



Convention to Combat Desertification

Distr.: General
28 July 2011

Original: English

Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention

Tenth session

Changwon, Republic of Korea, 11–20 October 2011

Item 4 (a) (i) of the provisional agenda

Improving the procedures for communication of information as well as the quality and format of reports to be submitted to the Conference of the Parties

The iterative process relating to the assessment of implementation, including performance and impact indicators, methodology and the reporting procedures

Iterative process: refinement of the set of performance indicators and associated methodologies

The iterative process: refinement of the set of performance indicators and associated methodologies

Note by the secretariat

Summary

The present document offers an analysis of the feedback that reporting entities provided on performance indicators and other elements of the reporting process, as the basis for the iterative process requested by the Conference of the Parties (COP) in decision 13/COP.9. It is a response to the request made by the Conference of the Parties at its ninth session that the Executive Secretary, together with the Global Mechanism (GM), report after the fourth reporting cycle in 2010 on the efficacy of the provisional performance indicators and recommend improvements. The document also offers an analysis of various aspects of the reporting process, such as, inter alia, timeframe, capacity-building, financing, data collection and quality control, and makes suggestions for adjustments.

The Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention at its tenth session may wish to review the recommendations made in this document and propose that the tenth session of the Conference of the Parties request the secretariat and the GM to implement the necessary improvements for the 2012 reporting cycle.

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction and background	1–6	3
II. Refinement of the set of performance indicators and related methodology	7	4
III. Refinement of the Standard Financial Annex and the Programme and Project Sheet		19
IV. Refinement of reporting on additional information.....		20
V. Adjustment of reporting procedures.....	8–9	20
VI. Conclusions and recommendations.....	10–14	24

I. Introduction and background

1. By adopting the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008–2018) (The Strategy),¹ the Conference of the Parties (COP) adopted four (medium- to long-term) strategic objectives and five (short- to medium-term) operational objectives. Impact indicators for measuring achievement of the strategic objectives were also adopted in decision 3/COP.8, and the Committee on Science and Technology (CST) was requested to work on their further refinement. A set of indicators for monitoring the implementation of The Strategy was incorporated into The Strategy but was not adopted. The Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention (CRIC) was given the task of reviewing these indicators.

2. Following the review at the seventh session of the CRIC, based on the inputs received from the Parties, the ninth session of the COP (COP 9) considered final drafts of the performance indicators and related targets. The COP decided to provisionally adopt the indicators and related methodologies and procedures,² with a view to reviewing their effectiveness and relevance for measuring performance and impact with respect to implementation of the Convention at the end of the first reporting cycle.

3. By the same decision, the COP also requested the secretariat, together with the Global Mechanism (GM), to use an iterative process to develop proposals for consideration at future sessions of the COP, commencing with the tenth and eleventh sessions, in order to refine the set of performance and impact indicators and associated methodologies. The COP requested the CRIC to review the status of this iterative process during its sessions and to recommend a minimum set of performance indicators for consideration at the eleventh session of the COP (COP 11). It also requested the Executive Secretary, together with the GM, to report after the fourth reporting cycle in 2010 and 2012 on the efficacy of the provisional performance and impact indicators, with due regard to the process of the CST for reviewing and improving the impact indicators for strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 and the proposals mentioned above, and to recommend improvements, including in the methodologies and reporting procedures included in decision 13/COP.9, based on recommendations from Parties and other reporting entities, for discussion and potential revision at the tenth and eleventh sessions of the COP.

4. The present document is a response to the request made at COP 9 to analyse the feedback provided by Parties and propose improvements. It builds on the feedback that reporting entities provided:

(a) through the section of their reports on additional information, which presented the reporting entities with an instrument to enrich the knowledge base of the CRIC on concrete issues and the constraints that they faced during the reporting process and the iterative process for performance indicators;

(b) during the ninth session of the CRIC (CRIC 9), as reflected in the report of that session;³

(c) as reflected in the report of the workshop for Reference Centres and their lessons learned reports,⁴ written as a part of the “Enabling a Paradigm Shift on Monitoring

¹ Decision 3/COP.8.

² Decision 13/COP.9.

³ ICCD/CRIC(9)/16.

⁴ Available at <<http://www.unccd.int/prais/>> and <<http://www.unccd-prais.com/>>.

and Assessment within the UNCCD” project, funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and executed by UNEP’s World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC).

(d) From the findings of the “Survey on challenges and constraints faced during the 2010 reporting and review process by country Parties that had not submitted their fourth national reports to the UNCCD by 25 February 2011”,⁵ prepared as a part of the performance review and assessment of implementation system (PRAIS) project and in line with the recommendations of the CRIC.⁶

5. In addition, the experience gained by the secretariat and the GM while preparing the synthesis and preliminary analysis of information submitted by the Parties in the reporting process was also used to provide recommendations for improvements in relation to various elements and aspects of the reporting process.

6. This document presents the recommendations for improvements on the basis of the feedback provided both with respect to the set of performance indicators and related methodology and to the adjustment of reporting procedures, which may be implemented in the next reporting cycle in 2012. It is understood, however, that changes in the number and/or formulation of performance indicators, as well as related targets, can only be made at COP 11 in 2013, in the context of the mid-term evaluation of The Strategy, as set out in decision 3/COP.8.

