



## Convention to Combat Desertification

Distr.: General  
24 August 2011

English only

---

### Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention

#### Tenth session

Changwon, Republic of Korea, 11–20 October 2011

Item 3 of the provisional agenda

**Assessment of the implementation of the Convention against performance indicators**

**Preliminary analysis of the information contained in the report from the secretariat on the operational objectives of the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008–2018)**

### **Preliminary analysis of information contained in the report from the secretariat on the operational objectives of The Strategy**

#### **Note by the secretariat**

##### *Summary*

This document contains a preliminary analysis of information collected by the secretariat on operational objectives 1, 2 and 3 of the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008–2018) (The Strategy). According to decision 13/COP.9, the secretariat shall participate in the assessment of implementation as one of the seven reporting entities and shall report on five of the 18 consolidated performance indicators. Since the secretariat is the only reporting entity reporting on CONS-O-2 and CONS-O-12, this document analyses the information provided on these indicators with a focus on the targets set in decision 13/COP.9. Since all seven reporting entities report on CONS-O-3, CONS-O-7 and CONS-O-11, the analysis of these indicators refers to the global analysis of the other reporting entities, which was presented to the ninth session of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention.

As this is the first time that the secretariat has used the performance review and assessment of implementation system to submit a report on performance indicators as part of the assessment of implementation, as well as a report on the implementation of its 2010–2011 work programme for the performance review, this document includes some considerations on the secretariat's schedule for reporting against performance indicators

The document also presents options for the refinement of some indicators and their targets as part of the iterative process.

## Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction.....	1–6	3
II. Assessment of implementation .....	7–27	4
A. Performance indicator CONS-O-2 for outcome 1.2 .....	7–12	4
B. Performance indicator CONS-O-3 for outcome 1.3 .....	13–17	5
C. Performance indicator CONS-O-7 for outcome 2.5 .....	18–20	7
D. Performance indicator CONS-O-11 for outcome 3.5 .....	21–24	8
E. Performance indicator CONS-O-12 for outcome 3.6 .....	25–27	9
III. Considerations on the secretariat’s reporting obligations against performance indicators.....	28–33	10
IV. Conclusions and recommendations.....	34–41	11
Annex		
Template and reporting guidelines for the secretariat .....		13

## I. Introduction

1. Parties at the ninth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 9) adopted a new performance review and assessment of implementation system (PRAIS). The 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008–2018) (The Strategy), contained in decision 3/COP.8, built the foundation of PRAIS and the terms of reference of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention (CRIC) define the review modalities, which consist of two main pillars: the performance review and the assessment of implementation (decisions 11/COP.9, 12/COP.9 and 13/COP.9).

2. The performance review is based on the respective work programmes of the Convention's institutions and bodies, which use a results-based management (RBM) approach, and is to be undertaken every two years at the session of the CRIC held in conjunction with ordinary sessions of the COP. The assessment of implementation compiled by the reporting entities is to be conducted against impact indicators for the strategic objectives of The Strategy (to be reported on every four years) and performance indicators for the operational objectives (to be reported on every two years), as well as reporting on financial flows contained in the Standardized Financial Annex and the Programme and Project Sheet. The assessment of implementation is to be undertaken at the CRIC session held between ordinary sessions of the COP. Reporting is accompanied by an iterative process of refining the indicators and methodologies applied.

3. The CRIC at its ninth session (CRIC 9) reviewed the information contained in reports from affected and developed country Parties, United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations, the Global Mechanism (GM), and the Global Environment Facility on operational objectives 1–5 of The Strategy, which were compiled and submitted to CRIC 9 in the preliminary analysis documents ICCD/CRIC(9)/3 to 6.<sup>1</sup>

4. The present document contains the analysis of the report by the secretariat on the set of five performance indicators,<sup>2</sup> which has been uploaded onto the PRAIS portal. The secretariat is the only reporting entity reporting on CONS-O-2 and CONS-O-12. The document therefore presents and analyses those indicators with a focus on their targets as set out in decision 13/COP.9. Since all seven reporting entities report on CONS-O-3, CONS-O-7 and CONS-O-11, the analysis of these three consolidated performance indicators also refers to the global analysis of the other reporting entities, which was presented at CRIC 9. The secretariat's report on assessment of implementation refers to the reporting period 2008–2009.

5. This is the first time that the secretariat has submitted a report on performance indicators in the PRAIS framework as part of the assessment of implementation or a report on the implementation of its 2010–2011 work programme for the performance review.<sup>3</sup> This document therefore includes some considerations on the secretariat's schedule for reporting on performance indicators.

---

<sup>1</sup> They are complemented by documents on financial flows (ICCD/CRIC(9)/8), on the review and compilation of best practices (ICCD/CRIC(9)/9) and on the consideration of the iterative process (ICCD/CRIC(9)/10).

<sup>2</sup> As contained in decision 13/COP.9, annex III.

<sup>3</sup> ICCD/COP(10)/12, Report on the implementation of the costed two-year work programme of the secretariat (2010–2011).

6. The template and reporting guidelines on assessment of implementation used for the first report of the secretariat are annexed to this document.<sup>4</sup>

## II. Assessment of implementation

### A. Performance indicator CONS-O-2 for outcome 1.2

**Performance indicator CONS-O-2**

Number of official documents and decisions at international, regional and subregional levels relating to DLDD issues.

(See CONS-O-2 in decision 13/COP.9, annex III)

7. This indicator provides a measure of the recognition of issues related to desertification/land degradation and drought (DLDD) at the international, regional and subregional levels by assessing the number and type of decisions and official documents from outside the Convention that contain declarations, conclusions and recommendations related to DLDD, distinguishing between the different bodies from which they emanate.

8. In 2008, reference was made to DLDD in 19 decisions of intergovernmental bodies and six decisions from international organizations, whereas in 2009 reference was made in only three decisions from intergovernmental organizations and there were no references in decisions by international organizations. This does not necessarily reflect a negative trend, however, but only mirrors the number of DLDD-relevant conferences in the biennium. For instance, the Ramsar Convention and the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) each held a COP in 2008 but not in 2009, and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) held the World Conservation Congress in 2008. It should also be noted that in 2009 two resolutions were passed by the General Assembly which made specific reference to desertification and the Convention.<sup>5</sup> In 2008 and 2009, regional organizations made reference to DLDD in one decision in each year. In addition, the reference in the Yokohama declaration reflects the importance given to DLDD in South-South cooperation between Asia and Africa.

9. Reference to DLDD was made in five documents emanating from meetings of intergovernmental organizations in 2008 and in 18 documents in 2009. This increase in numbers is mainly due to the eighth United Nations Forum on Forests, held in 2009. It should be noted, however, that the sixteenth sessions of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) in 2008 and the seventeenth session CSD in 2009 had a thematic focus on Africa, agriculture, drought and desertification, land and rural development.

---

<sup>4</sup> In line with decision 8/COP.8, which requests the secretariat to develop reporting guidelines for the review of the implementation of the Convention for all entities that are requested to report regularly to the COP, the secretariat has prepared a reporting template for the secretariat, and uploaded this template on to the PRAIS portal.

<sup>5</sup> Resolution 64 201 on the United Nations Decade for Deserts and the Fight against Desertification (2010–2020), and resolution 64 202 on the implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa).

**Contribution to the target**

The Convention website has been restructured and includes a thematic database on relevant decisions and documents as part of the PRAIS.

(See decision 13/COP.9, annex III, performance indicator CONS-O-2, target.)

10. Since the information needed is, by its nature, collected centrally, the secretariat is the only reporting entity to report on this indicator. During the reporting period (2008–2009), the secretariat compiled a list of relevant international forums and has uploaded it onto the PRAIS portal.<sup>6</sup> The database allows access to all the decisions and documents listed under the indicator.

11. The secretariat has achieved this target, although the database has been available on the PRAIS portal only since August 2011.

**Additional information for the iterative process**

12. Parties may wish to consider refining the target, since it only sets a milestone for 2010. The refined target could identify a quantitative objective related to a timeline, for instance, “the number of decisions or documents that refer to the Convention or DLLD by 2013”, or “the percentage increase in the number of decisions and documents making reference to the Convention or DLLD by 2013”.

**B. Performance indicator CONS-O-3 for outcome 1.3**

**Performance indicator CONS-O-3**

Number of civil society organizations and science and technology institutions participating in the Convention process.

(See CONS-O-3 in decision 13/COP.9, annex III)

13. This indicator measures the level of participation by civil society organizations and science and technology institutions at the institutional level of the Convention (meetings of the COP, the CRIC and the CST, as well as (sub)regional meetings, such as regional meetings preparatory to the COP). The indicator aims to monitor whether the active participation of these stakeholders in these institutional initiatives increases over time and whether effective mechanisms have been established to encourage the engagement of, and receive contributions from, civil society organizations and science and technology institutions.

<sup>6</sup> The database is available at <<http://www.unccd-prais.com/Home/DLDDDecisionsAndDocs>>.

**Contribution to the target**

A steady growth in the participation of civil society organizations and science and technology institutions in the Convention processes is recorded along the implementation period of The Strategy.

(See decision 13/COP.9, annex III, performance indicator CONS-O-3, target.)

14. The information provided in this reporting cycle can only be treated as baseline information, since trends for the participation of civil society organizations and science and technology institutions can only be identified by comparing participation at equivalent meetings.<sup>7</sup> It is therefore not yet possible to make any statement on this target.

