrients which are directly linked to DLDD and the UNCCD implementation
Relevant – Is the indicator relevant for DLDD national planning purposes, including monitoring of the National Action Programme (NAP)?	4	Yes.
Relevant – Can policymakers easily understand the indicator?	4	The information requires more analysis and simplification to be easily understood by policy makers.
Specific – Is the indicator based on well-understood and generally accepted conceptual models of the system to which it is applied so that changes in its value will have clear meaning regarding the process of concern?	4	Yes.
Specific – Is the requested spatial scale (national vs. affected areas) of the indicator appropriate for its monitoring purposes?	3	A finer scale may be more appropriate but would be costly.
Measurable – Are the definitions of the indicator and its constitutive elements clear and not ambiguous?	3	It is clear and unambiguous but may not be easily understood by all actors.
Measurable – Are the proposed methodologies for the measurement of this indicator sufficiently clear to ensure reliable data?	3	Methodologies are complex and limiting the number of actors that can participate in the monitoring process.
Time-bound – Is the indicator sensitive enough to detect important changes but not so sensitive that signals are masked by natural variability?	4	The indicator is sensitive enough to detect important changes.

Assessment Criteria (e-SMART)	Score	Remarks
Time-bound – Can the indicator detect changes at the required temporal and spatial scales and are the up-scaling / cross-scaling rules clear?	---	Yes.
Achievable – Are reliable data and monitoring systems available to assess trends and is data collection a relatively straightforward process?	3	Data is expensive to collect every year. As such, there are gaps in data for the indicator i.e. we managed to collect data for 3 out of the 5 years.
Achievable – Is the frequency of data collection in line with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the UNCCD?	4	Yes.
Economic – Is the indicator cost-effective? Is the cost of data collection affordable and worthwhile? (consider any required cost for personnel, capital but also, recurring costs)	---	Indicator would be cost effective if the number of local experts to collect and analyse the data is increased and adequately facilitated.

Additional indicators on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3

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

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

Purpose of the indicators

Water availability per capita	“To measure and monitor changes in access to water sources for the population. This can be used to assess the impacts of DLDD, and mitigation efforts, on water resources”
Change in land use	“To measure and monitor changes in the productive or protective uses of the land resource. This can be used to assess sustainability of land use.”
Food consumption per capita	“To measure and monitor changes in nutritional status. This can act as an indicator of both well-being and the availability of ecosystem services.”
Capacity of soils to sustain agro-pastoral use	“To measure and monitor changes in the status of soil health. This can be used to assess the impacts of DLDD, and mitigation efforts, on soil health.”
Degree of land degradation	“To measure and monitor changes in the extent and severity of land degradation. This can be used to assess the impact of agreements and programs to address land degradation and reclaim degraded lands.”
Plant and animal biodiversity	“To measure and monitor changes in the status of biodiversity relative to a ‘pristine’ baseline. This can be used as an indicator for overall environmental sustainability and used to assess the impacts of DLDD, and interventions, on enhancing biodiversity.”
Drought index	“Acts as an indicator for characterising sensitive and desertification-affected areas. This can be used to monitor the climatic conditions affecting water availability as a driving force of DLDD, provide early warnings of drought and assess severity and actions.”

Carbon stocks above and below ground	“To measure and monitor changes in above and below ground stocks as a global benefit. This can be used to assess the impacts of DLDD, and mitigation efforts on carbon stocks.”
Land under Sustainable Land Management (SLM)	“To act as a surrogate for measuring and monitoring a number of global benefits: (a) Climate regulation and carbon sequestration; (b) Vegetation cover and composition; and (c) Water retention and the regional hydrologic balance.”

None delivered.

Strategic Objective 4

Indicator SO-4-3

Strategic Objective 4

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

Impact indicator SO-4-3 for expected impact 4.1 (Increased financial, technical and technological resources are made available to affected developing country Parties, and where appropriate Central and Eastern European countries, to implement the Convention)

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Data sources (indicative only)

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

Check the glossary for

Integrated financing strategy; integrated investment framework

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

Year	Nominal amount (USD)
2010	200000
2011	400000

Sources of information

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

- **Public Investment Plan 2011/2012**

Attachments:

None.

Indicator SO-4-6

Strategic Objective 4

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

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

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Data sources (indicative only)

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

Check the glossary for
Incentive

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

Year	Laws and regulations	Economic and financial incentives	Cooperation frameworks	Sectoral policies
2010	---	---	1	1
2011	---	---	1	1

Qualitative assessment

Description of mechanisms

Mechanism	Description
A - Laws and regulations	---
B - Economic and financial incentives	---
C - Cooperation frameworks	Cooperation framework between five sectors of agriculture, energy, water and environment, lands and trade working through their sector investment plans (SIPs).
D - Sectoral policies	Mainstreaming DLDD/ SLM issues into key sector and district policies, programmes and budgets.

Geographical level of application

	International	Regional	Subregional	National	Local
A					
B					
C				X	
D				X	X

Sources of information

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

- 1. national Development Plan 2010/11 - 2014/15.
- 2. Agriculture sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan (DSIP).

Attachments:

None.

Indicator SO-4-7

Strategic Objective 4

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

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

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Data sources (indicative only)

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

Check the glossary for

N.A.

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

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

Qualitative assessment

Description of institutional arrangements

Level	Description
A - International	Interaction and support limited and largely restricted to electronic methods.
B - Regional	Interaction and support limited and largely restricted to electronic methods.
C - Subregional	Virtually no interaction due to lack of a viable institution.
D - National	Existence of the Inter Ministerial Cooperation Framework (IMCF) enhanced cross-sectoral participation and information sharing through its National Steering Committee, Technical Working Committee and Stakeholder Forum.
E - Local	Existence of cross-sectoral district task forces, including members of the Production and Natural Resources committees, working with local councils and community groups.

Sources of information

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

- **1. Reports from the UNCCD National Focal point Office.**

Attachments:

None.

Performance Indicators

Operational Objective 1: Advocacy, awareness raising and education

Performance indicator CONS-O-1 for Outcome 1.1

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Data sources (indicative only)

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

Check the glossary for

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

Check the reporting manual for

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

Overall target

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

Number of information events

Year	Number of information events	Estimated number of participants in the information events
2010	25	8000000
2011	40	10000000

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

Year	Stakeholder	Paper media products	Radio and TV	other ICT
2010	Public at Large	---	---	---
	Civil society organizations	---	---	---
	Science and technology institutions	---	---	---

Year	Stakeholder	Paper media products	Radio and TV	other ICT
2011	Public at Large	---	---	---
	Civil society organizations	---	---	---
	Science and technology institutions	---	---	---

Number of media products made public

Year	Newspapers	Radio and TV
2010	10	20
2011	15	25

Sources of information

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

- 1. The New Vision newspaper
- 2. The Daily Monitor newspaper
- 3. Bukedde newspaper
- 4. The Observer newspaper
- 6. Central Broadcasting Services radio
- 7. Radio Simba
- 8. Radio One
- 9. Kaboozi Radio
- 10 Star radio
- 11. Nation TV
- 12. WBS TV
- 13 Bukedde TV
- 14. NBS TV

Attachments:

None.