II. Refinement of the set of performance indicators and related methodology

7. Based on the preliminary analysis performed by the secretariat and the GM, CRIC 9 concluded that there is a need to further improve the framework of the reporting process, including reporting templates and methodologies, in order to avoid inconsistencies in the data and resolve the difficulties found in the implementation of the system.⁷ It recommended a simplification of reporting templates, elaboration and clarification of definitions and methodologies relating to the collection and processing of data, accommodation of qualitative comments and explanations within the reporting templates to complement the quantitative data, and agreement on clear guidelines for the preliminary analyses prepared by Convention institutions.⁸ The proposals for further work on reporting templates, including their simplification and accommodation of qualitative comments, as well as methodological issues for clarification, are presented in the tables below. The guidelines for the preliminary analysis prepared by Convention institutions are included in document ICCD/CRIC(10)/14.

⁵ Available at <<http://www.unccd.int/prais/>> and <<http://www.unccd-prais.com/>>.

⁶ ICCD/CRIC(9)/15, paragraph 92.

⁷ Ibid, paragraph 82.

⁸ Ibid, paragraphs 83 and 84.

<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Recommendations for action by CRIC 10</i>
1.1	CONS-O-1	Number and size of information events organized on the subject of desertification/land degradation and drought (DLDD) and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity, and audience reached by media addressing DLDD and DLDD synergies	<p>Feedback from CRIC 9:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Difficulties with the target for performance indicator CONS-O-1 2) Performance indicator CONS-O-1 may be of limited use since measuring awareness is too complex, subjective and time-consuming 3) Impossible to produce meaningful estimates of the share of national population informed about DLDD using existing reporting tools 4) Contributions by local level stakeholders to awareness-raising and education have not been reflected adequately in the national reports 5) Disaggregating data by year was also a problem. <p>Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports, as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Parties reported difficulties in collecting reliable data on the number of persons reached by the various media and noted that, from a methodological point of view, the risk of providing estimates which are not evidence-based is very high. 2) Some Parties also noted that the question whether the information provided in the communication process is part of the national communication strategy addressing environmental issues is too open and needs to be further defined. 	<p>Recommendations made by CRIC 9:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Targets during the iterative process and mid-term evaluation of The Strategy may need to be identified at the national level in order to meaningfully represent the specificity of country Parties' activities relating to awareness-raising 2) Contributions from local level stakeholders to awareness-raising and education should be taken into account during the next reporting cycle by developing appropriate data collection methodologies 3) The methodology for computing the percentage of national awareness needs to be clarified <p>Specific methodological issues for clarification after COP 10:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) How to measure awareness? 2) How to measure the number of persons reached by the media, in particular as it relates to television and radio programmes (avoiding double-counting)? 3) What can be considered a campaign, festival, etc? 4) Which territory should be reported on? 5) Who can be considered a "participant"? 6) What exactly is a "national communication strategy addressing environmental issues"? (which issues does it need to cover to be considered environmental, when can it be considered national, what are the linkages with the UNCCD communication strategy?)

<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Recommendations for action by CRIC 10</i>
1.3	CONS-O-3	Number of civil society organizations (CSOs) and science and technology institutions participating in the Convention processes	<p>Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) Some Parties reported a problem of the limited availability of relevant datasets (no databases readily available for the information requested) and, hence, the amount of time and workload required for collecting data from a wide range of stakeholders (CSOs, STIs) which do not report and act largely independently of the national focal points (NFPs).</p> <p>2) Limited qualitative analysis of the information is made possible by the current version of the template.</p> <p>3) There are a large number of CSOs involved in DLDD programmes/projects that are not accredited by the COP. It is not appropriate to exclude these unaccredited CSOs, considering that they largely contribute to addressing DLDD issues at the grassroots level.</p> <p>4) Some developed countries reported on data relating to CSOs/STIs in their own country, while others also tried to provide information for recipient countries.</p> <p>5) A yes/no question on national contribution to the target is not suitable for assessing real progress against the target of increased participation by CSOs and STIs in DLDD-related programmes and projects.</p> <p>6) For the qualitative assessment, some Parties considered the wording “Not important” as inappropriate, others suggested a more quantitative scaling approach (value 1 to 5 or 1 to 10).</p>	<p>Recommendation made by CRIC 9:</p> <p>1) The CST is requested to provide advice on how to intensify and streamline actions to increase the involvement of science and technology institutions in the Convention process.</p> <p>Recommendations based on the feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) More time and financial resources would be required for systematic reporting and establishing a database for CSOs and STIs at the country level on this indicator, particularly for large, decentralized countries, including through dedicated workshop/events for civil society and/or science institutions.</p> <p>2) The secretariat could provide a simple demonstration database as a data collection tool to facilitate compilation of data in the PRAIS portal, with the aim of assisting Parties in maintaining records of the CSOs and STIs involved in DLDD. This database could also contain qualitative information about the name and a short description of organizations, based on an extended template, in order to build and maintain a database at the national level and to have updated qualitative information about the nature of these CSOs/STIs.</p> <p>3) Guidelines and templates could request more information about actions being taken at the national level to promote participation by CSOs and STIs in the Convention process.</p> <p>4) A scale for rating questions (very important to not important) could be reconsidered.</p>