15. The baseline for participation at the CRIC and the CST is the eighth session of the CRIC (CRIC 8) and the first special session of the CST (CST S-1) in 2008. Representatives of 45 civil society organizations (a total of 73 participants), 51 governmental and 15 United Nations/intergovernmental science and technology institutions participated in CRIC 8 and CST S-1. The participation of 29 of the 45 civil society representatives was facilitated by the secretariat. The baseline for regional meetings is 2009, when the regional meetings preparatory to COP 9 took place. In 2009, representatives of 16 civil society organizations participated in the regional meetings preparatory to the COP, 13 of which were funded by the secretariat. The baseline for the participation of civil society organizations and science and technology institutions at the COP is COP 9. Representatives of 49 civil society organizations (with a total of 205 participants) and 77 governmental and 11 United Nations/intergovernmental science and technology institutions participated at COP 9 in 2009, 16 of which were funded by the secretariat.

**1. Comparison with the data and information provided by other reporting entities**

16. The data provided by the secretariat can be compared with the data provided by other reporting entities on the involvement of civil society organizations and science and technology institutions in the field in DLDD-related programmes and projects. Preliminary analysis presented in document ICCD/CRIC(9)/3 of the information contained in reports from affected and developed country Parties, United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations, and the Global Environment Facility on operational objective 1 of The Strategy shows that, in 2008, a total of 8883 civil society organizations were involved in DLDD-related programmes and projects worldwide. This number increased to 10,011 in 2009. In addition, 1707 science and technology institutions were involved in DLDD-related programmes and projects worldwide in 2008. This number decreased slightly to 1651 in 2009. The participation of civil society organizations at the CRIC and the CST in 2008 thus represents 0.5 per cent of the civil society organizations involved in DLDD-related programmes, and the participation of civil society organizations at COP 9 in 2009 also represents 0.5 per cent. The participation of science and technology institutions at the CRIC and the CST in 2008 represents 3.9 per cent of the science and technology institutions involved in DLDD-related programmes and projects, and the participation of science and technology institutions at COP 9 in 2009 represents 5.3 per cent of their involvement.

<sup>7</sup> That is, participation in the COP should only be compared with participation in the COP, and participation at regional meetings should only be compared with participation at regional meetings.

## 2. Additional information for the iterative process

17. The reporting template of the secretariat does not request information at the same level of detail on the participation of science and technology institutions and civil society organizations as that requested by other reporting entities. Less detail is requested on the participation of science and technology institutions, because this information is currently not available. There is a need for participants in the COP, the CST and the CRIC as well as in the regional meetings to clearly identify and register themselves as representing science and technology institutions. Once this information is provided and stored in the registration database, the reporting template for the secretariat should be changed to take better account of it.

## C. Performance indicator CONS-O-7 for outcome 2.5

### Performance indicator CONS-O-7

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

(See CONS-O-7 in decision 13/COP.9, annex III.)

18. This indicator measures the contribution of the secretariat to promoting synergistic processes at the national, subregional, regional and global levels which foster the introduction or strengthening of mutually reinforcing measures among the three Rio Conventions, by counting the number of instruments (i.e. joint planning/programming and/or operational mechanisms) the establishment of which has been supported, either technically and/or financially, by the secretariat.

19. Apart from the joint publication in 2009 of UNCCD/UNEP/UNDP, Climate Change in African drylands, options and opportunities for adaptation and mitigation, the secretariat did not directly provide technical or financial assistance for any country Party or region, but was mainly engaged in liaison with the other Rio conventions to promote synergies in the implementation of the Convention. The outcome of these activities is reflected in the elaboration of a roadmap between the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention for national action programme and national adaptation programme of action alignment, and CBD decision IX/17 on the sub-programme on biodiversity in dry and sub-humid lands.

### Contribution to the 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.

(See decision 13/COP.9, annex III, performance indicator CONS-O-7, target.)

### Contribution to the target and comparison with the data and information provided by other reporting entities

20. The target set for this indicator measures progress towards achievements at the country level. Therefore, the contribution of the secretariat to the achievement of this target can only be measured in the context of the assessments of implementation of all reporting

entities. As is presented in the preliminary analysis in document ICCD/CRIC(9)/4 of operational objective 2 of The Strategy, in 2009, 64 affected country Parties reported 116 synergistic initiatives. Most of the countries have both types of synergetic initiative (joint planning/programming initiatives and operational mechanisms for joint implementation or mutual reinforcement). Of the 64 affected countries which have a synergistic initiative, 16 (or 25 per cent) were supported by developed country Parties. It is arguable that this is more than one-third (38%) of the 2014 target. It is, however, difficult to measure the extent to which the advocacy action undertaken by the secretariat at the global level contributed to the achievement of this target.

#### D. Performance indicator CONS-O-11 for outcome 3.5

##### Performance indicator CONS-O-11

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

(See CONS-O-11 in decision 13/COP.9, annex III.)

21. This indicator measures the presence of DLDD-related knowledge-sharing processes at the national, subregional, regional and global levels, through the quantification of the type and number of existing knowledge-sharing systems. The information relevant to this indicator is mostly provided by the other reporting entities, the role of the secretariat being to compile this information and make it accessible in a database. In addition, the secretariat is invited to list any regional, subregional or global knowledge management system which has been uploaded to the database.

##### Contribution to the target

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

(See decision 13/COP.9, annex III, performance indicator CONS-O-11, target)

#### 1. Contribution to the target by compiling data provided by other reporting entities

22. At the time of reporting (2008–2009), the secretariat was planning to make use of the data to be submitted to PRAIS by the reporting countries in order to prepare the database. The database is uploaded on the website and accessible at: <<http://www.unccd-prais.com/Home/KnowledgeSharingSystems>>. The secretariat has achieved the target, although the thematic database on the DLDD-relevant knowledge-sharing systems has been available only since August 2011. It should be noted, however, that the information required for the compilation of the database was made available by Parties and other reporting entities only in late 2010. Although not specifically requested by the indicator, and in order to measure the contribution to the achievement of outcome area 3.5, the secretariat plans to compile data on the number of users of this database.

23. As is noted in document ICCD/CRIC(9)/5, 308 knowledge-sharing systems and 326 web links were reported by the Parties and three by the GM. The secretariat has compiled all the links to knowledge-sharing systems and made them available on the PRAIS portal sorted by region, subregion and country. The database is accessible at the following link:



<<http://www.unccd-prais.com/Home/KnowledgeSharingSystems>>. The database currently presents a collection of national knowledge management systems, since no reporting entities for subregional action programmes and regional action programmes have yet been identified.

**2. Additional information for the iterative process**

24. Since the target only sets a milestone for 2010 and the indicator could be improved, Parties may wish to further refine both as part of the mid-term evaluation and/or the iterative process. Since all reporting entities report against CONS-O-11, the estimated number of users of the thematic database on knowledge-sharing systems could eventually be reported.

**E. Performance indicator CONS-O-12 for outcome 3.6**

**Performance indicator CONS-O-12**

Number of science and technology networks, institutions or scientists engaged in research mandated by the COP.

(See CONS-O-12 in decision 13/COP.9, annex III.)

25. This indicator measures the presence of Convention-driven research processes by the quantification of technology networks, institutions and scientists that have contributed concretely with their research work to the implementation of the Convention. Only the secretariat reports on this indicator since only the engagement requested by the COP (on the advice of the CST) and/or formalized by the secretariat is to be considered. Thus, for the purposes of measuring indicator CONS-O-12, research mandated by the COP is defined as research undertaken by science and technology networks, institutions or scientists contracted by the secretariat to undertake research on issues raised by the COP.

**1. Contribution to the target**

26. CONS-O-12 does not have any targets identified by Parties. However, since there was a significant increase in engagement by science and technology networks, institutions and scientists in COP processes from 2008 to 2009, a trend may be indicated. In 2008, one scientific institution and three individual scientists were contracted by the secretariat. This number increased significantly in 2009, when four scientific networks, five scientific institutions and 11 individual scientists were contracted. In addition, 218 scientists participated in the 1st scientific conference. The participation of 50 of them, as well as 10 keynote speakers, was facilitated by the secretariat. The positive trend in the engagement of scientists in the Convention processes can be clearly ascribed to the new format of the CST since CST 9, which included the 1st scientific conference.

**2. Additional information for the iterative process**

27. An absolute target for this indicator would be of limited significance, but a trend could be measured from variations in the indicator over the two-year period.

### III. Considerations on the secretariat's reporting obligations against performance indicators

28. The provisions relating to the secretariat's reporting obligations under PRAIS are contained in decision 11/COP.9 and decision 13/COP.9.

29. Annex III of decision 13/COP.9 on improving the procedures for communication lists the secretariat among the seven reporting entities of PRAIS and singles out five performance indicators against which the secretariat is requested to report.<sup>8</sup> However, the decision does not indicate whether this report should be submitted at intersessional sessions of the CRIC together with the other reporting entities.

30. The terms of reference of the CRIC contained in the annex to decision 11/COP.9 determine that the performance review of the Convention's institutions and subsidiary bodies is to be undertaken at CRIC sessions held in conjunction with the COP and should include a review of performance indicators.

31. In response to the COP decisions relevant to its reporting obligations, the secretariat prepared and submitted for consideration by the Parties two separate sets of documents:

(a) A report on assessment of implementation of The Strategy (2008–2009), which is available on the PRAIS portal, together with the present document, and contains a preliminary analysis of the secretariat's report taking into consideration the reporting against performance indicators by other entities as applicable;

(b) A report on the implementation of the secretariat's 2010–2011 work programme and its 2010–2013 workplan (document ICCD/COP(10)/12) within the overall reporting on the performance of the Convention's trust funds, as well as a preliminary analysis of the performance reports of the Convention's institutions (ICCD/CRIC(10)/8).

