



Convention to Combat Desertification

Distr.: General
25 February 2013

Original: English

Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention

Eleventh session

Bonn, 15–19 April 2013

Items 3 and 5 of the provisional agenda

Assessment of implementation against the provisionally adopted performance indicators

Review of financial flows for the implementation of the Convention

Preliminary analysis of information contained in reports from subregional and regional reporting entities

Note by the secretariat

Summary

By its decision 3/COP.10, the Conference of the Parties decided that the subregional and regional institutions listed in the annex to that decision should act as reporting entities with regard to the preparation and submission of reports on the implementation of subregional action programmes (SRAPs) and regional action programmes (RAPs). Reports from three subregions (Caribbean, West Asia and Central Asia) were submitted by the deadline, but no regional reporting entities submitted reports by the deadline. According to the Article 11 of the Convention, apart from reporting on SRAPs and RAPs, subregional and regional reporting entities were also invited to report on the implementation of joint action programmes that are implemented in more than one country within a given subregion.

This document contains the preliminary analysis of information from three subregions on strategic and impact indicators, financial flows and additional information.

This is the first time that subregions and regions have been requested to provide reports on progress made in implementing the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008–2018) (The Strategy). Hence, the subregional and regional reports due for 2010–2011 should have set up the baseline for further monitoring. But because only a few reports were received, baselines have been set for only 20 per cent of the subregions. For the same reason it has been difficult or impossible to identify trends and to make any comparative analysis.

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	1–7	3
II. Strategic objectives of The Strategy and related impact indicators	8–12	4
A. General information	8–11	4
B. Impact indicators SO-4-3, SO-4-6 and SO-4-7	12	5
III. Operational objectives of The Strategy and related performance indicators	13–85	5
A. Operational objective 1	13–23	5
B. Operational objective 2	24–39	7
C. Operational objective 3	40–56	9
D. Operational objective 4	57–63	11
E. Operational objective 5	64–85	12
IV. Financial flows	86–94	14
A. Standard financial annex	86	14
B. Programmes and projects sheets	87–94	15
V. Additional information	95–102	15
A. Availability of financial resources for UNCCD reporting	95	15
B. Amount of financial resources invested in meeting UNCCD reporting obligations	96	16
C. Human resources invested in meeting UNCCD reporting obligations	97	16
D. Availability of technical/scientific knowledge for UNCCD reporting	98	16
E. Level of coordination for UNCCD reporting	99–100	16
F. Level of participation and consultation for UNCCD reporting	101	16
G. Identification of major difficulties in using the performance review and assessment of implementation system and their relevance	102	16
VI. Conclusions	103–117	16
VII. Recommendations	118	18

I. Introduction

1. Parties to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) recognize the need to strengthen the base and reach of the Convention, as well as to increase its effectiveness, and by decision 3/COP.8 they adopted the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008–2018) (The Strategy). Decision 3/COP.8 represents a milestone inasmuch as it sets the direction in which the Convention process should develop, and provides the tools to achieve the agreed goals. The Strategy defines the roles of all relevant actors in the Convention process and lays the foundation for a completely new – quantitative and results-based – approach to the implementation of the Convention and The Strategy itself, and for associated impact and performance reviews.¹

2. According to decisions 8/COP.8 and 13/COP.9 each Party and subregional and/or regional entity reporting shall report to the session of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention (CRIC) held between ordinary sessions of the Conference of the Parties (COP), through the secretariat, on the measures which it has taken for the implementation of The Strategy and the Convention.

3. By its decision 3/COP.10, the COP decided that the subregional and regional institutions listed in the annex to that decision should act as reporting entities with regard to the preparation and submission of reports on the implementation of subregional action programmes (SRAPs) and regional action programmes (RAPs). Regional Implementation Annexes that had not identified their subregional and regional reporting entities at the time of COP 10 were requested to identify them and notify the secretariat by 31 December 2011. A series of consultations with the relevant regional organizations took place after COP 10, and 13 subregional² and three regional³ reporting entities were identified through that consultation process. The Central Asia subregion could not agree on the reporting entity, so the secretariat has supported the consultant in order to assist the countries of that subregion in the reporting process.

4. Decision 3/COP.10 also requested the secretariat and the Global Mechanism to facilitate the reporting process at subregional and regional levels, through the provision of technical assistance, as required, and in consultation with the regional committees where established. The secretariat facilitated the consultation process and provided financial assistance to six subregional and regional entities. As the reporting entities in West Asia and Central Asia could not be identified in time for this reporting exercise, the secretariat also provided technical assistance to the countries of those subregions through consultants

¹ See document ICCD/CRIC(8)/4.