<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Recommendations for action by CRIC 10</i>
				<p>Specific methodological issues for clarification after COP 10:</p> <p>1) What can be counted as a “civil society organization”? (Should the municipal authorities in the regions be included? Should only accredited CSOs be counted or all?)</p> <p>2) Which territory should be reported on?</p>

<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Recommendations for action by CRIC 10</i>
CONS-O-4	Number and type of DLDD-related initiatives of CSOs and science and technology institutions in the field of education	<p>Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) Parties reported the problem of lacking relevant databases from which to collect information.</p> <p>2) Some Parties were unclear about the criteria by which educational activities undertaken by CSOs and STIs could be identified and reported. This was particularly difficult for educational activities within non-formal education but also for the formal education in cases where participation by /contributions from CSOs and STIs may not have been formalized.</p> <p>3) Some developed countries reported on data relating to CSOs/STIs in their own country, while others also tried to add information for recipient countries.</p> <p>4) A yes/no question on national contributions to the target is not suitable for assessing real progress against the target of increased involvement by CSOs and STIs in the delivery of DLDD-related educational initiatives.</p> <p>5) For qualitative assessment, a more quantitative scaling approach (value 1 to 5 or 1 to 10) is preferred.</p>	<p>Recommendation made by CRIC 9:</p> <p>1) The CST is requested to provide advice on how to intensify and streamline actions to increase the involvement of science and technology institutions in the Convention process.</p> <p>Recommendations based on the feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) More time for the reporting period and additional financial resources will be required to provide comprehensive information on this indicator, including through dedicated workshop/events for civil society and/or science institutions.</p> <p>2) The secretariat could provide a simple demonstration database to Parties as mentioned under point 2 on CONS-O-3 (right column).</p> <p>3) Guidelines and templates could be expanded as mentioned under point 3 (right column)</p> <p>4) Guidelines and templates could request more information about actions being taken at the national level to promote educational activities by CSOs and STIs on DLDD.</p> <p>5) A scale for rating of questions (very important to not important) could be reconsidered.</p> <p>Specific methodological issues for clarification after COP 10:</p> <p>1) What can be counted as a “civil society organization”? (Should the municipal authorities in the regions be included? Should only accredited CSOs be counted or all?)</p> <p>2) Which territory should be reported on?</p>

<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Recommendations for action by CRIC 10</i>
2.1	CONS-O-5	Number of affected country	<p>Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports, as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) The current template was considered by some Parties as limited in terms of investigating the status of implementation of the NAP.</p> <p>2) Some Parties believed that the qualitative aspects of this indicator have not been fully explored: yes/no questions were considered insufficient for investigating the characteristics of NAPs in a given country.</p> <p>3) Several Parties answered the questions “Had your country already adopted a NAP prior to The Strategy? and “If yes, has your country revised the NAP in alignment with The Strategy?” by providing the information at the date of reporting (2010), rather than for 2008-2009.</p> <p>4) For the qualitative assessment, some Parties suggested a more quantitative scaling approach (value 1 to 5 or 1 to 10) as highlighted above.</p> <p>5) The question “Has the formulation and/or alignment of the NAP been supported by external assistance?” is ambiguous because it can also refer to formulation of NAPs before the adoption of The Strategy.</p>	<p>Recommendations based on the feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) Higher prominence should be given to reporting on the status of implementation of the NAP in the context of the new reporting process, including through questions that allow for more flexibility in taking account of specific national contexts.</p> <p>2) Guidelines for this operational objective should be more explicit about the time period of reporting.</p> <p>3) A scale for rating of questions (very important to not important) could be reconsidered.</p> <p>4) The question of external assistance should be reformulated to read: “Has the alignment of the NAP or the formulation of an aligned NAP been supported by external assistance?”</p>
2.2	Parties, sub-regional and regional entities to have finalized the			
2.3	formulation/revision of NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs aligned to The Strategy, taking into account biophysical and socio-economic information, national planning and policies, and integration into investment frameworks			

<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Recommendations for action by CRIC 10</i>
2.4	CONS-O-6	Number of partnership agreements established within the framework of the Convention between developed country Parties/United Nations and intergovernmental organizations and affected country Parties	<p>Feedback from CRIC 9:</p> <p>1) Some Parties considered that the low level of partnerships on UNCCD issues reported during this reporting process is not due to lack of interest but rather indicates the fact that support to affected developing country Parties is provided regardless of existing partnership agreements concluded within the context of the UNCCD</p>	<p>Recommendations made by CRIC 9:</p> <p>1) The reporting template should not be limited to partnership agreements specifically established within the UNCCD institutional framework but also take into account other partnerships in line with the Convention and NAPs</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>1) Since the currently adopted indicator speaks only about partnership agreements established within the framework of the Convention, the current template cannot be replaced before a change of indicator during the mid-term evaluation of The Strategy. It is therefore proposed to add additional space under qualitative assessment to account for this additional information.</p>