National contribution to the target

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

Estimated share of total country population

35 %

Qualitative assessment

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

No answer provided.

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

No

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

No answer required.

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

Yes

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

Yes

Performance indicator CONS-O-3 for Outcome 1.3

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Data sources (indicative only)

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

Check the glossary for

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

Check the reporting manual for

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

Overall target

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

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

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

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

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

Provide the names of these organizations.

Name

National contribution to the target

At the time of reporting, is your government undertaking concrete initiatives to increase the participation of

CSOs and STIs in DLDD-related programmes and projects?

Yes

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

CSOs have been taken up as member to the UNCCD National coordinating body and are part of the stakeholders participating in the national SLM platform. CSOs, particularly CBOs coordinate and implement on-the ground SLM programmes to address DLDD and UNCCD. CSOs and STIs participated in the 2012 World Day to Combat Desertification activities.

Qualitative assessment

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

Reasons for increasing

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

Reason	Level of importance
Increased networking and collaboration opportunities	4
Increased access to information and to national and/or international financing opportunities	4
Increased willingness of the government in working with CSOs	3
Increased interest of donors in working with CSOs	2
Strengthened organizational, project management and fund-raising capacity of CSOs	3
Increased funding opportunities requiring partnership with the STIs	4
Strengthened organizational, project management and fund-raising capacity of the STIs	3
Other	4

Other (specify)

N/A

Reasons for decreasing for CSOs

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

Reason	Level of importance
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)

N/A

Reasons for decreasing for STIs

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

Reason	Level of importance
DLDD topics are not prioritized by national STIs	---

Reason	Level of importance
Low organizational, fund-raising and project management capacity of STIs	---
Decreased networking opportunities at national and international level	---
Diminishing funding	---
Other	---

Other (specify)

N/A

Performance indicator CONS-O-4 for Outcome 1.3

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Data sources (indicative only)

CSOs and STIs operating in the country.

Check the glossary for

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

Check the reporting manual for

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

Overall target

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

Number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by CSOs/STIs

Year	Number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by CSOs	Number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by STIs
2010	75	62
2011	90	75

Sources of information

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

- **1. Sustainable Land management (SLM) Programme Reports - Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF)**

Attachments:

None.

National contribution to the target

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

Yes

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

There is integration of DLDD and climate adaptation in school farm initiatives, particularly promoting Conservation Agriculture (CA) through schools. Regarding STIs, Masters and PhD degree students are carrying out research on DLDD issues. In addition, Makerere University introduced a Bachelors Degree course in Land Use and Management, integrating a number of DLDD training modules.

Qualitative assessment

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

Reasons for increasing

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

Reason	Level of importance
Increased access to funding	1
Increased awareness of DLDD-related problems and of the need for action	5
Increased knowledge of DLDD-related topics and enhanced skills of trainers/teachers	3
Government policies are more supportive of education initiatives	4
International donors are more supportive of education-focussed initiatives.	3
Other	---

Other (specify)

N/A

Reasons for decreasing for CSOs

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

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

Other (specify)

N/A

Reasons for decreasing for STIs

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

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

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

Other (specify)

N/A

Operational Objective 2: Policy framework

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

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Data sources (indicative only)

UNCCD NFP.

Check the glossary for

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

Overall target

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

NAP Adoption and Revision

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

Yes

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

2000

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

No

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

approval.

No answer required.

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

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

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

Other (specify)

N/A

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

No answer required.

If yes, specify the date of its approval.

No answer required.

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

None

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

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

No answer required.

Other (specify)

No answer required.

For countries having a NAP aligned to The Strategy

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

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

No answer provided.

Does your country's NAP assess DLDD drivers?

No answer provided.

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

No answer provided.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer provided.

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

No answer provided.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer provided.

Sources of information

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

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

No answer provided.

Attachments:

None.

National contribution to the target

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

2012–2013

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?

No answer provided.

Qualitative assessment

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

Yes

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

- GEF

If yes, which type of assistance did you receive?

- Financial Support

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

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

Reason	Level of importance
Not a priority for the government	0
Poor availability of biophysical and socio-economic baseline information	5
Existing investment frameworks are not fully compatible with the NAP	3

Reason	Level of importance
Streamlining the NAP into existing plans and policies is too time-consuming	2
Other	---

Other (specify)

N/A

Performance indicator CONS-O-7 for Outcome 2.5

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Data sources (indicative only)

Relevant national ministries.

Check the glossary for

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

Check the reporting manual for

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

Overall target

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

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

Yes

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

- **Evaluation of national plans and identification of gaps in synergies**
- **Identification of national sectors and policies that could benefit from synergies and cooperation**
- **Review of existing national plans and policies to enhance cooperation**

Other (specify)

No answer required.

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

Yes

If yes, specify the type of mechanism(s)

- Regular meetings between focal points and focal point teams
- Establishment of a national coordinating committee for the implementation of the Rio Conventions
- Other

Other (specify)

Joint projects for at least two convention focal areas under GEF.

Sources of information

List the synergistic instruments referred to above.

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

- 1. Minutes of GEF Steering Committee Meetings
- 2. Minutes of the Environment and Natural Resources sector meetings

Attachments:

None.

National contribution to the target

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

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

No answer provided.

Qualitative assessment

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

Yes

If yes, by the institutions of which Convention?

- UNCCD
- UNFCCC

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

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

Reason	Level of importance
Not a priority for the government	1
Lack of capacities	2
Lack of financial resources	5
Understaffing	4
Lack of time	3
Poor internal coordination among relevant ministries	2
Other	---

Other (specify)

N/A

Operational Objective 3: Science, technology and knowledge

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

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Data sources (indicative only)

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

Check the glossary for

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

Check the reporting manual for

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

Overall target

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

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

No

If yes, specify whether this system is functional

No answer required.

If yes, specify whether this system is regularly updated

No answer required.

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

Yes

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

No answer provided.

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

- Participatory Poverty Assessment
-

Sources of information

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

- Uganda Strategic Investment Framework for SLM

Attachments:

None.

National contribution to the target

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

Yes

If yes, when?