² Conférence des ministres en charge des forêts d’Afrique Centrale (Central Africa); Intergovernmental Authority on Development (Eastern Africa); Southern African Development Community (Southern Africa); Economic Community of West African States/Communauté économique des États de l’Afrique de l’Ouest (Western Africa); Arab Maghreb Union (Northern Africa); Arab Center for the Studies of Arid Zones and Dry Lands (ACSAD); The Center for People and Forests (South East Asia); Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (Pacific) (North-East Asia); the Northeast Asia Desertification, Land Degradation and Drought Network (DLDD-NEAN); International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (South Asia); Central American Integration System (Mesoamerica); Andean Community of Nations (Andean subregion); The Caribbean Network for Integrated Rural Development (Caribbean).

³ African Union (Africa); The Center for People and Forests (Asia); United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (Latin America and the Caribbean).

who prepared the reports in close consultations with the affected country Parties of those subregions.

5. Because of an initial lack of financial resources and slow disbursement of funding, the reporting entities had little time to prepare and submit their reports by the deadline of 30 October 2012. Reports from three subregions (Caribbean, West Asia and Central Asia) were submitted by the deadline and are being used for this preliminary analysis; two other reports were received after 31 October but before 31 December 2012. No regional reporting entities submitted reports. The reports included in the present analysis represent 20 per cent of the expected subregional reports, and cover two of the three regions where subregions are identified.

6. Article 11 of the Convention states that affected country Parties may prepare and implement RAPs and/or SRAPs and/or joint action programmes (JAPs) in order to harmonize, complement and increase the efficiency of national programmes. In this context, and apart from reporting on SRAPs and RAPs, subregional and regional reporting entities are also able to report on the implementation of JAPs that are implemented in more than one country within a given subregion. Templates and guidelines for subregional⁴ and regional⁵ reporting have been prepared by the secretariat; they are based on the template for affected country Parties and incorporate other relevant provisions contained in decisions 8/COP.8 and 11/COP.9.

7. This document contains the preliminary analysis of information from three subregions (Caribbean, West Asia and Central Asia) on strategic and impact indicators, financial flows and additional information. The information provided allows the setting of baselines for the three subregions, but no overall subregional and regional assessment could be undertaken.

II. Strategic objectives of The Strategy and related impact indicators

A. General information

8. Subregions reported on the preparation and adoption of SRAPs. A draft SRAP in the Caribbean was adopted on 2 September 2011, a final SRAP in West Asia was adopted on 2 July 2001 and a final SRAP in Central Asia was adopted on 3 September 2003.

9. All subregions are aware of JAPs implemented at the subregional level. The JAP for the Caribbean – Caribbean Biological Corridor – was adopted on 7 August 2007 and implemented in Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Haiti with Jamaica and Puerto Rico as observers.

10. The JAP in West Asia – Support to the Arab Center for the Studies of Arid Zones and Dry-Lands – was adopted on 1 September 1997 and implemented in Jordan, Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic.

11. The JAP in Central Asia – Pamir-Alai Land Management Project – was adopted on 1 January 2007 and implemented in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan.

⁴ [http://www.unccd.int/en/programmes/Reporting-review-and-assessment/Pages/Template-and-reporting-guidelines-for-Subregional-Action-Programmes-\(SRAP\).aspx](http://www.unccd.int/en/programmes/Reporting-review-and-assessment/Pages/Template-and-reporting-guidelines-for-Subregional-Action-Programmes-(SRAP).aspx).

⁵ <http://www.unccd.int/en/programmes/Reporting-review-and-assessment/Pages/Template-and-reporting-guidelines-for-RAP.aspx>.

B. Impact indicators SO-4-3, SO-4-6 and SO-4-7

12. Information provided in table 1 indicates trends in the supply of public finance for investments relating to desertification/land degradation and drought (DLDD) and the effectiveness of institutional arrangements and provides a measure of the efforts made in the subregions to facilitate the implementation of the Convention.