<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Recommendations for action by CRIC 10</i>
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	<p>Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports, as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) Some developed countries reported that they were uncertain about whether the indicator should reflect: a) financial commitments made during the reporting period, or b) projects that received financial support and that are under implementation during the reporting period, or c) the mechanisms and instruments for joint planning/implementation that have been established during the reporting period.</p> <p>2) Some developed countries also reported ambiguity on whether the support provided to regional or subregional organizations should be taken into account</p> <p>3) Some developed countries mentioned that the indicator is currently focused on the support provided to affected country Parties for initiatives of joint planning/implementation; while it could also include questions that relate to the national context of developed countries.</p> <p>4) Some countries were unclear whether the response to the first question (“Are you implementing joint planning/programming initiatives for the three Rio conventions?”) should reflect the situation as of 2008–2009 or at the time of reporting.</p>	<p>Recommendation made by CRIC 9:</p> <p>1) A clear definition of initiatives and programmes to be included in the computation of the indicator needs to be provided in order to produce more coherent information</p> <p>Recommendations based on the feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) Guidelines need to be made more specific about the definition of initiatives for synergistic planning/programming of the three Rio conventions or mechanisms for joint implementation. They should also show examples of what can be included in the reporting and what should not be reported on.</p> <p>2) Guidelines for this operational objective should be more explicit about the time period of reporting.</p>

<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Recommendations for action by CRIC 10</i>
3.1 3.2	CONS-O-8	Number of affected country Parties, sub-regional and regional entities to have established and supported national/sub-regional/regional monitoring systems for DLDD	<p>Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports, as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) The current definition of a “monitoring system, partially covering DLDD” allows too much room for interpretation.</p> <p>2) The current definition of a “monitoring system” (“A system implying the systematic gathering, storing and processing of data in terms of analysis and vulnerability assessment”) is putting a strong emphasis on the concept of vulnerability (food security/climate change) and may not fully reflect the complexities of DLDD.</p> <p>3) The current definition of a “monitoring system” does not account for socio-economic aspects of DLDD.</p> <p>4) Some developed countries reported that they were uncertain about whether the indicator should reflect: (a) financial commitments made during the reporting period in the field, or (b) projects that received financial support and that are under implementation during the reporting period, or (c) support to establish monitoring systems that have been established during the reporting period.</p>	<p>Recommendations made by CRIC 9:</p> <p>1) Need to clarify the definition and the methodological approach of the performance indicator related to “monitoring systems”</p> <p>2) Need to provide space for qualitative information on those national/regional DLDD monitoring systems reported by Parties</p> <p>Recommendations based on the feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) Guidelines should be changed to allow for more qualitative information on this indicator, for example, on the nature of the monitoring system or on plans to develop a monitoring system.</p> <p>2) Guidelines for this operational objective should be more explicit about the time period of reporting.</p> <p>Specific methodological issues for clarification after COP 10:</p> <p>1) What can be considered a DLDD-specific monitoring system? What can be considered an environmental monitoring system partially covering DLDD? (for example, can meteorological monitoring systems be eligible for a positive answer to this question?)</p> <p>2) Can a monitoring system that is not an environmental monitoring system, but accounts for the socio-economic aspects of DLDD, be considered a DLDD monitoring system?</p>

<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Recommendations for action by CRIC 10</i>
3.3 3.4	CONS-O-10	Number of revised NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs reflecting knowledge of DLDD drivers and their interactions, and of the interaction of DLDD with climate change and biodiversity	Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports, as well as from the analysis by the secretariat: See the feedback above for CONS-O-5 in relation to NAP alignment	Recommendation made by CRIC 9: 1) The CST is invited to provide advice to the Parties on how best to carry out a knowledge-based review and gap analysis of the process of aligning their NAPs with The Strategy. Recommendations based on the feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports as well as from the analysis by the secretariat: See the feedback above for CONS-O-5 in relation to NAP alignment.
3.5	CONS-O-11	Type, number and users of DLDD-relevant knowledge-sharing systems at the global, regional, sub-regional and national levels described on the Convention website	Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports, as well as from the analysis by the secretariat: 1) The analysis of information provided by the Parties shows that some Parties included information systems and websites that cannot be considered knowledge-sharing systems. 2) The figures on number of users varied significantly.	Recommendation made by CRIC 9: 1) The CST is invited to deliberate on the inclusion of reported knowledge-management systems into the scientific networks and related knowledge-management brokering systems Recommendations based on the feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports as well as from the analysis by the secretariat: 1) Guidelines should be made clearer about what can be included as a knowledge-management system and examples provided. Specific methodological issues for clarification after COP 10: 1) How to calculate the number of users of an internet site which is serving as a knowledge-management system? Assess the usefulness of this information.

