



## Convention to Combat Desertification

Distr.: General  
25 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) (iii) 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**

**How best to measure progress on strategic objective 4 of the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008–2018)**

### **How best to measure progress on strategic objective 4 of the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008–2018)**

#### Note by the secretariat

##### *Summary*

The present document has been prepared by the Global Mechanism in consultation with the secretariat, in conformity with decision 13/COP.9, attachment, annex II: provisional impact indicators for strategic objective 4, their reporting attribution and baseline. It presents the rationale and approach that these two Convention institutions are expected to follow in the development of guidelines for reporting against progress made in achieving strategic objective 4 (SO4) of the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008–2018) (The Strategy).

This document builds upon the recommendations contained in document ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.7, “Consideration of how best to measure progress on strategic objective 4 of The Strategy”, and provides complementary guidance and greater in-depth methodological advice. It also indicates how this data will be analysed by the Convention institutions to inform the performance review and assessment of implementation of The Strategy by the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention (CRIC).

The main requirements for monitoring progress on SO4, including advance information on some essential components of SO4 impact indicators are set out in chapter II; a broad description of the analysis and expected use that will be made of data collected through SO4 indicators is given in chapter III. Chapter IV provides a brief account of the issues that may be encountered in data collection and analysis on SO4, given the lessons

learned and challenges encountered during the fourth reporting cycle. A number of solutions are also proposed to prevent and/or address these issues so as to maximize the validity of the reporting exercise, based on good practices in impact assessment.

The CRIC is expected to review the suggestions and recommendations contained in this document at its tenth session (CRIC 10), with the aim of submitting a draft decision to COP 10. Parties may also wish to consider developing specific targets for the SO4 indicators. Once adopted by the COP, this decision will guide the development of detailed reporting templates for the next reporting cycle, scheduled to start in January 2012.

## Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
List of abbreviations.....		3
I. Introduction and background .....	1–8	4
II. Reporting requirements for measuring progress on strategic objective 4 .....	9–28	5
A. Strategic objective 4 indicators.....	9–18	5
B. Self-assessment of impact.....	19–28	9
III. Intended use of the data collected on strategic objective 4 .....	29–34	12
IV. Foreseeable reporting issues and suggested solutions based on good practices.....	35–36	13
V. Conclusions and recommendations .....	37–39	14

---

## List of abbreviations

CRS	OECD Creditor Reporting System
DAC	OECD Development Assistance Committee
DFI	development financing institution
DLDD	desertification, land degradation and drought
FIELD	Financial Information Engine on Land Degradation
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GM	Global Mechanism
IATF	Inter-Agency Task Force
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFS	integrated financing strategy
IRIS	Impact Reporting and Investment Standards
JLG	Joint Liaison Group
NAP	national action programmes
NONIE	Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation
ODA	official development assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OO5	Operational objective 5 of the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance UNCCD implementation (2008-2018)
PPS	programme and project sheet
PRAIS	performance review and assessment of implementation system
RBM	results-based management
REESIP	Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability, Impacts on the ground, and Potential for scaling-up
SLM	sustainable land management
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group