Table 1
Overview of impact indicators by subregion

	SO-4-3 <i>Nominal amount (USD) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives</i>		SO-4-6 <i>Number of mechanisms in place in the subregion to facilitate the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Convention</i>		SO-4-7 <i>Institutional set-up, responsibilities, and arrangements to facilitate the implementation of the Convention</i>	
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Caribbean	40 000 (SRAP)	60 000 (SRAP)	2 (SRAP), Cooperation frameworks	2 (SRAP), Cooperation frameworks	Good SRAP	Very good SRAP
West Asia	100 000 (SRAP) 500 000 (JAP)	100 000 (SRAP) 500 000 (JAP)	2 (SRAP), Cooperation frameworks	2 (SRAP), Cooperation frameworks	Very poor (SRAP and JAP)	Very poor (SRAP and JAP)
Central Asia	n/a	n/a	n/a	2 (JAP), Cooperation frameworks	Fair (SRAP and JAP)	Fair (SRAP and JAP)

III. Operational objectives of The Strategy and related performance indicators

A. Operational objective 1

1. Performance indicator CONS-O-1 for outcome 1.1

Number and size of information events organized on the subject of DLDD and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity, and audience reached by media addressing DLDD and DLDD synergies

a. Caribbean

13. For the period 2010–2011, no information events/media were organized in the subregion, and no media products were produced specifically addressing DLDD and/or DLDD synergy with climate change and biodiversity.

14. There is no subregional communication strategy addressing DLDD and/or DLDD synergy with climate change and biodiversity.

15. Two activities relating to the United Nations Decade for Deserts and the Fight Against Desertification (UNDDD) are being implemented in the subregion: “Agro-Forestry Tourism Initiative” in Belize and the “Women in SLM and Agriculture” project in St. Vincent.

b. *West Asia*

16. For the period 2010–2011, in the context of the JAPs, about 10 information events have been reported, with a total of 1150 participants. The numbers of media products reported in the context of the JAPs were 10 relating to print media and 10 relating to radio and TV.

17. There is no subregional communication strategy for this subregion. Activities relating to the UNDDD are being implemented by countries under the national frameworks of combating desertification and drought.

c. *Central Asia*

18. For the period 2010–2011, two information events were mentioned in both SRAP and JAP contexts, with a total of 240 participants. The numbers of media products in both SRAP and JAPs context were 25 relating to print media but only four relating to radio and TV coverage.

19. There is a subregional communication strategy for addressing DLDD and/or DLDD synergy with climate change and biodiversity.

20. In the context of the UNDDD, two activities were carried out nationally in the subregion, the World Day to Combat Desertification and the launch of the national action programme (NAP) alignment process.

2. Performance indicators CONS-O-3 and CONS-O-4 for outcome 1.3

Number of civil society organizations and science and technology institutions participating in the Convention processes (see table 2)

Number and type of DLDD-related initiatives of civil society organizations and science and technology institutions in the field of education

a. *Caribbean*

21. In 2010 five civil society organizations (CSOs) were involved in DLDD-related programmes/projects in the subregion (all in the SRAP context); in 2011 six CSOs were involved in such programmes/projects. Only two science and technology institutions (STIs) were involved in such programmes/projects in the subregion, one in 2010 and one in 2011, both in the SRAP context. Only one CSO undertook a DLDD-related education initiative, in the SRAP context, and no STIs undertook such initiatives.

b. *West Asia*

22. In both 2010 and 2011, 15 CSOs were participating in Convention processes through JAPs, and two STIs were participating in DLDD activities, through JAPs.

c. *Central Asia*

23. In 2010, 15 CSOs were participating in DLDD activities through SRAPs, and five CSOs were participating in the JAP context. In 2011 there was no CSO participation. No STI participation was reported in either year.

Table 2
Number of civil society organizations (CSOs) and science and technology institutions (STIs) involved in programmes and projects relating to desertification/land degradation and drought (DLDD), 2010 and 2011

<i>Subregion</i>	<i>Number of CSOs involved in DLDD-related programmes and projects</i>		<i>Number of STIs involved in DLDD-related programmes and projects</i>	
	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>
Caribbean	5	6	1	1
West Asia	15	15	2	2
Central Asia	20	-	-	-

B. Operational objective 2

1. Performance indicator CONS – O-5 for outcomes 2.1, 2.2, 2.3

Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities to have finalized the formulation/revision of NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs aligned to The Strategy, taking into account biophysical and socio-economic information, national planning and policies, and integration into investment frameworks

a. Caribbean

24. A draft SRAP has been prepared and adopted by all country Parties and the Caribbean Community (CARICOM). The Partnership Initiative on Sustainable Land Management (PISLM) Task Force is working with country Parties to align the SRAP to The Strategy, and the process should be completed by the first quarter of 2013.

25. The formulation of an aligned SRAP has been supported by the secretariat and the Global Mechanism (technical support). The major difficulties experienced in the process of revising the SRAP are:

- (a) Poor availability of biophysical and socio-economic baseline information at subregional level;
- (b) Streamlining the SRAP into existing plans and policies being too time-consuming.

b. West Asia

26. The SRAP was adopted in 2000 but is not yet aligned, mainly because of:

- (a) Capacity constraints at subregional level;
- (b) Lack of financial resources at subregional, bilateral and multilateral levels.