32. In order to avoid duplication of information, Parties may wish to advise on how to further improve the reporting process and consider the following options:

(a) **Maintaining the status quo:** The secretariat reports against the consolidated performance indicators and uploads them on to the PRAIS portal. The analysis of the secretariat is presented at CRIC sessions held in conjunction with the COP in a separate document, which makes reference to the information on the assessment of implementation provided by the other reporting entities;

(b) **Reporting streamlined:** The secretariat reports against the consolidated performance indicators and submits its information, together with the other reporting entities, to the CRIC sessions held between ordinary sessions of the COP. The analysis of the secretariat's performance indicators is undertaken together with the analysis of the other reporting entities and is presented in the same document as the assessment of implementation.

(c) **Merging performance reporting:** The secretariat reports against performance indicators as part of the performance review undertaken in CRIC sessions held in conjunction with the COP. Performance indicators on the secretariat's workplans and programmes are harmonized and complementary to those indicated in decision 13/COP.9, and the secretariat submits a single, consolidated report to the CRIC on its performance relating to the biennium in which the performance review takes place. The baseline established for 2008–2009, however, will be applied to measure progress.

---

<sup>8</sup> Paragraph 8, annex III, decision 13/COP.9 determines that the secretariat is requested to report on indicators CONS-O-2, CONS-O-3, CONS-O-7, CONS-O-11 and CONS-O-12.

33. Although the GM has already been given a specific timeline for reporting on assessment of implementation (i.e. at sessions held in between the sessions of the COP), Parties may wish to align the timeframes and the content of the reporting obligations of the Convention's two institutions to facilitate review by the CRIC.

#### **IV. Conclusions and recommendations**

34. As regards CONS-O-2, it could be stated that the secretariat achieved the target set for 2010 to upload a thematic database on relevant decisions and documents as part of the PRAIS, although the database has been accessible online only since August 2011. After reaching this target, a new target should be adopted that could refer to the number of decisions and documents making reference to the Convention and DLD in a given period.

35. No numeric targets against which progress can be measured are associated with CONS-O-3. It aims, instead, to achieve a steady growth in participation by civil society organizations and science and technology institutions in the Convention process. The information provided for 2008–2009 can only be treated as baseline information, since trends in participation at official meetings can only be measured over time.

36. The secretariat does not directly support initiatives at the national level, but does promote synergistic planning and implementation, mainly through liaison with the other Rio conventions. Since the target set for CONS-O-7 measures progress towards achievements at the country level, this indicator can be analysed only in the context of the assessment of implementation of all reporting entities. It is, however, difficult to measure the extent to which global advocacy by the secretariat contributed to the achievement of this target.

37. With regard to CONS-O-11, it could be stated that the secretariat has achieved the target, although the thematic database on DLDD-relevant knowledge-sharing systems has been accessible only since August 2011. As is noted above, the information required for the compilation of the database was made available by Parties and other reporting entities only in late 2010. The target needs to be further refined by requesting, for example, information on the number of users' knowledge-sharing systems in a given period of time.

38. CONS-O-12 does not define any targets. However, a significant increase in engagement by science and technology networks, institutions or scientists in the COP processes is reported (2008 to 2009). This positive trend could be ascribed to the new format of the CST, which since CST 9 had included a scientific conference.

39. The guidance provided by decision 13/COP.9 and decision 11/COP.9 leaves space for interpretation on when the secretariat should submit its report on the assessment of implementation. For this reporting cycle the assessment of implementation by the secretariat was undertaken in conjunction with the ordinary CRIC sessions, and is presented in this document.

40. However, as an alternative, for future reporting cycles the secretariat could undertake the assessment of implementation together with the other reporting entities, or link the analysis of the five consolidated performance indicators more closely to the performance review of the secretariat. In this regard, the document suggests three alternative approaches for the assessment of implementation and the performance review of the secretariat (see para. 32). On the one hand, an analysis of the linkages of the consolidated performance indicator with the secretariat work

programmes indicates that there is a high level of congruence between the consolidated performance indicators against which the secretariat is requested to report as part of the assessment of implementation and the indicators on the secretariat's work programme related to the same outcome areas. This provides an argument for linking the assessment of implementation by the secretariat more closely with the performance review or even for integrating the consolidated indicators into the secretariat's work programme, making their review an integral part of the performance review. On the other hand, having a separate assessment of implementation linked to the assessments of the other reporting entities might be considered valuable as additional information may be derived that is necessary for a comprehensive assessment.

41. Parties at CRIC 10 may wish to:

- (a) Review the baseline information for the five performance indicators and make recommendations on the contribution of the secretariat to the achievement of the three related outcome areas;
- (b) Consider the three options put forward in paragraph 32, on the synchronization and streamlining of the reports of the Convention's institutions;
- (c) Consider the options for further refinement of the targets for the five performance indicators proposed in the present document, as part of the iterative process or the mid-term evaluation.

## Annex

### Template and reporting guidelines for the secretariat

#### Contents

	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction.....	14
II. Template and reporting guidelines .....	16
A. General information.....	16
B. Table of contents.....	16
C. Performance indicators .....	17
D. Additional information .....	36
E. Best practices.....	39

## I. Introduction

1. Decisions 1/COP.9 and 13/COP.9, paragraphs 8 and 5, respectively, requested the secretariat, together with the GM and in collaboration with the UNEP/GEF capacity building initiative, to facilitate the reporting process of Parties and reporting entities and to prepare reporting tools for the fourth reporting cycle in 2010.
2. The information provided by Parties and by the Convention's institutions and subsidiary bodies through their reports is an integral part of the performance review and assessment of implementation system (PRAIS) established by decision 12/COP.9. According to decision 11/COP.9, this information will allow the CRIC to perform the functions of assessing the implementation of the Convention and The Strategy (2008–2018), of reviewing the performance of the Convention's institutions and subsidiary bodies following a result-based management approach (RBM), and of reviewing and compiling best practices on the implementation of the Convention.
3. The attachment to decision 13/COP.9, paragraph 6, requests the Convention's institutions and subsidiary bodies to submit a performance report of the last biennium to each session of the CRIC held in conjunction with ordinary sessions of the COP. These performance reports are structured along a RBM approach on the basis of the adopted work plans and programmes of work.
4. Besides the performance reports, according to paragraphs 7 and 8 of the attachment, the Convention's institutions are requested to report on some of the performance indicators provisionally adopted by decision 13/COP.9, on best practices and on any additional information related to reporting that may improve the overall monitoring process of the Convention. This reporting shall be harmonized with the reporting tools used by other reporting entities, to foster, overall, the maximum possible coherence of the reporting system of UNCCD.
5. The reporting tools of the stakeholders under review within the assessment of implementation (affected country Parties, developed country Parties, the Global Mechanism, United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations, entities reporting on the implementation of subregional and regional action programmes, the Global Environment Facility and, possibly, civil society organizations) have been developed along nine main building blocks.

1. General information
2. Table of contents
3. Impact indicators for strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 (DLDD profile)
4. Impact indicators for strategic objective 4
5. Performance indicators
6. Standard Financial Annex
7. Programme and Project Sheet
8. Additional information
9. Best practices

6. For coherence purposes, the secretariat's additional reporting will be structured against the same blocks, namely those blocks covering the reporting requirements set by decision 13/COP.9, paragraphs 7 and 8 of the attachment.

7. This document presents the reporting guidelines for the secretariat related to blocks 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9 (shaded blocks). The guidelines are based on the provisions of Annex III and V of decision 13/COP.9 specifying performance indicators, their reporting attribution, baseline and targets, and the thematic topics to be covered by collected best practices.

8. Decision 13/COP.9, paragraph 8, invites Parties and other reporting entities to refer to common terminology and definitions. Therefore, these guidelines should be read in conjunction with a glossary, common to all reporting entities and presented in a separate document.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Glossary Document, Title and Internet link to be added when posted on website.

## II. Template and reporting guidelines

### A. General information

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE REPORTING ENTITY	
Reporting Convention's institution	UNCC secretariat
Name and surname of the person submitting the report	Mr. Luc Gnacadja
Affiliation and contact details	Executive Secretary United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification UNCCD Secretariat P.O. Box 260129 D-53153 Bonn, Germany secretariat@unccd.int

### B. Table of contents

1. The table of contents of the report submitted by the secretariat includes:
  1. General information on the reporting entity (see paragraph II.A of the guidelines)
  2. Report on performance indicators (see paragraph II.C of the guidelines)
    - 1) *template for CONS-O-2*
    - 2) *template for CONS-O-3*
    - 3) *template for CONS-O-7*
    - 4) *template for CONS-O-11*
    - 5) *template for CONS-O-12*
  3. Report on the additional section (see paragraph II.D of the guidelines)
    - 1) *Additional section template*
  4. Report on best practices (see paragraph II.E of the guidelines)
    - 1) *Best practices templates*



### C. Performance indicators

2. Performance indicators are for measuring progress against the five operational objectives of The Strategy, in line with decision 3/COP.8. The year 2008 (the first year of the Strategy) serves as the baseline year.

3. The secretariat is requested to report on the following five performance indicators out of the eighteen consolidated performance indicators presented in ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.1 and Add.2.

