



## 防治荒漠化公约

Distr.: General  
29 August 2011  
Chinese  
Original: English

### 缔约方会议

科学和技术委员会

第十届会议

2011年10月11日至13日，大韩民国昌原  
临时议程项目4(b)

关于“战略”的战略目标1、2和3的进展  
情况的最佳衡量办法的咨询意见  
藉以分析报告实体拟于2012年提交的报告  
中所载科学和技术信息和分析相关科学结果  
的利用情况的模式

### 《公约》执行情况审评委员会

第十届会议

2011年10月11日至20日，大韩民国昌原  
临时议程项目4(a)(v)

改进信息通报程序以及提交缔约方会议报告  
的质量和格式

与执行情况评估工作相关的迭代进程，包括  
绩效和影响指标、方法学和报告程序缔约方  
和其他报告实体的报告所载信息初步分析指南

## 缔约方和其他报告实体的报告所载信息初步分析指南

### 秘书处的说明

#### 内容提要

根据第11/COP.9和第13/COP.9号决定，秘书处和全球机制，按照各自的任  
务授权，编写了缔约方和其他报告实体2010至2011年的报告所载信息的初步分  
析文件。

在《公约》执行情况审评委员会(审评委)第九届会议上，缔约方赞赏秘书处  
和全球机制在执行情况绩效审评和评估制度下，对缔约方和其他报告实体提交  
的信息进行的综合和分析工作；同时，缔约方指出，需进一步改进报告程序框架并  
商定《公约》机构可藉以进行初步分析的明确指南。

本文件介绍了将来藉以对国家缔约方和其他报告实体的报告所载信息进行  
初步分析的指南以及秘书处和全球机制在这方面应遵循的方法学。审评委不妨考  
虑本文件所介绍的备选办法并提出关于如何进行这一分析的建议。

## 目录

	段次	页次
缩略语 .....		3
表格 .....		4
一. 导言和初步分析任务 .....	1-9	5
A. 业务目标和资金流 .....	2-3	5
B. 战略目标 .....	4-6	5
C. 《公约》执行情况审评委员会的建议 .....	7-9	6
二. 报告进展情况分析工作的一般考虑和准则 .....	10-42	6
A. 一般考虑 .....	10-21	6
B. 拟议框架说明 .....	22-42	8
三. 结论和建议 .....	43	12
附件		
I. Guidelines for the analysis of the progress in reporting (table) .....		13
II. Guidelines for the analysis of information relating to the strategic objectives of The Strategy and related impact indicators (tables) .....		14
III. Guidelines for the analysis of information relating to the operational objectives of The Strategy and related performance indicators (tables) .....		18
IV. Guidelines for the analysis of financial information (tables) .....		34
V. Guidelines for the analysis of information relating to the additional information (tables) .....		37

## 缩略语

BODA	双边官发援	双边官方发展援助
COP	缔约方会议	缔约方会议
CRIC	审评委	《公约》执行情况审评委员会
CRS	经合组织贷方报告系统	经合组织贷方报告系统
CSO	民间社会组织	民间社会组织
CST	科技委	科学和技术委员会
DAC	发援会	经合组织发展援助委员会
DFI	发展融资机构	发展融资机构
DLDD	荒漠化、土地退化和干旱	
DPSIR	动因—压力—状态—影响—应对	
e-SMART	经济合算(E)—具体(S)—可衡量(M)—可实现(A)—相关(R)—有时限(T)	
FIELD	土地退化问题融资信息搜索引擎	
GEF	环境基金	全球环境基金
GM	全球机制	全球机制
IFAD	农发基金	国际农业发展基金
IFS	综合融资战略	综合融资战略
IGO	政府间组织	政府间组织
IIF	综合投资框架	综合投资框架
IRIS	影响报告和投资标准	影响报告和投资标准
JLG	联合联络小组	联合联络小组
JWP	联合工作方案	联合工作方案
NAP	国家行动方案	国家行动方案
NCSA	国家能力自我评估	国家能力自评
NONIE	影响评估网络之网络	
OECD	经合组织	经济合作与发展组织
PPS	方案和项目概况表	方案和项目概况表
PRAIS	执行情况绩效审查和评估制度	执行情况绩效审查和评估制度
RAC	相关活动代码	相关活动代码
RAP	区域行动方案	区域行动方案
RBM	成果管理制	基于成果的管理
SFA	标准财务附件	标准财务附件
SLM	可持续土地管理	可持续土地管理
SRAP	次区域行动方案	次区域行动方案
STI	科技机构	科学和技术机构
UNCCD	《荒漠化公约》	《联合国防治荒漠化公约》
UNEG	联合国评价小组	评价小组

## 表格

表	国家缔约方和其他报告实体所提供资料的分析元素 .....	8
Annex I		
Table	Analysis on progress in reporting .....	13
Annex II		
Table 1	Analysis of affected areas .....	14
Table 2	Indicator-based analysis - strategic objective 1 .....	14
Table 3	Indicator-based analysis - strategic objective 2 .....	15
Table 4	Impact indicators on strategic objective 4: purpose, data requirements, and sources of information .....	16
Annex III		
Table 1	Indicator-based analysis - operational objective 1 .....	18
Table 2	Indicator-based analysis - operational objective 2 .....	20
Table 3	Indicator-based analysis - operational objective 3 .....	24
Table 4	Indicator-based analysis - operational objective 4 .....	27
Table 5	Indicator-based analysis - operational objective 5 .....	29
Annex IV		
Table 1	Financial analysis - Standard Financial Annex .....	34
Table 2	Financial analysis - Programme and Project Sheets .....	35
Annex V		
Table 1	Reporting process-related issues, Global Environment Facility .....	37
Table 2	Accommodation of specific requests within decisions of the Conference of the Parties .....	38
Table 3	Reporting on the implementation of the national action programme .....	39
Table 4	Any other country-specific issues .....	39
Table 5	Support to NAP/SRAP/RAP implementation and/or review .....	40
Table 6	Support to capacity-building initiatives in eligible affected country Parties .....	40
Table 7	Mandate-specific reporting .....	41

## 一. 导言和初步分析任务

1. 在第九届会议上，籍第 11/COP.9 号决定，缔约方会议决定，根据《公约》执行情况审评委员会(审评委)的职权范围，<sup>1</sup> 秘书处应对缔约方和观察员提交的报告进行汇编和初步分析。第 13/COP.9 号决定<sup>2</sup> 还请全球机制分析资金流并向秘书处提交分析结果，以将其列入秘书处向审评委提交的报告之中。

### A. 业务目标和资金流

2. 根据第 13/COP.9 号决定、附件三(载有临时绩效指标清单、这些指标的报告属性、基线和具体目标)和附件四(标准财务附件)，已请缔约方和其他报告实体按照其具体法定任务向审评委提交报告。

3. 已为 2010-2011 年报告和审评进程编写了国家缔约方和其他报告实体的报告所载资料的初步分析文件，涉及 5 个业务目标的进展情况和资金分析。<sup>3</sup> 该初步分析是按照分析框架进行的，已向审评委提交了该分析框架供其参考。<sup>4</sup>

### B. 战略目标

4. 根据第 13/COP.9 号决定附件一和第 17/COP.9 号决定所载的规定，<sup>5</sup> 缔约方会议暂时接受了一套 11 项影响指标，用以衡量在实现战略目标 1、2 和 3 方面取得的进展。以下两个影响指标是受影响国家 2012 年报告的最低要求：“生活在贫困线以上人口的比例”和“土地植被状况”。其余影响指标虽然作了建议，但受影响国家在第四次报告和审评进程中可自由选择是否列入报告。

