

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

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

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 — Forest 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 — Development of Integrated Investment and Financing Strategy for Sustainable Land Management in Zambia
- Programme and Project Sheets
 - Programme/Project #2 — Strengthening Management Effectiveness and Generating Multiple Environmental Benefits within and around Protected Areas in Zambia
 - Programme/Project #3 — Low Emission Capacity Building (LECB) project
 - Programme/Project #4 — Partnership Interventions for the Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for Lake Tanganyika
- 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 | Zambia |
| Name and surname of the person submitting the report | Godwin Fishani Gondwe |
| Affiliation and contact details | figogmel@yahoo.co.uk |

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):

Lusaka Province

Most affected Districts are Lusaka , Chongwe and Kafue.

Central Province

Most affected Districts are Kabwe,Mumbwa and Kapiri-Mposhi

Eastern Province

Most affected Districts are Chipata, Nyimba, Mambwe and Petauke

Southern Province

Most affected Districts are Choma, Livingstone

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

3000 km²

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

0.62 %

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

'Desertification' means land degradation in arid, semi-arid and dry sub-humid areas resulting from

various factors, including climatic variations and human activities.

'Arid, Semi-Arid and Dry Sub-humid Areas' means areas, other than polar and sub-polar regions, in which the ratio of annual precipitation to potential evapotranspiration falls within the range from 0.05 to 0.65.

'Land Degradation' means reduction or loss, in arid, semi-arid and dry sub-humid areas, of the biological or economic productivity and complexity of rainfed crop land, irrigated cropland, or range, pasture, forest and woodlands resulting from land-uses or from a process or combination of processes, including processes arising from human activities and habitation patterns, such as:

- i) Soil erosion caused by wind and/or water,
- ii) Deterioration of the physical, chemical and biological or economic properties of soil, and
- iii) Long term loss of natural vegetation.

Forest degradation - The change of forest cover density within the forest class (e.g. from high density forest to open density forest) which negatively affect the stand or site and, in particular, lower the production capacity

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

Guided by the definition of DLDD, Land Use and Forest Cover Mapping using a composite of satellite image analysis, Geographical Information Systems tools and ground verification techniques. Affected areas were identified through vegetation mapping and change detection on the basis of the adopted definition of Forest degradation, which means - The change of forest cover density within the forest class (e.g. from high density forest to open density forest) which negatively affect the stand or site and, in particular, lower the production capacity

The sampling design adopted for the ILUA I in Zambia was systematic. No stratification was applied. The sample density and distribution in Zambia is shown in map 3 below. This was a system grid set across the country at 40km between tracts. The tracts were automatically spread over the surface area of Zambia regardless of the geographical location and topological conditions. The aim was to avoid biasness in plotting and data collection.

Further, A total of 44 Land-sat 5 TM and ETM+ images were purchased for the production of the latest land use map for Zambia. These images were geometrically corrected. Due to non availability of complete full scenes of images for a single year, 38 scenes were for the year 2005, and were captured between April and August, while 6 scenes were for the year 2004. All the images were originally acquired under UTM projection. Since Zambia has 3 zones namely UTM zone 34, 35 and 36, the interpretation of the land use/forest map could not be projected in UTM because of the differences in zones. Therefore, all the images were converted into the "Geographic coordinate system with its datum being WGS 84".

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:

- [Final ZNAP 2002.pdf](#), 955.5 kB

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 |
|------------------------------------|------|--|---|---------------------|
| Central Statistical Office, Zambia | 2012 | LIVING CONDITIONS MONITORING SURVEY REPORT 2006 2010 | Living Conditions Monitoring Branch, Central Statistical Office | www.zamstats.gov.zm |

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

A Rural area is the area outside the definition of urban and whose main economic activity of the population is predominantly must be agricultural and where basic modern facilities, such as piped water, tarred roads, post office, police post/station, health centre, etc are sparingly present. Rural areas are featured with Small-scale agricultural households; Medium scale agricultural households; Large-scale agricultural households and Non-agricultural households.

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 | 9791981 | 6458729 | 5875188 | Nationwide census | Yes | 100% |
| 2001 | 10090086 | 6555224 | 5852249 | Expert opinion | No | --- |
| 2002 | 10412055 | 6764149 | 5101989 | Expert opinion | No | --- |
| 2003 | 10748687 | 6984691 | 6664185 | Expert opinion | No | --- |
| 2004 | 11095391 | 7214296 | 6657234 | Stratified random survey | Yes | 5% |
| 2005 | 11449174 | 7449453 | 6983996 | Expert opinion | No | --- |
| 2006 | 11807747 | 7689811 | 6494260 | Stratified random survey | Yes | 5% |
| 2007 | 12169686 | 7933750 | 7058417 | Expert opinion | No | --- |
| 2008 | 12533509 | 8181027 | 7394770 | Expert opinion | No | --- |

| 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 |
|------|--|--|---|--------------------------|---|---|
| 2009 | 12902108 | 8432552 | 7483222 | Stratified random survey | Yes | 5% |
| 2010 | 13092666 | 7919216 | 7662847 | Nationwide census | Yes | 100% |
| 2011 | --- | --- | --- | Stratified random survey | --- | --- |

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

| Author | Year | Publication title | Publisher | Website address |
|------------------------------------|------|--|---|---------------------|
| Central Statistical Office, Zambia | 2012 | LIVING CONDITIONS MONITORING SURVEY REPORT 2006 2010 | Living Conditions Monitoring Branch, Central Statistical Office | www.zamstats.gov.zm |

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

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

No

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 | 1 | USD | Consumption survey |
| 2001 | 1 | USD | Expert opinion |
| 2002 | 1 | USD | Consumption survey |
| 2003 | 1 | USD | Expert opinion |
| 2004 | 57172 | ZMK | Consumption survey |
| 2005 | 2 | USD | Expert opinion |
| 2006 | 61007 | ZMK | Consumption survey |

| Year | National poverty line (value) | Currency | Method used |
|------|-------------------------------|----------|--------------------|
| 2007 | 2 | USD | Expert opinion |
| 2008 | 2 | USD | Expert opinion |
| 2009 | 2 | USD | Expert opinion |
| 2010 | 96366 | ZMK | Consumption survey |
| 2011 | 2 | USD | Expert opinion |

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

| Author | Year | Publication title | Publisher | Website address |
|------------------------------------|------|--|---|---------------------|
| Central Statistical Office, Zambia | 2012 | LIVING CONDITIONS MONITORING SURVEY REPORT 2006 2010 | Living Conditions Monitoring Branch, Central Statistical Office | www.zamstats.gov.zm |