Outcome	Indicator n°	Indicator name
1.2	CONS-O-2	Number of official documents and decisions at international, regional and subregional level relating to DLDD issues.
1.3	CONS-O-3	Number of CSOs and science and technology institutions participating in the Convention processes.
2.5	CONS-O-7	Number of initiatives for synergistic planning/programming of the three Rio Conventions or mechanisms for joint implementation, at all levels.
3.5	CONS-O-11	Type, number and users of DLDD-relevant knowledge-sharing systems at the global, regional, subregional and national levels described on the Convention website.
3.6	CONS-O-12	Number of science and technology networks, institutions or scientists engaged in research mandated by the COP.

4. Reporting is guided by means of templates, one for each performance indicator. Within the templates, *shaded areas* contain information and explanatory texts and *white areas* are for reporting purposes and need to be filled in by the secretariat with relevant quantitative data, selection of multiple choice boxes, or narrative information. The Section on qualitative assessment is shaded as well to indicate that no reporting should be undertaken in this reporting cycle. Qualitative assessment should be reported starting from the next reporting on assessment of implementation in 2013 using the baseline that was established in 2011.

5. With respect to the templates used for the other reporting entities, the reporting templates of the secretariat, as well as those of the GM, include a section on 'harmonization' where synergies and coherence with the reporting on RBM are outlined. Adopted work plans and programmes of work are in fact also structured against the operational objectives and outcome areas of The Strategy.

Templates for reporting on performance indicators

<b>Operational Objective 1:</b>		<b>Advocacy, awareness raising and education</b>			
<b>Performance indicator CONS-O-2 for Outcome 1.2</b>					
Number of official documents and decisions at international, regional and subregional levels relating to DLDD issues.					
<b>Understanding of the indicator</b>					
The indicator provides a measure of the recognition of DLDD issues at the international, regional and subregional levels by assessing the number and type of the non UNCCD decisions and of non UNCCD official documents containing declarations, conclusions and recommendations related to DLDD, distinguishing between the different bodies they emanate from in order to determine the effect of the decision and document. The indicator will outline whether the Convention receives enough attention in different contexts, including the political arena, whether DLDD issues have the necessary visibility, and whether they are taken into account in relevant policy-making processes. Only the secretariat reports on this indicator since the information needed is, by nature, to be collected centrally. A list of 'relevant international forums' shall be compiled and kept updated by the secretariat and decisions and documents shall be uploaded on the Convention website					
Data needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Information on decisions and official documents directly or indirectly related to DLDD issues and taken/presented/publicized at relevant international forums. For reference purposes</li> <li>▪ Official documents and decisions are classified according to their originating institutions, being (a) intergovernmental governing bodies such as the United Nation General Assembly, the Assembly and the Council of the Global Environment Facility, the Conference of the Parties of Multilateral Environmental Agreements - with the exception of the UNCCD COP – etc.), (b) international organizations, institutions, authorities working at global, (c) regional, (d) subregional levels and (e) any other entities not belonging to the previous groups.</li> <li>▪ Official documents shall contain declarations, conclusions and recommendations related to DLDD. They are classified according to the type of source (international, regional/subregional/national, CSOs/STIs, others), thus measuring the level of involvement in advocacy at different levels and by different stakeholders.</li> </ul>				
Data sources <i>(indicative only)</i>	The Internet, the web sites of the forums, the websites of the organizations dealing with DLDD, hard copies of decisions and documents.				
Check the glossary for	'Decisions and documents' 'Official document', 'CSOs', 'STIs', intergovernmental governing bodies, international organization, regional organization, subregional organization, relevant international forum				
<b>Number of DLDD-related decisions</b>					
<b>Decision taken by Year</b>	<b>Intergovernmental governing bodies</b>	<b>International organizations</b>	<b>Regional, organizations</b>	<b>Subregional organizations</b>	<b>Others</b>
2008					
2009					
2010					
2011					
2012					

2013					
2014					
2015					
2016					
2017					
2018					
Sources of information	<i>Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above (add as many rows as necessary). If reporting online, you may also upload relevant documents.</i>				
	1.				
	2.				
	3.				
<b>Number of DLDD-related official documents, by source</b>					
<b>Source</b>	<b>Intergovernmental governing bodies</b>	<b>International organizations</b>	<b>Regional, organizations</b>	<b>Subregional organizations</b>	<b>Others</b>
<b>Year</b>					
2008					
2009					
2010					
2011					
2012					
2013					
2014					
2015					
2016					
2017					
2018					
Sources of information	<i>Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above (add as many rows as necessary). If reporting online, you may also upload relevant documents.</i>				
	1.				
	2.				
	3.				
Overall target	By 2010 the Convention website has been restructured and includes a thematic database on relevant decisions and documents as part of the PRAIS.				
Contribution to the target	<p>At the time of reporting, is the UNCCD secretariat undertaking concrete initiatives to achieve the target set for 2010?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>If yes what kind of activities is the secretariat undertaking?</p> <p>[Textbox]</p>				

Qualitative assessment	<i>Specify the reasons for the increasing and/or decreasing trend of DLDD-related decisions/official documents (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance )</i>			
	<b>Reasons for increasing of decisions</b>			
		<i>Not important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Very important</i>
	UNCCD policy making process is accelerated by exceptional global events related to DLDD			
	Significant increase of valuable scientific evidence facilitating knowledge-based decision-making			
	Other (specify): (max 30 words)			
	<b>Reasons for decreasing of decisions</b>			
		<i>Not important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Very important</i>
	Exceptional global events emphasise other environmental priorities than DLDD			
	Lack of valuable scientific evidence supporting knowledge-based decision-making			
	Other (specify): (max 30 words)			
	<b>Reasons for increasing of official documents</b>			
		<i>Not important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Very important</i>
	UNCCD policy making process is accelerated by exceptional global events related to DLDD			
	Significant increase of valuable scientific evidence facilitating knowledge-based decision-making			
	Other (specify): (max 30 words)			
	<b>Reasons for decreasing of official documents</b>			
		<i>Not important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Very important</i>
	Exceptional global events emphasise other environmental priorities than DLDD			
	Lack of valuable scientific evidence supporting knowledge-based decision-making			
Other (specify): (max 30 words)				

Harmonization with RBM reporting	Specify the multi-year workplan for the secretariat in force at the time of reporting:									
	<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 100px;">2008–2011</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 100px;">2010–2013</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 100px;">2012–2015</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 100px;">2014–2017</td></tr> </table>		2008–2011		2010–2013		2012–2015		2014–2017	
		2008–2011								
		2010–2013								
		2012–2015								
		2014–2017								
	Is reporting on CONS-O-2 coherent with and/or synergistic to the expected accomplishments and corresponding performance indicators under outcome area 1.2 of the workplan?									
	<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 100px;">Yes</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 100px;">No</td></tr> </table>		Yes		No					
		Yes								
		No								
If yes, specify how the two are complementing each other.										
Max 100 words										
If no, explain any evidence of incongruence and, if possible, provide reasons:										
Max 100 words										
Specify the work programme for the secretariat in force at the time of reporting:										
<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 100px;">2008–2009</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 100px;">2010–2011</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 100px;">2012–2013</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 100px;">2014–2015</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 100px;">2016–2017</td></tr> </table>		2008–2009		2010–2011		2012–2013		2014–2015		2016–2017
	2008–2009									
	2010–2011									
	2012–2013									
	2014–2015									
	2016–2017									
Is reporting on CONS-O-2 coherent with and/or synergistic to the relevant expected accomplishments under operational objective 1 of the work programme?										
<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 100px;">Yes</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 100px;">No</td></tr> </table>		Yes		No						
	Yes									
	No									
If yes, specify how the two are complementing each other.										
Max 100 words										
If no, explain any evidence of incongruence and, if possible, provide reasons:										
Max 100 words										

<b>Operational Objective 1:</b>		<b>Advocacy, awareness raising and education</b>																																								
<b>Performance indicator CONS-O-3 for Outcome 1.3</b>																																										
Number of CSOs and science and technology institutions participating in the Convention processes.																																										
<b>Understanding of the indicator</b>																																										
The indicator measures the level of participation of civil society organizations (CSOs) and science and technology institutions (STIs) at the institutional level of the UNCCD (meetings of the COP and of the CRIC, and (sub)regional meetings). The indicator will outline whether the active involvement of these stakeholders in these institutional initiatives increases over time and whether the secretariat has established within the Convention valid and/or sufficient mechanisms for the engagement of, and receiving contributions from, CSOs and STIs. Other reporting entities will complement the information provided by the secretariat by reporting on the involvement of CSOs and STIs at the field level, in DLDD-related programmes and projects. Additionally, the GM will report on the involvement of CSOs and STIs within the IFS.																																										
Data needed		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The specification of the organizations participating to the meetings of the COP and of the CRIC and to regional/subregional meetings.</li> <li>▪ Only formal engagement is to be considered. At the institutional level, this implies registration of the stakeholders among the participants and their actual participation in the meetings.</li> </ul>																																								
Data sources <i>(indicative only)</i>		Registration forms and lists of attendance																																								
Check the glossary for		'STIs', 'CSOs', 'Convention processes', 'IFS'																																								
<b>Number of CSOs participating to UNCCD meetings (Ind=individuals; Org=organization)</b>																																										
Year	COP						CRIC/CST intersessional						(sub)regional																													
	Funded UNCCD		Funded Other		Total		Funded UNCCD		Funded Other		Total		Annex	Funded UNCCD		Funded Other		Total																								
	ind	org	ind	org	ind	org	ind	org	ind	org	ind	org		ind	org	ind	org																									
2008													I						II						III						IV						V					
2009													I						II						III						IV						V					
2010																																										
2011																																										
2012																																										
2013																																										