5. 籍第 13/COP.9 号决定，<sup>6</sup> 缔约方会议暂时通过了一套 7 个指标，用以衡量战略目标 4(SO-4)。ICCD/CRIC(10)/12 号文件介绍了以下内容：关于影响指标 SO4-1 至 SO4-7(衡量 SO-4 的进展情况)的补充报告要素、关于报告模板的补充指导意见和方法学建议、数据收集工作及随后分析。

<sup>1</sup> 参见载于 ICCD/COP(9)/18/Add.1 号文件的第 11/COP.9 号决定。

<sup>2</sup> 参见载于 ICCD/COP(9)/18/Add.1 号文件的第 13/COP.9 号决定。

<sup>3</sup> 参见 ICCD/CRIC(9)/INF.13 号文件和秘书处载于 ICCD/CRIC(9)/3、ICCD/CRIC(9)/4、ICCD/CRIC(9)/5、ICCD/CRIC(9)/6、ICCD/CRIC(9)/7、ICCD/CRIC(9)/9 和 ICCD/CRIC(9)/10 号文件中编写的综述和初步分析；全球机制编写的资金流分析载于 ICCD/CRIC(9)/8 和 ICCD/CRIC(9)/INF.12 号文件。

<sup>4</sup> 载于 ICCD/CRIC(9)/INF.13 号文件(业务目标、迭代过程和补充信息以及最佳做法)和 ICCD/CRIC(9)/8 号文件(资金流动对《公约》的执行情况)。

<sup>5</sup> 参见载于 ICCD/COP(9)/18/Add.1 号文件的第 17/COP.9 号决定。

<sup>6</sup> 参见第 13/COP.9 号决定附件二。

6. 根据第 11/COP.9 和 13/COP.9 号决定，将要求缔约方和其他报告实体在 2012-2013 年对照影响指标和其他报告要素作出报告。

### C. 《公约》执行情况审评委员会的建议

7. 在《公约》执行情况审评委员会(审评委)第九届会议上，缔约方赞赏秘书处和全球机制在执行情况绩效审查和评估制度下，对缔约方和其他报告实体提交的信息进行的综合和分析工作；同时，缔约方指出，需进一步改进报告程序框架，包括商定《公约》机构可藉以进行初步分析的明确指南。

8. 本文件介绍的指南所依据的是在 2010-2011 年报告和审查进程期间进行的分析，并考虑到缔约方在审评委第九届会议上提出的反馈和评论。

9. ICCD/CRIC(10)/11 号文件载有缔约方和其他报告实体提供的补充反馈信息，包括关于绩效指标和报告进程其他要素(即，报告时间框架、能力建设、融资、数据收集和质量控制)的信息。

## 二. 报告进展情况分析工作的一般考虑和准则

### A. 一般考虑

#### 1. 分析工作的地理范围和类型

10. 为回应一些国家缔约方表达的关切，<sup>7</sup> 本文所介绍的分析工作的所有要素均侧重于全球层面。区域层面的细分仅在对全球分析相关时才列入。

#### 2. 汇编资料、数据解释和数据质量检查

11. 分析工作要求：为分析之目的，将国家缔约方和其他报告实体提供的资料汇编为连贯的全球数据集。这项工作包括：汇总有关报告实体提供的资料，检查数据质量并在某种程度上解释所提供的资料。

12. 数据解释要求：制定数据处理标准程序，例如，超出范围的数据(与平均数据范围相比较，极高数值或极低数值)。

13. 在连续报告周期过程中，数据质量可望得到改善：在《荒漠化公约》审评和报告进程中，这些资料会得到使用，但在决定报告进程时限问题时应将其考虑在内。谨建议：将报告提交日期后的一段足够长的时间(三至六个月)用于数据质量检查，使《公约》机构能够就实质性问题再次向报告实体咨询。同样，亦建议：改进国家缔约方和其他报告实体的分析结果反馈机制。

---

<sup>7</sup> ICCD/CRIC(9)/16 号文件。

### 3. 列入报告的资料的可比性

14. 对国家缔约方和其他报告实体的报告所列资料进行正确的解释，这项工作要求所提供的资料具有大体上的可比性。

15. 《荒漠化公约》进程内部资料的可比性可望在连续报告周期过程(迭代进程)中得到改善：这些资料得到收集、汇编、解释和使用；而且，在国家、区域和全球各级的能力建设方面取得了进展。

16. 数据收集方法学和报告模板需在具体情境下和针对不同数据具备度进行测试，并相应加以制定。

### 4. 传播信息和分析工具

17. 由于初步指南正在测试之中，2011年进行的分析在个案基础上使用了临时分析工具。使用了在线数据分析系统，例如 IBM Cognos；<sup>8</sup> 还使用了更普通的离线工具，例如 Microsoft Excel。未来发展将需要：通过 PRAIS 门户提供汇编数据集和至少一部分分析功能。这将使报告实体和广大公众能够利用所收集的资料和自己进行具体分析。

### 5. 使用辅助数据集

18. 本文介绍的各种分析要素，连同国家数据一起，需要使用更多的全球数据集，例如人口数据、国内生产总值(GDP)和货币汇率以及地理参考数据集(例如，国家边界)。这些数据仅用于验证国家缔约方和其他报告实体提供的主要信息并为其提供参考。在以下事例中，介绍了使用辅助数据的实例。

19. 对 2010-2011 年报告和审评进程所提供的资料进行的分析，其所分析的是报告实体提供的与 2008-2009 两年期相关的数据和资料。在必要时，使用了下列联合国资料来源提供的人口、国内生产总值和汇率数据补充了与绩效指标相关的资料：

- 联合国经济和社会事务部(经社部)统计司：《2008 年人口和生命统计报告》(统计文件，A 系列，第六十二卷，第 2 期)：可获得的最新人口普查和估计数(2008-2009 年)。2010 年 7 月；
- 联合国经济和社会事务部(经社部)统计司：2008 年经济和社会发展社会指标：收入和经济活动指标。2010 年 6 月；
- 联合国财务处：联合国业务汇率(2008 至 2009 年)。

<sup>8</sup> Cognos 商务分析、商务情报和绩效管理。软件介绍：请访问<http://www-01.ibm.com/software/data/cognos/>。

20. 例如，在对“获得关于荒漠化、土地退化和干旱(DLDD)以及 DLDD 与气候变化和生物多样性的协同作用宣传的人口比例进展，按每年获宣人口百分比计算”进行全球层面分析时使用了人口数据。<sup>9</sup>

21. 例如，在对“通过 DLDD 相关方案和项目，向受影响国家提供的数额趋势”进行全球层面分析时使用了汇率。<sup>10</sup>

## B. 拟议框架说明

22. 本节概述对国家缔约方和其他实体提供的资料进行的分析工作的要素(见下表)。本文件附件一至附件五载有分析工作各要素的详细说明。

### 国家缔约方和其他报告实体所提供资料的分析工作要素

要素	说明	频率	状况
1 报告进展	对报告周期、涵盖范围和答复完整性的贡献  以下三方面的比较：报告进展、报告专拨资金和在设立 DLDD 监测系统方面的进展	2 年	已于 2010 年实施
2 战略目标进展情况	基于指标的分析——影响指标分析：  基于单一影响指标的分析  针对多个指标和目标的横贯分析	4 年	预计在 2012 年实施
3 业务目标进展情况	基于指标的分析——影响指标分析：  基于单一绩效指标和目标差距的分析  针对多个指标和目标的横贯分析	2 年	已于 2010 年实施
4 全球定性评估	目标进展情况简表	2 年	
5 资金分析	资金信息分析：  标准财务附件相关资料分析  标准财务附件相关资料分析	2 年	已于 2010 年实施 已于 2010 年实施
6 资金流和《公约》 执行进展情况	资金流横贯分析和在实现《荒漠化公约》业务目标方面的进展：	2 年	