## I. Introduction and background

1. By its decision 3/COP.8, the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) adopted the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008–2018) (The Strategy).
2. The Strategy defines four long-term strategic objectives and their corresponding indicative impact indicators, to be further developed and refined. At the seventh session of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention (CRIC 7), Parties requested the secretariat to initiate action with the Global Mechanism (GM) in further elaborating on the indicators related to strategic objective 4 (SO4).<sup>1</sup>
3. The SO4 refers to the mobilization of resources to support implementation of the Convention through building effective partnerships between national and international actors.
4. Its expected impacts relate to both financial and policy issues. In particular, expected impact 4.1 stipulates that “increased financial, technical and technological resources are made available to affected developing country Parties, and where appropriate Central and Eastern European countries, to implement the Convention”, while expected impact 4.2 refers to improved enabling policy environments for UNCCD implementation at all levels.
5. In document ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.7, the secretariat and the GM presented a set of impact indicators for SO4 developed in consultation with an Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF) on reporting and under the guidance received from the Bureaux of the Committee on Science and Technology (CST) and the CRIC.
6. By its decision 13/COP9, the COP decided to adopt provisionally the indicators developed by the secretariat and the GM, 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,<sup>2</sup> in line with improvements recommended by the Parties and other reporting entities.<sup>3</sup>
7. This document builds on the indicators, methodologies and procedures for measuring progress on SO4 described in document ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.7, and provides additional reporting elements, as well as complementary guidance and methodological advice with regard to the development of reporting templates, the data collection exercise and the subsequent analysis by the Convention institutions and subsidiary bodies.
8. These complementary elements for SO4 reporting and assessment originate from the lessons learned during the fourth UNCCD reporting cycle and the results of the first performance review and assessment of implementation of The Strategy conducted by the CRIC at its ninth session in February 2011.

---

<sup>1</sup> ICCD/CRIC(7)/5, paragraph 22.

<sup>2</sup> Decision 13/COP.9, paragraph 1.

<sup>3</sup> Decision 13/COP.9, attachment, paragraph 24.

## II. Reporting requirements for measuring progress on strategic objective 4

### A. Strategic objective 4 indicators

9. Impact indicators on SO4 have been developed with a view to measuring the status of achievement of the expected changes intended by the long-term objective to mobilize substantial, adequate and timely financial resources and other forms of support to assist affected developing country Parties in their implementation of the Convention.<sup>4</sup>

10. Further to a proposal contained in document ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.7, decision 13/COP.9 provisionally adopted seven impact indicators, to be further refined and finalized after the completion of the first reporting cycle under The Strategy. They refer, respectively, to the following aspects:

- SO4-1: Percentage change of multilateral donor contributions for UNCCD-related activities;
- SO4-2: UNCCD share of bilateral official development assistance (ODA);
- SO4-3: Percentage change of domestic financial commitment to UNCCD implementation;
- SO4-4: Percentage change of contributions from innovative sources of finance for UNCCD-related activities;
- SO4-5: Percentage change of private sector and other contributions for UNCCD-related activities;
- SO4-6: Number and type of legal and regulatory frameworks, economic incentives or other mechanisms securing or facilitating transfer of funds for the implementation of UNCCD, at all levels; and
- SO4-7: Clear entrusting of institutional responsibilities for UNCCD implementation, at all levels.

11. Indicators SO4-1 to SO4-5 refer to expected impact 4.1,<sup>5</sup> while indicators SO4-6 and SO4-7 refer to expected impact 4.2.<sup>6</sup> A summary description of these indicators is contained in the synoptic table 1 below. This table should be read in conjunction with document ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.7, which provides more detail on the rationale for the selection of these indicators, their basic characteristics, geographical level of application and methods of computation.

12. The table introduces additional information on these indicators, such as their purpose in the context of impact assessment on SO4, the specific data requirements and more precise indication of possible sources of information (or means of verification).

<sup>4</sup> Decision 3/COP.8, preamble and paragraph 9.

<sup>5</sup> Increased financial, technical and technological resources are made available to affected developing country Parties, and where appropriate Central and Eastern European countries, to implement the Convention.

<sup>6</sup> Enabling policy environments are improved for UNCCD implementation at all levels.

