



《公约》执行情况审评委员会

第十一届会议

2013年4月15日至19日，波恩

临时议程项目 5(a)

审评执行《公约》的资金流

初步分析受影响国家缔约方和发达国家缔约方、次区域和区域实体、联合国机构和政府间组织、全球环境基金以及秘书处和全球机制关于“战略”的战略目标 4 的报告中所载的信息

初步分析受影响国家缔约方和发达国家缔约方、次区域和区域实体、联合国机构和政府间组织、全球环境基金以及秘书处和全球机制关于“战略”的战略目标 4 的报告中所载的信息

秘书处的说明

概要

本文件载有对缔约国及其他报告实体提交的关于“战略”的战略目标 4：通过建立国内和国际行为者之间切实有效的伙伴关系筹措资源，以支持《公约》的执行(2010 至 2011 年报告期)的综合和初步分析。本文从全球、区域和次区域角度，就与该战略目标有关的七项影响指标中的五项提供了最新资料，并指出了实现指标的具体目标的趋势。

本文件还就实现这一目标所需的调整、精简和加强措施提出了一些建议，供《公约》执行情况审评委员会审议。

与报告程序有关的因素，包括对影响指标的可能改进和相关方法载于促进这一反复进程的文件 ICCD/CRIC(11)/15 之中。

目录

	段次	页次
一. 导言	1-6	3
二. 预期效果 4.1 的影响指标 SO-4-1	7-10	3
对《公约》相关目标的资金承诺的名义 金额(美元)	8-10	4
三. 预期效果 4.1 的影响指标 SO-4-2	11-17	4
A. 对《公约》相关目标的资金承诺的名义 金额(美元)	12-13	4
B. 双边官方发展援助的名义金额(美元)	14-17	5
四. 预期效果 4.1 的影响指标 SO-4-3	18-24	5
国内公共预算(国家或国家以下级别) 对《公约》相关目标的资金承诺的名义 金额(美元)	19-24	6
五. 预期效果 4.2 的影响指标 SO-4-6	25-32	7
促进为执行《公约》调动资源的机制数目	26-32	7
六. 预期效果 4.2 的影响指标 SO-4-7	33-42	8
推动《公约》执行的机构设置、职责和安排	34-42	8
七. 结论	43-47	10
八. 建议	48	10
附件		
对“战略”的战略目标 4 下影响指标的初步分析中涉及的图表		12

一. 引言

1. 本文件载有对缔约国及其他报告实体提交的关于“战略”的战略目标 4：通过建立国内和国际行为者之间切实有效的伙伴关系筹措资源，以支持《公约》的综合和初步分析。根据第 13/COP.9 号决定，本文件由全球机制与秘书处合作编写。
2. 战略目标 4 的七项影响指标中，本文件没有分析与新型资金来源和从私营部门调动的资源有关的影响指标(即影响指标 SO-4-4 和 SO-4-5)，全球机制将根据第 13/COP.10 和第 14/COP.10 号决定，基于现有资源、数据和当前研究，专门就这两项指标开展研究。
3. 对于与战略目标 4 有关的其余五项影响指标，本文基于报告实体提交的资料，开展了全面分析，以便对情况有一个整体认识。本报告提供了全球一级的分析，附件载有进一步资料，包括区域和次区域一级的分析图表。
4. 这是当前的报告和审评工作中第一次提供关于战略目标 4 的信息。分析基于 83 个报告实体关于战略目标 4 的报告。不过，每个指标收到的答复数目不同。鉴于分析时间有限，无法向报告实体深入核实数据的真实性。对战略目标 4 的分析侧重为支持受影响发展中国家以及(恰当情况下)中欧和东欧(中东欧)国家执行《公约》而调动的资源。分析全球一级的活动时，还包括为不同区域的多个国家提供的资源。
5. 分析结果主要基于报告实体在通过执行情况业绩审评和评估制度(业绩审评和评估制度)提交的官方报告中作出的回答和表达的意见。
6. 本文件最后载有与战略目标 4 有关的一般性结论，并阐述了与影响指标的基线信息有关的问题(基线视角)。本文件就实现“战略”目标需要开展的调整、精简和加强活动提出了一些建议，供《公约》执行情况审评委员会(审评委)审议。审评委不妨采用注重成果的框架，向缔约方、《公约》机构、附属机构及有关组织提供可采取行动的指导，以落实将提交缔约方会议审议的有针对性的建议。

二. 预期效果 4.1 的影响指标 SO-4-1

《荒漠化公约》相关活动多边捐赠方捐款的百分比变化

预期效果：向受影响发展中国家缔约方、恰当情况下向中欧和东欧国家提供更多资金、方法及技术资源，以执行《公约》。

7. 本指标旨在说明联合国机构和政府间组织，特别是多边发展筹资机构为荒漠化、土地退化和干旱相关投资以及可持续土地管理等其他《荒漠化公约》相关活动提供资金的趋势。

对《公约》相关目标的资金承诺的名义金额(美元)(见附件, 表 1)

8. 在要求报告该指标的政府间机构中, 只有全球环境基金(环境基金)提交了报告。
9. 环境基金报告称, 2010 年和 2011 年的资金承诺分别为 840 万美元和 5,220 万美元, 该两年期总计 6,060 万美元, 第二年比第一年增加了五倍。2011 年的大幅增加主要是因为环境基金大大提高了对非洲区域《公约》相关目标的资金承诺。此外, 环境基金 2011 年才开始对亚洲和中东欧作出资金承诺, 不过 2011 年未对全球活动作出资金承诺, 且整个报告期内未对地中海北部区域作出资金承诺。拉丁美洲和加勒比区域是唯一一个环境基金在报告期第二年资金承诺额反而减少的区域, 但仍然是整个报告期内资金承诺额第二大区域。
10. 由于其他实体未报告这一时期的情况, 因此无法估计政府间组织和多边发展筹资机构在这一时期的资金承诺总额。应鼓励荒漠化、土地退化和干旱相关活动的其他大型投资方, 例如多边开发银行今后提交报告。