<sup>9</sup> 绩效指标 CONS-O-1：“就荒漠化、土地退化和干旱(DLDD)和/或 DLDD 与气候变化和生物多样性的协同作用问题组织的宣传活动的数目和规模,以及处理 DLDD 和 DLDD 协同作用问题的媒体所接触的受众数目”。

<sup>10</sup> 绩效指标 CONS-O-15：“发达国家缔约方提供的应对 DLDD 问题的资金额”。



要素	说明	频率	状况
	以下两方面的比较：在实现《荒漠化公约》业务目标方面的进展情况和在全球层面在各业务目标之间对项目 and 投资的分配情况		
	基于相关活动代码的分析：比较指标动态，显示相对于资助水平(承诺额和投资额)的目标进展情况		
7 补充资金分析：	可持续土地管理技术(包括适应)方面的最佳做法分类	2 年	已于 2010 年实施
8 最佳做法分类	可持续土地管理技术(包括适应)方面的最佳做法分类	持续进行	已于 2010 年实施
	融资和资源动员方面的最佳做法分类	持续进行	2012 年起实施

## 1. 报告进展情况

23. 该元素包括以下内容：

(a) 报告进展情况：即，对报告周期、涵盖范围和答复完整性的贡献(详见附件一)；

(b) 以下三方面的比较：(a) 所定义的报告进展情况、报告专拨资金水平趋势和在设立 DLDD 监测系统方面的进展。

24. 该项分析将依据以下两项分析结果：资金分析和基于下文所描述的绩效指标的分析。

## 2. 战略目标进展情况(影响指标分析)

25. 该元素包括对影响指标的分析：

(a) 基于单一指标的分析(详见附件二)。关于影响指标的报告工作预计于 2012-2013 两年期开始；

(b) 针对多个指标和目标的横贯分析，以说明：例如，为 DLDD 专门划拨的更多资金是否也使受影响人口和生态系统的情况得到改善。该分析要素将在稍后阶段实施。

## 3. 业务目标和具体目标的进展情况(影响指标分析)

26. 该元素包括对影响指标的分析：

(a) 基于单一指标的分析，说明单一目标的进展情况(详见附件三)；

(b) 针对多个指标和目标的横贯分析(详见附件三)。该分析要素将在稍后阶段实施。

#### 4. 全球定性评估

27. 该元素包括，概述各战略目标和业务目标的具体目标进展情况。评估结果将汇编于一个表中：使用定性分类和适当符号，说明具体目标(已议定的具体目标)是否正在实现之中/无进展/落后于计划，或是否正在取得一般性改善(在尚未议定具体目标的情况下)。<sup>11</sup> 此项分析将在“目标差距”分析的结果基础上进行(此种分析的进一步详情，请参见附件三)。此项分析将在稍后阶段实施。

#### 5. 资金分析

28. 该元素包括以下内容：

(a) 分析与标准财务附件相关的资料(详见附件四，A 节)。已为 2010-2011 年报告和审评进程进行了此项分析；

(b) 分析与方案和项目概况表相关的资料(详见附件四，B 节)。已为 2008-2009 年审评和报告进程进行了此项分析。

29. 本节概述的分析框架介绍全球机制所制定的方法，藉此方法，在通过标准财务附件以及方案和项目概况表收集的信息基础上，分析资金流和趋势。

30. 该分析框架是全球机制在 PRAIS 项目范围内，在外部专家协助下<sup>12</sup> 并与经济合作与发展组织发展援助委员会(经合组织/发援会)密切磋商后制定的。

31. 分析方法和方法学基于广泛接受的政府间标准、定义和最佳做法以及在制作财务数据和维护发展融资数据库和投资监测系统(例如全球机制的土地退化问题融资信息搜索引擎和经合组织的贷方报告系统)方面的实际经验。

32. 资金流分析的总体目标是，为审评委对在实现“推进《公约》执行工作的十年战略规划和框架”(2008-2018)(“战略”)的战略目标和业务目标方面的进展评估和绩效审评提供参考。为此目的，在侧重于财务数据和指标的同时，分析框架还探讨了与《公约》的社会、环境和发展指标之间的联系。

33. 用于分析《荒漠化公约》资金流和趋势的分析方法的设计目标是，尤其考察以下几个方面：

- ‘投入’，即各级为执行《公约》所筹集的资源以及各种资金来源为支持各机构、方案、项目和其他相关举措所分配的资源；
- ‘产出’，即资助活动的投资回报，可从对这些活动的性质、范围、目标、预期成果和结果的定量和定性分析中推断得出。

---

<sup>11</sup> 例如，++/--, 笑脸, 绿/黄/红点或其组合。

<sup>12</sup> Unisfèra/Planetair。

34. 投入/产出分析主要基于分别载于国家缔约方和其他报告实体通过 PRAIS 系统提交的正式报告中的标准财务附件和方案与项目概况表章节中的财务数据。

35. 有其他信息作为补充，例如，有关国家的国内生产总值、所获得的官方发展援助、汇率数据和货币缩减指数——所有这些信息均从权威渠道获得。

36. 投入与产出分析按不同层面进行，这些层面又由参数和变量的不同组合构成。

37. 统计数据是通过表、图和图表阐释的，其中包括：以行和列呈现不同统计数据的一览表；视觉展示统计数据和趋势的图表、柱状图和图解；显示相关统计数据地理分布的示意图。

38. 亦进行数据完整性检控，以消除重复记录并验证数据相对于报告准则和定义的一致性水平。还对 PRAIS 数据和经合组织的贷方报告系统所载的发展援助数据进行比较分析，以确定潜在的不相符情况。

39. 应注意的是，在《荒漠化公约》第 4 次报告周期的首轮报告所产生的数据基础上进行的首次分析工作旨在提供一套基线统计数据，在后续报告周期中进行的分析将可较准确地确定趋势、衡量流量和进行进展审评。

## 6. 资金流和《公约》执行进展情况的横贯分析

40. 该元素包括以下内容：

(a) 在绩效指标和资金分析基础上，对以下两方面进行比较：在实现《荒漠化公约》的业务目标方面的进展情况和在全球层面在这些目标之间分配项目和资金(投资)的情况；

(b) 比较指标动态,显示相对于资助水平(基于相关活动代码的分析，资助水平指的是承诺额和投资额两个方面)的目标进展情况。

## 7. 补充资金分析：

41. 该元素包括分析补充资料：详见下文附件五。已为 2010-2011 年报告和审评进程进行了此项分析；

## 8. 最佳做法分类

42. 该元素包括对最佳做法的分类：ICCD/CRIC(10)/15 号文件载列了可持续土地管理(包括适应方面的)最佳做法分类；ICCD/CRIC(10)/16 号文件载列了供资和资源动员方面的最佳做法分类。已在 2010-2011 年报告和审评进程期间收集和公布了关于可持续土地管理(包括适应方面的)最佳做法的资料。<sup>13</sup> 预计将从 2012-2013 两年期开始实施供资和资源动员方面最佳做法分类。

<sup>13</sup> 参见 ICCD/CRIC(9)/9 号文件。

### 三. 结论和建议

43. 审评委第十届会议的缔约方不妨审议所建议的指南并建议第十届缔约方会议的缔约方：

(a) 请秘书处和全球机制按照各自任务授权：

(一) 实施载于本文件的“缔约方和其他报告实体的报告所载资料的初步分析指南”，对从 2012-2013 年报告和审评进程开始的资料进行初步分析；

(二) 按照上述指南，制定有关标准程序，处理缔约方和其他报告实体的报告所载数据；

(三) 根据需要更新数据处理指南和程序并在《荒漠化公约》网站和 PRAIS 门户上发布；

(b) 考虑在汇编和处理国家缔约方和其他报告实体所收到的资料时进行数据质量检查的必要性,并建议,从 2012 至 2013 报告和审评进程开始：

(一) 在报告提交日期后，将足够长的一段时间用于编写报告实体收到的资料并对其进行质量检查,使《公约》机构能够就实质性问题向这些实体咨询；

(二) 建立一个国家缔约方和其他报告实体分析结果的反馈机制。

## Annex I

[English only]