27. However, the subregion reports that a new SRAP is in preparation and is expected to be completed in the period 2014–2015. The new SRAP is receiving technical and financial support from external multilateral sources.

28. The main difficulties in SRAP alignment are:

- (a) Poor availability of biophysical and socio-economic baseline information at subregional level;

- (b) Existing investment frameworks not being fully compatible with the SRAP;
- (c) Streamlining the SRAP into existing plans and policies being too time-consuming.

c. *Central Asia*

29. The SRAP was adopted in 2003 but is not yet aligned, mainly because of:

- (a) Capacity constraints at subregional level (countries and institutions);
- (b) Lack of coordination with relevant subregional organizations and existing subregional programmes;
- (c) Lack of institutional clarity on how the alignment process at subregional level should be undertaken;
- (d) Lack of financial resources at subregional, bilateral and multilateral levels.

30. The process of alignment has not yet started but it is expected that it will be completed in the period 2014–2015.

2. Performance indicator CONS-O-7 for outcome 2.5

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

a. *Caribbean*

31. No joint planning/programming initiatives for the three Rio Conventions were implemented in the reporting period. No operational mechanisms for joint implementation or mutual reinforcement existed in the subregion during the reporting period.

32. No support has been provided by the institutions of the Rio Conventions for the establishment of synergistic processes in the subregion.

33. The major difficulties experienced in establishing synergistic planning/programming or mechanisms for joint implementation in the subregion were:

- (a) Capacity constraints at subregional level (countries and institutions);
- (b) Lack of coordination with relevant subregional organizations and existing subregional programmes.

b. *West Asia*

34. No joint planning/programming initiatives for the three Rio Conventions were implemented in the reporting period. As an operational mechanism, the regular meetings between relevant stakeholders were mentioned only in the context of the SRAP.

35. No support has been provided by the institutions of the Rio Conventions.

36. Among the major difficulties experienced in establishing synergetic planning were:

- (a) Capacity constraints at subregional level (countries);
- (b) Lack of financial resources at subregional, bilateral and multilateral levels;
- (c) Lack of accountability in the institutional framework and lack of support, participation and coordination by the affected country Parties of the subregion.

c. *Central Asia*

37. The identification of subregional sectors and policies that could benefit from synergy and cooperation has been reported as a joint planning initiative for the three Rio Conventions, implemented in the reporting period. In the JAP context, the enhancement of the institutional and scientific capacities and awareness of relevant stakeholders was reported as a joint planning initiative between the UNCCD and the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD).

38. No support has been provided by the institutions of the Rio Conventions.

39. The main difficulties in establishing synergetic planning were:

- (a) Capacity constraints at subregional level (institutions);
- (b) Lack of financial resources at subregional, bilateral and multilateral levels;
- (c) Lack of institutional clarity on how the alignment process at subregional level should be undertaken.

C. Operational objective 3

1. Performance indicator CONS-O-8 for outcomes 3.1 and 3.2

Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities to have established and supported a national/subregional/regional monitoring system for DLDD

a. *Caribbean*

40. No subregional monitoring system specifically dedicated to DLDD has been established during the reporting period. The financial constraints at subregional, bilateral and multilateral levels have been identified as a major difficulty in establishing a monitoring system in the subregion.

41. One of the organizations in the subregion has plans to provide support to seven affected country Parties in 2014–2015 for monitoring systems relating to DLDD.

b. *West Asia*

42. The subregional programme “Monitoring Desertification in the Arab Countries”, specifically dedicated to DLDD, has been established, and is functional and regularly updated. The main partners of the subregional monitoring system are the Arab Center for the Studies of Arid Zones and Dry Lands (ACSAD) and the National Centre for Remote Sensing (Lebanon). The subregional reporting entity has access to information on this monitoring system. The established monitoring system has been used in the framework of the JAP only.

43. There is a plan to support 13 affected country Parties to develop a monitoring system relating to DLDD issues in the period 2014–2015.

44. The subregion identified the following important difficulties in establishing the DLDD related monitoring system:

- (a) Financial constraints at subregional, bilateral and multilateral levels;
- (b) Capacity constraints at subregional level (countries).

45. The existing monitoring system in the subregion is maintained primarily by external resources.

c. *Central Asia*

46. No dedicated DLDD monitoring systems in SRAP or JAP frameworks were established or functioning during the reporting period. There are, however, plans to support five countries of the subregion to develop such a monitoring system in the period 2014–2015.

