



United Nations

ICCD/COP(10)/CST/INF.2



## Convention to Combat Desertification

Distr.: General  
29 August 2011

English only

---

### Conference of the Parties Committee on Science and Technology Tenth session

Changwon, Republic of Korea, 11–13 October 2011

Item 4 (a) of the provisional agenda

**Advice on how best to measure progress on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 of The Strategy**

**The development and implementation of impact indicators relating to the measurement of strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 of The Strategy**

## **Report on the pilot tracking exercises for the refinement of the set of impact indicators on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3**

**Note by the secretariat**

### *Summary*

As part of the iterative scientific process reviewing the 11 proposed impact indicators, a pilot exercise with 11 illustrative countries has been initiated, to take place in July–October 2011. The pilot will provide experience with impact indicator reporting by affected country Parties in preparation for the 2012–2013 reporting and review process. This report provides an overview of the pilot exercise and its status as of 5 August 2011 for the consideration by the Parties.

## Contents

|  | <i>Paragraphs</i> | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------------|-------------|
| I. Introduction.....   | 1–7               | 3           |
| II. The objectives of the pilot exercise.....  | 8–15              | 4           |
| Organization of the exercise.....  | 12–15             | 5           |
| III. Participating countries.....  | 16–23             | 5           |
| A. Selection process for funded countries.....   | 17–22             | 5           |
| B. The Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands project countries and<br>voluntarily participating countries..... | 23                | 6           |
| IV. Activities to date.....  | 24–38             | 7           |
| A. Preparation of guidance and resource materials.....   | 25–28             | 7           |
| B. The multinational inception workshop.....   | 29–37             | 8           |
| C. Technical support and dissemination.....  | 38                | 10          |
| V. Next steps.....   | 39                | 11          |
| VI. Conclusions and recommendations.....   | 40–42             | 11          |
| <br>Annexes  |                   |             |
| I. Set of impact indicators and related metrics/proxies.....   |                   | 13          |
| II. Selection criteria for participating countries.....  |                   | 15          |
| III. Timeline and stages of the pilot exercise (2011).....   |                   | 17          |

## I. Introduction

1. At its eighth session, the Conference of the Parties (COP) adopted the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008–2018) (The Strategy). The Strategy identifies long-term strategic objectives, three of which are science-related:<sup>1</sup>

- Strategic objective 1: To improve the living conditions of affected populations
- Strategic objective 2: To improve the condition of affected ecosystems
- Strategic objective 3: To generate global benefits through effective implementation of the Convention

2. In decision 3/COP.8, the COP requested the Committee on Science and Technology (CST) to advise on how best to measure progress with the achievement of these three strategic objectives.

3. In decision 17/COP.9,<sup>2</sup> the COP identified a subset of two impact indicators (indicator III, the proportion of the population in affected areas living above the poverty line, and indicator IX, land cover status) as the minimum required for reporting by affected country parties beginning in 2012. The remaining nine impact indicators were considered optional for inclusion in reports by affected countries.

4. Also in decision 17/COP.9, the COP requested the secretariat, under the guidance of the CST Bureau and using an iterative process, to develop proposals to refine the set of impact indicators and associated methodologies, taking account of:

- (a) The application and review of the impact indicators by affected countries;
- (b) Scientific peer review of the relevance, accuracy and cost-effectiveness of the impact indicators;
- (c) Possible synergy with relevant programmes, projects and institutions, including those associated with the other Rio conventions; and
- (d) Relevant contributions from UNCCD scientific conferences.

5. Decision 17/COP.9 further requests that the CST, with the support of the secretariat, provide assistance for pilot impact indicator tracking exercises at the national level, in particular to those countries that choose to report on the entire set of impact indicators in 2012.

6. The iterative process was designed to be participatory and formative.<sup>3</sup> Over 100 scientists from around the world and across various disciplines contributed to the scientific peer review of the relevance, accuracy and cost-effectiveness of the impact indicators, which was carried out from August 2010 to August 2011. The iterative process will include a pilot trial of the impact indicators. A pilot exercise with 11 illustrative countries has been initiated, to take place in July–October 2011. The pilot exercise will provide experience of

<sup>1</sup> The fourth strategic objective is related more to financial flows than science: “To mobilize resources to support implementation of the Convention through building effective partnerships between national and international actors.”

<sup>2</sup> <<http://www.unccd.int/cop/officialdocs/cop9/pdf/18add1eng.pdf#page=105>>.