2014																							
2015																							
2016																							
2017																							
2018																							
Number of STIs participating to UNCCD meetings																							
Year	COP			CRIC/CST intersessional			(sub)regional																
	Funded UNCCD	Funded Other	Total	Funded UNCCD	Funded Other	Total	Annex	Funded UNCCD	Funded Other	Total													
2008							I																
							II																
							III																
							IV																
							V																
2009							I																
							II																
							III																
							IV																
							V																
2010																							
2011																							
2012																							
2013																							
2014																							
2015																							
2016																							
2017																							
2018																							
Sources of information	<i>Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above.</i>																						
	1.																						
	2.																						
	3.																						
Overall target	A steady growth in the participation of CSOs and science and technology institutions in the Convention processes is recorded along the implementation period of The Strategy.																						
Contribution to the target	<i>At the time of reporting, is the UNCCD secretariat undertaking concrete initiatives to increase and/or facilitate the participation of CSOs and STIs in the Convention's processes at the institutional level?</i>																						
											<table border="1"> <tr><td></td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>No</td></tr> </table>											Yes	
	Yes																						
	No																						

Qualitative assessment	<i>Specify the reasons for the increasing and/or decreasing trend of the participation of CSOs and STIs to the Convention's processes at the institutional level. (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance)</i>			
	<b>Reasons for increasing</b>	<i>Not important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Very important</i>
	Increased networking and collaboration opportunities with CSOs			
	Increased networking and collaboration opportunities with STIs			
	Increased interest in working with CSOs			
	Increased interest in working with STIs			
	Strengthened lobbying capacity of STIs			
	Strengthened lobbying capacity of CSOs			
	Increased availability of funding			
	Other (specify): (max 30 words)			
<b>Reasons for decreasing for CSOs</b>	<i>Not important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Very important</i>	
Worsening of networking and collaboration linkages with CSOs				
Engagement of CSOs is not a priority				
Diminishing funding availability				
Other (specify): (max 30 words)				
<b>Reasons for decreasing for STIs</b>	<i>Not important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Very important</i>	
Decreasing interest of STIs in DLDD-related topics				
Engagement of STIs is not a priority				
Diminishing funding availability				
Other (specify): (max 30 words)				



Harmonization with RBM reporting	Specify the multi-year workplan for the secretariat in force at the time of reporting:									
	<table border="1"><tr><td></td><td>2008–2011</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>2010–2013</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>2012–2015</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>2014–2017</td></tr></table>		2008–2011		2010–2013		2012–2015		2014–2017	
		2008–2011								
		2010–2013								
		2012–2015								
		2014–2017								
	Is reporting on CONS-O-3 coherent with and/or synergistic to the expected accomplishments and corresponding performance indicators under outcome area 1.3 of the workplan?									
	<table border="1"><tr><td></td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>No</td></tr></table>		Yes		No					
		Yes								
		No								
If yes, specify how the two are complementing each other.										
Max 100 words										
If no, explain any evidence of incongruence and, if possible, provide reasons:										
Max 100 words										
Specify the work programme for the secretariat in force at the time of reporting:										
<table border="1"><tr><td></td><td>2008–2009</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>2010–2011</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>2012–2013</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>2014–2015</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>2016–2017</td></tr></table>		2008–2009		2010–2011		2012–2013		2014–2015		2016–2017
	2008–2009									
	2010–2011									
	2012–2013									
	2014–2015									
	2016–2017									
Is reporting on CONS-O-3 coherent with and/or synergistic to the relevant expected accomplishments under operational objective 1 of the work programme?										
<table border="1"><tr><td></td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>No</td></tr></table>		Yes		No						
	Yes									
	No									
If yes, specify how the two are complementing each other.										
Max 100 words										
If no, explain any evidence of incongruence and, if possible, provide reasons:										
Max 100 words										

<b>Operational Objective 2:</b>		<b>Policy framework</b>					
<b>Performance indicator CONS-O-7 for Outcome 2.5</b>							
Number of initiatives for synergistic planning/programming of the three Rio Conventions or mechanisms for joint implementation, at all levels.							
<b>Understanding of the indicator</b>							
<p>The indicator measures the performance of the secretariat in promoting synergistic processes at the national, subregional, regional and global level which foster the introduction of or strengthen the mutually reinforcing measures among the three Rio conventions, by counting the number of instruments (i.e. joint planning/programming and/or operational mechanisms) whose establishment has been supported (technically and/or financially) by the UNCCD secretariat.</p> <p>The assumption is that the higher the number of enabling instruments in place, the higher the possibility of achieving synergies in implementation. The information provided by the secretariat will be complemented by the reporting of other entities on synergistic processes at the national, subregional, regional and global level.</p>							
Data needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Planning/programming documents, information from partnership agreements and programmes/projects.</li> <li>▪ Only operational mechanisms which have the achievement of joint implementation, synergies, convergence, and the introduction or strengthening of reinforcing measures among the Rio Conventions clearly stated in their objectives shall be considered under this indicator.</li> </ul>						
Data sources (indicative only)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Relevant units within the secretariat.</li> <li>▪ Partnership agreements, global/(sub)regional programmes/projects reports.</li> </ul>						
Check the glossary for	“Joint planning/programming initiatives”, “Operational mechanisms for joint implementation or mutual reinforcement”, “Partnership agreements”						
<i>For an indicative list of activities by Parties to promote synergies among the Rio Conventions, refer to UNEP/CBD/COP/DC/IX/16, Annex II</i>							
<b>Number of enabling instruments established at subregional, regional and global level with the technical and/or financial support of the secretariat</b>							
		<b>Joint planning/programming initiatives</b>			<b>Operational mechanisms for joint implementation or mutual reinforcement</b>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>national</b>	<b>(sub)regional</b>	<b>global</b>	<b>national</b>	<b>(sub)regional</b>	<b>global</b>
2008							
2009							
2010							
2011							
2012							
2013							
2014							
2015							
2016							
2017							
2018							

<i>According to the information you have provided above, if you have supported the establishment of one or more enabling instrument(s), reply to the questions below.</i>	
<i>Specify the type of joint initiative(s) and/or of mechanism(s) supported (tick as many boxes as necessary)</i>	
Joint planning/programming initiatives	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Review of national plans and identification of gaps in synergies
<input type="checkbox"/>	Identification of sectors and policies that could benefit from synergies and cooperation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Review of plans and policies to enhance cooperation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Enhancement of the institutional and scientific capacity of relevant stakeholders as well as of their awareness
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (specify): (max 30 words)
Operational mechanisms for joint implementation or mutual reinforcement	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Carry out of periodic meetings between focal points and focal point teams
<input type="checkbox"/>	Establishment of a national coordinating committee for implementation of the three Rio Conventions
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (specify): (max 30 words)
<i>Specify the framework(s) within which the above support was provided (tick as many boxes as necessary)</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	UNCCD-related framework
<input type="checkbox"/>	Joint Liaison Group
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (specify): (max 30 words)
<i>Specify the type of support provided (tick as many boxes as necessary)</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mainly technical
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mainly financial
<input type="checkbox"/>	Both technical and financial
<input type="checkbox"/>	Facilitation role
<i>List the name(s) of the beneficiary UNCCD subregion(s)/region(s)/country(ies)(add as many rows as necessary)</i>	1.
	2.
	3.
Sources of information	<i>Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above (add as many rows as necessary). If reporting online, you may also upload relevant documents.</i>
	1.
	2.
	3.
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

Contribution to the target	<p><i>At the time of reporting, has the secretariat plans for providing support to one or more country(ies), UNCCD subregion(s)/region(s) or globally for the establishment of instruments fostering synergies among the three Rio Conventions?</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr><td style="width: 40px;"></td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>No</td></tr> </table> <p><i>If yes, when?</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr><td style="width: 40px;"></td><td>2010–2011</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>2012–2013</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>2014–2015</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>2016–2017</td></tr> </table> <p><i>If yes and if known at the time of reporting, to which country(ies)/subregion(s)/region(s)?(add as many rows as necessary)(if globally, write ‘global’; if not known leave the reply empty)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.</li> <li>2.</li> <li>3.</li> </ol>		Yes		No		2010–2011		2012–2013		2014–2015		2016–2017
	Yes												
	No												
	2010–2011												
	2012–2013												
	2014–2015												
	2016–2017												

Qualitative assessment	<i>In case the secretariat supported the establishment of synergistic planning/programming or mechanisms for joint implementation at the national, subregional, regional and/or global level, identify the major difficulties experienced in the establishment process (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).</i>			
		<i>Not important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Very important</i>
	Lack of coordination among relevant institutions of the recipient (sub)region(s)			
	Human and/or financial resources constraints of the recipient (sub)region(s)			
	Low political willingness of the recipient (sub)region(s)			
	Lack of coordination among the Rio Conventions' institutions			
	Lack of common targets among involved organizations/institutions/conventions			
	Other (specify): (max 30 words)			
	<i>In case the secretariat did not <u>support</u> the establishment of synergistic planning/programming or mechanisms for joint implementation at the national, subregional, regional and/or global level, identify the reasons that prevented the delivery of this type of support (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance)</i>			
		<i>Not important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Very important</i>
	Not a development cooperation priority for UNCCD			
	Insufficient financial resources			
	No intervention was requested by recipient (sub)region(s)			
	Other (specify): (max 30 words)			