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 | 7343986 | 75 | Nationwide census | 80% |
| 2001 | 7567564 | 75 | Expert opinion | 80% |
| 2002 | 7600800 | 73 | Stratified random survey | 70% |
| 2003 | 7739055 | 72 | Expert opinion | 70% |
| 2004 | 7766774 | 70 | Expert opinion | 70% |
| 2005 | 7785438 | 68 | Expert opinion | 70% |
| 2006 | 8222195 | 63 | Stratified random survey | 80% |
| 2007 | 7545206 | 62 | Expert opinion | 70% |
| 2008 | 7645440 | 61 | Expert opinion | 70% |
| 2009 | 7745464 | 60 | Expert opinion | 70% |
| 2010 | 7921063 | 60 | Nationwide census | 80% |
| 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 |

| 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 | 5425332 | 84 | Nationwide census | 90% |
| 2001 | 4916418 | 83 | Expert opinion | --- |
| 2002 | 4937829 | 83 | Stratified random survey | 5% |
| 2003 | 5028978 | 82 | Expert opinion | --- |
| 2004 | 5049988 | 81 | Expert opinion | --- |
| 2005 | 5065628 | 80 | Expert opinion | --- |
| 2006 | 4844581 | 80 | Stratified random survey | 5% |
| 2007 | 4918925 | 78 | Expert opinion | --- |
| 2008 | 4990426 | 78 | Expert opinion | --- |
| 2009 | 5059531 | 77 | Expert opinion | --- |
| 2010 | 4751530 | 77 | Nationwide census | 90% |
| 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 | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2005 | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2006 | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2007 | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2008 | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2009 | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2010 | --- | --- | --- | --- |

| Year | Country | | | |
|------|------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| | Number of people | Percentage of population | Method of poverty assessment | Approximate proportion of the national human population surveyed during the poverty assessment |
| 2011 | --- | --- | --- | --- |

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

| Author | Year | Publication title | Publisher | Website address |
|----------------------------|------|--|---|---------------------|
| Central Statistical Office | 2012 | LIVING CONDITIONS MONITORING SURVEY REPORT 2006 2010 | Living Conditions Monitoring Branch, Central Statistical Office | www.zamstats.gov.zm |
| Central statistical Office | 2012 | 2010 Census of Population and Housing | Central Statistical Office | www.zamstats.gov.zm |
| Central Statistical Office | 2003 | Population Projections Report | Central Statistical Office | www.zamstats.gov.zm |
| Central Statistical Office | 2012 | Living Conditions:Poverty in Zambia 1991-2006 | Central Statistical Office | www.zamstats.gov.zm |

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.

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

| 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 |
| 2009 | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | --- | --- | --- | --- |

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

Contact details

General information on the national contact person for this indicator

Name and surname

John Kalumbi - Director, Census and Statistics

Institution

Central Statistical Office

Address

Address: P. O. Box 31908, Lusaka, Zambia

Email

info@zamstats.gov.zm

Telephone

+260 211 251377/251370/253468/256520

Interpretation of indicator status/trend and policy implications

Poverty in affected areas

Did you provide data on poverty in affected 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 affected areas change over time?

No

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

The Living Conditions Monitoring Survey Report (LCMS) 2010 and 2006 highlights some key aspects of the living conditions of the Zambian population. The poverty results of the LCMS 2010 and LCMS 2006 cannot be compared to the results of the 2004, 1998, 1996 surveys, PSII 1993 and PSI 1991. This is because the results of the 2006 LCMS and 2010 LCMS used year specific Engel ratios to derive the food share while the rest used a fixed ratio. The 2006 LCMS and 2010 LCMS used items prices to update the poverty lines. Therefore, the results presented in this report are by no means exhaustive on any topic covered but only attempt to highlight salient aspects of living standards among various population subgroups at national, provincial and location levels.

Since 2005 the Zambian economy has continued to register positive real GDP growth of not less than 5 per cent. Much of this economic growth was observed during the implementation of the Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP), which covered the period 2006-2010. However, there has been no notable corresponding improvement in the well being of the people, especially in rural areas..

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?

Uncertain

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

Attachments:

None.

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

No answer provided.

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?

No

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

The Living Conditions Monitoring Survey Report (LCMS) 2010 and 2006 highlights some key aspects of the living conditions of the Zambian population. The poverty results of the LCMS 2010 and LCMS 2006 cannot be compared to the results of the 2004, 1998, 1996 surveys, PSII 1993 and PSI 1991. This is because the results of the 2006 LCMS and 2010 LCMS used year specific Engel ratios to derive the food share while the rest used a fixed ratio. The 2006 LCMS and 2010 LCMS used items prices to update the poverty lines. Therefore, the results presented in this report are by no means exhaustive on any topic covered but only attempt to highlight salient aspects of living standards among various population subgroups at national, provincial and location levels.

Since 2005 the Zambian economy has continued to register positive real GDP growth of not less than 5 per cent. Much of this economic growth was observed during the implementation of the Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP), which covered the period 2006-2010. However, there has been no notable corresponding improvement in the wellbeing of the people, especially in rural areas..

If yes, does the poverty rate in rural 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 rural areas?

Uncertain

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

No answer required.

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:

None.

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

No answer provided.

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 provided.

Poverty at the national level

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

Did you provide data on poverty at the national level?

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 at national level change over time?

Yes

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?

Both increase and decrease

Please explain the pattern emerging from the data.

At National Level, poverty has been slightly increasing during 2000-2004 and declining in the years 2005-2007, this is unevenly distributed across strata of society and the different regions of the country. Extreme poverty where people live for less than one United States Dollar a day (<1US\$/Day) is significant in rural settings, where the majority of the households depend on the consumption of their own products. It is also under these circumstances we find most cases of undernourishment, low life expectancy, analphabetism and lack of access to water and sanitation, which causes many deaths every year, especially among women and children.

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

Uncertain

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

Attachments:

None.

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

No answer provided.

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.

Zambia's Vision 2030 highlights three scenarios outlining development options, namely the baseline, the preferred and the optimistic. The socio-economic development objectives enshrined in the Preferred Scenario are: to attain and sustain annual real growth of 6 percent (2006-2010), 8 percent (2011-2015), 9 percent (2016-2020), and 10 percent between 2021 and 2030; to attain and maintain a moderate inflation rate of 5 percent; to reduce national poverty head count to less than 20 percent of the population; to reduce income inequalities measured by a Gini coefficient of less than 40; to provide secure access to safe potable water sources and improved sanitation facilities to 100 percent of the population in both urban and rural areas; to attain education for all; and, to provide equitable access to quality health care to all by 2030.

The Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP) 2011–2015 is the successor to the Fifth National

Development Plan (FNDP), aimed at actualising the aspirations of the Vision 2030 of becoming “a prosperous middle-income nation by 2030”. While the FNDP set the pace for improving economic infrastructure and investing in human development, the SNDP aims to build on the gains of the FNDP in the process of attaining the Vision 2030. During the FNDP period, the economy attained macroeconomic stability and continued economic growth averaging 6.1 percent while also achieving positive gains in infrastructure development. In the social sectors there was generally an improvement in the Maternal and Infant Mortality Rates and Education Enrolment Rates. Despite the gains, the reductions in unemployment and poverty levels were not significant. The theme of the SNDP is “Sustained economic growth and poverty reduction”. In line with this theme, the SNDP focuses on policies, strategies and programmes that will contribute significantly to addressing the challenges of realising broad-based pro-poor growth, employment creation and human development. Thus, the strategic focus of the SNDP is “infrastructure and human development”. The focus is guided by the principles of accountability, decentralization and efficient resource allocation. The objectives of the SNDP are to: accelerate infrastructure development; economic growth and diversification; promote rural investment and accelerate poverty reduction and enhance human development. While recognizing the importance of balanced growth in all sectors of the economy, the SNDP priority growth sectors are Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries, Mining, Tourism, Manufacturing and Commerce and Trade.