<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Recommendations for action by CRIC 10</i>
4.1 4.2	CONS-O-13	Number of countries, subregional and regional reporting entities engaged in building capacity to combat DLDD on the basis of National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA) or other methodologies and instruments	<p>Feedback from CRIC 9:</p> <p>1) Methodological problems make it difficult to direct the support on the basis of the data provided so far.</p> <p>Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports, as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) Time constraints for collecting relevant data were raised by some Parties.</p> <p>2) Some Parties reported difficulties in deciding whether a programme or project is relevant to be reported under this indicator as virtually all projects and programmes have a capacity-building component.</p> <p>3) The indicator would better serve its intended purpose if it went beyond assessing the mere number of initiatives, and tried to assess the size and, possibly, the scope of the initiatives.</p> <p>4) For countries that are both affected and developed, the current format of the template for this indicator is not conducive to proper reporting, as it is partly designed to report on the aid received and it is difficult to provide information on the actions funded only by own national resources.</p> <p>5) Some developed countries reported that they were uncertain about whether the indicator should reflect: (a) financial commitments made during the reporting period in the field, or (b) projects that received financial support and that are under implementation during the reporting period, or (c) support to capacity-building activities that have been established during the reporting period.</p> <p>6) The question on national contribution to the target was not considered very relevant, as there is virtually no country which does not have any capacity-building project or plan linked to DLDD.</p>	<p>Recommendation made by CRIC 9:</p> <p>1) Further methodological precision on the term “capacity-building initiative” should be provided in order to have more harmonized information provided by country Parties.</p> <p>Recommendations based on the feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) Guidelines should provide clear guidance on what are “major” capacity-building plans / programmes / projects</p> <p>2) Guidelines should be extended to include more qualitative information about the size, scope, effectiveness and status of progress of initiatives reported.</p> <p>3) Guidelines should be made flexible for reporting by those Parties that are both affected and developed.</p> <p>4) Guidelines for this operational objective should be more explicit about the time period of reporting.</p> <p>Specific methodological issues for clarification after COP 10:</p> <p>1) What is capacity-building?</p> <p>2) What is capacity development?</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>1) The question on establishing the national contribution to the target may need revision in the context of the mid-term evaluation of The Strategy.</p>

<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Recommendations for action by CRIC 10</i>
5.1	CONS-O-14	Number of affected country Parties, sub-regional and regional entities whose investment frameworks, established within the IFS devised by the GM or within other integrated financing strategies, reflect leveraging national, bilateral and multilateral resources for combating desertification and land degradation	<p>Feedback from CRIC 9:</p> <p>1) The mere existence of an IIF was not considered sufficient as an indicator to ascertain whether it leverages funding necessary for the implementation of the Convention</p> <p>Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports, as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) For countries that are both affected and developed, the current format of the template for this indicator is not conducive to proper reporting, as it is partly designed to report on the aid received and it is difficult to provide information on the actions funded only by own national resources.</p> <p>2) Some developed countries reported that they were uncertain about whether the indicator should reflect: (a) financial commitments made during the reporting period in the field, or (b) projects that received financial support and that are under implementation during the reporting period, or (c) support to the establishment of IIFs that have been established during the reporting period.</p> <p>3) Some Parties were not certain whether the response to the first question (“Has your country developed an integrated investment framework?”) should reflect the situation as of 2008–2009 or at the time of reporting (2010).</p>	<p>Recommendations made by CRIC 9:</p> <p>1) More in-depth analysis of the functionality and efficiency of existing IIFs is needed in order to obtain more accurate information during the reporting process.</p> <p>2) A more accurate definition of the term “integrated investment framework” was requested that would assist Parties at the national level to provide more accurate information.</p> <p>3) Reporting on progress with the implementation of the investment frameworks should be considered in the future</p> <p>4) There is a need for further comprehensive analysis on the difficulties encountered by country Parties regarding the establishment of IIFs, in order to provide sound guidance for the achievement of the related targets.</p> <p>Recommendations based on the feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) Guidelines for this operational objective should be more explicit about the time period of reporting.</p>

<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Recommendations for action by CRIC 10</i>
5.2	CONS-O-15	Amount of financial resources made available by developed country Parties to combat DLDD	<p>Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports, as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) The reporting on this indicator is time-consuming as it depends on extensive collection of data.</p> <p>2) The quality of the information depends largely on the quality and comprehensiveness of the information provided through the Standard Financial Annex (SFA) and the Programme and Project Sheet (PPS).</p> <p>3) Some Parties reported that they were uncertain whether to include multilateral contributions,</p> <p>4) Some Parties were uncertain whether to include contributions made to organizations working at the national level or focus on commitments related to DLDD projects directly supporting affected country Parties.</p>	<p>Recommendations made by CRIC 9:</p> <p>1) Need to clarify the guidelines for reporting against the performance indicator CONS-O-15.</p> <p>Recommendations based on the feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) Sufficient time for collection and verification of data needs to be built into the reporting process.</p> <p>2) Databases developed for this purpose would help speed up the collection and verification of data.</p> <p>3) There is a need to amend the PPS and the SFA to enable easier reporting on this indicator.</p> <p>4) More clarity is needed on what financial commitments should be reported under this indicator</p>
5.2	CONS-O-16	Degree of adequacy, timeliness and predictability of financial resources made available by developed country Parties to combat DLDD	<p>Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports, as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) Some countries suggested considering other issues beyond whether the contribution is adequate, timely and predictable.</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>1) The indicator currently focuses on adequacy, timeliness and predictability. Additional information can be included in the qualitative analysis.</p>