Harmonization with RBM reporting	<p><i>Specify the multi-year workplan for the secretariat in force at the time of reporting:</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 40px;"></td><td style="text-align: center;">2008–2011</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td style="text-align: center;">2010–2013</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td style="text-align: center;">2012–2015</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td style="text-align: center;">2014–2017</td></tr> </table> <p><i>Is reporting on CONS-O-7 coherent with and/or synergistic to the expected accomplishments and corresponding performance indicators under outcome area 2.5 of the workplan?</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 40px;"></td><td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td style="text-align: center;">No</td></tr> </table> <p><i>If yes, specify how the two are complementing each other.</i></p> <p><i>Max 100 words</i></p> <p><i>If no, explain any evidence of incongruence and, if possible, provide reasons:</i></p> <p><i>Max 100 words</i></p> <p><i>Specify the work programme for the secretariat in force at the time of reporting:</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 40px;"></td><td style="text-align: center;">2008–2009</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td style="text-align: center;">2010–2011</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td style="text-align: center;">2012–2013</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td style="text-align: center;">2014–2015</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td style="text-align: center;">2016–2017</td></tr> </table> <p><i>Is reporting on CONS-O-7 coherent with and/or synergistic to the relevant expected accomplishments under operational objective 2 of the work programme?</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 40px;"></td><td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td style="text-align: center;">No</td></tr> </table> <p><i>If yes, specify how the two are complementing each other.</i></p> <p><i>Max 100 words</i></p> <p><i>If no, explain any evidence of incongruence and, if possible, provide reasons:</i></p> <p><i>Max 100 words</i></p>		2008–2011		2010–2013		2012–2015		2014–2017		Yes		No		2008–2009		2010–2011		2012–2013		2014–2015		2016–2017		Yes		No
	2008–2011																										
	2010–2013																										
	2012–2015																										
	2014–2017																										
	Yes																										
	No																										
	2008–2009																										
	2010–2011																										
	2012–2013																										
	2014–2015																										
	2016–2017																										
	Yes																										
	No																										

<b>Operational Objective 3:</b>	<b>Science, technology and knowledge</b>
<b>Performance indicator CONS-O-11 for Outcome 3.5</b>	
Type, number and users of DLDD-relevant knowledge-sharing systems at the global, regional, subregional and national levels described on the Convention website.	
<b>Understanding of the indicator</b>	
The indicator measures the presence at the national, subregional, regional and global level of DLDD-related knowledge-sharing processes, through the quantification of the type and number of existing knowledge-sharing systems. Effectiveness of these systems is measured through quantification of their user-base. The indicator will inform to what extent scientific and traditional knowledge, including best practices, are available to and sufficiently shared with end-users. The information for this indicator is mostly provided by the other reporting entities. The role of the secretariat is to compile this information and make it accessible in a database system. For the secretariat this indicator will thus look at the work undertaken in preparing such a database. In addition the secretariat is asked to list any regional, subregional or global knowledge management system, which it has uploaded to the database.	
Data needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Information from websites.</li> <li>▪ Only DLDD-relevant knowledge-sharing systems and networks shall be considered.</li> </ul>
Data sources <i>(indicative only)</i>	Relevant organizations at the subregional, regional and global level. PRAIS portal
Check the glossary for	'knowledge-sharing system', 'PRAIS'
<i>List any DLDD-relevant 'knowledge-sharing system' at subregional, regional and global level you are aware of, providing an Internet link and estimated number of users per year (add as many rows as necessary)</i>	
Name of the system: Internet link: Estimated number of users per year:	
Name of the system: Internet link: Estimated number of users per year:	
Overall target	By 2010 the Convention website has been restructured and includes a thematic database on knowledge-sharing systems as part of the PRAIS that includes also the information provided by Parties and other reporting entities on this particular issue.
Contribution to the target	At the time of reporting, is the UNCCD secretariat undertaking concrete initiatives to achieve the target set for 2010?  Yes  No  If yes what kind of activities is the secretariat undertaking?  [Textbox]
Qualitative assessment	-

Harmonization with RBM reporting	<p><i>Specify the multi-year workplan for the secretariat in force at the time of reporting:</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="text-align: center;">2008–2011</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="text-align: center;">2010–2013</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="text-align: center;">2012–2015</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="text-align: center;">2014–2017</td></tr> </table> <p><i>Is reporting on CONS-O-11 coherent with and/or synergistic to the expected accomplishments and corresponding performance indicators under outcome area 3.5 of the workplan?</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="text-align: center;">No</td></tr> </table> <p><i>If yes, specify how the two are complementing each other.</i></p> <p><i>Max 100 words</i></p> <p><i>If no, explain any evidence of incongruence and, if possible, provide reasons:</i></p> <p><i>Max 100 words</i></p> <p><i>Specify the work programme for the secretariat in force at the time of reporting:</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="text-align: center;">2008–2009</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="text-align: center;">2010–2011</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="text-align: center;">2012–2013</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="text-align: center;">2014–2015</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="text-align: center;">2016–2017</td></tr> </table> <p><i>Is reporting on CONS-O-11 coherent with and/or synergistic to the relevant expected accomplishments under operational objective 3 of the joint work programme?</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="text-align: center;">No</td></tr> </table> <p><i>If yes, specify how the two are complementing each other.</i></p> <p><i>Max 100 words</i></p> <p><i>If no, explain any evidence of incongruence and, if possible, provide reasons:</i></p> <p><i>Max 100 words</i></p>		2008–2011		2010–2013		2012–2015		2014–2017		Yes		No		2008–2009		2010–2011		2012–2013		2014–2015		2016–2017		Yes		No
	2008–2011																										
	2010–2013																										
	2012–2015																										
	2014–2017																										
	Yes																										
	No																										
	2008–2009																										
	2010–2011																										
	2012–2013																										
	2014–2015																										
	2016–2017																										
	Yes																										
	No																										



<b>Operational Objective 3:</b>		<b>Science, technology and knowledge</b>									
<b>Performance indicator CONS-O-12 for Outcome 3.6</b>											
Number of science and technology networks, institutions or scientists engaged in research mandated by the COP.											
<b>Understanding of the indicator</b>											
The indicator measures the presence of Convention-driven research processes through the quantification of technology networks, institutions and scientists having contributed concretely with their research work to the implementation of the Convention. The indicator will inform to what extent the implementation of the Convention is guided by scientific evidence. Only the secretariat reports on this indicator since only the engagement requested by the COP (upon the advice of the CST) and/or formalised by the UNCCD secretariat is to be considered.											
Data needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Information on collaborating institutions, networks and scientists.</li> <li>▪ Only research and other similar works mandated by the COP should be considered, such as contribution to white papers, engagement in peer review etc.</li> </ul>										
Data sources <i>(indicative only)</i>	Agreements, memoranda of understanding and similar contractual/cooperation agreements with the UNCCD secretariat Institutions, networks and scientists whose involvement with official UNCCD process is registered as individual (national), regional or international organizations										
Check the glossary for	Science and technology institutions, science and technology network, research mandated by the COP										
<b>Number of DLDD-related research contracts/agreements finalized by the secretariat</b>											
<b>Stakeholders/Year</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
Networks											
Institutions											
Individual scientists											
Participants at UNCCD scientific conference											
Sources of information	<i>Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above (add as many rows as necessary). If reporting online, you may also upload relevant documents.</i>										
	1.										
	2.										
	3.										
Overall target	No targets have been set for this indicator										
Contribution to the target											

Qualitative assessment	<i>Specify the reasons for the increasing and/or decreasing trend of the contribution of institutions/networks/scientists to Convention-driven research processes (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).</i>			
	<b><i>Reasons for increasing</i></b>			
		<i>Not important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Very important</i>
	Increasing input from the CST in terms of advice to the CRIC/COP on research priorities			
	The successful tackling of the strategic objectives of The Strategy requires increasing reliance on research outputs			
	Increasing funding opportunities			
	Other (specify): (max 30 words)			
	<b><i>Reasons for decreasing</i></b>			
		<i>Not important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Very important</i>
	Diminishing input from the CST in terms of advice to the CRIC/COP on research priorities			
	Diminishing reliance of UNCCD implementation on scientific evidence			
	Lack of financial resources			
	Other (specify): (max 30 words)			
	<i>Specify the level of contribution of the research undertaken in the reporting biennium to each of the four strategic objectives of The Strategy.</i>			
		<i>Not important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Very important</i>
1. To improve the living conditions of affected populations				
2. To improve the conditions of affected ecosystems				
3. To generate global benefits through effective implementation of the UNCCD				
4. To mobilize resources to support implementation of the Convention through building effective partnerships between national and international actors				

Harmonization with RBM reporting	Specify the multi-year workplan for the secretariat in force at the time of reporting:																									
	<table border="1"> <tr><td></td><td>2008–2011</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>2010–2013</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>2012–2015</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>2014–2017</td></tr> </table> <p>Is reporting on CONS-O-12 coherent with and/or synergistic to the expected accomplishments and corresponding performance indicators under outcome area 3.6 of the workplan?</p> <table border="1"> <tr><td></td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>No</td></tr> </table> <p>If yes, specify how the two are complementing each other.</p> <p>Max 100 words</p> <p>If no, explain any evidence of incongruence and, if possible, provide reasons:</p> <p>Max 100 words</p> <p>Specify the work programme for the secretariat in force at the time of reporting:</p> <table border="1"> <tr><td></td><td>2008–2009</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>2010–2011</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>2012–2013</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>2014–2015</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>2016–2017</td></tr> </table> <p>Is reporting on CONS-O-12 coherent with and/or synergistic to the relevant expected accomplishments under operational objective 3 of the work programme?</p> <table border="1"> <tr><td></td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>No</td></tr> </table> <p>If yes, specify how the two are complementing each other.</p> <p>Max 100 words</p> <p>If no, explain any evidence of incongruence and, if possible, provide reasons:</p> <p>Max 100 words</p>		2008–2011		2010–2013		2012–2015		2014–2017		Yes		No		2008–2009		2010–2011		2012–2013		2014–2015		2016–2017		Yes	
	2008–2011																									
	2010–2013																									
	2012–2015																									
	2014–2017																									
	Yes																									
	No																									
	2008–2009																									
	2010–2011																									
	2012–2013																									
	2014–2015																									
	2016–2017																									
	Yes																									
	No																									

## **D. Additional information**

6. 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 those entities reporting to the Convention and consequently to make more targeted and specific recommendations to the COP. In general, it allows commenting or reporting upon issues that are not covered elsewhere but that are nevertheless of importance within the framework of the implementation of The Strategy and the Convention.