### Guidelines for the analysis of the progress in reporting (table)

#### Analysis on progress in reporting

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
PR1.1	<b>Coverage:</b> Number of reports received per reporting cycle in total, by region/subregion, by reporting entity	Affected, <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i> , developed, United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
PR1.2	<b>Coverage:</b> Number of reports submitted online per reporting cycle in total, by region/subregion, by reporting entity	Affected, <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i> , developed, United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
PR2.1	<b>Completeness:</b> classification of reports received based on <b>(a)</b> percentage of compiled fields (3 classes: incomplete, 50% completed, almost complete) <b>and/or</b> on <b>(b)</b> the number of indicators for which information is provided (3 classes)	Country Parties (affected, developed)
PR2.2	<b>Completeness:</b> Number of reports with information relating to specific indicators	Affected, <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i> , developed, United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
PR3.1	<b>Progress/trends:</b> <i>Trends in the number of reports received per reporting cycle</i>	Affected, <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i> , developed, United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF

*Notes:* PR denotes analysis of progress in reporting.

Italics indicate analyses to be implemented when time series are available.

*Abbreviations:* GEF Global Environment Facility, IGO intergovernmental organization, RAP regional action programme, SRAP subregional action programme.

## Annex II

[English only]

### Guidelines for the analysis of information relating to the strategic objectives of The Strategy and related impact indicators (tables)\*

#### A. General information

Table 1  
Analysis of affected areas

<i>Core indicator number</i>	<i>Indicator name</i>	<i>Metrics</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
Applies to all		Affected areas	II0.1.1	Extension of areas affected by DLDD by country and reporting year in terms of: (a) absolute values (ha);  (b) percentage of the national land area occupied by affected areas.	Affected country Parties

Notes: II denotes analysis of impact indicators

#### B. Strategic objective 1

Table 2  
Indicator-based analysis – strategic objective 1

<i>Core indicator number</i>	<i>Indicator name</i>	<i>Metrics</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
SO-1/2/3	III. Proportion of population living above the poverty line	Rural poverty rate	III.1.1	Progress in the proportion of population living above the poverty line	Affected country Parties
			<i>III.1.2</i>	<i>Trends showing progress in the proportion of population living above the poverty line.</i>	<i>Affected country Parties</i>

Notes: II denotes analysis of impact indicators.

Italics indicate analyses to be implemented when time series are available.

\* These guidelines have been developed on the basis of the document ICCD/COP(10)/CST/3.

## C. Strategic objective 2

Table 3  
Indicator-based analysis – strategic objective 2

<i>Core indicator number</i>	<i>Indicator name</i>	<i>Metrics</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
SO-5	IX. Land cover status	Land cover	II.2.1.1	Distribution of land cover classes by reporting period in terms of absolute values (ha) and percentages with respect to the total.	Affected country Parties
			<i>II.2.1.2</i>	<i>Progress in land cover status in terms of:</i> <i>(a) land cover changes for selected land cover classes, referring to both the latest reporting period and the baseline year;</i> <i>(b) trends in land cover changes for the selected land cover classes.</i>	<i>Affected country Parties</i>
S-5	IX. Land cover status	Land productivity/production	II.2.2.1	Land productivity of land cover/land use system by reporting period, in terms of distribution of productivity classes (3 or 4 classes: low, medium, high, very high; with thresholds depending on the variable used).	Affected country Parties
			II.2.2.2	Changes in land productivity (country assessment), in terms of number of countries where productivity is increasing, decreasing, stable, unknown.	Affected country Parties
			<i>II.2.2.3</i>	<i>Progress in land cover productivity in terms of:</i> <i>(a) land productivity changes for selected land cover classes, referred both to the latest reporting period and the baseline year;</i> <i>(b) trends in land productivity changes for selected land cover/land productivity systems.</i>	<i>Affected country Parties</i>

Notes: II denotes analysis of impact indicators.

Italics indicate analyses to be implemented when time series are available.

## D. Strategic objective 4

Table 4

### Impact indicators on strategic objective 4: purpose, data requirements and sources of information

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
SO4-1	Percentage change of multilateral donor contributions for UNCCD-related activities	QT	indication of the trend in the supply of finance for DLDD-related investments and other UNCCD-related activities by multilateral DFIs	G, I
SO4-2	UNCCD share of BODA	QT	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
SO4-3	Percentage change of domestic financial commitment to UNCCD implementation	QT	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
SO4-4	Percentage change of contributions from innovative sources of finance for UNCCD-related activities	QT	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)
SO4-5	Percentage change of private sector and other contributions for UNCCD-related activities	QT	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**
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	measures the efforts made by the Convention stakeholders to facilitate the implementation of the Convention	A, D, G, I, R



<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
SO4-7	Clear entrusting of institutional responsibilities for UNCCD implementation, at all levels	QL	indication of the effectiveness of institutional arrangements for UNCCD implementation with regard to the resource mobilization process	A, D, G, I, M, R, S

*Notes:* QT: quantitative; QL: qualitative.

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.

*Abbreviations:* BODA bilateral development assistance, DFI developing of integrated financing strategy, SO strategic objective.

\*\* Study to be coordinated by the GM and the secretariat as part of their joint work programme.

## Annex III

[English only]

### Guidelines for the analysis of information relating to the operational objectives of The Strategy and related performance indicators (tables)

#### A. Operational objective 1

Table 1  
Indicator-based analysis – operational objective 1

<i>Outcome in The Strategy</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
1.1	CONS-O-1	IA1.1, ID1.1	Progress in the proportion of population being informed about DLDD and DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity, in terms of percentage of population being informed per year	Country Parties (affected, developed), <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i>
		IA1.2, ID1.2	Regions/subregions where the most/largest events are held each year	Country Parties (affected, developed), <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i>
		IO1.2, IG1.2	Regions where the most/largest events are held each year	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
		IA1.3, ID1.3	Audience reached by each type of media product per reporting cycle  Type of media products being used most in each region/subregion	Country Parties (affected, developed), <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i>
		IO1.3, IG1.3	Audience reached by each type of media product per reporting cycle  Type of media products being used most in each region	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
		IA1.4, ID1.4, IO1.4	Number of reporting entities where information provided is part of a strategy	Country Parties (affected, developed), <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i> , United Nations agencies and IGOs

<i>Outcome in The Strategy</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	
1.3	CONS-O-3	IA3.1, ID3.1	Progress in the participation of CSOs and STIs in the Convention processes per year globally and by region/subregion	Country Parties (affected, developed), <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i>	
		IO3.1, IG3.1	Progress in the participation of CSOs and STIs in the Convention processes per year globally and by region/subregion	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	
		IA3.2, ID3.2	National contribution to the target	Country Parties (affected, developed), <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i>	
		IA3.3, ID3.3	Most important reasons for increasing/decreasing trends per region	Country Parties (affected, developed), <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i>	
		IO3.3, IG3.3	Most important reasons for increasing trends	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	
	1.3	CONS-O-4	IA4.1, ID4.1	Education initiatives by CSOs/STIs per year globally and by region/subregion  Types of events most predominant in each region/subregion	Country Parties (affected, developed), <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i>
			IO4.1, IG4.1	Education initiatives by CSOs/STIs per year globally and by region  Types of events most predominant in each region	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
			IA4.2, ID4.2	National contribution to the target	Country Parties (affected, developed), <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i>
			IA4.3, ID4.3	Most important reasons for increasing/decreasing trends in regions	Country Parties (affected, developed), <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i>
IO4.3, IG4.3			Most important reasons for increasing trends in regions	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	

*Notes:* IA denotes analysis of performance indicators relating to affected country Parties, ID denotes analysis of performance indicators relating to developed country Parties IO denotes analysis of performance indicators relating to United Nations agencies and international organizations, IG denotes analysis of performance indicators relating to the Global Environment Facility The symbol CONS-O-<number> refers to consolidated indicator <number>. The symbols above apply to all tables in this annex. Italics indicate analyses to be implemented when time series are available.