47. Among the most important difficulties in establishing DLDD dedicated monitoring system were:

(a) Lack of coordination among relevant affected country Parties of the subregion and unclear attribution of responsibilities;

(b) Lack of coordination among donor-led programme/project interventions at subregional level;

(c) Existing initiatives being too fragmented and unable to be realistically coordinated under one umbrella at subregional level.

2. Performance indicator CONS-O-10 for outcomes 3.3 and 3.4

Number of revised NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs reflecting knowledge of DLDD drivers and their interactions, and of the interaction of DLDD with climate change and biodiversity

a. *Caribbean*

48. There are plans to analyse the DLDD drivers, their interactions, and the interaction of DLDD with climate change and biodiversity on the basis of relevant scientific, expert and/or traditional knowledge in the period 2012–2013.

49. The most common reasons for scientific/traditional knowledge not being taken into account in developing the SRAP were:

(a) Lack of financial resources to mobilize the necessary knowledge at subregional, bilateral and multilateral levels;

(b) Poor coordination among the affected country Parties of the subregion, which prevented a subregional pooling of knowledge/expertise.

b. *West Asia*

50. The identification of biophysical and socio-economic drivers, and of their interaction in the subregion, will be based on the scientific literature, expert knowledge, and traditional knowledge. Analysis of the interaction between DLDD and climate change or biodiversity is mainly based on scientific literature and expert knowledge. The SRAP will reflect drought policy and drought preparedness, including mitigation. There are plans to analyse the DLDD drivers, their interactions, and the interaction of DLDD with climate change and biodiversity in the period 2014–2015.

51. Poor coordination among the affected country Parties of the subregion, which prevented a subregional pooling of scientific and traditional knowledge/expertise, was identified as the most important difficulty in developing the SRAP.

c. *Central Asia*

52. There are plans to analyse the DLDD drivers, their interactions, and the interaction of DLDD with climate change and biodiversity, in the period 2014–2015.

53. Scientific and/or traditional knowledge has not been taken into account in developing the SRAP because of:

(a) Lack of financial resources to mobilize the necessary knowledge at subregional, bilateral and multilateral levels;

(b) Poor coordination among the affected country Parties of the subregion, which prevented a subregional pooling of knowledge/expertise.

3. Performance indicator CONS-O-11 for outcome 3.5

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

54. The Caribbean subregion did not report on the knowledge-sharing system for the period 2010–2011.

55. In West Asia, CODAnet (the Combating Desertification in the Arab Region) was reported as the knowledge-sharing system, with 150 users per year. The knowledge-sharing system is used in the framework of the JAP.

56. In Central Asia, two knowledge-sharing systems (DryNet with 300 users per year and Youth Environmental Network of Central Asian with 500 users per year) were reported in 2010–2011. Both systems are used in the framework of the SRAP.

D. Operational objective 4

Performance indicator CONS-O-13 for outcomes 4.1 and 4.2

Number of countries, subregional and regional reporting entities engaged in building capacity to combat DLDD on the basis of national capacity self-assessment or other methodologies and instruments

a. Caribbean

57. During the period 2010–2011 no DLDD-related capacity-building initiative has been carried out. DLDD-related capacity-building needs in the subregion are still being assessed.

58. The subregional organizations plan to implement DLDD-specific capacity-building plans, programmes or projects in the context of the SRAP in 2014–2015.

59. At the time of reporting, the subregion had received technical support from the secretariat to build capacities to combat DLDD.

b. West Asia

60. Five capacity-building initiatives were reported in both 2010 and 2011. The capacity-building needs of the subregion had not been assessed. The subregion plans to have a subregional capacity-building plan in the framework of SRAP in the period 2012–2013.

61. Technical and financial support has been received through bilateral institutions in the framework of the JAP.

c. Central Asia

62. Two capacity-building initiatives were mentioned in 2010: the Central Asian Countries Initiative on Land Management (CACILM) Multi-Country Capacity-Building project (SRAP), and DryNet (JAP). The capacity-building needs have been assessed within the framework of the SRAP.