Table 1  
**Impact indicators on strategic objective 4: purpose, data requirements, and sources of information**

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Type<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Attribution<sup>b</sup></i>	<i>Data requirements</i>	<i>Data sources</i>
SO4-1	Percentage change of multilateral donor contributions for UNCCD-related activities	QT	It provides an indication of the trend in the supply of finance for DLDD-related investments and other UNCCD-related activities by multilateral DFIs	G, I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ DLDD-related programmes and projects of multilateral DFIs</li> <li>▪ UNCCD-related financial commitments by multilateral DFIs</li> <li>▪ Multilateral ODA marked with UNCCD Rio markers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PRAIS (financial annexes)</li> <li>▪ FIELD (portfolio reviews, financial data, funding trends)<sup>d</sup></li> <li>▪ OECD Creditor Reporting System<sup>d</sup></li> <li>▪ CRIC performance reviews of OO5 and analyses of financial flows</li> <li>▪ Relevant databases and publications of multilateral DFIs and other authoritative entities<sup>d</sup></li> </ul>
SO4-2	UNCCD share of bilateral ODA	QT	It provides an indication of the financial resources supplied by developed country Parties for DLDD-related investments and other UNCCD-related activities as part of their bilateral development cooperation	D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Official development assistance (ODA) of OECD/DAC member countries</li> <li>▪ Bilateral ODA marked with UNCCD Rio markers</li> <li>▪ DLDD-related programmes and projects of bilateral DFIs</li> <li>▪ UNCCD-related financial commitments by bilateral DFIs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PRAIS (financial annexes and CONS-O-15)</li> <li>▪ FIELD (financial data, funding trends)<sup>d</sup></li> <li>▪ OECD Creditor Reporting System<sup>d</sup></li> <li>▪ CRIC performance reviews of OO5 and analyses of financial flows</li> <li>▪ Relevant databases and publications of bilateral DFIs and other authoritative entities<sup>d</sup></li> </ul>
SO4-3	Percentage change of domestic financial commitment to UNCCD implementation	QT	It provides an indication of the trend in the supply of public finance for DLDD-related investments and other UNCCD-related activities by affected developing country Parties	A, R	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ DLDD-related programmes and projects (co)financed through public domestic budgets</li> <li>▪ Contribution by domestic public sources to investments and other initiatives to advance SLM</li> <li>▪ UNCCD-related financial commitments by affected developing country Parties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PRAIS (financial annexes)</li> <li>▪ CRIC performance reviews of OO5 and analyses of financial flows</li> <li>▪ Relevant country-level studies to inform the IFS process<sup>d</sup></li> <li>▪ Observatories of SLM funding opportunities and/or investments<sup>d</sup></li> <li>▪ Relevant databases and publications of authoritative entities<sup>d</sup></li> </ul>

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Type<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Attribution<sup>b</sup></i>	<i>Data requirements</i>	<i>Data sources</i>
SO4-4	Percentage change of contributions from innovative sources of finance for UNCCD-related activities	QT	It provides an indication of the trend in the supply of finance for DLDD-related investments and other UNCCD-related activities by funding sources other than DFIs and governments of affected developing country Parties	A, D, G, I, R (M-S <sup>c</sup> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ DLDD-related programmes and projects financed by innovative funding sources</li> <li>▪ Contribution by innovative funding sources to investments and other initiatives to advance SLM</li> <li>▪ UNCCD-related financial commitments by innovative funding sources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PRAIS (financial annexes)</li> <li>▪ FIELD (financial data, funding trends)<sup>d</sup></li> <li>▪ Joint Liaison Group (list of innovative funding sources)</li> <li>▪ CRIC performance reviews of OO5 and analyses of financial flows</li> <li>▪ Relevant databases and publications of authoritative entities<sup>d</sup></li> <li>▪ Relevant country-level studies to inform the IFS process<sup>d</sup></li> <li>▪ Observatories of SLM funding opportunities and/or investments<sup>d</sup></li> </ul>
SO4-5	Percentage change of private sector and other contributions for UNCCD-related activities	QT	It provides an indication of the trend in the supply of finance for DLDD-related investments and other UNCCD-related activities by the private sector, foundations and other sources not reporting to the UNCCD	M-S <sup>c</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ DLDD-related programmes and projects financed by the private sector and other sources</li> <li>▪ Contribution by the private sector to investments and other initiatives to advance SLM</li> <li>▪ UNCCD-related financial commitments by the private sector and other sources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PRAIS (financial annexes)</li> <li>▪ FIELD (donor profiles, financial flows)<sup>d</sup></li> <li>▪ CRIC performance reviews of OO5 and analyses of financial flows</li> <li>▪ Relevant databases and publications of authoritative entities<sup>d</sup></li> <li>▪ Relevant country-level studies to inform the IFS process<sup>d</sup></li> </ul>
SO4-6	Number and type of legal and regulatory frameworks, economic incentives or other mechanisms securing or facilitating transfer of funds for the implementation of UNCCD, at all levels	QT QL	It provides a measure of the efforts made by the Convention stakeholders to facilitate the implementation of the Convention	A, D, G, I, R	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Laws and regulations</li> <li>▪ Economic and financial measures (e.g. fiscal rules, tax benefits, credit lines and borrowing rules, etc.)</li> <li>▪ Cooperation frameworks (e.g. agreements, memorandums of understanding, contracts, etc.)</li> <li>▪ Sectoral policies (e.g. trade, marketing, property rights, business</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Public records of Convention stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Relevant databases and publications and other authoritative entities<sup>d</sup></li> <li>▪ PRAIS (CONS-O-6, CONS-O-14, CONS-O-18)</li> </ul>