*Abbreviations:* CSO civil society organization, GEF Global Environment Facility, IGO intergovernmental organization, RAP regional action programme, SRAP subregional action programme, STI science and technology institution

## B. Operational objective 2

Table 2  
Indicator-based analysis – operational objective 2

<i>Outcome in The Strategy</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
2.1, 2.2, 2.3	CONS-O-5	IA5.1	Progress in formulation of NAPs aligned with The Strategy	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs
		IA5.2	Most common reasons for NAP process not initiated/ aligned in some countries and their relevance	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs
		IA5.3	Alignment of NAPs to The Strategy: what components NAPs contain and which regions have integrated them into investment frameworks	Affected country Parties with NAP aligned with The Strategy, SRAPs/RAPs
		IA5.4	Which countries/ regions have received external assistance and type of assistance	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs
		IA5.5	Identification of major difficulties in formulation/ alignment of NAPs	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs
2.4	CONS-O-6	ID6.1	Progress and distribution of partnership agreements, in terms of:  (a) Number of partnership agreements concluded and under implementation or planned by type (3 types: relating to integrated investment framework established within integrated financing strategies (IFS), within other IFS or not related to integrated investment frameworks) and per year  (b) Geographical distribution of bilateral partnership agreements  (c) Distance to 2014 target  (d) National contribution to progress towards 2014 target	Developed country Parties
		IO6.1 IG6.1	Progress and distribution of partnership agreements, in terms of:	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF

<i>Outcome in The Strategy</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
			(a) Number of partnership agreements concluded and under implementation by type (3 types: relating to integrated investment framework established within IFS, within other integrated financing strategies or not related to integrated investment frameworks) and per year	
			(b) Geographical distribution of multilateral partnership agreements	
		ID6.2 IO6.2 IG6.2	Distance to 2014 target and distribution of partnership agreements	Developed country Parties, United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
		ID6.3 IO6.3 IG6.3	Contribution of UNCCD-related institutions and bodies	Developed country Parties, United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
		ID6.4 IO6.4	Identification of major difficulties in establishing partnership agreements	Developed country Parties, United Nations agencies and IGOs
2.5	CONS-O-7	IA7.1	Progress in the establishment of synergies among the three Rio conventions, in terms of:	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/ RAPs
			(a) Number of affected country Parties with joint national plans/functional mechanisms in place or planned to ensure synergies among three Rio conventions and time frame by which countries should have joint initiatives in place	
			(b) Coverage of joint initiatives and operational mechanisms	
			(c) Distance to 2014 target	
		IA7.2	Support from the institutions of the Rio conventions on the establishment of synergistic processes	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/ RAPs
		IA7.3	Identification of major difficulties in establishing synergies among the three Rio conventions	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/ RAPs

<i>Outcome in The Strategy</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
		ID7.1	<p>Contribution of developed country Parties to the establishment of synergies among the three Rio conventions, in terms of:</p> <p>(a) Number of enabling instruments established in affected country Parties with the support of developed country Parties per year by type of instrument (joint initiatives/ operational mechanisms)</p> <p>(b) Geographical distribution of support</p> <p>(c) National contribution to progress towards 2014 target</p>	Developed country Parties
		ID7.2	<p>Type of support provided, in terms of:</p> <p>(a) Number of countries providing support by type of initiatives/ mechanisms supported (5+3 = 8 types)</p> <p>(b) Number of countries providing support through specific frameworks by type of framework (4 types: UNCCD, CBD, UNFCCC, other)</p> <p>(c) Number of countries providing support by type of support (3 types: technical, financial, both)</p>	Developed country Parties
		ID7.3	<p>Progress in coordination with respect to the three Rio conventions, in terms of number of countries where national instruments allowing coordinated positioning are in place at each reporting cycle</p>	Developed country Parties
		ID7.4	<p>Identification of major difficulties in establishing enabling instruments</p>	Developed country Parties
		IO7.1, IG7.1	<p>Contribution of United Nations agencies, IGOs and the GEF to the establishment of synergies among the three Rio</p>	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF

<i>Outcome in The Strategy</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
			conventions, in terms of:	
			(a) Number of enabling instruments established in affected country Parties with the support of IGOs by type of instrument (joint initiatives/operational mechanisms)	
			(b) Geographical distribution of support	
		IO7.2, IG7.2	Type of support provided, in terms of:	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
			(a) number of organizations providing support by type of initiatives/mechanisms supported (5+3 = 8 types)	
			(b) Number of organizations providing support through specific frameworks by type of framework (4 types: UNCCD, CBD, UNFCCC, other)	
			(c) Number of organizations providing support by type of support (3 types: technical, financial, both)	
		IO7.3, IG7.3	Progress in coordination with respect to the three Rio Conventions, in terms of number of organizations where instruments fostering synergies are in place at each reporting cycle	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
		IO7.4, IG7.4	Identification of major difficulties in establishing enabling instruments	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF

*Note:* Italics indicate analyses to be implemented when time series are available.

*Abbreviations:* GEF Global Environment Facility, IFS integrated financing strategies, IGO intergovernmental organization, NAP national action programme, SRAP subregional action programme,

### C. Operational objective 3

Table 3  
Indicator-based analysis – operational objective 3

<i>Outcome in The Strategy</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
3.1 3.2	CONS-O-8	IA8.1	Progress in the establishment of national monitoring systems for DLDD, in terms of:  (a) Number of affected country Parties where an operational national monitoring system for DLDD is in place or planned and time frame by which countries should have monitoring systems in place  (b) Coverage of monitoring systems  (c) Distance to 2018 target	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/ RAPs
		IA8.2	Identification of major problems in establishing national monitoring systems	Affected country Parties with no monitoring system in place, SRAPs/RAPs
		IA8.3	Factors that limit the maintenance of monitoring systems for DLDD	Affected country Parties with monitoring systems in place, SRAPs/RAPs
		ID8.1	Contribution of developed country Parties to the establishment of DLDD and environmental monitoring systems in affected country Parties/regions and subregions, in terms of:  (a) Number of monitoring systems supported in affected country Parties, regions and subregions (both targeted to DLDD and not specific to DLDD)  (b) Geographical distribution of support  (c) National contribution to progress towards 2018 target	Developed country Parties
		ID8.2	Kind of support provided, in terms of:  (a) Number of countries providing support through specific frameworks, by type of framework (4 types: UNCCD, CBD, UNFCCC, other)	Developed country Parties



<i>Outcome in The Strategy</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
			(b) Number of countries providing support, by type of support (3 types: technical, financial, both)	
		ID8.3	How many systems are still in operation.	Developed country Parties
		ID8.4	Identification of major difficulties in establishing a monitoring system	Developed country Parties
		IO8.1, IG8.1	Contribution of organizations to the establishment of DLDD and environmental monitoring systems in affected country Parties/ regions and globally, in terms of:	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
			(a) Number of monitoring systems supported (both targeted to DLDD and not specific to DLDD)	
			(b) Geographical coverage of countries/regions supported	
		IO8.2, IG8.2	Kind of support provided, in terms of:	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
			(a) Number of organizations providing support through specific frameworks by type of framework (4 types: UNCCD, CBD, UNFCCC, other)	
			(b) Number of organizations providing support, by type of support (3 types: technical, financial, both)	
		IO8.3	How many systems are still in operation	United Nations agencies and IGOs
		IO8.4, IG8.4	Identification of major difficulties in establishing a monitoring system.	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
3.1 3.2	CONS-O-9	IA9.1	Progress in reporting on impact indicators along revised reporting guidelines in terms of:  (a) Number of affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs reporting on the two indicators (3 classes: reporting on both indicators,	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/ RAPs