63. Technical and financial support has been received from the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

E. Operational objective 5

1. Performance indicator CONS-O-14 for outcome 5.1

Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities whose investment frameworks, established within the integrated financing strategy (IFS) devised by the Global Mechanism (GM) or within other integrated financing strategies, reflect leveraging national, bilateral and multilateral resources for combating desertification and land degradation

a. Caribbean

64. The integrated investment framework (IIF) was not developed in the Caribbean subregion during the reporting period.

65. Financial constraints at national, subregional, bilateral and multilateral levels were reported as a major difficulty in the elaboration of the IIF in the Caribbean subregion.

b. West Asia

66. The IIF has not yet been developed, the major difficulties in its elaboration being:

(a) Lack of coordination among relevant affected country Parties of the subregion and unclear attribution of responsibilities;

(b) National, subregional, bilateral and multilateral resources being too diverse and unable to be realistically coordinated under one umbrella.

c. Central Asia

67. The IIF has been developed for five countries of the subregion with the assistance of the GM, the GEF and multilateral organizations in the form of technical and financial support and capacity-building. The subregion received assistance from the GM to explore non-traditional and innovative channels of financial resources.

68. The lack of coordination among relevant affected country Parties of the subregion, and unclear attribution of responsibilities, were identified as major difficulties in the elaboration of the IIF.

2. Performance indicator CONS-O-16 for outcome 5.2

Degree of adequacy, timeliness and predictability of financial resources made available by developed country Parties to combat DLDD

a. Caribbean

69. The bilateral assistance received by the Caribbean subregion for the implementation of The Strategy and of the Convention was not adequate, not timely and not predictable.

70. Funding received from the GM was used to host two meetings, to produce two reports on innovative financing and to provide some support for a website. More support in the subregion will be necessary to roll out the SRAP.

71. Capacity-building remains a key issue in this process and must be taken into consideration in all aspects of the process.

b. *West Asia*

72. The bilateral assistance received by the West Asia subregion was assessed as fairly adequate, fairly timely and fairly predictable.

73. The GIZ–ACSAD (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit–Arab Center for the Studies of Arid Zones and Dry Lands) JAP project in West Asia benefits from bilateral funding from the German Government to provide support to the subregion (Jordan, Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic).

74. Many countries of West Asia are not eligible for GEF support because of high levels of income.

c. *Central Asia*

75. The bilateral assistance received by Central Asia was assessed as fairly adequate, fairly timely and fairly predictable.

76. The major support to raise external resources was received from the GM, the GEF and bilateral agencies.

3. Performance indicator CONS-O-17 for outcome 5.3

Number of DLDD-related project proposals successfully submitted for financing to international financial institutions, facilities and funds, including the GEF

a. *Caribbean*

77. Two DLDD projects proposals were submitted in the framework of the SRAP during the reporting period, and raised USD 60,000. This amount is not regarded as sufficient, and there are plans to increase efforts aimed at resource mobilization. The resources used for DLDD activities came from national (20 per cent) and international (80 per cent) sources.

b. *West Asia*

78. One DLDD-related project proposal was submitted in the context of the JAP during the reporting period, and raised USD 500,000. This amount is not regarded as sufficient, and there are plans to increase efforts aimed at resource mobilization. The resources used for DLDD activities came from national (10 per cent) and international (90 per cent) sources.

c. *Central Asia*

79. One DLDD project proposal was submitted in the context of SRAP and four projects are ongoing (three in the SRAP context and one in the JAP context). The total amount raised is USD 880,000. This amount is not regarded as sufficient, and there are plans to increase efforts aimed at resource mobilization. The resources used for DLDD activities came from national (20 per cent) and international (80 per cent) sources.

4. Performance indicator CONS-O-18 for outcome 5.5

Amount of financial resources and type of incentives which have enabled access to technology by affected country Parties (see table 3)

a. *Caribbean*

80. No funds were allocated to facilitate access to material and to knowledge aid.

81. No subregional incentives intended to facilitate access to technology were established in the subregion.

b. West Asia

82. In the context of the JAP, USD 10,000 were allocated each year within the reporting period.

83. No subregional incentives intended to facilitate access to technology were established in the subregion.

84. The specific aspects and the nature of technology transfer included conservation agriculture, water harvesting and micro-dams.

c. Central Asia

85. Funds allocated to facilitate access to material and to knowledge aid were USD 134,000 in 2010 and USD 49,000 in 2011. No subregional incentives intended to facilitate access to technology were established in the subregion.

Table 3
Allocation of resources to facilitate access to technology

<i>Subregion</i>	<i>Funds allocated (USD)</i>	
	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>
Caribbean	-	-
West Asia	10 000	10 000
Central Asia	134 000	49 000

IV. Financial flows

A. Standard financial annex

86. Table 4 below shows the total financial commitments for activities relating to the implementation of the Convention in the reported subregions.