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Type<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Attribution<sup>b</sup></i>	<i>Data requirements</i>	<i>Data sources</i>
					development, etc.).	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNCCD-specific mechanisms</li> </ul>	
SO4-7	Clear entrusting of institutional responsibilities for UNCCD implementation, at all levels	QL	It provides an indication of the effectiveness of institutional arrangements for UNCCD implementation with regard to the resource mobilization process	A, D, G, I, M, R, S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evidence of institutional arrangements, instruments and mechanisms that facilitate resource mobilization – or the lack thereof</li> <li>▪ Best practices in resource mobilization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Public records of Convention stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Relevant databases and publications of authoritative entities</li> <li>▪ PRAIS (best practices on finance and resource mobilization)</li> </ul>

<sup>a</sup> QT: quantitative; QL: qualitative.

<sup>b</sup> A: affected country Parties; D: developed country Parties; C: civil society organizations; G: Global Environment Facility (GEF); I: United Nations agencies and intergovernmental institutions; M: Global Mechanism; R: subregional and regional reporting organizations; S: secretariat.

<sup>c</sup> Study to be coordinated by the GM and the secretariat as part of their joint work programme.

<sup>d</sup> To be used when data is not available in the PRAIS system, and/or for cross reference and validity check.



13. Each indicator will require a number of data elements, parameters or components, to be used for quantitative computations and/or for qualitative assessments. It is envisaged that these data elements will be collected primarily through the performance review and assessment of implementation system (PRAIS). The reporting format will consist of specific questions to be answered with either a numeric value, a selection between a list of options, or a narrative text. The PRAIS reporting templates on SO4 will therefore be structured accordingly.

14. It should be noted that some of the required data (e.g. relevant programmes, projects, and financial commitments of reporting entities, annual amount of financial resources made available by developed country Parties to combat DLDD, etc.) can easily be derived from the performance indicators and financial annexes<sup>7</sup> included in the PRAIS reports, and would thus not aggravate the reporting burden of country Parties. Other elements (e.g. bilateral ODA, economic incentives, institutional arrangements, etc.) might require additional efforts at generating the needed data.

15. PRAIS should therefore be used as the primary source of information, given that it is populated with data originating from official communications to the UNCCD. Authoritative sources of information other than PRAIS should be used for cross reference and validity check, as well as for filling data gaps upon prior consent of the reporting entity as required.

16. Data required for the different indicators could for example be collected from the GM FIELD,<sup>8</sup> the OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS), and other relevant databases and publications, such as national observatories of funding opportunities for sustainable land management (SLM) investments. Other data can be obtained from relevant integrated investment frameworks, as well as from the analytical studies undertaken at national level to inform the development of the integrated financing strategy (IFS), the main methodological tool developed by the GM in order to assist affected country Parties in their resource mobilization efforts,<sup>9</sup> or similar processes.