2012–2013

Qualitative assessment

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

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

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

Other (specify)

N/A

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

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

Reason	Level of importance
By means of national resources	2
By means of external support	2
No maintenance is possible due to limited professional capacities	---
No maintenance is possible due to limited financial resources	---
Other	---

Other (specify)

N/A

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

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Data sources (indicative only)

UNCCD NFP

Check the glossary for

'NFP'

Overall target

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

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

Yes

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

2012

2

2016

No answer provided.

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

Yes

Sources of information

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

- **See reports for poverty and land degradation assessment.**

Attachments:

None.

National contribution to the target

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Data sources (indicative only)

UNCCD NFP

Check the glossary for

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

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

Overall target

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

Sources of information

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

Assessment of the aligned NAP

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

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

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

No answer required.

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

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 required.

In your NAP, is the analysis of the interaction between DLDD and climate change or biodiversity

knowledge-based?

No answer provided.

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

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

No answer required.

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

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

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 required.

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

No answer provided.

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

No 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, when do you plan to do so?

2012–2013

Qualitative assessment

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

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

Reason	Level of importance
Relevant scientific literature is not available	5
Relevant traditional or expert knowledge is not available	4
Lack of financial resources to mobilise the necessary knowledge	5
Poor coordination among the relevant ministries prevented an internal pooling of knowledge/expertise	2
Relevant ministries could not contribute due to lack of time	2
Relevant ministries could not contribute due to lack of staff	3
Other	---

Other (specify)

N/A

Performance indicator CONS-O-11 for Outcome 3.5

Type, number and users of DLDD-relevant knowledge-sharing systems at the global, regional, subregional and

national levels described on the Convention website

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Data sources (indicative only)

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

Check the glossary for

'knowledge-sharing system', 'PRAIS'

Check the reporting manual for

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

Overall target

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

Knowledge-sharing systems

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

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

Item 1

Name of the system

Internet link

Estimated number of users per year

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

Add as many rows as necessary.

No answer provided.

Operational Objective 4: Capacity building

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

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Data sources (indicative only)

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

Check the glossary for

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

Check the reporting manual for

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

Overall target

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

Number of DLDD-related capacity-building initiatives implemented

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

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

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

No answer provided.

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

Yes

If yes, within the framework of which initiative?

Other

Other (specify)

SLM Country Investment Framework.

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

Yes

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

Yes

Sources of information

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

- 1. SLM Country Strategi Investment Framework.
- 2. NCSA Report and Action Plan for Uganda.

Attachments:

None.

National contribution to the target

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

2012–2013

Qualitative assessment

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

- Secretariat
- GEF
- Bilateral
- Multilateral (United Nations agencies, IGOs, international financing institutions, etc.)

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

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Data sources (indicative only)

Relevant national ministries

Check the glossary for

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

Overall target

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

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

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

No answer provided.

If yes, specify when it was developed.

No answer required.

Is your country's IIF based on the NAP?

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

Other (specify)

No answer required.

If assisted, which type of assistance did you receive?

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer required.

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

No answer provided.

Short overview of the progress in implementing the IIF

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

No answer provided.

Sources of information

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

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

No answer provided.

Attachments:

None.

National contribution to the target

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

Yes

If yes, when?

2012–2013

Qualitative assessment

Identify the major difficulties experienced in developing an IIF.

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

Reason	Level of importance
Financial constraints	5
Human resources constraints	3
Lack of coordination among relevant ministries and unclear attribution of responsibilities	1
Lack of coordination among those providing support	3
National bilateral and multilateral resources are too diverse; cannot be realistically coordinated under one umbrella.	1
Other	---

Other (specify)

N/A

Performance indicator CONS-O-16 for Outcome 5.2

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

-

Data sources (indicative only)

-

Check the glossary for

-

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

Refer your assessment to the following biennium only:

~~- In 2010, biennium 2008–2009~~

- In 2012, biennium 2010–2011

Overall target

No target has been set for this indicator.

Bilateral assistance received

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

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

Very few bilateral partnerships were in place to support implementation of the UNCCD in Uganda and funds available are too meagre as compared to the funding gap to address DLDD challenges. Support is channeled through multilateral agencies with bureaucracies leading to late receipt of funds.

Additional information on any other impacting aspects

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

Conditions and accountability requirements are too many creating undesirable bureaucracies and delays thereby aggravating the challenges of timeliness and predictability of the financial resources.

Qualitative assessment

Did you receive assistance in raising resources from bilateral donors?

Yes

If yes, from whom?

- GEF
- Multilateral (United Nations agencies, IGOs, international financing institutions, etc.)

Other (specify)

No answer required.

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

Yes

Performance indicator CONS-O-17 for Outcome 5.3

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

Information contained in the PPSs and SFAs submitted to UNCCD.

Data sources (indicative only)

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

Check the glossary for

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

Overall target

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

Sources of information

PPSs and SFAs

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

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

Biennium	Submitted (pipeline)	Ongoing
2010–2011	---	---

Amount of funds raised, by biennium

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

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

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

National contribution to the target

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

No

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

Yes

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

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

Qualitative assessment

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

Reasons for increasing

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

Reason	Level of importance
Easier and more transparent application procedures	1
Increased capacities of national stakeholders to prepare applications	2
Major natural hazards occurred at the national level considerably increased the level of resources made available by the international community	1
Access to funding is increasingly facilitated by third parties such as the private sector	3
Existence of a financing strategy (IFS or others)	1
Other	---

Other (specify)

N/A

Reasons for decreasing

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

Reason	Level of importance
Financing opportunities are not publicized enough, lack of access to necessary information	2
Complicated application procedures, the level of complexity being worsened by the different requirements of the various donors	5

Reason	Level of importance
Limited financial resources are made available for DLDD-related programmes/projects, and lack of DLDD-specific allocations within donors' portfolio.	5
Other	---

Other (specify)

N/A

Performance indicator CONS-O-18 for Outcome 5.5

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Data sources (indicative only)

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

Check the glossary for

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

Check the reporting manual for

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

Overall targets

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

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

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

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

Year	Technical support – material aid	Technical support – knowledge aid
2010	---	---

Year	Technical support – material aid	Technical support – knowledge aid
2011	---	---

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

Yes

If yes, specify which types of incentives.

- Policy or regulatory incentives (for example, related to market requirements and regulations, import/export, foreign investment, research & development support, etc.)
- Financial incentives (for example, preferential rates, State aid, subsidies, cash grants, loan guarantees, etc.)

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

Regarding technologies for DLDD, local resource users have limited access to improved and efficient technologies which are available with a few medium and large scale producers and processors dominantly foreign private sector entrepreneurs and organisations. Transfer of technology mostly in private hands is associated with high cost and without incentives making it inaccessible to the majority of small farmers and land users affected by DLDD.