Table 4
Financial analysis by subregion

	<i>Donors</i>	<i>Amount of funding</i>	<i>Type of funding</i>	<i>Recipient countries</i>
Caribbean	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
West Asia	GIZ	Euro 1000	Grant	Lebanon, Jordan, Syrian Arab Republic
Central Asia	Global Environment Facility Global Mechanism GIZ	USD 880 000	Grant Technical assistance	Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan

GIZ = The German Society for International Cooperation

B. Programme and projects sheets

1. Sectoral distribution of investments

87. The projects implemented in West Asia focused mainly on agriculture, education and water supply and sanitation.

88. The projects and programme implemented in Central Asia focused mainly on agriculture and forestry. Considerable investment was allocated for multisectoral activities.

2. Distribution of investments by UNCCD objective

89. The projects implemented in West Asia addressed strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 and operational objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4 of The Strategy.

90. The projects and programme implemented in Central Asia addressed strategic objectives 1, 2 and 4 and operational objectives 2, 4 and 5 of The Strategy.

3. Targeted areas

91. The two projects in West Asia covered areas of 1,500 and 5,800 ha.

92. The projects and programme in Central Asia covered areas ranging from 40,000 to 400,000 ha.

4. Beneficiaries

93. The two projects in West Asia benefited 1,500 and 20,000 people.

94. The projects and programme in Central Asia benefited up to 100,000 people each.

V. Additional information

A. Availability of financial resources for UNCCD reporting

95. The Caribbean and Central Asia subregions reported the availability of both internal and external financial resources to meet UNCCD reporting obligations. In West Asia only external resources were available.

B. Amount of financial resources invested in meeting UNCCD reporting obligations

96. The amount invested in the UNCCD reporting process in the Caribbean was USD 15,000. West Asia and Central Asia invested USD 7,500 each in the reporting process.

C. Human resources invested in meeting UNCCD reporting obligations

97. In each subregion, the same number of people, that is either 1, 2 or 3, were involved in the UNCCD reporting process, dedicating from 25 to 30 days to the process.

D. Availability of technical/scientific knowledge for UNCCD reporting

98. Only the Caribbean subregion reported that available technical and scientific knowledge was not sufficient to meet UNCCD reporting obligations.

E. Level of coordination for UNCCD reporting

99. Only the Caribbean subregion reported that coordination between the relevant affected country Parties, and between the institutional focal points of the SRAP and/or JAP, at the subregional level was not satisfactory enough to permit comprehensive and coherent reporting.

100. All subregions reported satisfactory coordination with the UNCCD regional coordination unit of their region during the reporting process.

F. Level of participation and consultation for UNCCD reporting

101. The SRAP reports have been validated by the relevant affected country Parties of each subregion.

G. Identification of major difficulties in using the performance review and assessment of implementation system and their relevance

102. The Caribbean and West Asia subregions reported that the major difficulty with using the performance review and assessment of implementation system (PRAIS) portal was that the authority issued by the secretariat to access the portal was difficult to use. Central Asia experienced no difficulties with accessing and using the PRAIS portal.

VI. Conclusions

103. Two factors hinder an objective analysis of progress made in achieving the strategic and operational objectives of The Strategy – the limited time available for the reporting, which could affect the quality of the reports, and, related to this, the limited number of reports that were submitted in time (only three) and could therefore be used for this analysis.

104. This is the first time that subregions and regions have been requested to provide reports on progress made in implementing The Strategy. Hence, the subregional and regional reports due for 2010–2011 should have set up the baseline

for further monitoring. But because only a few reports were received, baselines have been set for only 20 per cent of the subregions. And for the same reason it has been difficult or impossible to identify trends and to make any comparative analysis.

105. The analysis based on indicators SO-4-3, SO-4-6 and SO-4-7 shows positive trends in the provision of public finance for DLDD-related investments and other Convention-related activities to the affected developing country Parties in the context of the SRAP in the Caribbean and Central Asia subregions, and in the context of the SRAP and JAPs in West Asia. The subregions mentioned cooperation frameworks as a common mechanism to facilitate the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Convention. The effectiveness of the institutional arrangements for resource mobilization for the implementation of the Convention in the context of the SRAPs and/or JAPs was ranked differently, from poor in West Asia to very good in the Caribbean subregion.

106. The three subregions are undertaking Convention-related activities in the context of SRAPs and JAPs. In West Asia and Central Asia sufficient proportions of the population have been reached through information events/media and UNDDD initiatives, whereas no such activity was reported for the Caribbean subregion. A subregional communication strategy has been developed in Central Asia. CSOs were actively involved in the Convention processes during the reporting period whereas the participation of STIs was considerably less.