17. However, it should be envisaged that some data, such as on resources mobilized by those stakeholders not reporting to the UNCCD, will have to be collected through ad hoc data collection exercises. These exercises could take the form of studies to be undertaken with external assistance, under the coordination of the secretariat and the GM as part of their joint work programme. This will apply, in particular, to the computation of indicator SO4-5 and the partial computation of indicator SO4-4. A specific cost estimate for this latter study is included in the Convention budget for 2012-2013.

18. Terms of reference for these studies will be developed by the secretariat and the GM with a view to collecting the required information taking into account the availability of data and existing studies, the resources and time available and the specific guidance by the COP. If primary data collection is required, the techniques and instruments used for collecting and corroborating data<sup>10</sup> will have to be commensurate with resources available.

## **B. Self-assessment of impact**

19. Essentially, the seven impact indicators on SO4 refer to data on resources mobilized and enabling activities put in place by the UNCCD stakeholders and their partners. In other words, they measure the initial or direct input given to the resource mobilization process,

<sup>7</sup> Standard financial annex and programme and project sheet.

<sup>8</sup> See Financial Information Engine on Land Degradation (FIELD) at <<http://www.gmfield.info>>.

<sup>9</sup> ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.1.

<sup>10</sup> For instance, case studies, questionnaires, surveys, sampling, triangulations, etc.

but do not necessarily measure the final result or effect of this effort at the higher end of the results chain.

20. In this context, impact can be defined as the changes that have occurred in the conditions of ecosystems affected by DLDD, in the livelihoods of populations living in affected areas, and in the condition of global goods affected by DLDD (e.g. biological diversity and the climate), as a result of the mobilization of resources, that is, funds and partnerships, for relevant investments contributing to the implementation of the UNCCD.

21. For a comprehensive assessment of progress made on SO4, it is therefore recommended that affected country Parties and other reporting entities undertake, as part of the PRAIS reporting exercise on SO4, a self-assessment of impact as defined above. This will indicate what is perceived by the reporting country or organization at the time of reporting and should not be confused with an external or independent evaluation.

22. The self-assessment will be used to address other important aspects inherent to impact measurement, such as the performance, targeting and overall validity of the measures put in place in the reporting period. A harmonized approach will therefore be devised to collect information on such aspects as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, contribution to substantive impacts on the ground,<sup>11</sup> and potential for replication and scaling-up of the resources and partnerships mobilized. The definition of the impact assessment criteria is provided in table 2 below.

Table 2  
**Criteria for self-assessment of impact on strategic objective 4**

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Aspects to be taken into consideration (examples)</i>
Relevance	The extent to which the objectives of an investment are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, the size of the problem, country priorities, development partner and donor policies, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Investment portfolio design, adequacy and composition</li> <li>▪ Alignment with strategic objectives</li> <li>▪ Overall coherence with government priorities/needs and partners' policies</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	The extent to which the investment objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Achievement of expected objectives, including higher-order results</li> <li>▪ Changes in the overall context affecting the delivery of results</li> </ul>
Efficiency	A measure of how financial and other economically valuable resources (e.g. expertise, know-how, time, etc.) are converted into results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Costs of investments</li> <li>▪ Economic rate of return</li> <li>▪ Social and environmental returns</li> </ul>
Sustainability	The likelihood that the benefit streams generated by an investment continue beyond the phase of initial support. It also includes an assessment of the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks beyond the project's life.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Exit strategy/approach</li> <li>▪ Rationale for support</li> <li>▪ Effects of reduction of subsidies</li> <li>▪ Resilience to shocks/competition</li> <li>▪ Institutional capacities</li> </ul>

<sup>11</sup> That is, in relation to the expected impacts under strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 of The Strategy.