<sup>3</sup> ICCD/COP(10)/CST/2.

impact indicator reporting by affected country Parties in preparation for the 2012–2013 reporting and review process.

7. The United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) has been commissioned to provide technical support for this effort,<sup>4</sup> under the leadership of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) secretariat and with guidance from the CST Bureau. The project was launched at a multinational inception workshop in Mexico City on 11–13 July, hosted by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC). A follow-up workshop has been planned for early October 2011. The 11 participating countries are: Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, China, Colombia, Mexico, Portugal, Senegal, Spain, South Africa and Tunisia. This report provides an overview of the pilot exercise and its status as of 5 August 2011 for consideration by the Parties.

## II. The objectives of the pilot exercise

8. The pilot exercise (the ‘pilot’) will inform the process of refinement of the UNCCD impact indicators and will allow Parties, the CST Bureau and the secretariat to gain experience with their successful use in preparation for the 2012–2013 reporting and review process.

9. The pilot aims to produce evidence, examples and recommendations for the national production and reporting of the proposed impact indicator set.

10. As part of the iterative process, the pilot will incorporate and address where possible the findings of the scientific peer review<sup>5,6</sup> and the refinement process of the impact indicators.<sup>7</sup> In turn, the lessons learned from the testing process will feed into the scientific debate in a learning loop, which could result in a further refinement of the set of indicators. One of the critical outputs of the scientific peer review was the refinement of the structure of the set of indicators into a hierarchy, making it possible to distinguish what to measure (general indicators) and how it should be measured (metrics/proxies). The priority of the pilot will be to test the two mandatory impact indicators (see above) and their metrics/proxies (the rural poverty rate and land cover and land productivity/production), but the other nine indicators and their metrics/proxies will also be assessed on the basis of existing data and capacities in the countries participating in the pilot (a complete list of general indicators and related metrics/proxies is contained in annex I of this document).

11. The pilot will evaluate the technical and scientific aspects of reporting, together with the organizational and capacity needs of reporting the indicators. The specific objectives of this work are to:

(a) Assess the availability of relevant data for the proposed indicators in the countries participating in the pilot;

(b) Assess existing and proposed methodologies for the collection and analysis of relevant data for the proposed indicators and their metrics/proxies in the countries participating in the pilot;

---

<sup>4</sup> UNEP-WCMC was selected through an open tender advertised on the UNCCD website between December 2010 and January 2011.

<sup>5</sup> ICCD/COP(10)/CST/2

<sup>6</sup> ICCD/COP(10)/CST/INF.1

<sup>7</sup> ICCD/COP(10)/CST/2

(c) Produce evidence to provide recommendations on best practices for harmonizing future reporting, thereby facilitating the aggregation of data across scales;

(d) Identify gaps in capacity that need to be addressed, and the institutional arrangements that already exist and/or would be needed at the national level for successful compilation, validation and reporting of the impact indicators; and

(e) Contribute to the refinement of the set of impact indicators.

### **Organization of the exercise**

12. The pilot involves a process of multinational and national activities.

13. The pilot was officially launched at a multinational inception workshop, held in July 2011, and will include a concluding multinational workshop in October 2011, both organized by the secretariat with technical facilitation led by UNEP-WCMC. Each participating country is expected to organize a national process of testing the provisional impact indicators and to report their results and recommendations to the concluding multinational workshop. The participants in the multinational pilot inception workshop are expected to lead the organization and implementation of the pilot in their own countries.

14. In recognition of the short timeframe for the pilot, national testing will use only existing and available relevant data and indicators, although it is hoped that new analyses may also be conducted. However, the accurate and complete production of a national report using the UNCCD impact indicators is not the ultimate objective of the pilot process. The main objective of the exercise is to document the lessons learned and make recommendations regarding the feasibility of the use of the set of impact indicators in preparation for the 2012–2013 reporting and review process.

15. Guidance on the technical aspects of the indicators and the national organization of the pilot was provided in the multinational inception workshop.<sup>8</sup> A technical helpdesk will be available to participating countries during the pilot period.<sup>9</sup>

## **III. Participating countries**

16. The number of participating countries was contingent on the financial resources available for this work. Pilot activities are taking place at the national level in the countries listed in paragraph 7 above.

### **A. Selection process for funded countries**

17. At its meeting on 18–19 November 2010,<sup>10</sup> the CST Bureau was informed that, due to the limitations on resources, the secretariat was in a position to provide assistance to only four eligible affected country Parties, one each per Regional Annex with the exception of Annex IV. The Bureau agreed that it would have been preferable for the identification of pilot countries to have been done at the regional level.