7. The additional information section allows feedback to be received on the reporting process. 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.

8. The proposed template for reporting is adjusted to the mandate of the secretariat, as requested by decision 13/COP.9, paragraph 17 of the attachment; in particular, it responds to the request under paragraph 7 of the attachment to provide in the secretariat's report additional information relating to the reporting process.

Template for reporting on additional information

<b>ADDITIONAL INFORMATION</b>									
<b>Section 1. Reporting process-related issues, regarding support provided by secretariat to reporting entities</b>									
Financial resources	<p><i>Did the secretariat provide financial support to affected country Parties to meet UNCCD reporting obligations?</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> </tr> </table> <p><i>Provide an estimate of the amount invested by the secretariat into the UNCCD reporting process.</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td style="width: 100px;">Currency</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		Yes		No	Currency		Amount	
	Yes								
	No								
Currency									
Amount									
Human resources	<p><i>How many people were involved in the secretariat in the UNCCD reporting process?</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td style="width: 150px;">Number of people</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p><i>Estimate the total number of person/day dedicated by these people to the UNCCD reporting process:</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td style="width: 150px;">Number of person/day</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Number of people		Number of person/day					
Number of people									
Number of person/day									
<b>Section 2. Reporting process-related issues, regarding reporting process of the secretariat</b>									
Knowledge	<p><i>Could the secretariat count on sufficient in-house technical and scientific knowledge to meet UNCCD reporting obligations?</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> </tr> </table>		Yes		No				
	Yes								
	No								

PRAIS portal	<p><i>Did the secretariat make use of the training on access and utilization of the PRAIS portal?</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> </tr> </table> <p><i>Identify the difficulties of online reporting, if any (tick as many boxes as necessary and rate the level of importance).</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 70%;"></th> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><i>Not important</i></th> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><i>Important</i></th> <th style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><i>Very important</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Slow internet access</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Complexity of the system</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Difficulties in getting access credentials</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other (specify): (max 30 words)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Yes		No		<i>Not important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Very important</i>	Slow internet access				Complexity of the system				Difficulties in getting access credentials				Other (specify): (max 30 words)			
	Yes																								
	No																								
	<i>Not important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Very important</i>																						
Slow internet access																									
Complexity of the system																									
Difficulties in getting access credentials																									
Other (specify): (max 30 words)																									

**Section 3. Accommodation of specific requests within COP decisions**

Report on specific COP requests – <b>iterative process on indicators</b>	<p><i>Decision 13/COP.9, paragraphs 2, 3 and 24 (of the attachment), envisages an iterative process to refine the set of performance indicators and associated methodologies provisionally adopted by the same decision. As a tool to implement this process, the secretariat can provide here its suggestions and recommendations for improvement.</i></p> <p><i>Indicate against which e-SMART criteria the indicator(s) needs to be improved</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 25%;"></th> <th style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><i>economic</i></th> <th style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><i>Specific</i></th> <th style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><i>Measurable</i></th> <th style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><i>Achievable</i></th> <th style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><i>Relevant</i></th> <th style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><i>Time-bound</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>CONS-O-2</i></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>CONS-O-3</i></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>CONS-O-7</i></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>CONS-O-11</i></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>CONS-O-12</i></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<i>economic</i>	<i>Specific</i>	<i>Measurable</i>	<i>Achievable</i>	<i>Relevant</i>	<i>Time-bound</i>	<i>CONS-O-2</i>							<i>CONS-O-3</i>							<i>CONS-O-7</i>							<i>CONS-O-11</i>							<i>CONS-O-12</i>						
	<i>economic</i>	<i>Specific</i>	<i>Measurable</i>	<i>Achievable</i>	<i>Relevant</i>	<i>Time-bound</i>																																					
<i>CONS-O-2</i>																																											
<i>CONS-O-3</i>																																											
<i>CONS-O-7</i>																																											
<i>CONS-O-11</i>																																											
<i>CONS-O-12</i>																																											
Compliance with new COP deliberations superseding existing ones – if any	-																																										

<p>Any other issues that the secretariat may wish to communicate to the Conference of the Parties</p>	
---	--

## E. Best practices

9. According to decision 13/COP. 9, Annex V, UNCCD best practices shall be collected according to seven themes: 1. SLM technologies, including adaptation; 2. Capacity building and awareness raising; 3. DLDD and SLM monitoring and assessment/research; 4. Knowledge management and decision support; 5. Policy, legislative, institutional framework; 6. Funding/resource mobilization; 7. Participation, collaboration and networking.

10. While themes 2 to 7 represent different elements of the enabling environment needed for the implementation and dissemination/up-scaling of sustainable land management (SLM) technologies (indirect impact), theme 1 comprises all actions on the ground that have a direct impact on desertification, land degradation and drought mitigation.

11. In particular, as specified in document ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.5, paragraph 12, theme 1 ‘SLM technologies, including adaptation’ refers to SLM technologies that directly contribute to the prevention, mitigation and rehabilitation of desertification and land degradation on cropland, grazing land and woodland, with the aim of improving the livelihoods of affected populations and conserving ecosystem services. Successful implementation of SLM technologies is the base for achieving strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 of The Strategy. Theme 1 also integrates five of the strategic areas defined by decision 8/COP.4, namely: (a) sustainable land use management, including water, soil and vegetation in affected areas; (b) sustainable use and management of rangelands; (c) development of sustainable agricultural and ranching production systems; (d) development of new and renewable energy sources; and (e) launching of reforestation/afforestation programmes/ intensification of soil conservation programmes.

12. ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.5 provides definitions for ‘practice’, ‘good practice’ and ‘best practice’. These definitions are included in the common glossary that shall be referred to by Parties and other reporting entities while reporting to UNCCD, according to decision 13/COP.9, paragraph 8.

13. The template for reporting is based on the general structure for the documentation of best practices contained in ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.5, paragraphs 40 to 43; it is tailored to the documentation of best practices related to theme 1 ‘SLM technologies, including adaptation’.

14. When reporting on best practices implemented in affected country Parties, the secretariat is expected to have contacted and coordinated with the corresponding UNCCD NFP, to ensure coherence and lack of duplication in reporting on the practice.

**Template for reporting on best practices on  
sustainable land management technologies, including adaptation**

<b>SLM TECHNOLOGIES, INCLUDING ADAPTATION</b>					
<p><i>If your country has no best practices on the theme ‘SLM technologies, including adaptation’ you can omit to report hereafter.</i></p> <p><i>If you have best practices to report on the theme ‘SLM technologies, including adaptation’ add as many templates as necessary</i></p>					
Property rights	<p><i>Clarify if the technology described in the template, or a part of it, is covered by property rights:</i></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 40px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 40px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">No</td> </tr> </table> <p><i>If yes, please provide relevant information on the holder of the rights. (max 100 words)</i></p>		Yes		No
	Yes				
	No				
<b>DESCRIPTION</b>					
<b>Section 1. Context of the best practice: frame conditions (natural and human environment)</b>					
Title of the best practice					
Location (if available, also include a map)					
If the location has well defined boundaries, specify its extension in hectares	<table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 100px; padding: 2px;">Hectares (ha)</td> <td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td> </tr> </table>	Hectares (ha)			
Hectares (ha)					
Estimated population living in the location	<table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 100px; padding: 2px;">Number of people</td> <td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td> </tr> </table>	Number of people			
Number of people					



<p>Prevailing land use within the specified location</p>	<table border="1"> <tr><td></td><td>Cropland</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Grazing land</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Woodland</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Unproductive land</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Human settlement</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Other (specify) (max 30 words)</td></tr> </table>		Cropland		Grazing land		Woodland		Unproductive land		Human settlement		Other (specify) (max 30 words)
	Cropland												
	Grazing land												
	Woodland												
	Unproductive land												
	Human settlement												
	Other (specify) (max 30 words)												
<p>Brief description of the natural environment within the specified location.</p>	<p>Climate: <i>(max 50 words)</i></p> <p>Soil: <i>(max 50 words)</i></p> <p>Topography: <i>(max 50 words)</i></p>												
<p>Prevailing socio-economic conditions of those living in the location and/or nearby</p>	<p>Income level: <i>(max 50 words)</i></p> <p>Main income sources: <i>(max 50 words)</i></p> <p>Land tenure and land use rights: <i>(max 50 words)</i></p>												
<p>Short description of the best practice</p>	<p style="text-align: right;"><i>max 250 words</i></p>												
<p>On the basis of which criteria and/or indicator(s) (not related to The Strategy) the proposed practice and corresponding technology has been considered as 'best'?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;"><i>max 100 words</i></p>												
<p><b>Section 2. Problems addressed (direct and indirect causes) and objectives of the best practice</b></p>													
<p>With respect to DLDD, the best practice directly contributes to:</p>	<table border="1"> <tr><td></td><td>Prevention</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Mitigation</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Adaptation</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Rehabilitation</td></tr> </table>		Prevention		Mitigation		Adaptation		Rehabilitation				
	Prevention												
	Mitigation												
	Adaptation												
	Rehabilitation												
<p>Main problems addressed by the best practice</p>	<p>1. <i>(max 50 words)</i></p> <p>2. <i>(max 50 words)</i></p> <p>3. <i>(max 50 words)</i></p>												