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Aspects to be taken into consideration (examples)</i>
Impact on the ground	Changes that have occurred or are expected to occur in the livelihoods of populations living in affected areas (SO1), in the conditions of ecosystems affected by DLDD (SO2), and in the condition of global public goods affected by DLDD, such as biological diversity and the climate (SO3), as a result of the mobilization of resources (SO4) for relevant investments contributing to the implementation of the UNCCD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Changes in household income and net assets</li> <li>▪ Changes in poverty rates</li> <li>▪ Changes in the value of land in all its dimensions (provisioning, regulating, supporting, cultural)</li> <li>▪ Contribution to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity</li> <li>▪ Contribution to climate change mitigation</li> <li>▪ Magnitude of investment</li> <li>▪ Total beneficiaries/target areas</li> </ul>
Potential for replication and scaling-up	The extent to which investments have been or are likely to be replicated and scaled-up by government authorities, donor organizations, the private sector and other stakeholders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Innovativeness in the institutional arrangements, approach, solutions</li> <li>▪ Mechanisms to facilitate transfer of know-how, good practices, etc.</li> <li>▪ Acceptance/uptake by other partners and stakeholders</li> </ul>

(Source: adapted from the OECD/DAC *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management*, 2002, and from the IFAD *Evaluation Manual: Methodology and Processes*, 2009)

23. A guiding framework for self-assessment of impact, consisting of a grid of questions and procedural guidelines, will be developed by the secretariat and the GM to assist country Parties and other reporting entities in a self-assessment of impact against the above-mentioned REESIP criteria.<sup>12</sup> This will be done taking advantage, wherever possible, of existing frameworks, standards or quasi-standards in impact assessment.<sup>13</sup>

24. This framework will provide basic guidance and toolkits to assess impact using a flexible mix of quantitative and qualitative methods that are commensurate with the level of available resources. This will include methods to understand the proximate causes of good or bad performance or result, so as to provide useful indications for future benchmarking, correction or adjustment.

25. Drawing on the work of the international impact evaluation community,<sup>14</sup> the framework will be structured in such a way as to secure credibility, generate evidence, address issues of attribution and minimize variability. This approach will ensure that the definitions, methodologies and parameters used for the self-assessment will be applied homogeneously by all stakeholders across the reporting cycles, thereby resulting in reliable and comparable data.

26. Also key, when measuring impact achieved under SO4, will be the assessment of co-financing arrangements and the performance of partners involved in resource mobilization

<sup>12</sup> REESIP: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability, Impacts on the ground, and Potential for scaling-up.

<sup>13</sup> Such as the Impact Reporting and Investment Standards (IRIS) framework.

<sup>14</sup> This includes, for example, the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), the Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation (NONIE) and the OECD/DAC Network on Evaluation.

initiatives. Given the principle of shared but differentiated responsibility embedded in the Convention and The Strategy, this assessment would also provide important indications for the overall review of implementation of The Strategy.

27. A specific set of criteria will be provided as part of the above-mentioned framework to facilitate a self-assessment of partnerships related to SO4. To the extent possible, this will build on established methodologies and techniques<sup>15</sup> to assess the added value of partnerships and progress made with regard to their specific objectives.

28. The above-mentioned reporting requirements for measuring progress on SO4 are submitted for consideration to CRIC 10. Further to a decision made by the Parties at COP10 on this matter, detailed reporting guidelines will be developed by the secretariat, in collaboration with the GM, in time for the next reporting cycle, scheduled to start in January 2012. This will include electronic formats and templates to be incorporated in the PRAIS system.

### **III. Intended use of the data collected on strategic objective 4**

29. Data on progress made on SO4 will be collected as part of the reporting process through the PRAIS portal and analysed by the GM.<sup>16</sup> Findings from the analysis will be incorporated in the overall synthesis and preliminary analysis of the reports by the secretariat,<sup>17</sup> reviewed by the CRIC, assessed under the mid-term review of The Strategy, and made available through the PRAIS portal using state of the art knowledge management tools,<sup>18</sup> including the GM FIELD system.