<sup>8</sup> See UNEP-WCMC (2011), UNCCD pilot tracking exercise: Multinational Inception Workshop Report. Mexico City, 11–13 July 2011, <http://impact-pilot.unccd.int/>.

<sup>9</sup> [impact-pilot@unccd.int](mailto:impact-pilot@unccd.int).

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.unccd.int/science/docs/Report%20CST%20BM%2018-19%20Nov%202010.pdf>.

18. The issue of the identification of pilot countries was discussed at the Regional Meetings preparatory to the second special session of the CST (CST S-2). A set of selection criteria (see Annex II) was put forward to facilitate the consultation at the regional level and the identification of the pilot countries. Based on the deliberations of the Regional Meetings, two pilot countries were identified: China from Annex II and Armenia from Annex V. Based on the expressions of interest received at the Regional Meetings, a list of countries willing to participate in the pilot exercise was prepared for Annex I and III.

19. At its meeting on 19 February 2011,<sup>11</sup> the CST Bureau agreed to select the remaining pilot countries using electronic communications.

20. In order to support the CST Bureau in identifying the pilot countries, the secretariat prepared a compilation of information extracted from the reports submitted to the performance review and assessment of implementation system (PRAIS) in 2010, and from two questionnaires on the set of impact indicators submitted to all country Parties in 2009.<sup>12</sup> Preliminary information on the countries willing to participate in the pilot exercise was gathered from these reports and questionnaires: (a) the existence of a monitoring system for desertification/land degradation and drought (DLDD), or of an environmental monitoring system partially covering DLDD, at the national level; (b) the use of impact indicators and their level of implementation; (c) levels of capacity and experience with impact indicator processes; and (d) the level of institutional arrangements.

21. Based on the suggested selection criteria and the information gathered through PRAIS and the questionnaires, the CST Bureau agreed through electronic communications to select Senegal and Colombia as pilot countries for Annex I and Annex III, respectively.

22. The selected countries received a grant of EUR 10,000, intended as a modest contribution to national pilot expenses, including the costs of communications, internal travel, meetings and external assistance (consultancy). Funding was also provided for each selected country to have three national representatives attend the two multinational pilot workshops.

## **B. The Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands project countries and voluntarily participating countries**

23. In addition to the countries identified at the Regional Meetings and by the CST Bureau to receive financial support to participate in the pilot, countries are participating with the support of the Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands project (LADA) and other countries have volunteered to be part of the exercise using their own resources (see table 1).

Table 1  
Countries participating in the pilot exercise

| <i>Country</i> | <i>Notes</i>  |
|----------------|---|
| Algeria        | Algeria is taking part in the pilot using its own resources   |
| Argentina      | Argentina is taking part in the pilot using its own resources |

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.unccd.int/science/docs/Report%20CST%20BM%2019%20Feb%202011.pdf>.

<sup>12</sup> "Questionnaire on impact indicators in use in your country" and "Follow-up Questionnaire: Recommended minimum set of impact indicators".

| <i>Country</i> | <i>Notes</i>  |
|----------------|---|
| Armenia        | Armenia is taking part in the pilot on behalf of Annex V: the Regional Implementation Annex for Central and Eastern Europe          |
| China          | China is taking part in the pilot on behalf of Annex II: the Regional Implementation Annex for Asia. It is also a LADA country      |
| Colombia       | Colombia is taking part in the pilot on behalf of Annex III: the Regional implementation Annex for Latin American and the Caribbean |
| Mexico         | Mexico is taking part in the pilot using its own resources  |
| Portugal       | Portugal is taking part in the pilot using its own resources  |
| Senegal        | Senegal is taking part in the pilot on behalf of Annex I: the Regional Implementation Annex for Africa. It is also a LADA country   |
| Spain          | Spain is taking part in the pilot using its own resources   |
| South Africa   | South Africa is taking part in the pilot with support from the LADA project   |
| Tunisia        | Tunisia is taking part in the pilot with support from the LADA project  |

#### **IV. Activities to date**

24. The activities undertaken as of 8 August 2011 within the scope of the pilot exercise are set out below.

##### **A. Preparation of guidance and resource materials**

25. In the preparatory phase of the pilot exercise, draft templates and guidelines for national testing were prepared as well as a glossary of terms and definitions related to impact indicators.