三. 预期效果 4.1 的影响指标 SO-4-2

《荒漠化公约》在双边官方发展援助(ODA)中所占份额

预期效果: 向受影响发展中国家缔约方、恰当情况下向中欧和东欧国家提供更多资金、方法及技术资源, 以执行《公约》。

11. 本指标旨在说明发达国家缔约方作为双边发展合作的组成部分, 为荒漠化、土地退化和干旱相关投资及其他《公约》相关活动提供资金资源的情况。

A. 对《公约》相关目标的资金承诺的名义金额(美元)(见附件, 表 2 和图 1)

12. 七个发达国家缔约方就该指标提供了数据, 反映了国家、次区域、区域和全球范围内的活动。2010 年, 对《公约》相关目标的资金承诺总额为 4,410 万美元, 2011 年提高到 1.821 亿美元。提交报告的国家在本两年期的资金承诺总额为 2.262 亿美元。数据显示, 报告期内, 非洲获得的资金承诺最多, 而亚洲是 2010 年至 2011 年期间承诺额增幅最大的区域。报告显示, 地中海北部区域只有 2011 年获得了资金承诺。报告期内, 对非洲和亚洲的资金承诺有所提高, 对拉丁美洲和加勒比以及中东欧的资金承诺有所下降。对拉丁美洲和加勒比的资金承诺下降了约 69%, 对中东欧下降了 16%。

13. 2010 年至 2011 年期间, 发达国家缔约方的资金承诺保持相对稳定或有所增加, 只有一个国家突然在 2010 年作出了一大笔资金承诺(占该国承诺总额的 90%)。

B. 双边官方发展援助的名义金额(美元)(见附件, 表 3 和图 2)

14. 七个发达国家缔约方提供了报告期内整体官方发展援助的数据和信息。其中, 有一个国家没有提供 2011 年的任何数据; 鉴于该国是 2010 年官方发展援助的最大提供国, 导致报告期第二年各区域得到的援助总额大幅下降。此外, 报告实体均未提供 2011 年对拉丁美洲和加勒比以及地中海北部国家的援助数据。有两个国家只提供了对不同区域多个国家的援助总额, 虽然原本不具有全球性质, 但只能计入全球活动。有鉴于此, 2010-2011 年报告期的双边官方发展援助总额为 161 亿美元, 主要针对非洲(51%), 其次是拉丁美洲和加勒比(15%)和亚洲(9%)。

官方发展援助用于《公约》相关活动的比例(见附件, 表 4)

15. 监测双边官方发展援助用于《公约》相关活动比例的基线显示, 尽管不同区域、不同捐助方之间存在差异, 但是平均比例很低(0.84%)。非洲比例最高(1.9%), 亚洲约为非洲的一半, 其他区域比例非常低(0.2%至 0.7%)。如果按报告该指标的发达国家缔约方统计, 用于《公约》相关活动的比例差异更大, 从 0.2%到 8.5%不等。

16. 不过应注意到, 除一个国家外, 其他发达国家缔约方报告的双边官方发展援助额均不符合经济合作与发展组织(经合组织)收到的官方数据。¹ 因此, 不得不认为本指标下的百分比的准确性一般或较低。

17. 今后的分析不妨也衡量受影响国家缔约方在公共预算中将国内资源分配给《荒漠化公约》相关目标的比例, 以便比较, 并作为 SO-4-3(见下文)的补充指标以及援助协调性的替代指标。

四. 预期效果 4.1 的影响指标 SO-4-3

执行《荒漠化公约》的国内资金承诺的百分比变化

预期效果: 向受影响发展中国家缔约方、恰当情况下向中欧和东欧国家提供更多资金、方法及技术资源, 以执行《公约》。

18. 本指标旨在说明受影响发展中国家缔约方为荒漠化、土地退化和干旱相关投资及其他《公约》相关活动供应公共资金的趋势。

¹ 资料来源: 经合组织, 发展中国家的资金流入量数据, 2012 年 12 月 20 日。可查阅: <http://www.oecd.org/development/aidstatistics/statisticsonresourceflowstodevelopingcountries.htm>。

国内公共预算(国家或国家以下级别)对《公约》相关目标的资金承诺的名义金额(美元)

1. 全球分析(见附件, 表 5 和图 3)

19. 2010 年, 国内公共预算对《公约》相关目标的资金承诺的名义金额总计 263.8 亿美元; 2011 年下降到 257.4 亿美元。非洲、亚洲以及拉丁美洲和加勒比均略有下降。中东欧区域下降幅度较大, 地中海北部是报告期内唯一一个资金承诺额增加的国家。整个报告期(2010 年和 2011 年)资金承诺额最高的是亚洲(243.4 亿美元), 其次依次为拉丁美洲和加勒比(201.6 亿美元)、非洲(73.2 亿美元)、地中海北部(1.9416 亿美元)、中东欧(6,450 万美元)。

2. 受影响国家缔约方(次区域和区域分析)

a. 非洲(见附件, 表 6 和图 4)

20. 2010 年, 非洲区域国内公共预算对《公约》相关目标的资金承诺的名义金额总计 38.9 亿美元; 2011 年下降到 34.4 亿美元。降幅最大的是西非; 而中非、东非和北非的资金承诺额在本报告期内有所上升。不过, 西非同时也是国内公共预算资金承诺额最高的次区域, 其次是北非。

b. 亚洲(见附件, 表 7 和图 5)

21. 2010 年, 亚洲区域国内公共预算对《公约》相关目标的资金承诺的名义金额总计 122.3 亿美元; 2011 年略降至 121.1 亿美元。东亚是国内公共预算资金承诺额最高的次区域, 其次是西亚。南亚和东南亚 2011 年的承诺额低于 2010 年。

c. 拉丁美洲和加勒比(见附件, 表 8 和图 6)

22. 2010 年, 拉丁美洲和加勒比区域国内公共预算对《公约》相关目标的资金承诺的名义金额总计 101.0 亿美元。2011 年基本持平。中美洲的承诺额小幅下降, 其他次区域或上升或保持稳定。中美洲是国内预算资金承诺额最高的次区域, 其次是南锥体国家。

d. 地中海北部

23. 地中海北部区域只有一个国家提交了报告, 称资金承诺额从 2010 年的 6,450 万美元增加到 2011 年的近 1.3 亿美元。

e. 中欧和东欧

24. 中东欧有两个国家就该指标提供了数据。数据显示, 来自国内公共预算的资金承诺额从 9,400 万美元(2010 年)下降到 111 万美元(2011 年)。