30. The GM will analyse the data collected on SO4 impact indicators as described in document ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.7 and in document ICCD/CRIC(10)/14. The results of this analysis will complement the findings of the analysis of financial flows based on data collected through the standard financial annex and programme and project sheet for every biennium, as well as the preliminary analysis of performance indicators under operational objective 5 of The Strategy. A time series will be developed to monitor progress over time. Findings and information on SO4 will be incorporated into the knowledge management tool of the PRAIS and the FIELD system of the GM.

31. The GM will also undertake a compilation and preliminary analysis of the data reported by countries and observers under the self-assessment of impact. To this effect, the GM will adopt a combination of rating, weighting and scoring systems that would enable aggregations of data from the national to the global level and vice versa, the generation of statistics and the identification of trends.

32. The above analytical reports will inform the performance review and assessment of the implementation of The Strategy by the CRIC, as well as the envisaged mid-term and final reviews of The Strategy, to be held in 2013 and 2019, respectively.

33. Trends, patterns, features and gaps observed in the evolution of these data over time will allow the CRIC and the COP, as well as the individual country Parties and organizations, to identify the necessary measures to put in place in order to secure the achievement of SO4.

---

<sup>15</sup> For instance, outcome mapping, partnership journal, relationship analysis, etc. Some of these techniques are being pilot tested by the GM as part of its results and impact assessment methodology.

<sup>16</sup> Decision 13/COP.9, attachment, paragraph. 22.

<sup>17</sup> Decision 13/COP.9, attachment, paragraph. 21.

<sup>18</sup> Decision 13/COP.9, attachment, paragraph. 27.

34. It should be noted that no specific targets have been adopted for SO4 and its underlying expected impacts. It would therefore be helpful, in order to enable a quantitative assessment of progress in the achievement of this objective of The Strategy, if the COP were to decide to adopt specific benchmarks against which this assessment could be made. The COP may also wish to commission a study as part of the mid-term evaluation exercise to define a set of voluntary targets on SO4, for consideration at COP11.

#### **IV. Foreseeable reporting issues and suggested solutions based on good practices**

35. On the basis of lessons learned from the fourth UNCCD reporting cycle and the results of the PRAIS reporting, a number of issues that could hamper impact assessment on SO4 should be expected. These include the following:

(a) Issue of data coverage. For the fourth UNCCD reporting cycle (the first reporting exercise under The Strategy), nearly half of the developed countries did not report. While the ratio was better for the developing countries in the different regional annexes, the issue of lack of coverage impinges on the computation of a robust baseline and on progress monitoring over time;

(b) Few multilateral organizations reporting. While multilateral development organizations are known to provide the largest share of financing for DLDD activities, the majority of them, including United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations do not report to the UNCCD. This further aggravates the situation with regard to monitoring progress on the SO4-1 indicator in particular;

(c) Issue of variability. Reporting guidelines tend to be understood differently by different reporting countries and organizations. In some cases, the understanding of the guidelines varies over time. This leads to incomparable data and analyses;

(d) Issue of definitions. Some of the terminology used in The Strategy lends itself to excessively broad (e.g. private sector) or vague interpretations (e.g. innovative financing). In the absence of commonly agreed upon standards or more specific delimitations of scope, this leads to serious difficulties in data collection and sometimes to duplication of efforts between parallel reporting exercises.