Sources of information

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

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

No answer provided.

Attachments:

None.

National contribution to the target

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

No

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

Yes

If yes, when?

2016–2017

Qualitative assessment

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

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

Reason	Level of importance
Policy or regulatory incentives are not enforced	5
There are not enough resources to apply financial or fiscal incentives	5
The national financial and credit systems (banks, credit agencies, etc) are not supportive	5

Reason	Level of importance
Other	---

Other (specify)

N/A

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

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

Reason	Level of importance
Access facilitated by the spreading of IT	---
More appropriate technologies available	---
Appropriateness of government incentives	---
Other	---

Other (specify)

N/A

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

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

Reason	Level of importance
Technology sustainability is poor; technologies do not represent viable investments	2
Lack of fixed infrastructure for accessing technologies (those created on an ad hoc basis disappear once the support ends)	5
Lack of capacities for operation and maintenance of technologies	4
Lack of enabling policy and regulatory environments	3
Other	---

Other (specify)

N/A

Standard Financial Annex

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Financial Commitment #1 — National Livestock Productivity Improvement Project (NLPIP)

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

- **Uganda - CCD Focal Point - Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries**

Other

No answer provided.

Identification code

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

0091

Funding organization

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

- **African Development Bank**

Other

No answer provided.

Name of activity funded

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

National Livestock Productivity Improvement Project (NLPIP)

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

- **Uganda**
-

Recipient organization(s)

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

- **Uganda - 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

No answer provided.

Commitment date

Enter the date at which the financial commitment has been formally approved by the extending organization

2005

Amount committed

Enter the total amount of money committed

29601000 US Dollar

Type of funding

Indicate the type of funding provided through the financial commitment.

Loan (concessional)

Start date

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

01/07/2005

Completion date

Enter the date at which the funding has been or is expected to be utilized by the recipient organization, if applicable

31/12/2011

Duration (no. of months)

Indicate the period covered by this funding, if applicable, expressed in number of months

No answer provided.

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)

1

Relevant Activity Codes (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).

- **1.2.3 Science and Technology**
 - **2.1.4 Education**
 - **2.2.11 Services and Infrastructure**
 - **3.1.3 Livestock Systems**
 - **3.2.5 Pasture and Range Management**
 - **5.3 Livestock Health/Relocation/Rescue**
-

Sources of information

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

- **Public Investment Plan (PIP) FY 2012/13 – 2014/15**

Attachments:

None.

Financial Commitment #2 — Farm Income Enhancement and Forest Conservation (FIEFOC) 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

- **Uganda - CCD Focal Point - Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries**

Other

No answer provided.

Identification code

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

0968

Funding organization

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

- **African Development Fund**

Other

No answer provided.

Name of activity funded

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

Farm Income Enhancement and Forest Conservation (FIEFOC) Project

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

- **Uganda**
-

Recipient organization(s)

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

- **Uganda - 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

No answer provided.

Commitment date

Enter the date at which the financial commitment has been formally approved by the extending organization

2005

Amount committed

Enter the total amount of money committed

0 ---

Type of funding

Indicate the type of funding provided through the financial commitment.

Loan (concessional)

Start date

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

2005

Completion date

Enter the date at which the funding has been or is expected to be utilized by the recipient organization, if applicable

2010

Duration (no. of months)

Indicate the period covered by this funding, if applicable, expressed in number of months

No answer provided.

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)

1

Relevant Activity Codes (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).

- **2.2.1 Capacity-Building**
 - **3.1.1 Agriculture**
 - **3.1.2 Forestry**
 - **3.1.4 Other Production Systems**
 - **3.2.7 Water Conservation**
 - **3.2.8 Sustainable Land Management**
 - **3.2.5 Pasture and Range Management**
 - **4.1.2 Drought mitigation**
 - **4.1.3 Environment Restoration**
 - **5.7 Reconstruction of Water Management Systems and Infrastructure**
-

Sources of information

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

- **Public Investment Plan (PIP) FY 2009/10 – 2011/12**

Attachments:

None.

Financial Commitment #3 — Sustainable Land Management (SLM)

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

- **Uganda - CCD Focal Point - Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries**

Other

No answer provided.

Identification code

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

1009

Funding organization

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

- **Global Environment Facility**

Other

- 1. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
 - 2. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
-

Name of activity funded

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

Sustainable Land Management (SLM)

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

- Uganda
-

Recipient organization(s)

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

- Uganda - 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

No answer provided.

Commitment date

Enter the date at which the financial commitment has been formally approved by the extending organization

01/07/2007

Amount committed

Enter the total amount of money committed

1172000 US Dollar

Type of funding

Indicate the type of funding provided through the financial commitment.

No answer provided.

Start date

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

01/07/2007

Completion date

Enter the date at which the funding has been or is expected to be utilized by the recipient organization, if applicable

Duration (no. of months)

Indicate the period covered by this funding, if applicable, expressed in number of months

No answer provided.

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)

1

Relevant Activity Codes (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).

- 2.1.1 Public Awareness Campaigns
 - 2.1.2 Publications and communication material
 - 2.2.1 Capacity-Building
 - 2.2.10 Resource Management Planning
 - 2.2.4 Action Programmes
 - 2.2.7 Mainstreaming
 - 2.2.8 Partnership Building
 - 3.1.1 Agriculture
 - 3.1.2 Forestry
 - 3.1.3 Livestock Systems
 - 3.2.6 Land Conservation
 - 3.2.7 Water Conservation
 - 3.2.8 Sustainable Land Management
-

Sources of information

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

- i. Public Investment Plan (PIP) FY 2009/10 – 2011/12
- ii. Agriculture Sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan (DISP)

Attachments:

None.

Financial Commitment #4 — Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management Activities in Six Cattle Corridor Districts of Uganda

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

- Uganda - CCD Focal Point - Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries

Other

No answer provided.

Identification code

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

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

No answer provided.

Funding organization

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

- **United Nations Drylands Development Centre**
- **United Nations Development Programme**
- **Norway - Central Government Institutions**

Other

No answer provided.

Name of activity funded

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

Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management Activities in Six Cattle Corridor Districts of Uganda

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

- **Uganda**
-

Recipient organization(s)

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

- **Uganda - 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

No answer provided.

Commitment date

Enter the date at which the financial commitment has been formally approved by the extending organization

No answer provided.

Amount committed

Enter the total amount of money committed

1644364 US Dollar

Type of funding

Indicate the type of funding provided through the financial commitment.

Grant

Start date

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

01/09/2009

Completion date

Enter the date at which the funding has been or is expected to be utilized by the recipient organization, if applicable

31/12/2012

Duration (no. of months)

Indicate the period covered by this funding, if applicable, expressed in number of months

No answer provided.