五. 4.2 预期效果 4.2 的影响指标 SO-4-6

确保或便利转移资金，以便在所有各级执行《荒漠化公约》的法律和规范框架、经济激励措施或其他机制的数目和类型

预期效果：确保或便利转移资金，以便在所有各级执行《荒漠化公约》的法律和规范框架、经济激励措施或其他机制的数目和类型。

25. 本指标旨在衡量《公约》利害关系方为便利执行《公约》而采取的努力。

促进为执行《公约》调动资源的机制数目

1. 全球分析(见附件，表 9)

26. 要求报告实体汇报可以为执行《公约》激励投资和增加资金的机制。这类机制包括：(一) 法律和法规；(二) 经济和财政激励措施；(三) 合作框架；(四) 部门政策。2010 年，受影响国家缔约方报告实施了 1,136 个促进为执行《公约》调动资源的机制。报告期末增加到 1,166 个。亚洲在 2010 年和 2011 年均处于领先，实施的机制占该区域所有机制的 70%，其次是非洲。这两年最常用的机制是部门政策，其次依次为法律和法规、经济和财政激励措施，以及合作框架。非洲、亚洲以及拉丁美洲和加勒比对这些机制的使用有所增加，地中海北部区域略有下降，中东欧区域降幅较大。多边机构未报告该指标的情况。

2. 受影响国家缔约方(次区域和区域分析)

a. 非洲(见附件，表 10)

27. 2010 年，非洲共实施了 168 个促进为执行《公约》调动资源的机制，报告期末增加到 173 个。西非在这两年均处于领先，实施的机制占该区域所有机制的 60%以上，其次是中非和南部非洲。这两年最常用的激励措施是合作框架(全球范围内最少使用的)，其次依次为部门政策，经济和财政激励措施，以及法律和法规。本报告期内，增加执行资源和转移资金的机制数目变化不大。

b. 亚洲(见附件，表 11)

28. 2010 年，亚洲共实施了 809 个促进为执行《公约》调动资源的机制，报告期末增加到 859 个。中亚在这两年均处于领先，实施的机制占该区域所有机制的 74%，其次是南亚。这两年最常用的激励措施是部门政策，其次依次为法律和法规、经济和财政激励措施，以及合作框架。除南亚略有下降外，其他次区域为执行《公约》供资的机制均有所增加。

c. 拉丁美洲和加勒比(见附件, 表 12)

29. 2010 年, 拉丁美洲和加勒比共实施了 92 个促进为执行《公约》调动资源的机制, 报告期末增加到 98 个。中美洲是实施机制最多的次区域。这两年最常用的机制是部门政策, 其次依次为合作框架、法律和法规, 以及经济和财政激励措施。除安第斯次区域外, 其他次区域促进投资的机制或有所增加, 或保持稳定。

d. 地中海北部(见附件, 表 13)

30. 2010 年, 地中海北部区域实施了七个促进为执行《公约》调动资源的机制, 报告期末下降到六个。激励措施类型的分布较为平均, 但合作框架更常用一些。

e. 中欧和东欧(见附件, 表 14)

31. 2010 年, 中东欧区域实施了 60 个促进为执行《公约》调动资源的机制; 报告期末下降到 30 个。最常用的机制是法律和法规, 其次是经济和财政激励措施, 但是 2011 年大幅减少。

3. 发达国家缔约方(见附件, 表 15)

32. 发达国家缔约方称 2010 年共有 56 个供资机制, 通过与受影响国家缔约方的发展合作促进为执行《公约》调动资源, 2011 年只有 38 个。这两年中, 有两个国家的机制分别占总数的一半以上和大约三分之一。这两年使用最多的机制是合作框架, 其次为法律和法规, 以及部门政策。报告期内实施了两个经济和财政激励机制。实施机制最多的国家报告称, 该国的机制从 2010 年的 34 个大幅下降到 2011 年的 15 个。

六. 预期效果 4.2 的影响指标 SO-4-7

在所有各级明确赋予执行《荒漠化公约》的机构责任

预期效果: 确保或便利转移资金, 以便在所有各级执行《荒漠化公约》的法律和规范框架、经济激励措施或其他机制的数目和类型。

33. 本指标是为了衡量执行《荒漠化公约》的机构安排在筹集资源进程方面的效力。

推动《公约》执行的机构设置、职责和安排

1. 全球分析(见附件, 表 16 至 20)

34. 对推动《公约》执行的机构设置、职责和安排的效力的总体评价比较积极, 不过不同区域之间以及不同地域层级(从国际到地方)之间存在一些差异。报告期

的两年之间评价差异不大。总体趋势是：国际一级的机构安排更令人满意，对机构设置的满意度从区域、次区域、国家到地方一级逐级递减。

2. 受影响国家缔约方(区域和次区域分析)

a. 非洲(见附件, 表 21 至 25)

35. 根据报告, 国际一级的机构安排更令人满意, 对区域、次区域、国家和地方一级安排的满意度较低。报告期的两年之间评价差异不大。

b. 亚洲(见附件, 表 26 至 30)

36. 亚洲是满意度最高的区域之一, 几乎没有国家对任何级别的机构设置、职责和安排的评价为差或非常差。报告期的两年之间评价差异不大。

c. 拉丁美洲和加勒比(见附件, 表 31 至 35)

37. 拉丁美洲和加勒比也对机构设置、职责和安排较为满意, 只有极少数国家对安排的评价为差或非常差(每年一个国家评估区域和次区域一级的安排, 均来自中美洲)。报告期的两年之间评价差异不大。

d. 地中海北部(见附件, 表 36 至 40)