36. Suggested solutions:

(a) To improve data coverage, it may be advisable to explore and introduce incentives to stimulate reporting by affected country Parties and observers, such as the establishment of a group of major impact investors, simplified or accelerated procedures for accreditation, etc.;

(b) To obtain information on resources mobilized by major investors, such as multilateral DFIs that do not report to the UNCCD, it may be necessary to commission ad hoc studies or portfolio reviews aiming at measuring and assessing the impact of resources mobilized and enabling activities put in place directly or indirectly in line with SO4;

(c) To address the issue of variability, the secretariat and the GM could be requested to provide the necessary training to affected country Parties in the framework of a global capacity-building initiative. In this connection, international organizations and financial institutions, including, inter alia, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), could be invited to make adequate resources available to the implementing agency of the programme

for organizing and delivering these enabling activities<sup>19</sup> in consultation and collaboration with Convention institutions;

(d) To address the issue of definitions, the Joint Liaison Group could be requested to provide the required technical assistance for the indicators relating to impact indicator SO4-4<sup>20</sup> as part of the proposed terms of reference and modus operandi of the Group as suggested in document ICCD/CRIC(10)/14;

(e) To facilitate and ease the reporting burden it would be advisable, particularly for developing country Parties, to develop and establish, in collaboration with the GM and with financial support from the GEF and other available funding sources, adequate information systems as part of their national monitoring systems for reporting, such as observatories on SLM/DLDD investments, to facilitate data collection and reporting on SO4.

## V. Conclusions and recommendations

**37. The present document presents the rationale and approach that the secretariat and the GM propose to adopt in the development of detailed guidelines for reporting on progress made in achieving SO4 of The Strategy.**

**38. The recommendations contained in this document originate from the preliminary proposal by the secretariat and the GM on how best to measure progress on SO4 discussed at CRIC 8,<sup>21</sup> build on the experience and lessons learned during the fourth reporting cycle, and benefit from the feedback provided by country Parties at CRIC 9.**

**39. Following review of this document and the associated recommendations by the CRIC, Parties at COP 10 may wish:**

(a) **To adopt the proposed approach for measuring progress on SO4, consisting of both impact indicators and a self-assessment of impact, as outlined in this document;**

(b) **To instruct the secretariat and the GM to develop, in line with the recommendations and indicative aspects described in this document, detailed reporting guidelines on SO4 including formats and templates to be incorporated in the PRAIS system;**

(c) **To request the secretariat to develop, in collaboration with the GM, detailed terms of reference for the studies to be commissioned in relation to SO4-4 and SO4-5 indicators taking into account the availability of data, existing studies, and the resources and time available;**

(d) **To endorse the principle of relying on ad hoc studies for the computation of indicators and the assessment of impact of resources mobilized by relevant organizations and entities not reporting to the UNCCD;**

(e) **To invite the GEF to make adequate resources available to the Convention's institutions and country Parties for training and capacity building on SO 4 reporting, as appropriate and as part of a global programme in support to the 2012–2013 reporting and review exercise;**

---

<sup>19</sup> Decision 13/COP.9, paragraph 6.

<sup>20</sup> Decision 13/COP.9, paragraph 7.

<sup>21</sup> ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.7.

(f) To request the secretariat and the GM, with financial support from the GEF and other available funding sources, to assist country Parties in the development and establishment of information systems to facilitate data collection and reporting, including on issues relating to SO4;

(g) To take note of the intended use, analysis and dissemination of data on SO4;

(h) To allocate in the core budget of the secretariat and the Global Mechanism, as appropriate, the necessary human and financial resources:

(i) to develop and finalise detailed reporting guidelines on SO4;

(ii) to commission studies to collect and compute information on SO4-4 and SO4-5 indicators;

(iii) to assist, on request, affected country Parties and other reporting entities on SO4 reporting; and

(iv) to analyse data and information on SO4 in line with best practices on impact assessment;

(i) To adopt specific benchmarks for measuring progress on SO4 at the relevant sessions of the CRIC, and in view of the forthcoming mid-term evaluation of The Strategy in 2013;

(j) To commission a study, to be coordinated by the CRIC Bureau as part of the mid-term evaluation of The Strategy, to define a set of voluntary targets on SO4, for consideration at COP 11.

---