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)

3

Relevant Activity Codes (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).

- **1.1.3 Weather Forecasting**
 - **1.2.1 Traditional Knowledge and Best Practices**
 - **1.2.2 Bio-physical Research and Science**
 - **2.1.1 Public Awareness Campaigns**
 - **2.1.4 Education**
 - **2.2.1 Capacity-Building**
 - **2.2.10 Resource Management Planning**
 - **2.2.2 Community Development**
 - **2.2.7 Mainstreaming**
 - **2.2.6 Governance and Legislation**
 - **3.1.1 Agriculture**
 - **3.1.2 Forestry**
 - **3.1.3 Livestock Systems**
 - **3.2.5 Pasture and Range Management**
 - **3.2.6 Land Conservation**
 - **3.2.7 Water Conservation**
 - **3.2.8 Sustainable Land Management**
 - **4.1.2 Drought mitigation**
 - **4.1.3 Environment Restoration**
-

Sources of information

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

- **i. Project document**

Attachments:

None.

Financial Commitment #5 — Enabling Environment for SLM to overcome land degradation in the Uganda cattle corridor Districts.

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

- **Uganda - CCD Focal Point - Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries**

Other

No answer provided.

Identification code

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

00072031

Funding organization

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

- **Global Environment Facility**

Other

No answer provided.

Name of activity funded

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

Enabling Environment for SLM to overcome land degradation in the Uganda cattle corridor Districts.

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

- **Uganda**
-

Recipient organization(s)

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

- **Uganda - CCD Focal Point - Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries**

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

No answer provided.

Commitment date

Enter the date at which the financial commitment has been formally approved by the extending organization
01/01/2010

Amount committed

Enter the total amount of money committed
1830730 US Dollar

Type of funding

Indicate the type of funding provided through the financial commitment.

Grant

Start date

Enter the date at which the funding has been or is expected to be made available to the recipient organization
12/08/2010

Completion date

Enter the date at which the funding has been or is expected to be utilized by the recipient organization, if applicable
31/12/2013

Duration (no. of months)

Indicate the period covered by this funding, if applicable, expressed in number of months

No answer provided.

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)

3

Relevant Activity Codes (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).

No answer provided.

Sources of information

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

- **i. Project document**

Attachments:

None.

Financial Commitment #10 — Water for Production

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

- **Uganda - CCD Focal Point - Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries**

Other

No answer provided.

Identification code

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

0169

Funding organization

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

- **Uganda - Central Government Institutions**

Other

No answer provided.

Name of activity funded

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

Water for Production

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

- **Uganda**
-

Recipient organization(s)

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

- **Uganda - 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

No answer provided.

Commitment date

Enter the date at which the financial commitment has been formally approved by the extending organization

04/09/2012

Amount committed

Enter the total amount of money committed

156000000 US Dollar

Type of funding

Indicate the type of funding provided through the financial commitment.

Basket Funding

Start date

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

No answer provided.

Completion date

Enter the date at which the funding has been or is expected to be utilized by the recipient organization, if applicable

2015

Duration (no. of months)

Indicate the period covered by this funding, if applicable, expressed in number of months

No answer provided.

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 Codes (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).

- 1.1.1 Indicators
- 1.1.2 Soil Observations
- 1.2.2 Bio-physical Research and Science
- 2.1.1 Public Awareness Campaigns
- 2.1.2 Publications and communication material
- 2.2.1 Capacity-Building
- 2.2.10 Resource Management Planning
- 2.2.11 Services and Infrastructure
- 2.2.12 Social Development
- 2.2.2 Community Development
- 2.2.6 Governance and Legislation
- 2.2.7 Mainstreaming
- 3.1.5 Production Support
- 3.2.7 Water Conservation
- 3.2.8 Sustainable Land Management
- 4.1.1 Adaptation to climate change
- 4.1.2 Drought mitigation
- 4.1.3 Environment Restoration

- **4.1.6 Water delivery**
 - **5.2 Land Reclamation and/or Rehabilitation**
 - **5.7 Reconstruction of Water Management Systems and Infrastructure**
-

Sources of information

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

- **i. Public Investment Plan (PIP) FY 2009/10 – 2011/12**
- **ii. Ministry of Water and Environment Policy Statement for Financial year 2010-2011**

Attachments:

None.

Programme and Project Sheets

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Programme/Project #1 — National Livestock Productivity Improvement Project (NLPIP)

Reporting entity(ies)

Enter the full name and acronym of the reporting entity(ies)

- **Uganda - CCD Focal Point - Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries**

Other

No answer provided.

Identification code

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

0091

Title

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

National Livestock Productivity Improvement Project (NLPIP)

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

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

Cooperating Institution

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 and 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.

- **National Agriculture Research Organization (NARO)**
-

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

- **Uganda**
-

Target area size/administrative unit

Area Size

Indicate the total area expressed in number of hectares

No answer provided.

Administrative Unit

Indicate the administrative unit targeted in the project area, if known, by the Programme/Project.

45 districts of the "cattle corridor"

Target Group

No answer provided.

Beneficiaries

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

Enter the total number of people benefitting from the Programme/Project, if known.

No answer provided.

Start date

Indicate the date at which the Programme/Project started or is due to start, if known.

01/07/2005

Completion date

Indicate the date at which the Programme/Project was completed or is due to be completed, if known.

31/12/2011

Status

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

Completed

Programme/Project co-financing

Source

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

No answer provided.

Other

No answer provided.

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)

No answer provided.

Programme/Project co-financing

Item 1

Source

Uganda - Central Government Institutions

Source (other)

Currency

UGX

Amount

79380000000

United Nations 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

1

UNFCCC adaptation

1

UNFCCC mitigation

0

CBD

0

Strategic objectives

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

- 1

Operational objectives

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

- 1
- 2
- 4

Sector(s) of intervention

Indicate the sector(s) of intervention as specified in the related documentation, choosing from the list of purpose codes provided in the quick reference guide (ICCD/CRIC(9)/INF.11). The OECD list of purpose codes 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.

- **31163 Livestock**
- **31166 Agricultural extension**
- **31182 Agricultural research**
- **31191 Agricultural services**
- **31195 Livestock/veterinary services**

Programme/Project Components

No answer provided.

Relevant Activity Code(s) (RACs)

Indicate all RACs that may apply to the Programme/Project (refer to the RACs guidance note for more information, examples and instructions).

- **1.2.3 Science and Technology**
- **2.1.4 Education**
- **3.1.3 Livestock Systems**
- **2.2.11 Services and Infrastructure**

Expected or achieved results

Provide information on the results achieved or expected from the implementation of the Programme/Project.