26. In particular, detailed reporting templates and guidance for the metrics associated with the subset of two mandatory impact indicators were prepared. These are contained in document ICCD/COP(10)/CST/3 and ICCD/COP(10)/CST/INF.6, respectively. The terms and definitions related to the subset of impact indicators are included in document ICCD/COP(10)/INF.9.

27. The reporting template developed for national testing also provides an opportunity for countries to report additional information on a set of nine voluntary indicators, where applicable and feasible depending on national circumstances and capacities. Guidance on the recommended metrics identified during the scientific review process as a possible basis for harmonized reporting by affected country parties was also prepared. It includes extensive information on each of the metrics, as well as recommendations on the methodologies to be used for the compilation of the mandatory and voluntary indicators, and a country reporting template for providing feedback and lessons learned on the application at the national level of the UNCCD set of impact indicators.

28. Documents developed for national testing are available to pilot country participants via a password-secured website and on request and accreditation from the secretariat.

## **B. The multinational inception workshop**

29. The multinational inception workshop was held on 11–13 July 2011 at the Subregional Headquarters of ECLAC in Mexico City. The overarching objective of the workshop was to obtain a common understanding of the UNCCD impact indicators for monitoring and reporting on DLDD in affected countries, and to create an informal network ('community of practice') of professionals from the participating pilot countries, the members of which can support each other during the pilot process.

30. In addition to Mexico, participants from 10 countries were invited, of which five were able to attend (Armenia, China, Colombia, Senegal and South Africa). Two countries were unable to get visas in time (Algeria and Tunisia) and a further three could not attend the workshop (Argentina, Portugal, Spain). Participants also included representatives from five synergistic initiatives: the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel of the Global Environment Facility (GEF-STAP), the Global Mechanism (GM), the LADA project, and ECLAC-Chile in its capacity as a PRAIS Reference Centre.

31. The workshop programme was designed around three interrelated themes, which were addressed sequentially over the three days:

- (a) Day 1: Producing successful indicators;
- (b) Day 2: Familiarization with the impact indicators;
- (c) Day 3: Designing the national exercise.

32. The programme<sup>13</sup> for each day consisted of a mix of presentations and exercises which were designed to promote the development and implementation of national indicators for use in the pilot exercise.

33. During the first day, the objectives and terms of reference for the pilot exercise were reiterated and pilot countries shared their national experiences with impact indicators relevant to DLDD. Participants summarized the status of the National Action Programme (NAP) alignment process, and how areas affected by DLDD are identified in their country. In working groups, participants explored the requirements of successful indicator development and their interpretation in relation to DLDD.

34. Day 2 focused on familiarization with the impact indicators. Barron Orr, author of the white paper "Scientific review of the UNCCD provisionally accepted set of impact indicators to measure the implementation of strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3"<sup>14</sup> discussed the process and progress of the scientific review to date, and its likely recommendations. He outlined how the pilot could inform the review process and stressed the need to harmonize the information generated from the proposed indicators and their metrics/proxies across countries. Participants from each pilot country shared their experiences of how to define

---

<sup>13</sup> See UNEP-WCMC (2011). UNCCD pilot tracking exercise. Multinational Inception Workshop Report. Mexico City, Mexico. 11–13 July, 2011, <http://impact-pilot.unccd.int/>.

<sup>14</sup> 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", <[http://www.unccd.int/science/docs/Microsoft%20Word%20-%20White%20paper\\_Scientific%20review%20set%20of%20indicators\\_Ver1\\_31011%E2%80%A6.pdf](http://www.unccd.int/science/docs/Microsoft%20Word%20-%20White%20paper_Scientific%20review%20set%20of%20indicators_Ver1_31011%E2%80%A6.pdf)>.



and delineate affected areas with a view to identifying, through the pilot, a workable, operational definition that is agreed between countries.

35. Participants discussed their national experiences with data limitations pertaining to DLDD indicators, their capacity needs and the feasibility and limitations of the indicators for both testing and reporting. The Biodiversity Indicator Partnership (BIP) indicator development framework<sup>15</sup> was explored as an example of producing successful indicators and identifying nationally and locally relevant impact indicators. Participants discussed the need to adopt a flexible approach to indicator development and reporting that allows countries to move forward by building on existing experience and skills as well as harmonization across countries.

36. On day 3, the thematic issues of poverty and land cover status were discussed. In connection with poverty, concerns were raised about which measure of poverty to use, while on land cover status, questions were raised about how classification systems were to be standardized and the issue of scale would be addressed.