<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Recommendations for action by CRIC 10</i>
5.3	CONS-O-17	Number of DLDD-related project proposals successfully submitted for financing to international financial institutions, facilities and funds, including the GEF	<p>Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports, as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) The reporting on this indicator is time-consuming as it depends on extensive collection of data.</p> <p>2) Collecting data for this indicator requires intensive interaction with financial officers from a wide range of organizations. This requires considerable effort and makes the indicator uneconomic.</p> <p>3) The quality of the information depends largely on the quality and comprehensiveness of the information provided through the SFA and the PPS.</p> <p>4) The current template does not allow the inclusion of project proposals to be funded with national resources – this is particularly important for those countries and regions where the national budget is a key source of funding for DLDD-related projects.</p>	<p>Recommendations based on the feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) Sufficient time for collection and verification of data needs to be built into the reporting process.</p> <p>2) Databases developed for this purpose would help speed up the collection and verification of data.</p> <p>3) There is a need to amend the PPS and the SFA to enable easier reporting on this indicator.</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>1) Currently, the indicator refers to international projects. During the mid-term evaluation, the scope for extension of indicator to account for projects funded nationally may be important.</p>
Outcome	Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports, as well as from the analysis by the secretariat			Comment
5.4		Some Parties noted that the reporting format does not include indicators for Outcome 5.4 of The Strategy on “innovative financing” (i.e. Innovative sources of finance and financing mechanisms are identified to combat desertification/land degradation and mitigate the effects of drought, including from the private sector, market-based mechanisms, trade, foundations and CSOs, and other financing mechanisms for climate change adaptation and mitigation, biodiversity conservation and sustainable use and for hunger and poverty reduction”).		The need to introduce an additional indicator could be assessed during the mid-term evaluation.

<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Recommendations for action by CRIC 10</i>
5.5	CONS-O-18	Amount of financial resources and type of incentives which have enabled access to technology by affected country Parties	<p>Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports, as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) Some Parties reported a problem with defining technology transfer.</p> <p>2) Some Parties reported a problem in understanding how to establish linkages between an initiative or incentive and an actual transfer of technology (results).</p> <p>3) The section does not allow in-depth investigation and understanding of the issues related to the transfer of technology.</p> <p>4) Some Parties reported a problem with disaggregating data by year.</p>	<p>Recommendations based on the feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) Qualitative information should be included in order to account for specific aspects and the nature of technology transfer.</p> <p>Specific methodological issues for clarification after COP 10:</p> <p>1) What can be considered technology transfer (technical assistance, material assistance, software, etc.)? In which areas?</p> <p>2) What is an incentive?</p>

III. Refinement of the Standard Financial Annex and the Programme and Project Sheet

Feedback

Feedback from CRIC 9:

- 1) Some Parties underlined that there are different interpretations of what should be listed under the Standard Financial Annex and the Programme and Project Sheet.
- 2) Some Parties underlined that the analysis should have better distinguished between commitments of affected developing countries, affected countries with economies in transition (national resources), commitments of developed non-affected countries (Official Development Assistance) and commitments of developed affected countries (with a clear distinction between commitments mobilized for the fight against DLDD at the national level and commitments mobilized for international cooperation on DLDD).
- 3) Some Parties questioned the way that the Rio Markers were used quantitatively.

Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports, as well as from the analysis by the GM:

- 1) The vast majority of countries appreciated the relevance of this section of the report and found the compilation of the SFA and the PPS a highly relevant exercise that will contribute to building much needed knowledge about financial flows for UNCCD implementation. However, the short timeframe for the reporting, combined with the level of coordination required between the NFPs and their respective national and international stakeholders (ministries of finance, donors, UN agencies, IFIs, etc.) posed some challenges in terms of collecting the required information.
- 2) For both the SFA and the PPS it was felt that too much information and an excessive level of detail is requested by the current reporting template and guidelines. Simplification was recommended for both templates and merging of the two templates into a single financial format was highly recommended by several Parties. This recommendation may reflect the difficulty of several countries in understanding the differences between the SFA and the PPS format and the rationale behind the two templates. Developed Parties, for example, generally felt that the SFA was the most appropriate tool and the PPS format was more relevant for recipient countries.
- 3) The introduction of categories such as Rio Markers, Relevant Activity Codes and OECD purpose codes in the UNCCD reporting raised concerns due to the fact that for the vast majority of projects such classifications were not available in existing databases. This implied the need to retro-fit the relevant values for a large amount of information with which, in many instances, the NFPs or other reporting officer were not familiar. In order to reduce the reporting burden, some developed countries suggested closer alignment between the PPS/SFA formats and the OECD donor reporting system. Exploring ways to ensure coordinated reporting between recipient and donor countries was also recommended by several stakeholders.

Recommendations for action by CRIC 10

Recommendations made by CRIC 9:

There is a need to clarify the issue of different interpretations of what should be listed under the SFA and the PPS in revised reporting guidelines.

- 1) There is a need for the GM to further refine its analysis on financial flows.
- 2) There is a need for further work on the issue of the quantitative use of Rio Markers in view of the next reporting cycle.