- **i. 6000 indigenous cows and 13920 goats purchased;**
- **ii. 5000 traps laid sets – 1600 dozes of East Coast Fever procured and allocated to districts;**
- **iii. Bid for 2400000 cubic metre of water prepared and sold out;**
- **iv. Demonstration plots set up in 24 districts – 8 training sessions**
- **v. Completed livestock census report – completed acceptable rangeland status report;**
- **vi. 6 livestock markets – 80 slaughter sheds – 52 weekly livestock market scripts and price information disseminated;**
- **vii. Demonstration inputs procured and distributed in 24 districts; 4 training sessions;**
- **viii. Primary data on livestock numbers collected from 80 districts – updated rangeland information.**

Sources of information

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

- **i. Public Investment Plan (PIP) FY 2009/10 – 2011/12**

Attachments:

None.

Programme/Project #2 — Farm Income Enhancement and Forest Conservation(FIEFOC) Project

Reporting entity(ies)

Enter the full name and acronym of the reporting entity(ies)

- Uganda - CCD Focal Point - Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries

Other

No answer provided.

Identification code

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

0968

Title

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

Farm Income Enhancement and Forest Conservation(FIEFOC) Project

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

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

Cooperating Institution

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

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

Enter the name(s) of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), including Non-Governmental Organizations, research institutions and-or Science and 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.

No answer provided.

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

- Uganda
-

Target area size/administrative unit

Area Size

Indicate the total area expressed in number of hectares

No answer provided.

Administrative Unit

Indicate the administrative unit targeted in the project area, if known, by the Programme/Project.

37 districts

Target Group

No answer provided.

Beneficiaries

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

Enter the total number of people benefitting from the Programme/Project, if known.

No answer provided.

Start date

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

Indicate the date at which the Programme/Project started or is due to start, if known.

No answer provided.

Completion date

Indicate the date at which the Programme/Project was completed or is due to be completed, if known.

2010

Status

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

Completed

Programme/Project co-financing

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

No answer provided.

Programme/Project co-financing

Item 1

Source

Source (other)

Currency

Amount

United Nations 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

1

UNFCCC adaptation

1

UNFCCC mitigation

1

CBD

1

Strategic objectives

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

- 1
 - 2
 - 4
-

Operational objectives

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

- 1
- 4
- 5

Sector(s) of intervention

Indicate the sector(s) of intervention as specified in the related documentation, choosing from the list of purpose codes provided in the quick reference guide (ICCD/CRIC(9)/INF.11). The OECD list of purpose codes 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.

- 31161 Food crop production
- 31166 Agricultural extension
- 31181 Agricultural education/training
- 31165 Agricultural alternative development
- 31220 Forestry development
- 31281 Forestry education/training
- 31291 Forestry services

Programme/Project Components

No answer provided.

Relevant Activity Code(s) (RACs)

Indicate all RACs that may apply to the Programme/Project (refer to the RACs guidance note for more information, examples and instructions).

- 2.2.1 Capacity-Building
- 2.2.10 Resource Management Planning
- 2.2.11 Services and Infrastructure
- 2.2.2 Community Development
- 2.2.7 Mainstreaming
- 2.2.8 Partnership Building
- 2.2.9 Project Development
- 3.1.1 Agriculture
- 3.1.2 Forestry
- 3.2.6 Land Conservation
- 3.2.8 Sustainable Land Management

Expected or achieved results

Provide information on the results achieved or expected from the implementation of the Programme/Project.

No answer provided.

Sources of information

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

- i. Public Investment Plan (PIP) FY 2009/10 – 2011/12

Attachments:

None.

Programme/Project #3 — Sustainable Land Management (SLM)

Reporting entity(ies)

Enter the full name and acronym of the reporting entity(ies)

- **Uganda - CCD Focal Point - Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries**

Other

- **N/A**
-

Identification code

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

1009

Title

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

Sustainable Land Management (SLM)

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

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

Cooperating Institution

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

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

Enter the name(s) of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), including Non-Governmental Organizations, research institutions and-or Science and 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.

No answer provided.

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

- **Uganda**
-

Target area size/administrative unit

Area Size

Indicate the total area expressed in number of hectares

No answer provided.

Administrative Unit

Indicate the administrative unit targeted in the project area, if known, by the Programme/Project.

3 districts

Target Group

No answer provided.

Beneficiaries

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

Enter the total number of people benefitting from the Programme/Project, if known.

No answer provided.

Start date

Indicate the date at which the Programme/Project started or is due to start, if known.

01/07/2007

Completion date

Indicate the date at which the Programme/Project was completed or is due to be completed, if known.

2012

Status

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

Ongoing

Programme/Project co-financing

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

No answer provided.

Programme/Project co-financing

Item 1

Source

Source (other)

Currency

Amount

United Nations 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

3

UNFCCC adaptation

1

UNFCCC mitigation

1

CBD

0

Strategic objectives

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

- 1
- 2

Operational objectives

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

- 1
- 2
- 4

Sector(s) of intervention

Indicate the sector(s) of intervention as specified in the related documentation, choosing from the list of purpose codes provided in the quick reference guide (ICCD/CRIC(9)/INF.11). The OECD list of purpose codes 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.

- 31166 Agricultural extension
- 31181 Agricultural education/training
- 31182 Agricultural research
- 31161 Food crop production

Programme/Project Components

No answer provided.

Relevant Activity Code(s) (RACs)

Indicate all RACs that may apply to the Programme/Project (refer to the RACs guidance note for more information, examples and instructions).

- 1.2.1 Traditional Knowledge and Best Practices
- 2.2.1 Capacity-Building
- 2.2.8 Partnership Building
- 2.2.10 Resource Management Planning
- 3.1.1 Agriculture
- 3.2.8 Sustainable Land Management
- 4.1.2 Drought mitigation

Expected or achieved results

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

Provide information on the results achieved or expected from the implementation of the Programme/Project.

No answer provided.

Sources of information

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

- i. Public Investment Plan (PIP) FY 2009/10 – 2011/12

Attachments:

None.

Programme/Project #4 — Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management Activities in Six

Cattle Corridor Districts of Uganda

Reporting entity(ies)

Enter the full name and acronym of the reporting entity(ies)

- **Uganda - CCD Focal Point - Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries**

Other

No answer provided.

Identification code

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

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

No answer provided.

Title

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

Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management Activities in Six Cattle Corridor Districts of Uganda

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

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

Recipient

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 and 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.

- **21 community based organisations from 6 cattle corridor districts.**

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

- **Uganda**

Target area size/administrative unit

Area Size

Indicate the total area expressed in number of hectares

No answer provided.