37. Building on the work and discussions held over the first two days of the workshop, participants drafted an action plan of activities they intend to undertake at the national level to meet the objectives of the pilot exercise (see Figure 1). Although the short timeframe for completion of the pilot presented a major challenge, all the participants agreed that they felt more confident in their understanding of the impact indicators and the purpose of the pilot exercise, and that it would be feasible to implement the set of indicators in their country. Pilot countries also confirmed their willingness to share lessons learned with Parties at the tenth session of the COP (COP 10).

---

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.bipindicators.net/guidancedocumentsforationaluse>.

Figure 1  
**Model timetable of activities planned by each pilot country to be undertaken at the national level**

| <b>Country:</b>                    | WWWW               |     |    |    |     |    |    |    |     |    |     |     |                             |     |     |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----|----|----|-----|----|----|----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----------------------------|-----|-----|
| <b>Date:</b>                       | 13 July 2011       |     |    |    |     |    |    |    |     |    |     |     |                             |     |     |
| <b>Representative 1:</b>           | XXXX               |     |    |    |     |    |    |    |     |    |     |     |                             |     |     |
| <b>Representative 2:</b>           | YYYY               |     |    |    |     |    |    |    |     |    |     |     |                             |     |     |
| <b>Representative 3:</b>           | ZZZZ               |     |    |    |     |    |    |    |     |    |     |     |                             |     |     |
| Activity                           | Who is responsible | Jul |    |    | Aug |    |    |    | Sep |    |     |     | Feedback reporting deadline | Oct |     |
|                                    |                    | w1  | w2 | w3 | w4  | w5 | w6 | w7 | w8  | w9 | w10 | w11 |                             | w12 | w13 |
| Multinational inception workshop   |                    |     |    |    |     |    |    |    |     |    |     |     |                             |     |     |
| Identify stakeholders              |                    |     |    |    |     |    |    |    |     |    |     |     |                             |     |     |
| 1st National workshop              |                    |     |    |    |     |    |    |    |     |    |     |     |                             |     |     |
| Indicator calculation and analyses |                    |     |    |    |     |    |    |    |     |    |     |     |                             |     |     |
| Preparation of draft report        |                    |     |    |    |     |    |    |    |     |    |     |     |                             |     |     |
| Report review                      |                    |     |    |    |     |    |    |    |     |    |     |     |                             |     |     |
| 2nd National workshop              |                    |     |    |    |     |    |    |    |     |    |     |     |                             |     |     |
| Finalization of report             |                    |     |    |    |     |    |    |    |     |    |     |     |                             |     |     |
| Multinational conclusions workshop |                    |     |    |    |     |    |    |    |     |    |     |     |                             |     |     |
| COP 10                             |                    |     |    |    |     |    |    |    |     |    |     |     |                             |     |     |

### C. Technical support and dissemination

38. Technical support and guidance on the production and analysis of the indicators to countries involved in the pilot exercise will include the provision of guidance documents and reporting templates, a website,<sup>16</sup> which also enables countries to post their own

<sup>16</sup> UNCCD Impact Indicators pilot: <http://impact-pilot.unccd.int/>

material, access to a helpdesk<sup>17</sup> for technical support and access to a Shared Document Area,<sup>18</sup> which facilitates the sharing and communication of materials among participants in the pilot. The goal is to build a community of practice among international experts and the indicator originators,<sup>19</sup> and to enable peer-to-peer support and knowledge building. Countries will submit brief monthly reports on their progress in identifying data and calculating the indicators, and be monitored in their implementation of national pilot activities.

## V. Next steps

39. National and multinational level activities within the pilot will continue as per the timeline outlined in annex III. The findings and recommendations of the exercise will be presented at a side event at COP 10.

## VI. Conclusions and recommendations

**40. Having reviewed this document in conjunction with documents ICCD/COP(10)/CST/3 and ICCD/COP(10)/CST/INF.6, as well as the glossary contained in document ICCD/COP(10)/INF.9 (terminology and definitions used, among other things, in the formulation of the subset of impact indicators), and**

**41. Taking into consideration that,**

**(a) The reporting templates on impact indicators for use by affected country Parties have been developed and will be tested through pilot impact indicators tracking exercises at the national level, and that**

**(b) The lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations from this exercise will be made available at COP10,**

**(c) Many affected country Parties at the regional meetings preparatory to CST S-2 expressed an interest in participating in the pilot.**

**42. The CST may wish to recommend the COP to:**

**(a) Provisionally adopt the draft reporting templates contained in document ICCD/COP(10)/CST/3;**

**(b) Entrust the secretariat with fine-tuning the reporting templates for use in the second leg of the fourth reporting and review process based on the conclusions and recommendations of the pilot impact indicator tracking exercise;**

**(c) Request the secretariat to make available and to publish on the UNCCD website the methodological guide to reporting on the two mandatory impact indicators and their associated metrics contained in document**

<sup>17</sup> impact-pilot@unccd.int.