38. 地中海北部区域的两个受影响国家缔约方报告了各级机构安排的效力。报告期两年之间的评价相同, 对机构设置、职责和安排的评价为非常好、好或中等。唯一例外是, 有一个国家 2010 年和 2011 年对国家一级设置的评价均为差。

e. 中欧和东欧(见附件, 表 41 至 45)

39. 中东欧区域的三个受影响国家缔约方报告了这一指标。报告期两年之间的评价相同。对国际一级的安排最满意, 促进《公约》执行的机构设置、职责和安排得到的评价为非常好或好。有一个国家对区域、次区域和地方一级设置的评价为差。

3. 发达国家缔约方(见附件, 表 46)

40. 八个发达国家缔约方报告了对各级机构安排的满意度, 报告期两年之间的评价基本相同。对国际一级安排的满意度最高, 对区域和次区域一级安排的满意度最低。

4. 全球环境基金(见附件, 表 47)

41. 全球基金报告称, 对推动《公约》执行的机构设置、职责和安排非常满意。报告期两年之间的评价相同, 除了对次区域一级机构设置的评价为中等外, 对其他各级的评价都是非常好。

5. 全球机制(见附件, 表 48)

42. 全球机制报告称, 对各级推动《公约》执行的机构设置、职责和安排都非常满意。报告期两年之间的评价相同, 对各级机构设置的评价都是非常好。

七. 结论

43. 通过分析缔约方及其他有关报告实体提交的报告, 得出了关于通过建立国家和国际行为者之间切实有效的伙伴关系筹集资源, 以支持《公约》执行的一些重要结论, 并证实了一些广为流传的长期看法。应注意, 一些报告实体没有回答有关该战略目标的问题; 因此, 数据以及基于数据的分析的准确度不高。

44. 只经过一个报告周期还无法全面地讨论该战略目标的实现情况。因此, 作为基线水平分析, 本文件研究了 2010-2011 两年期的总数, 以及每一年的数据显示出的一些指示性趋势。这些初步结果非常鼓舞人心。不过, 从下一个两年期开始, 可以评价初步趋势是否得到确认, 以及国家缔约方在实现战略目标 4 下的预期结果方面是否取得重大进展。

45. 可认为所有报告实体——环境基金(影响指标 SO-4-1)、发达国家缔约方(影响指标 SO-4-2)、受影响国家缔约方(影响指标 SO-4-3)——对《公约》相关目标作出的资金承诺的名义金额均令人满意, 几乎所有区域和次区域获得的承诺金额在本报告期内都呈上升趋势。

46. 拥有大量不同类型的机制和激励措施似乎是一个积极因素, 切实有助于为执行《公约》调动资源。各国似乎最常利用政策和法律激励因素, 而较少利用经济和财政激励措施。不过, 几乎所有区域 2010 年至 2011 年的机制数目都呈上升趋势。

47. 对国际、区域、次区域、国家和地方一级推动《公约》执行的机构设置、职责和安排的效力的评估显示, 评价结果为中等至良好。大多数区域和报告实体似乎都对国际一级的安排最满意, 满意度逐级递减, 对地方一级的满意度最低。这表明, 可持续土地管理投资的扶持型环境需要落实到地方一级, 以便利土地和生态系统服务的实际管理。

八. 建议

48. 以下初步建议可在审评委第十一届会议上审议, 以期尽早就将送交缔约方会议第十一届会议的决定草案开展磋商:

(a) 鼓励环境基金保持对受影响国家缔约方《公约》相关活动的资金划拨的上升趋势；

(b) 请发达国家缔约方更加大力地支持受影响国家缔约方的《公约》相关活动，提高双边官方发展援助用于可持续土地管理和《荒漠化公约》相关活动的比例，并特别关注获得援助呈下降趋势的区域；

(c) 请受影响国家缔约方加大公共预算对《公约》相关目标的资金承诺；

(d) 鼓励受影响国家缔约方和发达国家缔约方在建立各类机制和激励措施，以支持为《公约》执行调动资源方面，保持上升趋势；

(e) 请各缔约方、联合国机构和政府间组织，包括环境基金改善推动《公约》执行的机构设置、职责和安排，特别是区域、次区域、国家和地方一级的机构设置、职责和安排；

(f) 请附属机构和《公约》机构在各自将提交缔约方会议第十一届会议讨论的工作方案和计划中纳入对这些建议的审议，以期向受影响国家缔约方提供在“战略”的战略目标 4 方面需要的援助。

Annex

[English only]

**Tables and figures accompanying the preliminary analysis of
impact indicators established under strategic objective 4 of
The Strategy**

List of figures

	<i>Page</i>
1. Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives from developed country Parties (by receiving region, with the exclusion of global activities)	17
2. Nominal amount (USD million) of bilateral Official Development Assistance from developed country Parties (by receiving region, with the exclusion of global activities)	18
3. Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives made from domestic public budgets (Global)	19
4. Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives made from domestic public budgets (Africa)	20
5. Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives made from domestic public budgets (Asia)	20
6. Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for convention-related objectives made from domestic public budgets (Latin America and the Caribbean)	21

List of tables

1. Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives from the Global Environment Facility	16
2. Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives from developed country Parties (by receiving country and region)	16
3. Nominal amount (USD million) of bilateral Official Development Assistance from developed country Parties (by receiving country and region)	17
4. Convention-related assistance as a share of bilateral Official Development Assistance from developed country Parties (by recipient region)	18
5. Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives made from domestic public budgets (Global)	19
6. Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives made from domestic public budgets (Africa)	19
7. Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives made from domestic public budgets (Asia)	20
8. Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives made from domestic public budgets (Latin America and the Caribbean)	21