Administrative Unit

Indicate the administrative unit targeted in the project area, if known, by the Programme/Project.

6 districts

Target Group

No answer provided.

Beneficiaries

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

Enter the total number of people benefitting from the Programme/Project, if known.

No answer provided.

Start date

Indicate the date at which the Programme/Project started or is due to start, if known.

01/09/2009

Completion date

Indicate the date at which the Programme/Project was completed or is due to be completed, if known.

31/12/2012

Status

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

Ongoing

Programme/Project co-financing

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

No answer provided.

Programme/Project co-financing

Item 1

Source

Source (other)

Currency

Amount

United Nations 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

3

UNFCCC adaptation

1

UNFCCC mitigation

1

CBD

0

Strategic objectives

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

- 1
 - 2
-

Operational objectives

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

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
-

Sector(s) of intervention

Indicate the sector(s) of intervention as specified in the related documentation, choosing from the list of purpose codes provided in the quick reference guide (ICCD/CRIC(9)/INF.11). The OECD list of purpose codes 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.

- **31110 Agricultural policy and administrative management**
 - **31130 Agricultural land resources**
 - **31140 Agricultural water resources**
 - **31161 Food crop production**
 - **31163 Livestock**
 - **31165 Agricultural alternative development**
 - **31181 Agricultural education/training**
 - **31182 Agricultural research**
 - **31192 Plant and post-harvest protection and pest control**
 - **31193 Agricultural financial services**
 - **31195 Livestock/veterinary services**
 - **31291 Forestry services**
 - **41010 Environmental policy and administrative management**
 - **41081 Environmental education/ training**
-

Programme/Project Components

No answer provided.

Relevant Activity Code(s) (RACs)

Indicate all RACs that may apply to the Programme/Project (refer to the RACs guidance note for more information, examples and instructions).

- **1.1.3 Weather Forecasting**
- **1.2.1 Traditional Knowledge and Best Practices**
- **1.2.2 Bio-physical Research and Science**
- **2.1.1 Public Awareness Campaigns**
- **2.1.4 Education**
- **2.2.1 Capacity-Building**
- **2.2.10 Resource Management Planning**
- **2.2.2 Community Development**
- **2.2.7 Mainstreaming**
- **3.1.1 Agriculture**
- **3.1.2 Forestry**

- 3.2.5 Pasture and Range Management
- 3.2.6 Land Conservation
- 3.2.7 Water Conservation
- 3.2.8 Sustainable Land Management
- 4.1.3 Environment Restoration

Expected or achieved results

Provide information on the results achieved or expected from the implementation of the Programme/Project.

- i. SLM priority interventions integrated in the DDPs and budgets of selected Districts in the cattle corridor.
- ii. SLM priority interventions identified and implemented by local communities in six (6) target Districts.
- iii. The UNCCD/NAP Focal Office and Inter-ministerial committee on SLM capacitated to manage SLM Country Programmes.

Sources of information

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

- i. Project document

Attachments:

None.

Programme/Project #5 — Enabling Environment for SLM to overcome land degradation in the Uganda cattle corridor Districts.

Reporting entity(ies)

Enter the full name and acronym of the reporting entity(ies)

- Uganda - CCD Focal Point - Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries

Other

No answer provided.

Identification code

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

00072031

Title

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

Enabling Environment for SLM to overcome land degradation in the Uganda cattle corridor Districts.

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

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

Recipient

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

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

Enter the name(s) of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), including Non-Governmental Organizations, research institutions and-or Science and 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.

No answer provided.

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

- Uganda

Target area size/administrative unit

Area Size

Indicate the total area expressed in number of hectares

No answer provided.

Administrative Unit

Indicate the administrative unit targeted in the project area, if known, by the Programme/Project.

2 Districts

Target Group

No answer provided.

Beneficiaries

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

Enter the total number of people benefitting from the Programme/Project, if known.

No answer provided.

Start date

Indicate the date at which the Programme/Project started or is due to start, if known.

12/08/2010

Completion date

Indicate the date at which the Programme/Project was completed or is due to be completed, if known.

31/12/2013

Status

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

Ongoing

Programme/Project co-financing

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

No answer provided.

Programme/Project co-financing

Item 1

Source

Source (other)

Currency

Amount

United Nations 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

1

UNFCCC mitigation

1

CBD

1

Strategic objectives

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

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

Operational objectives

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

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Sector(s) of intervention

Indicate the sector(s) of intervention as specified in the related documentation, choosing from the list of purpose codes provided in the quick reference guide (ICCD/CRIC(9)/INF.11). The OECD list of purpose codes 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.

- **31110 Agricultural policy and administrative management**
- **31163 Livestock**
- **31165 Agricultural alternative development**
- **31166 Agricultural extension**
- **31182 Agricultural research**
- **31193 Agricultural financial services**

- 31210 Forestry policy and administrative management
 - 31261 Fuelwood/charcoal
 - 31282 Forestry research
-

Programme/Project Components

No answer provided.

Relevant Activity Code(s) (RACs)

Indicate all RACs that may apply to the Programme/Project (refer to the RACs guidance note for more information, examples and instructions).

- 1.2.2 Bio-physical Research and Science
 - 2.1.1 Public Awareness Campaigns
 - 2.1.3 Consultative platforms
 - 2.1.5 Synergies
 - 2.2.1 Capacity-Building
 - 2.2.10 Resource Management Planning
 - 2.2.12 Social Development
 - 2.2.2 Community Development
 - 2.2.3 Drivers and Incentives
 - 2.2.6 Governance and Legislation
 - 2.2.7 Mainstreaming
 - 2.2.8 Partnership Building
 - 3.1.2 Forestry
 - 3.1.3 Livestock Systems
 - 3.1.1 Agriculture
 - 3.2.1 Air and Climate Protection
 - 3.2.3 Forest/Scrub Management
 - 3.2.5 Pasture and Range Management
 - 3.2.8 Sustainable Land Management
 - 4.1.2 Drought mitigation
 - 4.1.3 Environment Restoration
-

Expected or achieved results

Provide information on the results achieved or expected from the implementation of the Programme/Project.

- **i. Policies, legislative and institutional frameworks for SLM, energy and livestock sectors reviewed**
- **ii Security for land and resources tenure increased as incentive for investing in SLM**
- **iii National policy for regulating sustainable charcoal production in place**
- **iv Biophysical and socio-economic assessments undertaken**
- **v. Capacity for land use planning and adoption of improved practices in place**
- **vi. Particularly degraded lands rehabilitated**
- **vii. A participatory M&E system designed and used to monitor ecosystem health**
- **viii. Agricultural productivity increased sustainably**
- **ix Farmers and herders increase access to micro-finance**
- **x. Insurance for livestock and selected crops piloted**
- **xi. Technologies for improved conversions along the charcoaling chain provided**
- **xii Income from carbon finance earned through sustainable charcoal production**
- **xiii. Skills for sustainable charcoaling delivered**
- **xiv. Charcoal associations capacitated**

xv. Communication and conflict resolution improved

Sources of information

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

- **i. Project Document**

Attachments:

None.