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? | 3 | This is subjective assessment on the basis of assessments related to DLDD due to lack of a comprehensive DLDD -focussed Monitoring and Evaluation in the Country |
| Relevant – Is the indicator relevant for DLDD national planning purposes, including monitoring of the National Action Programme (NAP)? | 4 | This is in line with the national development planning process as highlighted in the Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP 2006-2010) and the Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP 2011-2015) |
| Relevant – Can policymakers easily understand the indicator? | 2 | There is little appreciation of DLDD at higher political level due to insufficient awareness raising scale undertaken because of small resource allocations in the national budgets |
| 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 | While understanding is sound at technical levels, there is much more required to raise awareness in the general population in Zambia. |
| Specific – Is the requested spatial scale (national vs. affected areas) of the indicator appropriate for its | 5 | This is a desirable requirement in the national planning process. |

| Assessment Criteria (e-SMART) | Score | Remarks |
|---|-------|--|
| monitoring purposes? | | |
| Measurable – Are the definitions of the indicator and its constitutive elements clear and not ambiguous? | 3 | Reasonably measurable. |
| Measurable – Are the proposed methodologies for the measurement of this indicator sufficiently clear to ensure reliable data? | 3 | While understanding is sound at technical levels, there is much more required to raise awareness in the general population in Zambia. |
| Time-bound – Is the indicator sensitive enough to detect important changes but not so sensitive that signals are masked by natural variability? | 4 | Reasonably time-bound |
| Time-bound – Can the indicator detect changes at the required temporal and spatial scales and are the up-scaling / cross-scaling rules clear? | 4 | Indicator can reasonably detect changes at required temporal and spatial scales |
| Achievable – Are reliable data and monitoring systems available to assess trends and is data collection a relatively straightforward process? | 1 | There is no robust DLDD focussed M&E adopted by Government in the country . |
| Achievable – Is the frequency of data collection in line with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the UNCCD? | 4 | While the frequency of data collection is in line with reporting requirements of UNCCD, changes in poverty may be detected over a longer temporal scale. |
| 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) | --- | This is achievable but requires integrated financing to boost domestic resource mobilization. |

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 — Forest cover

Land cover type

Name

Forest 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 | in situ. It does not include land that is predominantly under agricultural or urban land use. |
| 2001 | --- |
| 2002 | --- |
| 2003 | --- |
| 2004 | Land spanning more than 0.5 hectares with trees higher than 5 meters and a canopy cover of more than 10 percent, or trees able to reach these thresholds in situ. It does not include land that is predominantly under agricultural or urban land use. |
| 2005 | in situ. It does not include land that is predominantly under agricultural or urban land use. |
| 2006 | --- |
| 2007 | |
| 2008 | --- |
| 2009 | |
| 2010 | --- |
| 2011 | --- |

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:

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?

Yes

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

Satellite image

Classification:

Manual

Please specify the spatial resolution of the image:

30m

Please specify the temporal resolution of the image:

16days

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

---m

Please specify the year that the photo was captured:

2004

Please specify the month that the image was captured:

August

Percentage of country surface assessed via this classification:

100%

Ground truthing conducted?

Yes

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

High resolution verification?

Yes

If percentage accuracy is available, please specify:

---%

Expert opinion?

Yes

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

Please specify the number of experts involved:

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

| Author | Year | Publication title | Publisher | Website address |
|-----------------------------|------|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------|
| FAO and Forestry Department | 2008 | Integrated Land Use Assessment Zambia 2005-2008 | FAO and Forestry Department of Zambia | --- |

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 | --- | ---% |
| 2008 | 499000 | 66% |
| 2009 | --- | ---% |
| 2010 | --- | ---% |
| 2011 | --- | ---% |

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:

None.

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).

No map data provided.

Contact details

General information on the national contact person for this indicator

Name and surname

Anna Chileshe Masinja

Institution

Forestry Department

Address

Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection, Kwacha Annex, Cairo Road, P. O. Box 50042, LUSAKA

Email

No answer provided.

Telephone

+260 211 234375

Interpretation of indicator status/trend and policy implications

Interpretation of the indicator

Did you provide data for more than one year?

No

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

No

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

No answer required.

Does the indicator change over time?

No answer required.

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?

No answer required.

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.

No answer required.

Does the extent of affected areas increase or decrease?

No answer required.

Please explain the pattern emerging from the data.

No answer required.

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.)

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.

Government has put in place a comprehensive National Policy on Environment (2007) and an ambitious Environmental Management Act No 12 of 2011 whose focus has begun to be adopted in the National Development Plan such as the Sixth National Development Plan 2011-2015.

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? | 5 | Very much relevant as it provides visualisation of the DLDD process |

| Assessment Criteria (e-SMART) | Score | Remarks |
|---|-------|--|
| Relevant – Is the indicator relevant for DLDD national planning purposes, including monitoring of the National Action Programme (NAP)? | 5 | Very much relevant as it provides visualisation of the DLDD process |
| Relevant – Can policymakers easily understand the indicator? | 5 | With clear visualisation, policy makers have no difficulty in interpreting the impacts on the people |
| 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 | The indicator rides on acceptable scientific approaches in remote sensing and GIS |
| Specific – Is the requested spatial scale (national vs. affected areas) of the indicator appropriate for its monitoring purposes? | 4 | Yes, it provides comparison of impact on people in affected areas to the general public response |
| Measurable – Are the definitions of the indicator and its constitutive elements clear and not ambiguous? | 5 | Very clear |
| Measurable – Are the proposed methodologies for the measurement of this indicator sufficiently clear to ensure reliable data? | 4 | an iterative process is desirable to adapt methods to changing situations |
| Time-bound – Is the indicator sensitive enough to detect important changes but not so sensitive that signals are masked by natural variability? | 4 | With flexibility through iteration, the indicator may be in harmony to apply the necessary sensitivity suitable to address the arising situation |
| Time-bound – Can the indicator detect changes at the required temporal and spatial scales and are the up-scaling / cross-scaling rules clear? | 4 | The indicator is highly likely to facilitate |
| Achievable – Are reliable data and monitoring systems available to assess trends and is data collection a relatively straightforward process? | 2 | Relatively straight forward |
| Achievable – Is the frequency of data collection in line with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the UNCCD? | 3 | At national level, variances in approach may occur |
| 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 | Reasonably cost-effective |

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.

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

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

No answer provided.

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) |
|------------------|-----------------|--|
| --- | --- | --- |

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

If Others, please specify:

No answer required.

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

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

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:

None.

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).

No answer provided.

Interpretation of the indicator

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

Did you provide data for more than one year?

No answer provided.

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?

No answer required.

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?

No answer required.

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.

No answer required.

Does the extent of affected areas increase or decrease?

No answer required.

Please explain the pattern emerging from the data.

No answer required.

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.)