<i>Outcome in The Strategy</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
			not reporting, reporting on one indicator) for the two reporting cycles	
			(b) Number of affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs using or planning to use (by time period (2 time periods) reporting guidelines/CST methodology for the two reporting cycle	
			(c) Distance to 2018 target	
		IA9.2	Most important difficulties experienced in reporting on impact indicators and their relevance	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs
3.3 3.4	CONS-O-10	IA10.1	Progress in NAPs quality self-assessment, in terms of:	Affected country Parties with a NAP aligned to The Strategy, SRAPs/RAPs
			(a) Number of affected country Parties where driver identification/analysis of interactions in NAPs is already based on knowledge or planned (by time period, 4 periods)	
			(b) Which type of knowledge is used (scientific literature, expert or traditional knowledge)	
			(c) Number of affected country Parties where drought mitigation is analysed and/or reflected in NAPs	
			(d) Distance to 2018 target	
		IA10.2	Most common reasons for scientific/traditional knowledge not being taken into account in developing NAPs	Affected country Parties with a NAP aligned to The Strategy, SRAPs/RAPs
3.5	CONS-O-11	IA11.1, ID11.1, IO11.1, IG11.1	Effectiveness, measured using numbers of users, of knowledge-sharing systems for each region/subregion	Country Parties (affected, developed, SRAPs/RAPs, United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF

*Note:* italics indicate analyses to be implemented when time series are available.

*Abbreviations:* GEF Global Environment Facility, IFS integrated financing strategies, IGO intergovernmental organization, NAP national action programme, SRAP subregional action programme,

## D. Operational objective 4

Table 4  
Indicator-based analysis – operational objective 4

<i>Outcome in The Strategy</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
4.1	CONS-O-13	IA13.1	Progress in the establishment of capacity-building initiatives, in terms of:	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/ RAPs
4.2			(a) Number of capacity-building initiatives undertaken by affected country Parties, regions/subregions or planned, and time frame by which countries should have capacity-building initiatives in place  (b) Coverage of capacity-building initiatives  (c) distance to 2014 target	
		IA13.2	Progress in assessing capacity-building needs, in terms of:	Affected country Parties
			(a) Number of affected country Parties, regions/subregions that have assessed capacity-building needs, and which framework was used (NCSA or other)  (b) Number of number of affected country Parties, regions/subregions that have assessed availability of resources for addressing capacity-building needs and whether resource requirements are included in an investment framework  (c) Assistance received (secretariat, GM GEF, bilateral, multilateral) to build capacities	SRAPs/ RAPs
		ID13.1	Contribution of developed country Parties to the establishment of capacity-building initiatives in affected country Parties/ regions and subregions, in terms of:	Developed country Parties
			(a) Number of capacity-building initiatives supported or planned to be supported (per time period, 4 periods) in affected country Parties,	

<i>Outcome in The Strategy</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
			regions and subregions (NCSA-generated or other) per year	
			(b) Geographical coverage of support	
			(c) National contribution to progress towards 2018 target	
		ID13.2	Identification of main reasons for DLDD capacity-building plans/programmes not being implemented	Developed country Parties
		IO13.1	Contribution of United Nations agencies and IGOs to the establishment of capacity-building initiatives in affected country Parties/ regions and subregions, in terms of:	United Nations agencies and IGOs
			(a) Number of capacity-building initiatives supported in affected country Parties, regions and subregions (both NCSA-generated and other) per year	
			b) Geographical coverage of support	
		IO13.2, IG13.2	Identification of main reasons for DLDD capacity-building plans/programmes not being implemented	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
		IG13.1	Contribution of GEF to the establishment of capacity-building initiatives in affected country Parties/ regions and subregions, in terms of:	GEF
			(a) Number of capacity-building initiatives supported in affected country Parties, regions and subregions (both NCSA-generated and other) per year	
			(b) Geographical coverage of support	

*Note:* Italics indicate analyses to be implemented when time series are available.

*Abbreviations:* GEF Global Environment Facility, IFS integrated financing strategies, IGO intergovernmental organization, NAP national action programme, NCSA national capacity self-assessment, SRAP subregional action programme,

## E. Operational objective 5

Table 5  
Indicator-based analysis – operational objective 5

<i>Outcome in The Strategy</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
5.1	CONS-O-14	IA14.1	Progress in the development of integrated investment framework in affected country Parties, regions/subregions, in terms of:  (a) Number of affected country Parties, regions/subregions with integrated investment framework, developed or planned and whether based on NAP  (b) Coverage of integrated investment frameworks  (c) Distance to 2014 target	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs
		IA14.2	Assistance received from donors/institutions for the establishment of integrated investment frameworks in affected country Parties, in terms of:  (a) Number of frameworks supported by different donor groups/institutions (5 groups: GM, GEF, bilateral, multilateral, others)  (b) Type of support received (3 types: technical, financial, both)  (c) Number of frameworks devised within IFS and assisted by GM  (d) Number of frameworks allowing leveraging	Affected country Parties with integrated investment framework based on NAP, SRAPs/RAPs
		IA14.3	Identification of the main difficulties in each region in developing frameworks	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs
		ID14.1	Contribution of developed country Parties to the development of integrated investment frameworks in affected country Parties, regions/subregions, in terms of:	Developed country Parties

<i>Outcome in The Strategy</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
			(a) Number of integrated investment frameworks supported (within both IFS and other strategies) and planned to be supported (by time period) per year	
			(b) Geographical coverage of support	
			(c) National contribution to target	
		ID14.2	Kind of support provided, in terms of:	Developed country Parties
			(a) Number of countries providing support through specific frameworks by type of framework (4 types: UNCCD, CBD, UNFCCC, other)	
			(b) Number of countries providing support by type of support (3 types: technical, financial, both)	
		ID14.3	Identification of main reasons why integrated investment frameworks have not been supported/ had difficulty in being supported	Developed country Parties
		IO14.1	Contribution of United Nations agencies and IGOs to the development of integrated investment frameworks in affected country Parties, regions/subregions, in terms of:	United Nations agencies and IGOs
			(a) Number of integrated investment frameworks supported (within both IFS and other strategies) per year and before 2008	
			(b) Geographical coverage of support	
		IO14.2, IG14.2	Kind of support provided, in terms of:	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
			(a) Number of countries providing support through specific frameworks by type of framework (4 types: UNCCD, CBD, UNFCCC, other)	

<i>Outcome in The Strategy</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
			(b) Number of countries providing support by type of support (3 types: technical, financial, both)	
		IO14.3, IG14.3	Identification of main reasons why integrated investment frameworks have not been supported/ had difficulty in being supported	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
		IG14.1	Contribution of the GEF to the development of integrated investment frameworks in affected country Parties, regions/subregions, in terms of:  (a) Number of integrated investment frameworks supported (within both IFS and other strategies) and planned to support (by time period) per year  (b) Geographical coverage of support	GEF
5.2	CONS-O-15	ID15.1	Trends in the amounts being made available to affected countries through DLDD-related programmes and projects  Difference in amounts committed and amounts disbursed	Developed country Parties
		ID15.2	<i>Main reasons for trends</i>	Developed country Parties
	CONS-O-16	IA16.1	<i>Qualitative assessment of bilateral assistance received by affected country Parties, regions/subregions, in terms of:</i>  (a) <i>Rating of adequacy, timeliness and predictability of bilateral assistance received (3 classes: adequate, fairly adequate, not adequate) and whether assistance constrained performance in planning and implementation with respect to UNCCD</i>	Affected country Parties entitled to receive assistance under the UNCCD, SRAPs/RAPs entitled to receive assistance under the UNCCD