Programme/Project #10 — Water for Production

Reporting entity(ies)

Enter the full name and acronym of the reporting entity(ies)

- **Uganda - CCD Focal Point - Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries**

Other

No answer provided.

Identification code

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

0169

Title

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

Water for Production

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

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

Implementing 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 and 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.

- **Farmers organizations involved in management and construction of both private and Public valley dams and tanks**
-

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

- **Uganda**
-

Target area size/administrative unit

Area Size

Indicate the total area expressed in number of hectares

No answer provided.

Administrative Unit

Indicate the administrative unit targeted in the project area, if known, by the Programme/Project.

Country wide

Target Group

No answer provided.

Beneficiaries

Enter the total number of people benefitting from the Programme/Project, if known.

No answer provided.

Start date

Indicate the date at which the Programme/Project started or is due to start, if known.

No answer provided.

Completion date

Indicate the date at which the Programme/Project was completed or is due to be completed, if known.

2015

Status

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

Ongoing

Programme/Project co-financing

Source

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

No answer provided.

Other

No answer provided.

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)

No answer provided.

Programme/Project co-financing

Item 1

Source

Danish International Development Agency

Source (other)

Currency

USD

Amount

2000000

United Nations 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

1

UNFCCC mitigation

0

CBD

0

Strategic objectives

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

- 1
-

Operational objectives

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

- 1
 - 3
 - 4
-

Sector(s) of intervention

Indicate the sector(s) of intervention as specified in the related documentation, choosing from the list of purpose codes provided in the quick reference guide (ICCD/CRIC(9)/INF.11). The OECD list of purpose codes 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.

- 14010 Water resources policy and administrative management
 - 14015 Water resources protection
 - 14020 Water supply and sanitation - large systems
 - 14030 Basic drinking water supply and basic sanitation
 - 14081 Education and training in water supply and sanitation
-

Programme/Project Components

No answer provided.

Relevant Activity Code(s) (RACs)

Indicate all RACs that may apply to the Programme/Project (refer to the RACs guidance note for more information, examples and instructions).

- 1.1.2 Soil Observations
- 1.2.2 Bio-physical Research and Science
- 1.2.3 Science and Technology
- 2.2.1 Capacity-Building
- 2.2.10 Resource Management Planning

- 2.2.11 Services and Infrastructure
 - 2.2.12 Social Development
 - 2.2.2 Community Development
 - 3.2.7 Water Conservation
 - 3.2.8 Sustainable Land Management
 - 4.1.1 Adaptation to climate change
 - 4.1.2 Drought mitigation
 - 4.1.6 Water delivery
 - 5.7 Reconstruction of Water Management Systems and Infrastructure
-

Expected or achieved results

Provide information on the results achieved or expected from the implementation of the Programme/Project.

- i. Detailed feasibility study for bulk water transfer and design of one pilot scheme completed.
 - ii. Contracts for the construction of water for production facilities in 4 districts signed.
 - iii. Rehabilitation of Kahinga dam in Sembabule district completed.
 - iv. Construction of Nshenyi valley tank in Ntungamo district completed.
 - v. Construction of Rubaare valley tank in Ntungamo district, Bwanakaraki dam and a piped water supply scheme in Sembabule on-going.
 - vi. Sitting and designing of water for production reservoirs and multipurpose use in 20 districts on-going.
 - vii. Construction of 7 wind mill powered borehole – based livestock watering systems in Karamoja region completed.
 - viii. Procurement of construction equipment in advanced stages.
 - ix. Formation of appropriate management structures to ensure sustainability of constructed facilities on-going.
-

Sources of information

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

- i. Public Investment Plan (PIP) FY 2009/10 – 2011/12
- ii. Ministry of Water and Environment Policy Statement for Financial year 2010-2011

Attachments:

None.

Additional Information

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

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

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

Reporting process-related issues

Financial resources

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

Yes

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

Access through a GEF agency

Amount received (USD)

44091 USD

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

No

If yes, describe the difficulties experienced.

No answer required.

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

51000 US Dollar

Human resources and knowledge

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

30 people

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

150 person/day

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

No

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

Guidelines for the reporting process are relatively new and data for the indicators may not be available for all DLDD affected areas.

Coordination, participation and consultation

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

No answer provided.

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

Yes

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

No answer provided.

Validation meeting, subregional and regional processes

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

Yes

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

No

PRAIS portal

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

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

No answer provided.

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

No answer provided.

If you experienced difficulties, identify the reasons.

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

No answer required.

Other (specify)

No answer required.

Accommodation of specific requests within COP decisions

Report on specific COP requests – iterative process on indicators

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

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

Performance indicators

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

	economic	Specific	Measurable	Achievable	Relevant	Time-bound
CONS-O-1						
CONS-O-3						
CONS-O-4						
CONS-O-5						
CONS-O-7						

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

Impact indicators

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

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

Reporting on the implementation of NAP

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

31-60%

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

No answer required.

Human resources

Lessons learnt (report on the 2 most important only)

1. Cross-sectoral coordination is key in identifying competent human resource to fully support the reporting process.
2. Existing knowledge and scientific networks are valuable in harnessing national expertise to review and update the national report.

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

1. High staff turn over leads to loss of institutional capacity to support the reporting process.

2. Inadequate and untimely financing for technical experts providing input to the reporting process.

Financial resources

Lessons learnt (report on the 2 most important only)

1. A great improvement in shortening time of approval of resources by GEF to support the reporting process provided incentive and confidence for a quick and efficient financing to enable adequate reporting on the key impact indicators.
2. Provision of adequate funds ensured collection of much of the information and data from the custodian agencies, hence ensuring provision of the required information for the reporting process.

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

1. The many processes required before disbursement of funds to the relevant experts created some delays in data collection.
2. The short time frame for report preparation affected the efficiency of activity implementation; hence, limiting the effectiveness of the investment in the reporting process.

Any other country-specific issues

Any other country-specific issues

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

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

No answer provided.

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

No answer required.

Submission form

Submission form	
Name of the reporting officer *	Stephen Muwaya
Date of submission *	15 Oct 2012
Signature	
<hr/>	
Name of the authorizing officer	Vincent R. Rubarema
Date of authorization	15 Oct 2012
Signature	



© UNCCD