Recommendations based on the feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports as well as from the analysis by the GM:

- 1) Improve the interface in order to perform a selection of consistency checks, in particular order of magnitude checks.
- 2) Propose linkages between donors' and affected Parties' data, in order to facilitate the provision of information and avoid duplication of information (and ensure global consistency).
- 3) Simplify questions and ensure consistency using adequate tables (e.g. ask where it happens, then derive the subregional and regional annex from the country where the action takes place).
- 4) Offer default values of key parameters.

4) One of the most criticized design features of the PRAIS portal had a particular impact on the user-friendliness of the SFA and the PPS templates on the PRAIS portal. The presentation of the various questions one by one on the screen made entering a large number of projects and a large amount of data particularly cumbersome and time-consuming. The development of a functionality to import automatically SFA and PPS data previously collected on an excel template revealed itself to be fundamental to allowing countries to report on a large number of initiatives (particularly useful for developed countries).

IV. Refinement of reporting on additional information

Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports, as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:

- 1) Several countries felt that the review of the indicators made possible under the section on the “Iterative process on indicators” was insufficient.
- 2) Some Parties stated that reporting on the implementation of the NAP did not have sufficient prominence in the template.

Recommendations based on the feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:

- 1) Specific feedback forms for each indicator at the end of each template could be included, including more qualitative assessment and the opportunity to explain the methodology and provide relevant meta-data.
- 2) A more detailed format should be available for reporting on the status of NAP implementation.

V. Adjustment of reporting procedures

8. In addition to the feedback on performance indicators, the SFA, the PPS and the additional information section, the Parties provided feedback on various other aspects of the reporting process. Five important topics crystallized from this analysis:

- (a) Time constraints;
- (b) Data collection, management and quality control (including coordination at the national level);
- (c) Capacity-building;
- (d) Financing;
- (e) Issues related to the functioning of the PRAIS portal (data collection at the global level).

9. These are presented in detail in the table below, together with suggestions for improvements and possible future action. The matters relating to data quality control at the level of secretariat/GM’s use for the purposes of synthesis and preliminary analysis of information submitted by Parties are discussed in document ICCD/CRIC(10)/14.

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Recommendations for action by CRIC 10</i>
Time constraints	<p>Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports, as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) Time constraints represented a significant challenge during the 2010 reporting cycle and necessarily had an impact on the completeness of the reports and the quality of the information contained therein. Data collection and analysis, capacity-building, consultations and official approval/submission processes at the national level are time-consuming. Many Parties suggested that they should have six months for reporting.</p>	<p>Recommendations made by CRIC 9:</p> <p>1) Future reporting should provide sufficient time for systematic data collection, quality check and validation of reports which may affect the way the CRIC reviews information emerging from the reporting process.</p> <p>2) A more realistic time frame for future reporting would need to be decided on, taking into consideration the scheduling of those CRIC sessions that review information received from Parties and other reporting entities.</p>
Data collection, management and quality control	<p>Feedback from CRIC 9:</p> <p>1) The importance was highlighted of the development of suitable national databases for reporting, enabled through adequate financial and technical support, that would ensure continuity in the reporting process and a readily accessible information infrastructure that can be used for reporting purposes.</p> <p>2) Concerns were expressed regarding the process at the national level, which requires increased awareness-raising among key stakeholders in order to improve the coordination of data collection and the required participatory approach.</p> <p>Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports, as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) Most Parties gathered much of their data through meetings and workshops, as well as in direct contact with individual stakeholders, including interviews, meetings, email communication, structured questionnaires and direct database access. Many Parties, however, reported a problem with data accessibility and availability. One of the most frequent reasons was the problem of coordination between ministries and other relevant institutions, for instance, to get access to sensitive data or to have the report coordinated/approved for submission. Even when the required data were available and accessible, the information was largely scattered and/or not systematically collected/organized in such a way as to facilitate reporting according to the PRAIS standards and requirements.</p>	<p>Recommendations made by CRIC 9:</p> <p>1) The existence of national databases would need to be incorporated into the PRAIS project in order to ensure that Parties build up a national monitoring network that allows easy access to information when needed.</p> <p>2) The secretariat should develop a coherent framework to ensure data quality.</p> <p>3) There is a need for increased capacity-building on data collection and management for PRAIS.</p> <p>Recommendations based on the feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <p>1) Coordination mechanisms, such as National Coordinating Bodies, play an important role in the reporting process and should be revitalized and/or strengthened, as they are in the best position to oversee collaborative efforts by multiple stakeholders and are a suitable forum for national stakeholders to share responsibility for UNCCD reporting.</p> <p>2) In order to ensure improved reporting for the next cycle, it is important that all Parties establish and/or maintain systems for the collection of the required data. This should go hand in hand with improved information management systems within the NFP office, with the full involvement of all relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>3) An upgraded PRAIS portal should be continuously open as a working tool for the NFPs, and could serve as an extension of national level monitoring systems</p>