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 provided.

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? | 5 | Land productivity is key to sustainable development and this makes the indicator very relevant. |
| Relevant – Is the indicator relevant for DLDD national planning purposes, including monitoring of the National Action Programme (NAP)? | 5 | The an iterative implementation of DLDD efforts to combat desertification require informed plans and data on land productivity is key. |
| Relevant – Can policymakers easily understand the indicator? | 3 | Well interpreted data can be understood easily 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 | Highly so. |
| Specific – Is the requested spatial scale (national vs. affected areas) of the indicator appropriate for its monitoring purposes? | 4 | This facilitates comparison of situations in affected areas with the national status. |
| Measurable – Are the definitions of the indicator and its constitutive elements clear and not ambiguous? | 5 | Reasonably clear. |
| Measurable – Are the proposed methodologies for the measurement of this indicator sufficiently clear to ensure reliable data? | 2 | The science behind land productivity assessments is quite complex. |

| Assessment Criteria (e-SMART) | Score | Remarks |
|---|-------|---|
| Time-bound – Is the indicator sensitive enough to detect important changes but not so sensitive that signals are masked by natural variability? | 3 | Quite sensitive. |
| Time-bound – Can the indicator detect changes at the required temporal and spatial scales and are the up-scaling / cross-scaling rules clear? | 4 | May be very useful if applied with iterative flexibility. |
| Achievable – Are reliable data and monitoring systems available to assess trends and is data collection a relatively straightforward process? | 3 | Quite a number of systems are available but scattered in various institutions and somewhat unco-ordinated |
| Achievable – Is the frequency of data collection in line with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the UNCCD? | 3 | Quite in line |
| 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 | The costs increase with amount of detail required in the assessment. |

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 | 2000000 |
| 2011 | 2500000 |

Sources of information

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

- **GRZ Green Papers 2009, 2010 and 2011**
- **GRZ MTEF Budgets 2009-2011**
- **Fifth National Development Plan 2006-2010**

Attachments:

- [2011 Green Paper.pdf](#), 768.33 kB

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 | 1 |
| 2011 | 1 | --- | --- | --- |

Qualitative assessment

Description of mechanisms

| Mechanism | Description |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| A - Laws and regulations | Government put in place an Environmental Management Act No 12 of 2011 which provide guidance for regulating and supporting implementation of International agreements including the Rio Conventions |
| B - Economic and financial incentives | --- |

| Mechanism | Description |
|----------------------------|--|
| C - Cooperation frameworks | A Joint Assistance Strategy for Zambia (JASZ) was developed by the Cooperating Partners to manage their development cooperation with the Government of the Republic of Zambia (GRZ) in alignment with the Fifth National Development Plan. |
| D - Sectoral policies | A Public Private Partnership (PPP) Policy has been formulated to promote and support 3p partnerships in sustainable development in Zambia. |

Geographical level of application

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

Sources of information

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

- **Reports filed in the Ministry of Lands Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (MLNREP) on progress in the development of IIFS for SLM in Zambia, with support from the Global Mechanism; Records at MLNREP on submissions for policy and legislation in line ministries; UNCCD NAP.**
- **Environmental Management Act No 12 of 2011; Zambia Environmental Outlook report 2008**

Attachments:

None.

Indicator SO-4-7

Strategic Objective 4

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

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

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Data sources (indicative only)

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

Check the glossary for

N.A.

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

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

Qualitative assessment

Description of institutional arrangements

| Level | Description |
|-------------------|---|
| A - International | UNCCD Secretariat and Global Mechanism (GM) in collaboration with development aid and financing institutions are relatively well equipped and financed resulting in better implementation effectiveness and efficiency. |
| B - Regional | UNCCD Regional Coordination Units facilitated by the Secretariat are relatively effective |
| C - Subregional | Zambia belongs to the Southern African Development Community (SADC) whose limited structure and resource basket results in rationalisation of activity priorities which favour other initiatives than DLDD. |
| D - National | There is poor coordination of DLDD activities due to limited resources and structures of focal point institutions. |
| E - Local | There is little impact at District and lower levels. |

Sources of information

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

- **National Adaptation Programme of Action 2007**
National Capacity Self Assessment Report - Zambia
Reports of studies commissioned by GM and GRZ on the development of IIFS for SLM in Zambia
National Situational Analysis Reports
Zambia Environmental Outlook Report 2008

Attachments:

- [NCSA Zambia.pdf](#), 250.05 kB

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 | 12 | 3000 |
| 2011 | 15 | 5000 |

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 | 10 |
| 2011 | 12 | 12 |

Sources of information

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

- **Records in the Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection**

National Climate Change Advocacy and Communication Strategy

Attachments:

- [NCCCAS Final Draft April 2011.pdf](#), 1.51 MB

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

60 %

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?

Yes

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

Yes

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

No answer required.

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

No answer provided.

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.

| Year | Number of CSOs involved in DLDD-related programmes/projects | Number of STIs involved in DLDD-related programmes/projects |
|------|---|---|
| 2010 | 152 | 12 |
| 2011 | 155 | 15 |

Provide the names of these organizations.

| Name |
|---|
| The University of Zambia |
| The Copperbelt University |
| Zambia Forestry College |
| National Institute for Scientific and Industrial Research |
| National Science and Technology Council |
| Zambia Association of Research and Development |
| Zambia Land Alliance |
| Center for Energy Engineering and Environment Zambia |
| Zambia Climate Change Network |
| Zambia Wildlife Authority |

| Name |
|---|
| Zambia Environmental Management Agency |
| Zambia Agriculture Research Institute |
| Zambia National Farmers Union |
| Community Markets for Conservation (COMACO) |
| WWF Zambia |
| CBNRM Forum |
| Wildlife Conservation Society of Zambia |

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

Increased access to funding. Increased awareness of DLDD-related problems and of the need for action.
Increased knowledge of DLDD-related topics and enhanced skills of trainers/trainers
Government policies are more supportive of education initiatives

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 | 5 |
| Increased access to information and to national and/or international financing opportunities | 4 |
| Increased willingness of the government in working with CSOs | 4 |
| Increased interest of donors in working with CSOs | 4 |
| Strengthened organizational, project management and fund-raising capacity of CSOs | 3 |
| Increased funding opportunities requiring partnership with the STIs | 3 |
| Strengthened organizational, project management and fund-raising capacity of the STIs | 3 |
| Other | --- |

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

Reasons for decreasing for CSOs

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

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

| Reason | Level of importance |
|---|---------------------|
| Costly participatory processes | 4 |
| Low organizational, fund-raising and project management capacity of CSOs | 5 |
| Government policies and/or the legal environment do not foster the engagement of CSOs | 0 |
| Diminishing funding | 3 |
| Other | --- |

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

Reasons for decreasing for STIs

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

| Reason | Level of importance |
|--|---------------------|
| DLDD topics are not prioritized by national STIs | 3 |
| Low organizational, fund-raising and project management capacity of STIs | 4 |
| Decreased networking opportunities at national and international level | 1 |
| Diminishing funding | 2 |
| Other | --- |

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

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 | 67 | 14 |
| 2011 | 74 | 18 |

Sources of information

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

- **Records in the Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection;**
Water Sector Advisory Group;
Zambia Environmental Management Agency;
Progress Reports.
Economic Reports

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

With support from the UNCCD Global Mechanism, Government initiated the development of Integrated Investment Framework and Financing Strategy for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in Zambia. The process is comprehensively consultative with wide CSO/STI participation;

Sector policies and legislation such as the Forestry Policy and Legislation, Wildlife Policy and Legislation which are currently under review (Final drafts completed) have been influenced to provide for CSO/STI involvement.