107. West Asia and Central Asia adopted their SRAPs prior to the adoption of The Strategy to which they plan to align their SRAPs in the period 2014–2015. The Caribbean subregion is making its first attempt to develop and align a SRAP.

108. Among the major difficulties experienced by the subregions in the process of revising the SRAPs were”:

- (a) Poor availability of biophysical and socio-economic baseline information at subregional level;
- (b) Streamlining the SRAP into existing plans and policies being too time-consuming.

109. The main reasons reported for not initiating SRAP alignment were:

- (a) Capacity constraints at subregional level (countries and institutions);
- (b) Lack of financial resources at subregional, bilateral and multilateral levels.

110. Limited progress has been achieved so far in establishing synergy among the Rio Conventions at the subregional level. No support was provided by the institutions of the Rio Convention institutions. Among the major difficulties experienced in establishing synergistic planning/programming were:

- (a) Capacity constraints at subregional level (countries and institutions);
- (b) Lack of financial resources at subregional, bilateral and multilateral levels.

111. Although only West Asia has reported the establishment of a functioning monitoring system relating to DLDD issues, all three subregions have plans either to continue their support for monitoring systems, or to establish them. Important difficulties in establishing the DLDD related monitoring system were:

- (a) Financial constraints at subregional, bilateral and multilateral levels;
- (b) Capacity constraints at subregional level (countries).

112. The subregions reported the following as common reasons for scientific/traditional knowledge not being taken into account in developing the SRAP:

(a) Lack of financial resources to mobilize the necessary knowledge at subregional, bilateral and multilateral levels;

(b) Poor coordination among the affected country Parties of the subregion, which prevented a subregional pooling of knowledge/expertise.

113. Nevertheless, the subregions plan to analyse the DLDD drivers, their interactions, and the interaction of DLDD with climate change and biodiversity in the period 2014–2015. The subregions reported substantial numbers of users of the knowledge-sharing systems.

114. Capacity-building initiatives have been implemented at subregional level, although the extent of such initiatives varies across the subregions. Assessment of the capacity-building needs is at various stages in different subregions. All subregions reported on the support received from various agencies to build capacities to combat DLDD.

115. Only Central Asia reported on development of an IIF. Major difficulties that hindered elaboration of an IIF in the Caribbean subregion and West Asia included:

(a) Financial constraints at national, subregional, bilateral and multilateral levels;

(b) Lack of coordination among relevant affected country Parties of the subregion and unclear attribution of responsibilities.

116. The bilateral assistance received by the subregions for the implementation of The Strategy and of the Convention has been assessed, in general, as fairly adequate, fairly timely and fairly predictable. In order to mobilize resources, at least one DLDD project proposal was submitted by each subregion during the reporting period. National contributions to the projects varied from 10 to 20 per cent. Two subregions have allocated funds to facilitate access to material and to knowledge aid. No subregional incentives intended to facilitate access to technology were established in the subregions.

117. Despite the difficulties mentioned above, it appears that at least a baseline for the assessment of activities implemented under the Convention at subregional level, has been established.

VII. Recommendations

118. The following are preliminary recommendations that may be considered by Parties at the eleventh session of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention (CRIC 11), taking into consideration the analysis provided in this document, with a view to initiating early consultations on draft decisions to be forwarded for consideration by the COP at its eleventh session:

(a) Those subregions that already plan to align their SRAPs should be urged to undertake the steps required to revise them in accordance with the requirements of the guideline on NAP alignment and The Strategy; and those subregions which still have no such plans should take steps to prepare them;

(b) The Convention's institutions should be invited to step up their efforts to ensure collaboration with other Rio Conventions at subregional level;

(c) Development partners and financial institutions, particularly the GEF, should be invited to provide further assistance to the subregional and regional entities for the establishment and alignment of SRAPs and RAPs, as well as for the preparation of reports according to the provisions of the Convention;

(d) As the lack of coordination among donor-led programme/project interventions at subregional level has been mentioned as one of the major difficulties in the establishment of monitoring system, the secretariat and the GM should be requested to step up their efforts to improve communication with the donor agencies in order to support the subregions;

(e) The Committee on Science and Technology should be requested to provide advice on how to increase subregional incentives intended to facilitate access to technology established in the subregions;

(f) Although most subregions have made efforts to increase the number of information events in order to improve awareness on DLDD, they should be invited to increase such efforts;

(g) Regional Implementation Annexes should be urged to make efforts to identify subregional and regional entities where required, and to increase the number of reports and amount of information provided for further review of the implementation of the Convention.