9.	Number of mechanisms in place to facilitate the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Convention, by type (Global).....	21
10.	Number of mechanisms in place to facilitate the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Convention, by type (Africa)	22
11.	Number of mechanisms in place to facilitate the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Convention, by type (Asia)	23
12.	Number of mechanisms in place to facilitate the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Convention, by type (Latin America and the Caribbean).....	23
13.	Number of mechanisms in place to facilitate the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Convention, by type (Northern Mediterranean)	24
14.	Number of mechanisms in place to facilitate the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Convention, by type (Central and Eastern European).....	24
15.	Number of mechanisms in place to facilitate the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Convention, by type (developed country Parties)	24
16.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the international level (Global).....	24
17.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the regional level (Global).....	25
18.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the subregional level (Global)	26
19.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the national level (Global).....	26
20.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the local level (Global)	27
21.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the international level (Africa)	27
22.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the regional level (Africa)	28
23.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the subregional level (Africa).....	28
24.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the national level (Africa).....	28
25.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the local level (Africa).....	29
26.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the international level (Asia)	29
27.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the regional level (Asia)	30
28.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the subregional level (Asia).....	30
29.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the national level (Asia)	31
30.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the local level (Asia)	31
31.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the international level (Latin America and the Caribbean).....	32
32.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the regional level (Latin America and the Caribbean).....	32
33.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the subregional level (Latin America and the Caribbean).....	32
34.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the national level (Latin America and the Caribbean).....	33
35.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the local level (Latin America and the Caribbean).....	33

36.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the international level (Northern Mediterranean)	34
37.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the regional level (Northern Mediterranean)	34
38.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the subregional level (Northern Mediterranean)	34
39.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the national level (Northern Mediterranean)	34
40.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the local level (Northern Mediterranean)	34
41.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the international level (Central and Eastern European)	35
42.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set up at the regional level (Central and Eastern European)	35
43.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set up at the sub-regional level (Central and Eastern European)	35
44.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the national level (Central and Eastern European)	35
45.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set up at the local level (Central and Eastern European)	35
46.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the international, regional, subregional, national and local levels (developed country Parties): Average results	36
47.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the international, regional, subregional, national and local levels (Global Environment Facility).....	36
48.	Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the international, regional, subregional, national and local levels (Global Mechanism)	36

I. Tables for impact indicator SO-4-1

Table 1

Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives from the Global Environment Facility

<i>Region</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>	<i>Percentage change</i>
Africa	3.5	38.7	10.0
Asia	-	6.5	n/a
Latin America and the Caribbean	4.0	3.3	-0.2
Northern Mediterranean	-	-	n/a
Central and Eastern European	-	3.8	n/a
Global activities	0.9	-	n/a
Total	8.4	52.2	5.2


II. Tables and figures for impact indicator SO-4-2

Table 2

Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives from developed country Parties (by receiving country and region)

<i>Region</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>	<i>Percentage change</i>
Africa	20.0	141.3	606
Asia	1.0	13.3	1 287
Latin America and the Caribbean	12.2	3.7	-69
Northern Mediterranean	-	0.2	n/a
Central and Eastern European	0.3	0.3	0
Global activities	10.6	23.3	119
Total	44.1	182.1	313

Figure 1
Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives from developed country Parties (by receiving region, with the exclusion of global activities)



LAC=Latin America and the Caribbean; NorMed= Northern Mediterranean;
 CEE= Central and Eastern European

Table 3
Nominal amount (USD million) of bilateral Official Development Assistance from developed country Parties (by receiving country and region)

<i>Region</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>	<i>Percentage change</i>
Africa	6 636.2	1 654.2	-75.1
Asia	1 318.8	102.7	-92.2
Latin America and the Caribbean	2 385.7	-	n/a
Northern Mediterranean	97.8	-	n/a
Central and Eastern European	137.1	0.6	-99.6
Global activities	1 916.0	1 897.1	-1.0
Total	12 491.6	3 654.6	-70.7

Figure 2

Nominal amount (USD million) of bilateral Official Development Assistance from developed country Parties (by receiving region, with the exclusion of global activities)




Table 4

Convention-related assistance as a share of bilateral Official Development Assistance from developed country Parties (by recipient region)

<i>Region</i>	<i>Share of bilateral ODA(percentage)</i>
Africa	1.9
Asia	1.0
Latin America and the Caribbean	0.7
Northern Mediterranean	0.2
Central and Eastern European	0.4
Global activities	0.9

III. Tables and figures for impact indicator SO-4-3

Table 5

Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives made from domestic public budgets (Global)

<i>Region</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>	<i>Percentage change</i>
Africa	3 885.8	3 435.7	-11.6
Asia	12 228.9	12 111.5	-01.0
Latin America and the Caribbean	10 104.4	10 058.2	-0.5
Northern Mediterranean	64.5	129.7	101.1
Central and Eastern European	94.0	1.1	-98.8
Total	26 377.6	25 736.1	-2.4

Figure 3
Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives made from domestic public budgets (Global)




Table 6
Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives made from domestic public budgets (Africa)

<i>Sub-region</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>	<i>Percentage change</i>
Central Africa	0.3	0.3	3.7
Eastern Africa	0.2	0.4	100.0
Northern Africa	660.7	859.9	30.1
Southern Africa	20.6	20.1	-2.8
Western Africa	3 204.0	2 555.1	-20.2
Total	3 885.8	3 435.7	-11.6

Figure 4
Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives made from domestic public budgets (Africa)




Table 7
Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives made from domestic public budgets (Asia)

<i>Sub-region</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>	<i>Percentage change</i>
Central Asia	86.9	87.3	0.4
East Asia	8 623.0	8 643.3	0.2
Pacific	0.1	0.1	0
South Asia	262.2	179.5	-31.5
South-East Asia	250.6	195.1	-22.1
West Asia	3 006.2	3 006.2	0.0
Total	12 228.9	12 111.5	-0.9

Figure 5
Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives made from domestic public budgets (Asia)





Table 8
Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives made from domestic public budgets (Latin America and the Caribbean)

<i>Sub-region</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>	<i>Percentage change</i>
Andean	5.5	6.3	14.9
Caribbean	3 34.3	402.2	20.3
Mesoamerica	6 286.9	6 143.4	-2.3
South Cone	3 477.7	3 506.3	0.8
Total	10 104.4	10 058.2	-0.5

Figure 6
Nominal amount (USD million) of financial commitments for convention-related objectives made from domestic public budgets (Latin America and the Caribbean)



IV. Tables for impact indicator SO-4-6

Table 9
Number of mechanisms in place to facilitate the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Convention, by type (Global)