<sup>18</sup> <<https://shareddocumentsarea.basecamphq.com/login>>.

<sup>19</sup> The metrics/proxies for each of the 11 impact indicators were obtained from two major parallel indicator development activities conducted by scientists working with the Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA) / World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT) and the United Nations University, Institute for Water, Environment and Health (UNU-INWEH) / Global Environment Facility (GEF) KM: Land Initiative (KM:Land), and one each contributed by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the CBD. See document ICCD/COP(10)/CST/2 for more information.

**ICCD/COP(10)/CST/INF.6, as well as the glossary of terms and definitions contained in document ICCD/COP(10)/INF.9;**

**(d) Request the secretariat to make available for the 2012–2013 reporting and review process reporting guidelines and a generic template developed and tested in pilot exercises for the remaining impact indicators;**

**(e) Request the secretariat to continue to provide assistance with pilot impact indicator tracking exercises at the national level and to report on lessons learned at COP 11.**

## Annex I

### Set of impact indicators and related metrics/proxies

This table, extracted from document ICCD/COP(10)/CST/2, presents the proposed refinements to the provisionally accepted set of impact indicators contained in annex I to decision 17/COP.9, including metrics/proxies to be considered for testing and/or further assessment/development

| <i>Core indicators<br/>(with proposed revisions)</i>   | <i>General indicators<br/>(revisions of 11 provisional<br/>indicators)</i>     | <i>Metrics/proxies<br/>(operational approaches proposed for testing, where ready, and further<br/>assessment/development where not)</i> | <i>Degree of<br/>expert<br/>agreement</i> | <i>Readiness<br/>for testing*</i> |
|--|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Strategic objective 1: To improve the living conditions of affected populations</b>                                   |  |   |   |                                   |
| <b>Core indicator S-(1/2/3):</b><br>Improvement in the livelihoods of people potentially impacted by the process of DLDD | <b>III Proportion of the population living above the relative poverty line</b> | Rural poverty rate**  | High                                      | Green                             |
|  | I Water availability per capita  | Percentage of population with access to (safe) drinking water   | Medium                                    | Yellow                            |
|  |  | Water availability and use  | Low***                                    | Yellow                            |
|  | IV Food consumption per capita   | Proportion of chronically undernourished children under the age of 5 in rural areas**   | High                                      | Yellow                            |
| <b>Strategic objective 2: To improve the condition of ecosystems</b>   |  |   |   |                                   |
| <b>Core indicator S-4:</b><br>Reduction in the total area affected by DLDD   | VI Degree of land degradation  | A less complex version of Level of land degradation + Trends in seasonal precipitation  | High                                      | Yellow                            |
|  | VIII Drought index   | Trends in WMO Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI) (a meteorological drought index)   | (New)                                     | Green                             |
|  | V Capacity of soils to sustain agro-pastoral use                               | GLADIS “soil health status”   | (New)                                     | Green                             |
|  | II Change in land use  | Land use (in support of deriving (a) VI Land degradation and (b) XI Land under SLM, and also in interpreting (c) IX Land cover status)  | Low***                                    | Yellow                            |