The Sixth National Development Plan has initiated mainstreaming of SLM in key sectors of the economy and identifies the role of CSOs/STIs.

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 | 4 |
| Increased awareness of DLDD-related problems and of the need for action | 3 |
| Increased knowledge of DLDD-related topics and enhanced skills of trainers/trainers | 3 |

| Reason | Level of importance |
|---|---------------------|
| Government policies are more supportive of education initiatives | 4 |
| International donors are more supportive of education-focussed initiatives. | 3 |
| Other | --- |

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

Reasons for decreasing for CSOs

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

| Reason | Level of importance |
|--|---------------------|
| Lack of financial resources | 2 |
| Insufficient awareness and knowledge by national CSOs of DLDD-related issues | 2 |
| Limited capillary presence of national CSOs at the grass-root level | 4 |
| Other | --- |

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

Reasons for decreasing for STIs

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

| Reason | Level of importance |
|---|---------------------|
| Lack of financial resources | 2 |
| National STIs are more focussed on research activities than on education and training | 4 |
| Other | --- |

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

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.

2002-02-20

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 | 2 |
| Lack of capacities | 4 |
| Lack of financial resources | 3 |
| Understaffing | 4 |
| Lack of time | 2 |
| Poor internal coordination among relevant ministries | 3 |
| Other | --- |

Other (specify)

Government initiated National Development Planning process to which all sectoral strategies provide feed. The timing of these processes overlapped with the NAP alignment call and this denied concentration on the NAP alignment.

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.

With Government embarking on National Development Planning (now implementing the Sixth National Development Plan 2011-2015), the NAP alignment will have to be complementary and in harmony with the national Vision 2013 and Development Plans.

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

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

Yes

Does your country's NAP assess DLDD drivers?

Yes

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

No

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?

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

Sources of information

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

- **Zambia's Vision**
- Sixth National Development Plan**
- The Third National Report on Implementation of UNCCD**
- Fifth National Development Plan**
- IUCN Zambia website and personal communication**
- CBNRM Forum - personal communication**
- 6.National Capacity self Assessment (NCSA 2007)**
-
- 7.National Situational Ana**

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?

2014–2015

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?

No

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

No answer required.

If yes, which type of assistance did you receive?

No answer required.

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

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

Performance indicator CONS-O-7 for Outcome 2.5

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

Understanding of the indicator

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**
- **Enhancement of the institutional and scientific capacities and awareness of relevant stakeholders**
- **Other**

Other (specify)

National budget submissions preparations

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**
- **Establishment of national collaborative processes on synergies in reporting under the Rio Conventions**
- **Other**

Other (specify)

National budgeting and work planning.

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.

- **Environment Sector Advisory Group**
- **Water Sector Advisory Group**
- **Natural Resources Consultative Forum**
- **Zambia Environment Outlook Reports**
- **State of Environment Reports**

Reports of Internal Meetings

Attachments:

None.

National contribution to the target

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?

2010–2011

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
- CBD
- 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 | 0 |
| Lack of capacities | 2 |
| Lack of financial resources | 4 |
| Understaffing | 4 |
| Lack of time | 3 |
| Poor internal coordination among relevant ministries | 3 |
| Other | --- |

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

Operational Objective 3: Science, technology and knowledge

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

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

Understanding of the indicator

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.

- Integrated Land Use Assessment, Integrated Water Resources Assessment; Environmental Outlook Reporting; State of Environment reporting; Wildlife tracking tools; Climate Early Warning System (being further developed); Land Information Management System; Forest Resources Monitoring.

Sources of information

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

- Integrated Land Use Assessment (ILUA) Zambia 2005-2008

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?

2016–2017

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 | 5 |
| Lack of capacities | 4 |
| Human resources constraints | 4 |
| Lack of coordination among relevant ministries and unclear attribution of responsibilities | 3 |
| Lack of coordination among donor-led programme/project interventions | 3 |
| Existing initiatives are too fragmented; cannot be realistically coordinated under one umbrella | 2 |
| Existing national and/or sub-national monitoring systems use different methodologies and cannot be realistically harmonized | 2 |
| Other | --- |

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

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

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

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

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

Understanding of the indicator

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

7

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.

- 1.Integrated Landuse Assessment (ILUA) Zambia 2005-2008
- 2.National Situational Analysis Report 2005
- 3.National Capacity Self Assessment Report 2007
- 4. PRAIS User manual v2.02
- CSO, LIVING CONDITIONS MONITORING SURVEY REPORT 2006 2010
- CSO 2010 Census of population and housing

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

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

Yes

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

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.

| Type of knowledge | Level of importance |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Scientific literature | 5 |
| Expert knowledge | 5 |
| Traditional knowledge | 5 |

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.

- 1. FAO and Forestry Department (2008) Integrated Land Use Assessment (ILUA) Zambia, 2005-2008, Lusaka.

2. Siampale,A (2008) Land use and forest cover change (LUFCC) detection analysis, Forestry Department, Lusaka 1990, 2000 and 2005”

Attachments:

None.

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

Yes

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.

| Type of knowledge | Level of importance |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Scientific literature | 4 |
| Expert knowledge | 3 |
| Traditional knowledge | 3 |

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.

- 1. Zambia's NBSAP;
- 2.Records in the Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection;
- 3. National Biodiversity Reports to UNCBD

Attachments:

None.

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

Yes

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?

2016–2017

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 | 0 |
| Relevant traditional or expert knowledge is not available | 0 |
| Lack of financial resources to mobilise the necessary knowledge | 3 |
| Poor coordination among the relevant ministries prevented an internal pooling of knowledge/expertise | 4 |
| Relevant ministries could not contribute due to lack of time | 3 |
| Relevant ministries could not contribute due to lack of staff | 3 |
| Other | --- |

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

Performance indicator CONS-O-11 for Outcome 3.5

Type, number and users of DLDD-relevant knowledge-sharing systems at the global, regional, subregional and national levels described on the Convention website

Understanding of the indicator

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

Data needed

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

Data sources (indicative only)

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

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

Zambia Environmental Management Agency information system

Internet link

www.zema.org.zm/

Estimated number of users per year

2000000

Item 2

Name of the system

Land Information Management System

Internet link

Estimated number of users per year

1000000

Item 3

Name of the system

Central Statistical Office information system

Internet link

www.zamstats.gov.zm

Estimated number of users per year

3000000

Item 4

Name of the system

Zambezi River Authority

Internet link

<http://www.zaraho.org.zm/>

Estimated number of users per year

500000

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.

Name of the System

No answer provided.

Internet Link

No answer provided.