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Laws and regulations</i>	<i>Economic and financial incentives</i>		<i>Cooperation frameworks</i>	<i>Sectoral policies</i>	<i>Total</i>
2010	Africa	32	35	59	42	168	
	Asia	300	100	58	351	809	
	Latin America and the Caribbean	17	4	23	48	92	
	Northern Mediterranean	2	1	3	1	7	

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Laws and regulations</i>	<i>Economic and financial incentives</i>	<i>Cooperation frameworks</i>	<i>Sectoral policies</i>	<i>Total</i>
	Central and Eastern European	35	15	3	7	60
	Total	386	155	146	449	1 136
2011	Africa	35	35	58	45	173
	Asia	321	103	61	374	859
	Latin America and the Caribbean	16	4	27	51	98
	Northern Mediterranean	2	1	2	1	6
	Central and Eastern European	15	9	2	4	30
	Total	389	152	150	475	1 166

Table 10
Number of mechanisms in place to facilitate the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Convention, by type (Africa)

	<i>Sub-region</i>	<i>Laws and regulations</i>	<i>Economic and financial incentives</i>	<i>Cooperation frameworks</i>	<i>Sectoral policies</i>	<i>Total</i>
2010	Central Africa	9	8	11	11	39
	Eastern Africa	-	-	1	1	2
	Northern Africa	2	1	1	1	5
	Southern Africa	5	2	15	16	38
	Western Africa	16	24	31	13	84
	Total	32	35	59	42	168
2011	Central Africa	13	9	11	14	47
	Eastern Africa	-	-	1	1	2
	Northern Africa	1	1	1	1	4
	Southern Africa	5	1	14	15	35
	Western Africa	16	24	31	14	85
	Total	35	35	58	45	173

Table 11
Number of mechanisms in place to facilitate the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Convention, by type (Asia)

	<i>Sub-region</i>	<i>Laws and regulations</i>	<i>Economic and financial incentives</i>	<i>Cooperation frameworks</i>	<i>Sectoral policies</i>	<i>Total</i>
2010	Central Asia	261	28	14	295	598
	East Asia	2	48	5	4	59
	Pacific	-	-	-	-	-
	South Asia	31	13	15	28	87
	South-East Asia	1	1	1	3	6
	West Asia	5	10	23	21	59
	Total	300	100	58	351	809
2011	Central Asia	278	29	18	312	637
	East Asia	3	53	5	4	65
	Pacific	-	-	-	-	-
	South Asia	33	8	15	30	86
	South-East Asia	2	1	1	5	9
	West Asia	5	12	22	23	62
	Total	321	103	61	374	859

Table 12
Number of mechanisms in place to facilitate the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Convention, by type (Latin America and the Caribbean)

	<i>Sub-region</i>	<i>Laws and regulations</i>	<i>Economic and financial incentives</i>	<i>Cooperation frameworks</i>	<i>Sectoral policies</i>	<i>Total</i>
2010	Andean	4	1	7	3	15
	Caribbean	4	1	1	9	15
	Mesoamerica	5	0	4	27	36
	South Cone	4	2	11	9	26
	Total	17	4	23	48	92
2011	Andean	2	2	5	2	11
	Caribbean	4	1	1	11	17
	Mesoamerica	5	0	4	27	36
	South Cone	5	1	17	11	34
	Total	16	4	27	51	98

Table 13
Number of mechanisms in place to facilitate the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Convention, by type (Northern Mediterranean)

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Laws and regulations</i>	<i>Economic and financial incentives</i>	<i>Cooperation frameworks</i>	<i>Sectoral policies</i>	<i>Total</i>
2010	Northern	2	1	3	1	7
2011	Mediterranean	2	1	2	1	6

Table 14
Number of mechanisms in place to facilitate the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Convention, by type (Central and Eastern European)

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Laws and regulations</i>	<i>Economic and financial incentives</i>	<i>Cooperation frameworks</i>	<i>Sectoral policies</i>	<i>Total</i>
2010	Central and Eastern	35	15	3	7	60
2011	European	15	9	2	4	30

Table 15
Number of mechanisms in place to facilitate the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Convention, by type (developed country Parties)

	<i>Developed country Parties</i>	<i>Laws and regulations</i>	<i>Economic and financial incentives</i>	<i>Cooperation frameworks</i>	<i>Sectoral policies</i>	<i>Total</i>
2010	Europe	6	1	45	4	56
	Total	6	1	45	4	56
2011	Europe	6	2	23	7	38
	Total	6	2	23	7	38

VII. Tables for impact indicator SO-4-7

Table 16
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the international level (Global)

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Africa	4	5	5	5	0
	Asia	2	7	6	1	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean	4	3	2	0	0

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
	Northern Mediterranean	0	2	0	0	0
	Central and Eastern European	1	1	0	0	0
	Total	11	18	13	6	0
2011	Africa	3	6	5	5	0
	Asia	1	8	6	1	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean	5	3	1	0	0
	Northern Mediterranean	0	2	0	0	0
	Central and Eastern European	1	1	0	0	0
	Total	10	20	12	6	0

Table 17
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the regional level (Global)

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Africa	2	4	7	3	1
	Asia	1	3	7	3	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean	4	1	2	1	1
	Northern Mediterranean	0	0	2	0	0
	Central and Eastern European	1	0	0	1	0
	Total	8	8	18	8	2
2011	Africa	1	5	6	5	0
	Asia	1	3	7	2	1
	Latin America and the Caribbean	4	1	2	1	1
	Northern Mediterranean	0	0	2	0	0
	Central and Eastern European	1	0	0	1	0
	Total	7	9	17	9	2

Table 18
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the subregional level (Global)

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Africa	2	5	4	4	2
	Asia	0	5	8	2	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean	3	2	3	1	1
	Northern Mediterranean	0	1	0	0	0
	Central and Eastern European	0	1	0	1	0
	Total	5	14	15	8	3
	2011	Africa	1	7	3	4
Asia		0	5	8	2	0
Latin America and the Caribbean		3	2	3	1	1
Northern Mediterranean		0	1	0	0	0
Central and Eastern European		0	1	0	1	0
Total		4	16	14	8	3