<i>Outcome in The Strategy</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
			(b) <i>Analysis of trends of the above</i>	
			(c) <i>Where assistance constrained performance</i>	
		IA16.2	<i>Distribution/coverage of support to affected country Parties, regions/subregions in raising resources by bilateral donor groups (6 groups)</i>	Affected country Parties entitled to receive assistance under the UNCCD  SRAPs/RAPs entitled to receive assistance under the UNCCD
5.3	CONS-O-17	IA 17.1	Progress in mobilizing resources, in terms of:  (a) Number of project proposals successfully submitted (in the pipeline) or number of projects being implemented (ongoing) per biennium  (b) Amounts of funds raised for the ongoing projects per biennium  (c) Distribution of project proposals  (d) <i>Trends in the number of successfully submitted project proposals and amounts</i>	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/ RAPs
		IA 17.2	Major reasons behind increasing/decreasing trends	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/ RAPs
		IO 17.1, IG 17.1	Progress in mobilizing resources and contributions of United Nations agencies and IGOs, in terms of:  (a) Number of project proposals successfully submitted (in the pipeline) or number of projects being implemented (ongoing) per biennium (4 classes: submitted to the organization, developed with aid from the organization, submitted by the organization, developed by the organization)	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF



<i>Outcome in The Strategy</i>	<i>Indicator number</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
			(b) Amounts of funds raised for the ongoing projects supported and developed by the organization per biennium (c) Distribution of project proposals (both supported and developed by the organization) (d) <i>Trends in the number of successfully submitted project proposals and amounts</i>	
		IO 17.2, IG 17.2	Major reasons behind increasing/decreasing trends	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
5.5	CONS-O-18	IA 18.1	Progress in the allocation of resources to facilitate access to technology, in terms of: (a) Amounts allocated to facilitate technology transfer (for material aid and knowledge aid), by year and where (b) Measures put in place at the national level: incentives already in place (policy, financial, fiscal) or measures planned and where (c) <i>Trends in the amounts allocated and number of countries already with incentives or planning measures to facilitate technology transfer</i>	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs
		IA18.2	Assessment of the effectiveness of incentives and adequacy of resources allocated (based on yes/no answers) and reasons for that, in terms of: (a) Number of countries where resources allocated are not adequate (b) Major reasons why incentives have proved not to be effective( 4 types of reasons)	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/ RAPs
		IA18.3	Major reasons behind increasing/decreasing trends	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/ RAPs

*Note:* Italics indicate analyses to be implemented when time series are available.

*Abbreviations:* GEF Global Environment Facility, IFS integrated financing strategies, IGO intergovernmental organization, NAP national action programme, SRAP subregional action programme,

## Annex IV

[English only]

### Guidelines for the analysis of financial information (tables)

#### A. Guidelines for the analysis of information relating to the Standard Financial Annex

Table 1  
Financial analysis – Standard Financial Annex

<i>ID</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Outputs</i>	<i>Reporting entities / Disaggregations<sup>a</sup></i>
F1	Global level of commitments	Measures the total financial commitments for activities related to the implementation of the Convention at all levels	- nominal amounts - weighted amounts - percentage of GDP - percentage of ODA	- Global level (DCPs+ACPs+OSs) - Total DCPs - Total ACPs - Total ADCPs - Total OSs - RACs
F2	Commitments per donor/country/funding source	Measures the commitments made by each funding source	- nominal amounts - weighted amounts - percentage of GDP - percentage of ODA	- DCP - ACP - ADCP - OS - RACs
F3	Commitments per recipient region	Measures the level of commitments per UNCCD region	- nominal amounts - weighted amounts - percentage of GDP	- UNCCD regions - Other regions - RACs
F4	Commitments per recipient country	Measures the level of commitments per individual recipient country	- nominal amounts - weighted amounts - percentage of GDP	- RCP - RACs

<sup>a</sup> DCP: commitments by a developed country Party for national and international DLDD-related activities; ACP: commitments by an affected developing country Party for DLDD-related activities; ADCP: commitments by an affected developed country Party exclusively for DLDD-related activities taking place in its own territory; OS: commitments by other sources of funding (e.g. United Nations agency, intergovernmental organization, non-governmental or civil society organization, etc.); RCP: commitments received by an affected country Party from all domestic and foreign sources; UNCCD regions: UNCCD regional annexes (Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, Northern Mediterranean, Central and Eastern Europe); RAC: relevant activity code.

*Notes:*

- Weighted amounts are calculated on the basis of Rio marker (RM) scores. In cases where a financial commitment lacked a relevant RM score, this appears in the financial analysis as “not screened”.
- The weights of corresponding RM scores are as follows:
  - RM 0 = 0%
  - RM 1 = 33%
  - RM 2 = 66%
  - RM 3 = 100%.
- GDP figures are obtained from the World Bank. ODA figures are obtained from the OECD.
- In addition to a geographical distribution, the amounts are further disaggregated to produce information detailing levels of commitments relevant to each RAC.

## B. Guidelines for the analysis of information relating to the Programme and Project Sheets

Table 2  
Financial analysis – Programme and Project Sheets

<i>ID</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Outputs</i>	<i>Reporting entities / Disaggregations<sup>a</sup></i>
F5	Volume of investments	Indicates the volume of investments made in UNCCD-relevant programmes and projects, as a measure of the ongoing efforts to combat desertification, land degradation and drought. It also allows a comparison to be made with data on financial commitments, thereby showing the ‘new’ funding allocations as a proportion of the ‘stock’ of resources already invested	- nominal amounts - weighted amounts - percentage of GDP - percentage of ODA	- Global volume (DCPs+ACPs+OSs) - Total DCPs - Total ACPs - Total ADCPs - Total Oss - RACs
F6	Geographic distribution of investments	Provides a breakdown of investments by recipient country or region	- number of projects - nominal amounts - weighted amounts - percentage of GDP	- RCP - UNCCD regions - Other regions - RACs
F7	Sectoral distribution of investments	Shows the distribution of investments and number of programme/projects according to the sectors of destination (or purpose codes)	- number of projects - nominal amounts - weighted amounts	- OECD sector codes - UNCCD regions - Other regions
F8	Distribution by UNCCD objective	Shows the distribution of investments and number of programmes/projects per Strategic and Operational Objective of The Strategy	- number of projects - nominal amounts - weighted amounts	- OO - SO

<i>ID</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Outputs</i>	<i>Reporting entities / Disaggregations<sup>a</sup></i>
F9	Targeted areas	Shows the distribution of investments and projects across broad ranges of project area sizes, thereby providing a measure of the average scale of investments, as well as an indication of the areas most frequently targeted by UNCCD-related investments	- number of projects - nominal amounts - weighted amounts	- Global level - UNCCD regions - Other regions - RCP
F10	Beneficiaries	Shows the distribution of programmes/ projects and investment levels across broad ranges of beneficiaries, thereby providing an indication of the scope and scale of projects	- number of projects - nominal amounts - weighted amounts	- Global level - UNCCD regions - Other regions - RCP

<sup>a</sup> DCP: investments by a developed country Party in national and international DLDD-related activities; ACP: investments by an affected developing country Party in DLDD-related activities; ADCP: investments by an affected developed country Party exclusively in DLDD-related activities taking place in its own territory; OS: investments by other sources of funding (e.g. United Nations agency, intergovernmental organization, non-governmental or civil society organization etc.); RCP: investments received by an affected country Party from all domestic and foreign sources; UNCCD regions: UNCCD regional annexes (Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, Northern Mediterranean, Central and Eastern Europe); RAC: relevant activity code; OO: operational objectives 1–5 of The Strategy; SO: strategic objectives 1-4 of The Strategy.