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Recommendations for action by CRIC 10</i>
Capacity-building (including Reference Centres) and financing	<p>Feedback from CRIC 9:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A strong call was made for further capacity-building. 2) Financial support made available for the PRAIS process is insufficient. <p>Feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports, as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The capacity of reference centres to provide technical support during the reporting was influenced by factors such as lack of clear mandate for supporting implementation of the UNCCD and previous experience with MEA reporting processes, lack of linkages with regional integration processes, lack of ability to create synergies between the support to the reporting process and mainstreaming activities (cost-effectiveness of the support), etc. 	<p>Recommendations made by CRIC 9:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The role and mandate of the reference centres need further clarification in order to become effective and ensure proper involvement in future reporting. 2) The secretariat should provide detailed draft terms of reference for the future involvement of reference centres in the reporting process. Country Parties should be involved in the process of the development of terms of reference for the selection procedures, the reference centres and the selection of the reference centres. 3) Provision of adequate financial assistance for the next reporting cycle should be ensured <p>Recommendations based on the feedback from Parties in their reports, Reference Centre workshop and lessons learned reports as well as from the analysis by the secretariat:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The efficiency of reference centres could be increased by including specific activities at the national level (facilitation, support missions, etc.) and by expanding the opportunities for regional/subregional interaction (i.e. an additional workshop to share experience and solve problems). 2) Given that the introduction of reporting on impact indicators in the 2012 reporting exercise will further increase the complexity of reporting, it is clear that the quality of future reporting will even more be dependent on sufficient funding for data collection and analysis. 3) The different reporting requirements of MEAs continue to put a significant burden on NFPs, and there is potential for harmonizing the new system with the multiple demands of other conventions, particularly in terms of taking full advantage of synergies by creating integrated databases on environmental issues.

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Recommendations for action by CRIC 10</i>
PRAIS portal	<p>Feedback from CRIC 9:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Some Parties noted technical issues relating to the user-friendliness of the PRAIS portal. 2) The reports as generated from the PRAIS portal do not represent a good tool for awareness-raising at national level. 	<p>Recommendations made by CRIC 9:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Efforts should be undertaken to address malfunctioning of the system for future use, also in terms of availability of templates and reference documents in all official languages. 2) Off-line reporting templates/formats for report submission for those countries which have difficulty accessing the Internet should be provided. 3) The technical set-up of the PRAIS portal should be simplified in order to minimize the number of countries that would face difficulties in reporting. 4) The secretariat should continue working on improving the PRAIS portal, ensuring its interactivity and facilitating circulation of information through it, taking into account the feedback on its features as provided by the reporting entities. 5) The reports as generated from the PRAIS portal should be improved. 6) Portal development for next reporting cycle should be finalized urgently, incorporating the gaps of previously reporting process, developing of guidelines for SRAP/RAP implementation, followed by capacity-building workshop of relevant stakeholders.

VI. Conclusions and recommendations

10. The first reporting exercise under the new reporting procedures received broad support from the Parties and was largely considered a major step towards full implementation of quantitative reporting based on indicators and targets. The reporting entities, as well as the Convention's institutions and subsidiary bodies, invested significant efforts in this exercise and consider it to be the start of a long-term learning process. It offered the Parties opportunities that go beyond their reporting obligations. The preparation of national reports has proved useful not just as a tool for monitoring the implementation of the Convention at the national level, but also for planning purposes. Many Parties took advantage of this effort to assess the capacity-building needs of their country, to better understand the needs in relation to data collection, availability and accessibility, as well as for the coordination of all stakeholders involved in the implementation of the Convention and in reporting. This is also the reason why many countries emphasized the benefits of better linking the monitoring of National Action Plans with the requirements of the reporting process. Established and well maintained monitoring systems are essential in this respect.

11. The ultimate aim of the new reporting system is to assist the Parties in assessing the state of implementation of the Convention and The Strategy and in making use of the information gathered in this process to enhance policymaking, awareness-raising and communication as well as further streamlining efforts at the national, subregional, regional and global levels to combat desertification, land degradation and drought. The PRAIS portal, as the global instrument for the collection, processing and analysis of the data submitted by Parties and other reporting entities, during and beyond the reporting process, should be placed at the core of the new knowledge-management system currently being established for the Convention, and should serve as an important tool for Parties to create knowledge about the Convention.

12. Performance indicators will undergo a full assessment of their usefulness in monitoring the implementation of the Convention during the mid-term evaluation of The Strategy at COP 11 in 2013. However, it is clear that some simplification of the reporting templates, clarifications of methodological questions as well as an improved balance between quantitative and qualitative elements of reporting are needed in order to increase the quality of reporting in the next reporting cycle.

13. A more realistic timeframe for reporting is another important element of improving the reporting process. It became evident in the first reporting exercise that all stakeholders (Parties, other reporting entities, Convention institutions and bodies, and civil society organizations) need adequate time to undertake the activities necessary for high-quality reporting and analysis. The availability of timely, adequate and predictable financial resources is also crucial for the success of reporting. Further continual capacity-building should go hand-in-hand with the establishment and maintenance of national monitoring systems.

14. Based on the feedback presented in this document, Parties at CRIC 10 may wish to consider the recommendations made above and to propose that COP 10:

(a) Request the secretariat and the GM to implement the necessary improvements in the 2012 reporting cycle;

(b) Identify a suitable timetable for the eleventh session of CRIC to consider additional information relating to the assessment of implementation, and the reporting on impact indicators.