Table 19
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the national level (Global)

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Africa	3	6	5	5	1
	Asia	1	12	2	0	1
	Latin America and the Caribbean	4	4	2	0	0
	Northern Mediterranean	1	0	0	1	0
	Central and Eastern European	0	2	1	0	0
	Total	9	24	10	6	2
	2011	Africa	3	6	5	5
Asia		2	12	1	0	1
Latin America and the Caribbean		6	3	1	0	0
Northern Mediterranean		1	0	0	1	0
Central and Eastern European		0	2	1	0	0
Total		12	23	8	6	2

Table 20
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the local level (Global)

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Africa	3	2	4	9	2
	Asia	0	9	3	2	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean	3	2	5	0	0
	Northern Mediterranean	0	1	1	0	0
	Central and Eastern European	0	2	0	1	0
	Total	6	16	13	12	2
2011	Africa	3	2	5	8	2
	Asia	0	10	2	2	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean	4	3	3	0	0
	Northern Mediterranean	0	1	1	0	0
	Central and Eastern European	0	2	0	1	0
	Total	7	18	11	11	2

Table 21
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the international level (Africa)

	<i>Subregion</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Central Africa	1	1	1	0	0
	Eastern Africa	0	0	1	0	0
	Northern Africa	0	1	1	0	0
	Southern Africa	2	0	2	1	0
	Western Africa	1	3	0	4	0
	Total	4	5	5	5	0
2011	Central Africa	1	1	1	0	0
	Eastern Africa	0	0	1	0	0
	Northern Africa	0	1	1	0	0
	Southern Africa	2	0	2	1	0
	Western Africa	0	4	0	4	0
	Total	3	6	5	5	0

Table 22
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the regional level (Africa)

	<i>Subregion</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Central Africa	1	1	1	0	0
	Eastern Africa	0	0	1	0	0
	Northern Africa	0	0	2	0	0
	Southern Africa	0	1	2	0	0
	Western Africa	1	2	1	3	1
	Total	2	4	7	3	1
2011	Central Africa	1	1	0	1	0
	Eastern Africa	0	0	1	0	0
	Northern Africa	0	0	2	0	0
	Southern Africa	0	1	2	0	0
	Western Africa	0	3	1	4	0
	Total	1	5	6	5	0

Table 23
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the subregional level (Africa)

	<i>Subregion</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Central Africa	1	1	1	0	0
	Eastern Africa	0	0	0	0	1
	Northern Africa	0	0	1	1	0
	Southern Africa	0	1	1	1	0
	Western Africa	1	3	1	2	1
	Total	2	5	4	4	2
2011	Central Africa	1	2	0	0	0
	Eastern Africa	0	0	0	0	1
	Northern Africa	0	0	1	1	0
	Southern Africa	0	1	1	1	0
	Western Africa	0	4	1	2	1
	Total	1	7	3	4	2

Table 24
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the national level (Africa)

	<i>Subregion</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Central Africa	0	0	2	1	0
	Eastern Africa	0	1	0	0	0
	Northern Africa	1	1	0	0	0
	Southern Africa	2	1	0	2	0
	Western Africa	0	3	3	2	1
	Total	3	6	5	5	1

	<i>Subregion</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2011	Central Africa	0	0	2	1	0
	Eastern Africa	0	1	0	0	0
	Northern Africa	1	1	0	0	0
	Southern Africa	2	1	0	2	0
	Western Africa	0	3	3	2	1
	Total	3	6	5	5	1

Table 25
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the local level (Africa)

	<i>Subregion</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Central Africa	0	0	1	2	0
	Eastern Africa	0	1	0	0	0
	Northern Africa	1	0	0	1	0
	Southern Africa	2	0	1	1	1
	Western Africa	0	1	2	5	1
	Total	3	2	4	9	2
2011	Central Africa	0	0	1	2	0
	Eastern Africa	0	1	0	0	0
	Northern Africa	1	0	1	0	0
	Southern Africa	2	0	1	1	1
	Western Africa	0	1	2	5	1
	Total	3	2	5	8	2

Table 26
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the international level (Asia)

	<i>Subregion</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Central Asia	1	1	1	1	0
	East Asia	0	0	1	0	0
	Pacific	0	0	1	0	0
	South Asia	1	1	2	0	0
	South-East Asia	0	1	1	0	0
	West Asia	0	4	0	0	0
	Total	2	7	6	1	0
2011	Central Asia	1	1	1	1	0
	East Asia	0	0	1	0	0
	Pacific	0	0	1	0	0
	South Asia	0	2	2	0	0
	South-East Asia	0	1	1	0	0
	West Asia	0	4	0	0	0
	Total	1	8	6	1	0

Table 27
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the regional level (Asia)

	<i>Subregion</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Central Asia	1	1	1	1	0
	East Asia	0	0	1	0	0
	Pacific	0	0	1	0	0
	South Asia	0	1	1	1	0
	South-East Asia	0	0	1	1	0
	West Asia	0	1	2	0	0
	Total	1	3	7	3	0
2011	Central Asia	1	1	1	0	1
	East Asia	0	0	1	0	0
	Pacific	0	0	1	0	0
	South Asia	0	1	1	1	0
	South-East Asia	0	0	1	1	0
	West Asia	0	1	2	0	0
	Total	1	3	7	2	1

Table 28
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the subregional level (Asia)

	<i>Su-region</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Central Asia	0	2	1	0	0
	East Asia	0	1	1	0	0
	Pacific	0	0	1	0	0
	South Asia	0	1	3	0	0
	South-East Asia	0	0	0	2	0
	West Asia	0	1	2	0	0
	Total	0	5	8	2	0
2011	Central Asia	0	2	1	0	0
	East Asia	0	1	1	0	0
	Pacific	0	0	1	0	0
	South Asia	0	1	3	0	0
	South-East Asia	0	0	0	2	0
	West Asia	0	1	2	0	0
	Total	0	5	8	2	0

Table 29
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the national level (Asia)