| <i>Core indicators<br/>(with proposed revisions)</i>   | <i>General indicators<br/>(revisions of 11 provisional<br/>indicators)</i> | <i>Metrics/proxies<br/>(operational approaches proposed for testing, where ready, and further<br/>assessment/development where not)</i> | <i>Degree of<br/>expert<br/>agreement</i> | <i>Readiness<br/>for testing*</i> |
|--|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Core indicator S-5:</b><br>Maintenance of or<br>increases in ecosystem<br>function, including net<br>primary productivity | <b>IX Land cover status</b>  | Land cover**  | High                                      | Green                             |
|  |  | Land productivity   | Medium                                    | Green                             |
|  | <b>VII Plant and animal<br/>biodiversity****</b>                           | Crop and livestock diversity (agro-biodiversity)  | High                                      | Yellow                            |
|  |  | Trends in abundance and distribution of selected species  | High                                      | Yellow                            |
|  |  | Soil biodiversity   | (New)                                     | Red                               |
| <b>Strategic objective 3: To generate global benefits through effective implementation of the UNCCD</b>                      |  |   |   |                                   |
| <b>Core indicator S-6:</b><br>Increases in carbon stocks<br>(soil and plant biomass)   | X Carbon stocks above<br>and below ground                                  | Above ground organic carbon stocks  | High                                      | Yellow                            |
|  |  | Below ground organic carbon stocks  | High                                      | Red                               |
| <b>Core indicator S-7:</b> Areas<br>of forest, agricultural and<br>aquaculture ecosystems<br>under sustainable<br>management | XI Land under SLM  | Land under SLM + general indicator VII Plant and animal biodiversity<br>(secondary role) + II Change in land use                        | High                                      | Yellow                            |
|  | V Capacity of soils to<br>sustain agro-pastoral use                        | GLADIS “soil health status”   | (New)                                     | Yellow                            |

\* Readiness scheme: Green = ready for testing, Yellow = requires fine-tuning, Red = requires further development.

\*\* Although named slightly differently, the operational definition of this indicator is very similar to that given by Berry, L., E. Abraham, and W. Essahli. 2009. The UNCCD Recommended Minimum Set of Impact Indicators. Draft Report. Consultancy report (1) for the CST of the UNCCD. 99 pp. <<http://www.unccd.int/regional/rcm/docs/UNCCD%20Min%20Set%20of%20Impact%20Indicators%20Final%20Report%20June%202014.pdf>>.

\*\*\* As a stand-alone metric/proxy, there was limited or divided support for this metric/proxy. However, if used in support of another indicator, the level of agreement was much higher.

\*\*\*\* Also a secondary indicator under core indicator S-7.

## Annex II

### Selection criteria for participating countries

1. The following selection criteria are put forward for consideration by the CST Bureau. The CST Bureau might decide to apply them for the final selection of the pilot countries, if needed. The same criteria could be used to facilitate the consultation at the regional level and possibly the identification of the pilot countries:

(a) Geographical balance: This is a well-established criterion within the framework of the Convention. All Regional Implementation Annexes will be represented in the pilot. This will result in a minimum of 5 countries in the Pilot. Additional countries from one or more of the Regional Implementation Annexes may be brought into the pilot provided that sufficient financial resources are available. However, the available financial resources do not permit the inclusion of representation of all the diversity of countries and DLDD issues within each Regions;

(b) Further criteria for the selection of countries are:

(i) Representation of different levels of capacity and experience with Land and sustainable land management (SLM) indicators processes. Implementation of the Convention faces different bottlenecks and constraints. Testing the indicators only in countries that have high levels of capacity and extensive experience in indicators processes may result in biased results. The selected pilot countries need to be representative of different levels of capacity and different levels of experience with SLM indicators. However, only countries with at least a basic capacity to test the majority of indicators within the timeframe of the pilot can be included.

(ii) Sufficient institutional arrangements to start the pilot in May 2011 and complete it in September 2011. Due to the time constraints of reporting for COP10 in October 2011, it is necessary to have a rapid and focused technical pilot process. Demonstration of the necessary government and institutional support and arrangements to quickly organize the testing and reporting of the indicators will be required.

(iii) Knowledge of PRAIS and submission of a 2010 report within the fourth reporting and review process. Only countries that have successfully submitted their 2010 report to the Convention shall be eligible to participate in the pilot. This is to ensure that only countries with a track record of meeting the reporting requirements of the Convention are taken into consideration. Second, given the limited timeframe for the exercise, it can be reasonably assumed that previous exposure of national stakeholders to the reporting process, and the PRAIS monitoring system and its online reporting module will facilitate achievement of the objectives of the pilot.

(iv) Evidence of national coordination mechanisms for environmental information management, monitoring and reporting. Given the broad scope of the set of indicators to be tested, the existence of environmental information coordination mechanisms would be advantageous, such as a national Environmental Information System, national MEA coordination committees, Rio conventions joint planning/programming or operational mechanisms for joint implementation and experience of piloting integrated reporting.

(v) The availability of national level co-financing. Given that the pilot will be undertaken with limited financial resources, additional national level co-financing

(from governments, donors, United Nations agencies) may be considered advantageous.