Estimated number of users per year

No answer provided.

Operational Objective 4: Capacity building

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

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

| Year | NCSA-generated | Other initiatives |
|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 2010 | 4 | 2 |
| 2011 | 2 | 1 |

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

ILUA Phase 2

Capacity Development for Sustainable Utilisation of Environmental Assets and Climate Change Project

Environment and Natural Resources Management and Mainstreaming Programme

Adaptation to Effects of Drought and climate change in agro-ecological Zone 1 and 2 project in Zambia

GEF Small Grants Programme

Interim Environment Fund

Civil Society Fund

Strengthening Management Effectiveness and Generating Multiple Environmental Benefits within and around Protected Areas in Zambia

Technology Needs Assessment

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

Yes

If yes, within the framework of which initiative?

NCSA

Other (specify)

No answer required.

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.

- **Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP 2006-2010)**
- 2.National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA 2007)**
- 3.National Situational Analysis Reports 2005**
- 4.National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA)**
- 5.Zambia National Action Programme for Implementation of UNCCD**

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?

2014–2015

Qualitative assessment

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

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

If yes, which type of assistance have you received?

- **Technical support**
 - **Financial support**
-

Operational Objective 5: Financing and technology transfer

Performance indicator CONS-O-14 for Outcome 5.1

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?

Yes

If yes, specify when it was developed.

No answer provided.

Is your country's IIF based on the NAP?

Yes

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

- GM

Other (specify)

No answer required.

If assisted, which type of assistance did you receive?

- Technical support
- Financial support

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

Yes

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?

Yes

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

Yes

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.

At the time of reporting the development of draft IIFS was being finalised. Implementation would start later.

Sources of information

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

- Global Mechanism of the UNCCD
Reports filed in the Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (Natural Resources and environmental Protection Department)

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?

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 | 2 |
| Human resources constraints | 4 |
| Lack of coordination among relevant ministries and unclear attribution of responsibilities | 3 |
| Lack of coordination among those providing support | 0 |
| National bilateral and multilateral resources are too diverse; cannot be realistically coordinated under one umbrella. | 0 |
| Other | --- |

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

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

Fairly timely

Predictability of bilateral assistance

Fairly predictable

Provide narrative justification on your above rating

Zambia has and is implementing two SLM related projects with support from GEF. Although disbursement of funds, through UNDP is fairly timely, there is much room for more projects to be implemented. One area giving great challenges is management of wetlands in Zambia. As key sources of livelihoods, wetlands, some of which are Ramsar Sites, have huge socio-economic implications to a greater number of local Zambia. Therefore, a new and increased level of investment in natural resources management is desirable.

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.

No answer provided.

Qualitative assessment

Did you receive assistance in raising resources from bilateral donors?

Yes

If yes, from whom?

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

Other (specify)

Treasury of the Government of the Republic of Zambia

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

| Biennium | Submitted (pipeline) | Ongoing |
|-----------|----------------------|---------|
| 2010–2011 | 15 | 8 |

Amount of funds raised, by biennium

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

| Biennium | Currency | Total amount |
|-----------|----------|--------------|
| 2010–2011 | USD | 20000000 |

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 | 25 |
| International sources | 75 |

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 | 4 |
| Increased capacities of national stakeholders to prepare applications | 4 |
| Major natural hazards occurred at the national level considerably increased the level of resources made available by the international community | 3 |
| Access to funding is increasingly facilitated by third parties such as the private sector | 3 |
| Existence of a financing strategy (IFS or others) | 0 |
| Other | --- |

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

Reasons for decreasing

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

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

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

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 | USD | 0 |
| 2011 | USD | 0 |

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 | --- | --- |
| 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.)

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.

No answer provided.

Sources of information

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

- Economic Reports of Zambia
Fifth National Development Plan 2006-2010
Sixth National Development Plan 2006-2010

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 answer provided.

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?

2014–2015

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 | 4 |
| There are not enough resources to apply financial or fiscal incentives | 2 |
| The national financial and credit systems (banks, credit agencies, etc) are not supportive | 4 |
| Other | --- |

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

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)

No answer provided.

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 | --- |
| Lack of fixed infrastructure for accessing technologies (those created on an ad hoc basis disappear once the support ends) | --- |
| Lack of capacities for operation and maintenance of technologies | --- |
| Lack of enabling policy and regulatory environments | --- |
| Other | --- |

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

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 — Development of Integrated Investment and Financing Strategy for Sustainable Land Management in Zambia

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

- **Zambia - CCD Focal Point - Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources**

Other

- **UNCCD National Focal Point: Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (Zambia)**

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

- **Global Mechanism**

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

Development of Integrated Investment and Financing Strategy for Sustainable Land Management in Zambia

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

- **Africa**
 - **Southern Africa**
 - **Zambia**
-

Recipient organization(s)

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

- **Zambia - CCD Focal Point - Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources**

Other

- **Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection**
-

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

2009-12-15

Amount committed

Enter the total amount of money committed

750000 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

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

No answer provided.

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).

- **2 Capacity Development and Planning**
 - **2.1 Advocacy and Awareness Raising**
 - **2.1.1 Public Awareness Campaigns**
 - **2.1.2 Publications and communication material**
 - **2.1.3 Consultative platforms**
 - **2.2 Enabling Activities**
 - **2.2.5 Integrated Financing Strategies**
-

Sources of information

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

- **Government Documents filed by Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection
The Global Mechanism**

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 #2 — Strengthening Management Effectiveness and Generating Multiple Environmental Benefits within and around Protected Areas in Zambia

Reporting entity(ies)

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

No answer provided.

Other

- **UNCCD National Focal Point (Zambia)- Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection.**
-

Identification code

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

GEF Project ID: 4629

Title

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

Strengthening Management Effectiveness and Generating Multiple Environmental Benefits within and around Protected Areas in Zambia

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.)
Executing Agency

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

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

- • **The Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) as an agency under the MTENR and the main national institution responsible for the management of the wildlife estate in Zambia will be the key partner for implementing Component 1, building the PA system at national level, and focusing on two target core Nation**
 - • **Local communities and Community Resource Boards in the four target GMAs, as well as the traditional Chiefs of the area, and District Councils, will be key role-players in Components 2 and 3, undertaking joint management and planning for the GMAs and supporting the introduction of the new technolog**
 - • **Private Sector Tourism Investors will be key both in GMAs and in the two NPs targeted - better protected area management practices will result in improved wildlife estates, which will lead to an increase in the flow of photographic safari tourists as well to an increase in hunting concessions in r**
 - • **Tertiary institutions, in particular the University of Zambia and the Copperbelt University are expected to play a role in research efforts supporting the project, in the charcoal technology and on remote sensing and land cover data.**
-

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

- **Africa**
 - **Southern Africa**
 - **Zambia**
-

Target area size/administrative unit

Area Size

Indicate the total area expressed in number of hectares

5000000 hectares

Administrative Unit

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

in selected protected areas (including core National Parks and buffer Game Management Areas)

Target Group

No answer provided.