*Notes:*

- Weighted amounts are calculated on the basis of Rio marker (RM) scores. Specific RM scores at project component level are used to correct the level of weighting resulting from the application of the RM score at programme/project level. Programmes and projects lacking a valid RM score are included in the analysis as “not screened”.
- The weights of corresponding Rio marker scores are as follows:
  - RM 0 = 0%
  - RM 1 = 33%
  - RM 2 = 66%
  - RM 3 = 100%.
- GDP figures are obtained from the World Bank. ODA figures are obtained from the OECD.
- In addition to a geographical distribution, the amounts are further disaggregated to produce information detailing levels of commitments relevant to each RAC.
- Analyses F9 and F10 illustrate the distribution of investments across a set of pre-defined ranges of values in terms of project area size and number of beneficiaries.

## Annex V

[English only]

### Guidelines for the analysis of information relating to the additional information (tables)

#### A. Reporting process-related issues, Global Environment Facility

Table 1  
Reporting process-related issues, Global Environment Facility

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
AA10, AD1.1	Availability of financial resources for UNCCD reporting, in terms of percentage of countries that could count on sufficient financial resources to meet UNCCD reporting obligations	Country Parties (affected, developed), <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i>
AO1.1, AG1.1	Financial support to affected country Parties for UNCCD reporting, in terms of number of organizations providing support	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
AA1.2, AD1.2	Amount of financial resources invested in meeting UNCCD reporting obligations in each reporting cycle	Country Parties (affected, developed), <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i>
AO1.2, AG1.2	Amount of financial resources invested in meeting UNCCD reporting obligations in each reporting cycle	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF
AA1.3, AD1.3	Human resources invested in meeting UNCCD reporting obligations at each reporting cycle, in terms of:  (a) Number of people involved  (b) Number of person/days dedicated	Country Parties (affected, developed), <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i>
AA1.4, AD1.4	Availability of technical/scientific knowledge for UNCCD reporting, in terms of percentage of countries that could count on sufficient knowledge to meet UNCCD reporting obligations	Country Parties (affected, developed), <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i>
AA1.5	Level of coordination for UNCCD reporting, in terms of percentage of countries where coordination with relevant line ministries was satisfactory	Affected country Parties, <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i>
AA1.6, AD1.6	Level of participation and consultation for UNCCD reporting, in terms of:	Country Parties (affected, developed), <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i>

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
	(a) Percentage of countries where a participatory or consultative approach was applied	
	(b) Percentage of countries where a validation meeting was held	
AA1.7	Contribution to the subregional/regional reporting processes in terms of percentage of countries that actively participated in reporting processes	Affected country Parties
AA1.8, AD1.8	Exploitation of the PRAIS portal in terms of percentage of countries reporting online that could count on sufficient training	Country Parties (affected, developed) reporting on line, <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i> reporting on line
AA1.9	Identification of major difficulties in using the PRAIS system and their relevance	Affected country Parties not reporting online, <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i> not reporting online
AD1.9	Identification of major difficulties in using the PRAIS system and their relevance	Developed country Parties not reporting online, <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i> not reporting online

*Notes:* AA: denotes analysis of additional information relating to respectively affected country Parties.

AD: denotes analysis of developed country Parties.

AO: denotes analysis of United Nations , agencies and International organizations.

AG: denotes analysis of the Global Environment Facility.

The symbols above apply to all tables in this annex.

Italics indicate analyses to be implemented when time series are available.

*Abbreviations:* GEF Global Environment Facility, IGO intergovernmental organization, PRAIS performance review and assessment of implementation system, RAP regional action programme, SRAP subregional action programme,

## B. Accommodation of specific requests within decisions of the Conference of the Parties

Table 2

### Accommodation of specific requests within decisions of the Conference of the Parties

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
AA2.1	Need for improvement in reporting on indicators in terms of percentage of countries indicating need for improvement on specific e-SMART criteria (6 criteria) and indicators (13 indicators, 14 indicators from 2012 onwards)	Affected country Parties experiencing difficulties in reporting on one or more indicator(s), <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i> experiencing difficulties in reporting on one or more indicator(s)
AD2.1	Need for improvement in reporting on indicators, in terms of percentage of countries indicating need for improvement on specific e-SMART criteria (6 criteria) and indicators (10 indicators)	Developed country Parties experiencing difficulties in reporting on one or more indicator(s)

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
AO2.1, AG2.1	Need for improvement in reporting on indicators in terms of percentage of countries indicating need for improvement on specific e-SMART criteria (6 criteria) and indicators (10 indicators)	United Nations agencies and IGOs experiencing difficulties in reporting on one or more indicator(s), GEF

*Abbreviations:* e-SMART economic, specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time bound, GEF Global Environment Facility, IGO intergovernmental organization, RAP regional action programme, SRAP subregional action programme,

### C. Reporting on the implementation of the national action programme

Table 3

#### Reporting on the implementation of the national action programme

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
AA3.1	Progress in the implementation of the NAP in terms of number of countries in each implementation stage (5 stages identified by percentage of activities included in NAP currently implemented: no activity implemented, 1-30%, 31-60%, 61-90%, 91-100%)	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs
AA3.2	Lessons learned in relation to implementation of NAP	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs

*Abbreviations:* NAP national action programme, RAP regional action programme, SRAP subregional action programme.

### D. Any other country-specific issues

Table 4

#### Any other country-specific issues

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
AA4.1	Specific issues not covered in the reporting guidelines, in terms of:  (a) Number of countries reporting specific issues by category (7 categories)  (b) Description of issues	Affected country Parties that have specific issues for the COP, SRAPs/RAPs
AD4.1	Specific issues not covered in the reporting guidelines, in terms of:  (a) Number of countries reporting specific issues by category (7 categories)  (b) Description of issues	Developed country Parties which have specific issues for the COP, SRAPs/RAPs

## E. Support to NAP/SRAP/RAP implementation and/or review

Table 5  
**Support to NAP/SRAP/RAP implementation and/or review**

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
AO5.1	Contribution of United Nations agencies and IGOs to the implementation of NAPs/SRAPs and RAPs, in terms of:  a) Number of NAPs/SRAPs and RAPs supported by type (3 types)  b) Coverage of support (countries/regions/subregions supported)	United Nations agencies and IGOs
AO5.2	Contribution of United Nations agencies and IGOs to the review of NAPs/SRAPs and RAPs, in terms of:  a) Number of NAPs/SRAPs and RAPs supported by type (3 types)  b) Coverage of support (countries/regions/subregions supported)	United Nations agencies and IGOs
AO5.3	Contribution of United Nations agencies and IGOs to UNCCD scope, strategies and objectives, in terms of number of organizations contributing to implementation and objectives in each rating class (3 classes)	United Nations agencies and IGOs

## F. Support to capacity-building initiatives in eligible affected country Parties

Table 6  
**Support to capacity-building initiatives in eligible affected country Parties**

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
AG6.1	Progress achieved by the NCSA	GEF



## G. Mandate-specific reporting

Table 7  
**Mandate-specific reporting**

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>
AG7.1	GEF reporting  Information on discussions within the GEF Council on GEF strategies, programmes and projects for financing the agreed incremental costs of activities concerning desertification	GEF
AG7.2	GEF reporting  Information on GEF replenishment agreements and the funding programmed for land degradation	GEF
AG7.3	GEF reporting  Information on GEF monitoring and evaluation activities relating to projects concerning desertification	GEF
AG7.4	GEF reporting  A synthesis of projects approved by the GEF Council during the reporting period concerning desertification with an indication of GEF and other resources allocated to such projects	GEF
AG7.5	GEF reporting  A listing of projects approved by the GEF Council concerning desertification, with an indication of the cumulative financial resources allocated by the GEF to such projects	GEF