2. Subject to the criteria of balanced geographical representation and in line with the principle of cost-effectiveness, language requirements will be considered in order to enhance the efficacy of such an intense and time-constrained project. Operating in two or a maximum of three of the United Nations languages would contribute to reducing translation costs, facilitate the coordination of a global initiative and promote the exchange of information among participating countries.



## Annex III

### Timeline and stages of the pilot exercise(2011)

| <i>Timeframe</i> | <i>Activity</i>  | <i>Notes</i>  |
|------------------|--|---|
| February         | Call for expressions of interest to participate in the pilot impact indicator tracking exercise  | Activity concluded  |
| February–April   | Production of templates and guidelines for the national testing  | Activity concluded  |
| May              | Finalization of the identification of countries to receive financial support for the organization of the pilot<br><br>Production of terms of reference with specification of roles and responsibilities of pilot countries | Activity concluded  |
| May–June         | Finalization and translation of templates and guidelines for the national testing  | Activity concluded  |
| July             | Multinational pilot Inception Workshop<br><br>Establishment of the pilot support website   | Activity concluded  |
| July–August      | National pilot Inception Workshops or Meetings   | The national pilot teams or task forces will each organize and run a National Impact Indicators pilot inception workshop or meeting. The national inception workshops will detail the objectives, organization and workplan of the pilot in each country. This will include decisions about who is responsible for the production of each of the 11 indicators and the production of the pilot report. Key stakeholders in the national implementation of the Convention may be invited in order to inform them of the pilot and to seek their support. However, the workshop will principally be a technical and organizational event, led by the participants in the Multinational pilot Inception Workshop. For each of the eleven indicators a quick assessment will be conducted of whether any existing national or subnational indicators and their methods are relevant and can be adapted, or whether new data collection and analysis is necessary. The |

| <i>Timeframe</i> | <i>Activity</i>  | <i>Notes</i>  |
|------------------|--|---|
|                  |  | workshop will also assess the capacity and technical support needs for producing and reporting on the impact indicators, and consider possible means to address these needs. The workshop will conclude with the definition of an action plan and responsibilities for the calculation of all eleven impact indicators (where possible).  |
| August-September | National Data Gathering and Indicator Calculation and Analysis | The national pilot teams or task forces will carry out the gathering of relevant data and its analysis and presentation as indicators for the objectives of the Convention. The national teams or task forces will also be testing the templates, guidelines and materials produced to assist them, so that they can subsequently be improved.  |
| September        | National pilot Conclusions Workshops or Meetings               | <p>A workshop or technical meeting will be held in each participating country, to determine the presentation of the national results and lessons learned to the Multinational pilot Conclusions Workshop. The considerations will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The effectiveness of the indicators for assessing the impact of the Convention and supporting its implementation,</li> <li>• The existence and accessibility of data,</li> <li>• The existence of monitoring and reporting systems for the indicators,</li> <li>• The appropriateness, ease of use and feasibility of the methods for calculating the indicators,</li> <li>• Capacity needs and gaps,</li> <li>• Institutional arrangements and needs for producing and reporting the indicators,</li> <li>• The suitability of and improvements to the templates and guidelines.</li> </ul> <p>A template for the national reports and recommendations for the CST will be provided. A first draft of the national reports will be submitted to the secretariat two weeks before the Multinational pilot Conclusions Workshop, so that feedback can be provided on the reports to improve their utility and their results can inform the design of the multinational workshop.</p> |

| <i>Timeframe</i>     | <i>Activity</i>  | <i>Notes</i>   |
|----------------------|--|--|
| Beginning of October | Multinational pilot Conclusions Workshop                   | This workshop will start with presentations from each of the participating countries of their national reports using the indicators, and present their lessons learned and recommendations. This information will be compiled and analysed according to each of the indicators and the evaluation criteria and topics already identified. One of the issues to be examined is the question of producing and using the indicators at multiple scales, from local to national to global, with questions about the suitability of methods and data sets and the mechanisms for multi-scale use. |
| 10–21 October        | Presentations of lessons learned at a side event at COP 10 | pilot countries will share their experience with the other Parties   |
| October–November     | Evaluation and Reporting                                   | UNEP-WCMC will work with the secretariat and the CST bureau to assess the results of the pilot. In particular, the national results and the Multinational pilot Conclusions Workshop will be used to draft global technical guidance and recommendations. This is likely to include some generic scenarios, for example, for a country that has no data, a country with an established indicator methodology that is in line with the recommendation, and a country with other indicators/methodologies that will need to be gradually aligned.  |