Beneficiaries

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

13000000

Start date

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

2012-01-01

Completion date

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

2017-12-31

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

United Nations Development Programme

Source (other)

Global Environment Facility (GEF)

Currency

USD

Amount

13148864

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

2

UNFCCC mitigation

2

CBD

2

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.

- **311 AGRICULTURE**
- **312 FORESTRY**
- **313 FISHING**
- **332 TOURISM**
- **400 MULTISECTOR/CROSS-CUTTING**
- **160 OTHER SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES**
- **16061 Culture and recreation**
- **16040 Low-cost housing**
- **16010 Social/ welfare services**
- **31130 Agricultural land resources**
- **31140 Agricultural water resources**
- **31161 Food crop production**
- **31163 Livestock**
- **31165 Agricultural alternative development**
- **31166 Agricultural extension**
- **31220 Forestry development**
- **31261 Fuelwood/charcoal**
- **31281 Forestry education/training**
- **31282 Forestry research**
- **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 Capacity Development and Planning
- 2.1 Advocacy and Awareness Raising
- 2.2 Enabling Activities
- 2.2.1 Capacity-Building
- 2.2.10 Resource Management Planning
- 2.2.11 Services and Infrastructure
- 2.2.2 Community Development
- 2.2.3 Drivers and Incentives
- 2.2.4 Action Programmes
- 2.2.5 Integrated Financing Strategies
- 2.2.7 Mainstreaming
- 2.2.8 Partnership Building
- 2.2.9 Project Development
- 3 Resource Management
- 3.1 Production Systems
- 3.1.1 Agriculture
- 3.1.2 Forestry
- 3.1.3 Livestock Systems
- 3.1.4 Other Production Systems
- 3.2 Natural Resource Management
- 3.2.2 Biodiversity Conservation
- 3.2.6 Land Conservation
- 3.2.7 Water Conservation
- 3.2.8 Sustainable Land Management
- 3.2.4 Other Resource Conservation

Expected or achieved results

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

- **A. PA system framework strengthened. This includes:** i) Professional development program to build ZAWA Head Office operational and planning capacity; ii) Leadership training program for all Park Managers and Area Wardens (iii) Business intelligence system established at Head Office; (iv) Sustainable financing plan for PA system incl. identifying specific revenue generation mechanisms
- B. Site level operations strengthened for Target Core PAs. This includes for target NPs:** (i) Strengthened system for enforcement for pilot sites; (ii) Staff training for planning; accounting and record-keeping (iii) Business plans developed and implemented (iv) User fees collection system developed
- C. Expansion of PA Core through upgrading and gazetting.** (i) Zoning and boundary demarcation based on land use planning (Component 2) (ii) Reclassification and gazetting of 5,579 km² of forested portions of GMAs in terms of new categories (iii) Incorporation into Core PA management system of newly gazetted ar
- **A. Land use governance and planning in GMAs strengthened:** (i) Multi-stakeholder partnerships established for managing new Partnership Parks / Game Reserves; (ii) Integrated Land Use Assessment plans developed and implemented, linked to the national REDD readiness programme; (iii) Business plans / investment frameworks developed for GMAs
- B. Land and forest resources managed more sustainably:** (i) Farmer support programme providing extension and capacity building on conservation agriculture - fostering natural ecological processes to increase yields, reducing pressure on forests ii) Establishment of infrastructure for new practices in conservation farming; (ii) Research on sustainable harvesting rates for non-timber forest products and for short-rotation coppicing; (iv) Training of Forestry Department officials, Community Resource Boards and village structures on sustainable harvesting, and restoration methods; building of enforcement capacity; (v) Restoration of forest portions by for

- **A. Deployment of low-carbon technologies and development of sustainable charcoal schemes in two target GMAs (i) Community cooperatives formed and trained to operate kilns; (ii) Charcoal retort kiln pilots introduced - 240 (120 in two GMAs) to replace earth kilns; (iii) Monitoring, tracking and licensing system established for all improved kilns**
- **B. Scale-up of improved technology promoted through (i) Integrated national data system on charcoal use and production in GMAs developed; (ii) National standardized baseline developed for sustainable charcoal; (iii) Financial incentives implemented to encourage purchase of kilns by producer associations nationally**

Sources of information

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

- **Strengthening Management Effectiveness and Generating Multiple Environmental Benefits within and around Protected Areas in Zambia (PIF) document filed by Godwin Fishani Gondwe (GEF Operational Focal Point) obtained from GEF Secretariat.**

Attachments:

- [09-22-11 PIMS 4625 Zambia GEF5 PIF final resubmission UNMARKED \(1\).pdf](#), 624.98 kB
-

Programme/Project #3 — Low Emission Capacity Building (LECB) project

Reporting entity(ies)

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

- **Zambia - CCD Focal Point - Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources**

Other

- **Zambia - UNCCD National Focal Point - Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection**
-

Identification code

Enter the Programme/Project identification code (ID) or number, given by the relevant extending agency (if applicable)
UNDP/EU Project ID 00078575

Title

Enter the Programme/Project title, and sub-title if applicable.
Low Emission Capacity Building (LECB) 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.)
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.

- **Selected key stakeholders, including research institutions, academia, private sector, consulting**

entities, NGOs, farmers/cooperatives, and rural communities.

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

- Africa
 - Southern Africa
 - Zambia
-

Target area size/administrative unit

Area Size

Indicate the total area expressed in number of hectares

7000 hectares

Administrative Unit

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

Unknown

Target Group

No answer provided.

Beneficiaries

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

120000

Start date

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

2012-03-01

Completion date

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

2014-06-30

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

United Nations Development Programme

Source (other)

European Union (EU)

Currency

USD

Amount

642000

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

2

UNFCCC mitigation

2

CBD

2

Strategic objectives

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

- 1
- 2
- 3

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.

- **311 AGRICULTURE**
- **31110 Agricultural policy and administrative management**

- 31120 Agricultural development
- 31130 Agricultural land resources
- 31140 Agricultural water resources
- 31161 Food crop production
- 31165 Agricultural alternative development
- 31191 Agricultural services
- 312 FORESTRY
- 31210 Forestry policy and administrative management
- 31220 Forestry development
- 31291 Forestry services
- 31261 Fuelwood/charcoal

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 Capacity Development and Planning
 - 2.1 Advocacy and Awareness Raising
 - 2.2 Enabling Activities
 - 2.1.3 Consultative platforms
 - 2.1.5 Synergies
 - 2.2.1 Capacity-Building
 - 2.2.10 Resource Management Planning
 - 2.2.13 Resource Mobilization
 - 2.2.5 Integrated Financing Strategies
 - 2.2.7 Mainstreaming

Expected or achieved results

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

- **Expected Results**

Outcome 1: Sustainable National GHG Inventory Management system designed

Output 1: Institutional arrangements and process for a national inventory system described

Output 2: Key category analysis improved (e.g. trend analysis)

Outcome 2: Up to four (4) NAMAs developed in the energy, agriculture industrial processes, and waste management sectors

Output 1: NAMA readiness activities undertaken

Output 2: Identification and scoring of NAMAs

Output 3: Prioritization and selection of NAMAs

Output 4: NAMA concept notes prepared

Output 5: Endorsement by government and potential sources of support

Output 6: Detailed NAMA proposals prepared

Output 7: Support to identification of financing

Outcome 3: MRV systems designed to support implementation and evaluation of NAMAs

Output 1: Awareness raised and capacities built on MRV in general

Output 2: MRV systems designed to support implementation and evaluation of selected NAMAs, with linkages to the GHG inventory system

Sources of information

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

- **UNDP Zambia Country Office**
GEF Operational Focal point - Zambia

Attachments:

- [Final LECB Project Document for Zambia - 20612 sig.pdf](#), 936.39 kB
-

Programme/Project #4 — Partnership Interventions for the Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for Lake Tanganyika

Reporting entity(ies)

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

No answer provided.