	<i>Subregion</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Central Asia	0	3	1	0	0
	East Asia	0	1	1	0	0
	Pacific	0	0	0	0	1
	South Asia	0	4	0	0	0
	South-East Asia	0	2	0	0	0
	West Asia	1	2	0	0	0
	Total	1	12	2	0	1
2011	Central Asia	0	4	0	0	0
	East Asia	1	0	1	0	0
	Pacific	0	0	0	0	1
	South Asia	0	4	0	0	0
	South-East Asia	0	2	0	0	0
	West Asia	1	2	0	0	0
	Total	2	12	1	0	1

Table 30
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the local level (Asia)

	<i>Subregion</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Central Asia	0	0	2	0	0
	East Asia	0	1	0	1	0
	Pacific	0	0	0	1	0
	South Asia	0	4	0	0	0
	South-East Asia	0	1	1	0	0
	West Asia	0	3	0	0	0
	Total	0	9	3	2	0
2011	Central Asia	0	1	1	0	0
	East Asia	0	1	0	1	0
	Pacific	0	0	0	1	0
	South Asia	0	4	0	0	0
	South-East Asia	0	1	1	0	0
	West Asia	0	3	0	0	0
	Total	0	10	2	2	0

Table 31
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the international level (Latin America and the Caribbean)

	<i>Subregion</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Andean	3	1	0	0	0
	Caribbean	1	0	0	0	0
	Mesoamerica	0	2	1	0	0
	South Cone	0	0	1	0	0
	Total	4	3	2	0	0
2011	Andean	3	1	0	0	0
	Caribbean	1	0	0	0	0
	Mesoamerica	1	1	1	0	0
	South Cone	0	1	0	0	0
	Total	5	3	1	0	0

Table 32
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the regional level (Latin America and the Caribbean)

	<i>Subregion</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Andean	3	0	1	0	0
	Caribbean	1	0	0	0	0
	Mesoamerica	0	1	0	1	1
	South Cone	0	0	1	0	0
	Total	4	1	2	1	1
2011	Andean	3	0	1	0	0
	Caribbean	1	0	0	0	0
	Mesoamerica	0	1	0	1	1
	South Cone	0	0	1	0	0
	Total	4	1	2	1	1

Table 33
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the subregional level (Latin America and the Caribbean)

	<i>Subregion</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Andean	2	1	1	0	0
	Caribbean	1	1	0	0	0
	Mesoamerica	0	0	1	1	1
	South Cone	0	0	1	0	0
	Total	3	2	3	1	1

	<i>Subregion</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2011	Andean	2	1	1	0	0
	Caribbean	1	1	0	0	0
	Mesoamerica	0	0	1	1	1
	South Cone	0	0	1	0	0
	Total	3	2	3	1	1

Table 34
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the national level (Latin America and the Caribbean)

	<i>Su-region</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Andean	3	1	0	0	0
	Caribbean	1	1	0	0	0
	Mesoamerica	0	1	2	0	0
	South Cone	0	1	0	0	0
	Total	4	4	2	0	0
2011	Andean	3	1	0	0	0
	Caribbean	1	1	0	0	0
	Mesoamerica	1	1	1	0	0
	South Cone	1	0	0	0	0
	Total	6	3	1	0	0

Table 35
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the local level (Latin America and the Caribbean)

	<i>Subregion</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Vry poor</i>
2010	Andean	2	0	2	0	0
	Caribbean	1	1	0	0	0
	Mesoamerica	0	1	2	0	0
	South Cone	0	0	1	0	0
	Total	3	2	5	0	0
2011	Andean	2	0	2	0	0
	Caribbean	1	1	0	0	0
	Mesoamerica	1	1	1	0	0
	South Cone	0	1	0	0	0
	Total	4	3	3	0	0

Table 36
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the international level (Northern Mediterranean)

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Northern	-	2	-	-	-
2011	Mediterranean	-	2	-	-	-

Table 37
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the regional level (Northern Mediterranean)

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Northern	-	-	2	-	-
2011	Mediterranean	-	-	2	-	-

Table 38
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the subregional level (Northern Mediterranean)

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Northern	-	1	-	-	-
2011	Mediterranean	-	1	-	-	-

Table 39
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the national level (Northern Mediterranean)

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Northern	1	-	-	1	-
2011	Mediterranean	1	-	-	1	-

Table 40
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the local level (Northern Mediterranean)

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Northern	-	1	1	-	-
2011	Mediterranean	-	1	1	-	-

Table 41
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the international level (Central and Eastern European)

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Central and Eastern	1	1	-	-	-
2011	Europe	1	1	-	-	-

Table 42
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set up at the regional level (Central and Eastern European)

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Central and Eastern	1	-	-	1	-
2011	Europe	1	-	-	1	-

Table 43
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set up at the sub-regional level (Central and Eastern European)

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Central and Eastern	-	1	-	1	-
2011	Europe	-	1	-	1	-

Table 44
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the national level (Central and Eastern European)

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Central and Eastern	-	2	1	-	-
2011	Europe	-	2	1	-	-

Table 45
Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set up at the local level (Central and Eastern European)

	<i>Region</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>
2010	Central and Eastern	-	2	-	1	-
2011	Europe	-	2	-	1	-

Table 46

Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the international, regional, subregional, national and local levels (developed country Parties): Average results

	<i>Developed country Parties</i>	<i>International</i>	<i>Regional</i>	<i>Subregional</i>	<i>National</i>	<i>Local</i>
2010	Europe	fair	poor	poor	fair	fair
2011	Europe	fair	poor	fair	fair	fair

Table 47

Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the international, regional, subregional, national and local levels (Global Environment Facility)

		<i>International</i>	<i>Regional</i>	<i>Subregional</i>	<i>National</i>	<i>Local</i>
2010	Global Environment Facility	very good	very good	fair	very good	very good
2011	Global Environment Facility	very good	very good	fair	very good	very good

Table 48

Evaluation of effectiveness of the institutional set-up at the international, regional, subregional, national and local levels (Global Mechanism)

		<i>International</i>	<i>Regional</i>	<i>Subregional</i>	<i>National</i>	<i>Local</i>
2010	Global Mechanism	very good	very good	very good	very good	-
2011	Global Mechanism	very good	very good	very good	very good	-