	4. (max 50 words)
Outline specific land degradation problems addressed by the best practice	<i>max 100 words</i>
Specify the objectives of the best practice	1. (max 50 words)
	2. (max 50 words)
	3. (max 50 words)
	4. (max 50 words)
<b>Section 3. Activities</b>	
Brief description of main activities, by objective	<u>Objective 1.</u> 1. (max 50 words) 2. (max 50 words) 3. (max 50 words)
	<u>Objective 2.</u> 1. (max 50 words) 2. (max 50 words) 3. (max 50 words)
	<u>Objective 3.</u> 1. (max 50 words) 2. (max 50 words) 3. (max 50 words)
	<u>Objective 4.</u> 1. (max 50 words) 2. (max 50 words) 3. (max 50 words)
Short description of the technology	<i>max 250 words</i>
Technical specifications of the technology – if any	<i>max 250 words</i>
<b>Section 4. Institutions/actors involved (collaboration, participation, role of stakeholders)</b>	
Name and address of the institution developing the technology	

Was the technology developed in partnership?	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>No</td> </tr> </table> <p>If yes, list the partners:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.</li> <li>2.</li> <li>3.</li> <li>4.</li> </ol>		Yes		No								
	Yes												
	No												
Specify the framework within which the technology was promoted	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> <td>Local initiative</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>National initiative – government-led</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>National initiative – non-government-led</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>International initiative</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Programme/project-based initiative</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Other (specify) (max 30 words)</td> </tr> </table>		Local initiative		National initiative – government-led		National initiative – non-government-led		International initiative		Programme/project-based initiative		Other (specify) (max 30 words)
	Local initiative												
	National initiative – government-led												
	National initiative – non-government-led												
	International initiative												
	Programme/project-based initiative												
	Other (specify) (max 30 words)												
Was the participation of local stakeholders, including CSOs, fostered in the development of the technology?	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>No</td> </tr> </table> <p>If yes, list local stakeholders involved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.</li> <li>2.</li> <li>3.</li> <li>4.</li> </ol>		Yes		No								
	Yes												
	No												
For the stakeholders listed above, specify their role in the design, introduction, use and maintenance of the technology, if any.	<p><i>max 250 words</i></p>												

Was the population living in the location and/or nearby involved in the development of the technology?	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%;"></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> </tr> </table> <p style="margin-top: 10px;">If yes, by means of what?</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%;"></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Consultation</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Participatory approaches</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Other (specify) (max 30 words)</td> </tr> </table>		Yes		No		Consultation		Participatory approaches		Other (specify) (max 30 words)
	Yes										
	No										
	Consultation										
	Participatory approaches										
	Other (specify) (max 30 words)										

**ANALYSIS**

**Section 5. Contribution to impact**

Specify to which strategic objectives of The Strategy the technology contributes ( <i>more than one box can be ticked</i> )	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%;"></td> <td>1. To improve the living conditions of affected populations</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>2. To improve the conditions of affected ecosystems</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3. To generate global benefits through effective implementation of the UNCCD</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>4. To mobilize resources to support implementation of the Convention through building effective partnerships between national and international actors</td> </tr> </table>		1. To improve the living conditions of affected populations		2. To improve the conditions of affected ecosystems		3. To generate global benefits through effective implementation of the UNCCD		4. To mobilize resources to support implementation of the Convention through building effective partnerships between national and international actors
	1. To improve the living conditions of affected populations								
	2. To improve the conditions of affected ecosystems								
	3. To generate global benefits through effective implementation of the UNCCD								
	4. To mobilize resources to support implementation of the Convention through building effective partnerships between national and international actors								

Describe on-site impacts (the major two impacts by category)	<p><i>Production or productivity:</i></p> <p>1. (max 50 words)</p> <p>2. (max 50 words)</p> <p><i>Socio-economic level (including cultural level):</i></p> <p>1. (max 50 words)</p> <p>2. (max 50 words)</p> <p><i>Environmental level:</i></p> <p>1. (max 50 words)</p> <p>2. (max 50 words)</p> <p><i>Other (specify):</i></p> <p>1. (max 50 words)</p> <p>2. (max 50 words)</p>
--	--

Describe the major two off-site (i.e. not occurring in the location but in the surrounding areas) impacts	<p>1. (max 50 words)</p> <p>2. (max 50 words)</p>
---	---

Impact on biodiversity and climate change	<p>In your opinion does the best practice/technology you have proposed positively impact on biodiversity conservation?</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 30px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> </tr> </table> <p>Explain the reasons: <i>max 250 words</i></p> <p>In your opinion does the best practice/technology you have proposed positively impact on climate change mitigation?</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 30px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> </tr> </table> <p>Explain the reasons: <i>max 250 words</i></p> <p>In your opinion does the best practice/technology you have proposed positively impact on climate change adaptation?</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 30px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> </tr> </table> <p>Explain the reasons: <i>max 250 words</i></p>		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No
	Yes												
	No												
	Yes												
	No												
	Yes												
	No												
Has a cost-benefit analysis been carried out?	<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 30px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> </tr> </table> <p>If yes, summarize its main conclusions: <i>max 250 words</i></p>		Yes		No								
	Yes												
	No												

Section 6. Connection to other UNCCD themes													
Specify if the technology relates to one or more of the other UNCCD themes	<table border="1"> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>Capacity-building and awareness-raising</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>DLDD and SLM monitoring and assessment/research</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>Knowledge management and decision support</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>Policy, legislative, institutional framework</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>Funding/resource mobilization</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>Participation, collaboration and networking</td></tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Capacity-building and awareness-raising	<input type="checkbox"/>	DLDD and SLM monitoring and assessment/research	<input type="checkbox"/>	Knowledge management and decision support	<input type="checkbox"/>	Policy, legislative, institutional framework	<input type="checkbox"/>	Funding/resource mobilization	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participation, collaboration and networking
<input type="checkbox"/>	Capacity-building and awareness-raising												
<input type="checkbox"/>	DLDD and SLM monitoring and assessment/research												
<input type="checkbox"/>	Knowledge management and decision support												
<input type="checkbox"/>	Policy, legislative, institutional framework												
<input type="checkbox"/>	Funding/resource mobilization												
<input type="checkbox"/>	Participation, collaboration and networking												
Section 7. Adoption and replicability													
Was the technology disseminated/introduced to other locations?	<table border="1"> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>No</td></tr> </table> <p><i>If yes, where? (add as many rows as necessary)</i></p> <p>Location: _____</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No								
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes												
<input type="checkbox"/>	No												
Were incentives to facilitate the take up of the technology provided?	<table border="1"> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>No</td></tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No								
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes												
<input type="checkbox"/>	No												
If yes, specify which type of incentives	<table border="1"> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>Policy or regulatory incentives (for example, related to market requirements and regulations, import/export, foreign investment, research &amp; development support, etc)</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>Financial incentives (for example, preferential rates, State aid, subsidies, cash grants, loan guarantees, etc)</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>Fiscal incentives (for example, exemption from or reduction of taxes, duties, fees, etc)</td></tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Policy or regulatory incentives (for example, related to market requirements and regulations, import/export, foreign investment, research & development support, etc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Financial incentives (for example, preferential rates, State aid, subsidies, cash grants, loan guarantees, etc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fiscal incentives (for example, exemption from or reduction of taxes, duties, fees, etc)						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Policy or regulatory incentives (for example, related to market requirements and regulations, import/export, foreign investment, research & development support, etc)												
<input type="checkbox"/>	Financial incentives (for example, preferential rates, State aid, subsidies, cash grants, loan guarantees, etc)												
<input type="checkbox"/>	Fiscal incentives (for example, exemption from or reduction of taxes, duties, fees, etc)												
Can you identify the three main conditions that led to the success of the presented best practice/technology?	<p><i>Examples of conditions leading to success may include: highly motivated local governments, farmers organized into well structured cooperatives, extremely favorable weather conditions, etc. For each 'condition of success' you are able to identify, specify whether in your opinion such condition is: (a) linked to the local context and thus cannot be replicated elsewhere; (b) replicable elsewhere with some level of adaptation; (c) replicable elsewhere with major adaptation.</i></p>												

	<p>1. (max 50 words)</p> <p>2. (max 50 words)</p> <p>3. (max 50 words)</p>												
<p>In your opinion, the best practice/technology you have proposed can be replicated, although with some level of adaptation, elsewhere?</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td style="width: 50px;"></td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>No</td> </tr> </table>		Yes		No								
	Yes												
	No												
<p>If yes, at which level?</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td style="width: 50px;"></td> <td>Local</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Sub-national</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>National</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Subregional</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Regional</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>International</td> </tr> </table>		Local		Sub-national		National		Subregional		Regional		International
	Local												
	Sub-national												
	National												
	Subregional												
	Regional												
	International												
<p><b>Section 8. Lessons learned</b></p>													
<p>Related to human resources</p>	<p>1. (max 50 words)</p> <p>2. (max 50 words)</p> <p>3. (max 50 words)</p>												
<p>Related to financial aspects</p>	<p>1. (max 50 words)</p> <p>2. (max 50 words)</p> <p>3. (max 50 words)</p>												
<p>Related to technical aspects</p>	<p>1. (max 50 words)</p> <p>2. (max 50 words)</p> <p>3. (max 50 words)</p>												