Other

- **UNCCD National Focal Point: Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection**
-

Identification code

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

GEF Project ID: 1017

Title

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

Partnership Interventions for the Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for Lake Tanganyika

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.

- **Academia and Research Institutions**
-

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

- Africa
- Central Africa
- Burundi
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Southern Africa
- United Republic of Tanzania
- Zambia

Target area size/administrative unit

Area Size

Indicate the total area expressed in number of hectares

22300000 hectares

Administrative Unit

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

Lake Tanganyika Basin

Target Group

No answer provided.

Beneficiaries

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

150000

Start date

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

2009-09-15

Completion date

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

2012-12-31

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

United Nations Development Programme

Source (other)

Global Environment Facility

Currency

USD

Amount

57700000

Item 2

Source

Source (other)

Government of the Republic of Zambia

Currency

USD

Amount

48000

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

2

Strategic objectives

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

- 1
- 2
- 3

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.

- **140 WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION**
- **14010 Water resources policy and administrative management**
- **14015 Water resources protection**
- **14040 River development**
- **14050 Waste management/disposal**
- **14081 Education and training in water supply and sanitation**
- **160 OTHER SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES**
- **16010 Social/ welfare services**
- **16040 Low-cost housing**
- **16061 Culture and recreation**
- **16062 Statistical capacity building**
- **311 AGRICULTURE**

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 Monitoring and Research**
- **1.1 Monitoring**
- **1.1.1 Indicators**
- **1.1.2 Soil Observations**
- **1.1.3 Weather Forecasting**
- **1.1.4 Financial Tracking**
- **1.1.5 Reporting**
- **1.2 Knowledge, Science and Technology**
- **1.2.1 Traditional Knowledge and Best Practices**
- **1.2.2 Bio-physical Research and Science**
- **1.2.4 Socio-Economic Research and Science**
- **2 Capacity Development and Planning**
- **2.1 Advocacy and Awareness Raising**
- **2.1.1 Public Awareness Campaigns**
- **2.1.2 Publications and communication material**
- **2.1.3 Consultative platforms**
- **2.2.1 Capacity-Building**
- **2.2.10 Resource Management Planning**
- **2.2.11 Services and Infrastructure**
- **3 Resource Management**
- **3.1 Production Systems**
- **3.1.1 Agriculture**
- **3.1.2 Forestry**
- **3.1.3 Livestock Systems**

- **3.1.4 Other Production Systems**
 - **3.1.5 Production Support**
-

Expected or achieved results

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

- **Outcome 1 (Regional Activity) : Regional and national institutions internalize the implementation of the SAP and FFMP and provide institutional support for the cooperative management of Lake Tanganyika under the ratified Convention.**
 - **Outcome 3 (Burundi, Tanzania and Zambia): Sediment discharge reduced from demonstration catchment management sites; with providing significant livelihood benefits to local people.**
 - **Outcome 4 (Regional Activity) : Regional monitoring - management system for the Lake.**
-

Sources of information

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

- **GEF Operational Focal Point and GEF Secretariat.**
Project Documents

Attachments:

- [10-8-04 Annex 3,4,5,6,7 LT REGIONAL COMPONENT FINAL.pdf](#), 1.08 MB

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

Question marked as 'Skipped'.

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

No answer provided.

Which options provided by the GEF Financing for Enabling Activities under the UNCCD did your country choose to apply for?

No answer provided.

Amount received (USD)

No answer required.

Did your country experience difficulties in applying for and accessing the GEF funding?

No answer provided.

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.

No answer provided.

Human resources and knowledge

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

45 people

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

5 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.

It was difficult to access funding for enabling this activity.

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?

No

Did your country actively cooperate with the entities entrusted with preparing the subregional and regional reports (SRAP / RAP reports) ?

Yes

PRAIS portal

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?

Yes

If you experienced difficulties, identify the reasons.

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

| Reason | Level of importance |
|--|---------------------|
| Slow internet access | 4 |
| Complexity of the system | 2 |
| Difficulties in getting access credentials | 4 |
| Other | --- |

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

Accommodation of specific requests within COP decisions

Report on specific COP requests – iterative process on indicators

Decision 13/COP.9, paragraphs 2, 3 and 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.

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 | X | | | | | |
| CONS-O-3 | X | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| CONS-O-4 | X | | | | | |
| CONS-O-5 | X | | | | | |
| CONS-O-7 | X | | | | | |
| CONS-O-8 | X | | | | | |
| CONS-O-9 | X | | | | | |
| CONS-O-10 | X | | | | | |
| CONS-O-11 | X | | | | | |
| CONS-O-13 | X | | | | | |
| CONS-O-14 | X | | | | | |
| CONS-O-16 | X | | | | | |
| CONS-O-17 | X | | | | | |
| CONS-O-18 | X | | | | | |

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?

61-90%

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. The need to have real time data capture from stakeholders other than wait for the end of the biennium
2. The need to mobilize adequate resources to support the drafting and validation processes

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

1. Constraints posed by the lean structure of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Department, the focal point of UNCCD, UNFCCC and UNCBD led to de-concentration of efforts in implementation of DLDD activities.
2. Inadequate resources to cover an increasing level of expectations due to emerging issues

Financial resources

Lessons learnt (report on the 2 most important only)

1. The need to mobilize adequate resources to support the NAP reporting process.
2. The need to have an adequate staffing level to cope with increasing workload resulting from inclusion of emerging environmental issues.

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

1. limited resources triggered implementation challenges.
2. Lean staffing due to no timely recruitment of new staff to fill vacancies

Any other country-specific issues

Any other country-specific issues

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

Yes

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

Category

Funding/resource mobilization

Other (specify)

Development of Integrated Financing Strategy and inclusion of SLM interventions for wetland management

Narrative description

It would be necessary the the COP to request Parties to adopt and exert the necessary political interventions to ensure that the Integrated Investment Frameworks and Financing Strategies (IIFS) are effectively implemented to enable mobilisation of adequate funding/resources for SLM.

Submission form

| Submission form | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Name of the reporting officer * | Godwin Fishani Gondwe (Mr) - UNCCD National Focal Point (Zambia) |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Date of submission * | 14 Oct 2012 |
| Signature | |
| <hr/> | |
| Name of the authorizing officer | Godwin Fishani Gondwe (Mr) - Acting Director of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Department; Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (Zambia) |
| Date of authorization | --- |
| Signature | |



© UNCCD