

23 July 2015

Original: English/French/Russian/Spanish

# United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification

## Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention

### Fourteenth session

Ankara, Turkey, 13–22 October 2015

## Compilation of comments provided by Parties on Non-paper 2: “Additional procedures or institutional mechanisms to assist the Conference of the Parties in regularly reviewing the implementation of the Convention”\*

### Regional Implementation Annex I – Africa

This document reviews processes that are in place for the COP to follow when reviewing the implementation of the Convention. It also goes further and recommends some changes in the current procedures. Our focus, views and comments are only on the proposed changes or recommendations which will change the current way of implementing the Convention. The Region's observations are as follows:

**Para 21 (a) Recommendation:** Reporting against performance indicators will be discontinued, as many targets on operational objectives have already been achieved or will be achieved by the end of 2015.

**Our view:** The recommendation to discontinue reporting on performance indicators cannot be considered at this moment as such a decision should be long term and be informed by the reporting needs of future guiding frameworks e.g. relevant Sustainable Development Goals and the follow on UNCCD Strategy after the current one expires.

**Para 21. (b) Recommendation:** Data from accredited global sources would be compiled by the secretariat for a core set of progress indicators to be further validated and complemented by affected country Parties.

**Our view:** There must be clear negotiated guidelines on the sources, type and use of data from accredited sources.

**Para 21. (c) Recommendation:** Affected country Parties would be requested to report on the implementation of national action programmes and the achievement of voluntary targets of land degradation neutrality, or any other global target relevant to the Convention that the General Assembly adopts within the Sustainable Development Goals.

---

\* Please note that the contributions contained in this document are published as received without formatting or formal editing and that an informal translation of the contributions received in languages other than English is provided herein, as requested by the Bureau of the CRIC.

ICCD/CRIC(14)/MISC.1

GE.15-12426(E)



Please recycle



**Our View:** There is need to ensure reporting reflects global partnerships requiring all parties to report on results of their actions either to implement, build capacity transfer technology or provide financial support to the implementation of NAPS and LDN. Consider the outcomes of the Sustainable Development Goals to guide reporting.

**Para 21. (d) Recommendation:** Data reported by developed country Parties in other relevant reporting commitments, particularly within the Creditor Reporting System of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Assistance Committee, would be used for the assessment and review of financial flows for the implementation of the Convention.

**Our View:** This removes direct reporting responsibilities from developed country parties to provide a direct response to their commitments in the convention. It also raises the question of who will undertake the task of isolating and compiling information relevant to the UNCCD from such Creditor Reporting System and whether the concerned parties then endorse the information before it is submitted. This has financial implications as well.

**Para 22. (a) Recommendation:** In accordance with paragraph 21 above, affected country Parties, and other reporting entities as relevant, would be requested to report every four years; the CRIC would review this information with the same frequency, convening its intersessional sessions every four years.

**Our view:** This recommendation is equally premature as the decision on the timing of reporting should be long term and take into consideration the reporting needs of future guiding frameworks e.g. relevant Sustainable Development Goals and the follow on UNCCD Strategy after the current one expires.

**Para 23 (b): Recommendation:** The CRIC would convene its inter-sessional sessions jointly with, or subsequent to, sessions of the CST, which in turn would advise the CRIC on how best to review progress towards achieving strategic objectives and/or targets and ensure that the CRIC relies on solid, scientifically sound data;

**Our view:** Similar with the comment made on Par. 21 (a). In addition it is noted that this recommendation provides opportunity for increased synergy between the two subsidiary bodies, however the challenge is that usually none of the two bodies has been provided adequate time to accomplish its responsibilities. This approach can be useful if the time given to the joint sessions is adequate to allow interaction between the two bodies and allows time for each body to carry out its full responsibilities also ensuring that participation is effective and benefits of joint organisation of the sessions are realised.

**Para 24. (a) Recommendation:** Meetings of the Regional Implementation Annexes would be organized as stand-alone meetings, to be convened in the regions with the logistical and financial support of a host country from the region, including for the cost of participation of entitled countries.

**Our view:** Financial support by host country parties especially in Africa to meet the requirements of this recommendation may not be realised. The circumstances in the regions have not changed much since the convention came into force. As such it is unlikely for the regions to hold regional meetings under the proposed arrangements with a few exceptions. This is further constrained by the inability to operationalise the RCM and RCU in the region which removes internal capacity of the region to mobilise regional resources and partners that could support this approach (in the context of the UNCCD). This however could have worked if in addition to the will by country parties in the region to host and organise the logistics there is partnerships by developed country parties in accordance with the relevant articles to support financially the proposed regional meetings.

In addition, it must be understood that the review of the Convention is wider than just focusing on reports submitted by Parties and thus CRIC sessions are not to be directly linked with reporting by Parties. The relegation of some of the responsibilities of the CRIC to Regional meetings needs further review and exchange of ideas. In the event that a decision is taken in favour of the regional meetings, these should be made as part of the Convention activities and must be convened and financed (in its core budget) by the Secretariat.

## **GENERAL COMMENT ON NON-PAPER 2.**

**The legal basis for Non Paper 2 is not clear. We have not found the COP decision or any other empowering instrument that requested the Secretariat to provide additional procedures or mechanism to assist the COP in reviewing implementation of the convention.**

## Regional Implementation Annex IV – Northern Mediterranean

Non-paper 2 proposes a significant change on the way Parties report on implementation of the Convention and its strategic plan and on how CRIC works. The proposals are substantial and significant. The whole document is based on the assumption that COP 12 will take decisions on this regard but Non-paper 2 does not provide the necessary details of the general proposals contained therein. As such, Annex IV Parties identified some issues which would benefit from some clarifications and further reasoning by the Secretariat before further considerations on these proposals can be made by our Regional Annex.

Regarding the **discontinuation of reporting against performance indicators and starting a new period reporting according to a new set of progress indicators** (as proposed in § 21 b and c):

- Annex IV Parties agree that national reporting should focus on information that leads to a better understanding of land degradation and drought and should demonstrate the importance of land management, in particular for climate change mitigation and adaptation. We consider of great relevance the ongoing work to develop common indicators with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (UNCBD).
- We note that the number and quality of reports submitted significantly depends on the financial support provided by GEF which is following the four years frequency of the replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund. With regard to the 2016 reporting, it seems that we will be faced with the same problem as in previous years - new templates will be given and Parties won't have the necessary time to collect data and compile their report. As stated in §13 the periodic adjustment of the reporting obligation still remains a limiting factor.
- We cannot take the achievement of goals for granted. Non-paper 2 argues that many targets on operational objectives have already been or will be achieved by the end of 2015. This rationale is used to propose the discontinuation of reporting against operational objectives (in §21.a). It is our understanding that, in themselves, many of the operational objectives can be achieved in a given year but not in following years. Continuous reporting is therefore essential to assess if Parties are on track with implementation but also to identify patterns and trends which help us either to follow best practices or to understand where we must increase our implementation efforts.
- We believe it is worth analyzing which performance indicators are still useful to evaluate the implementation of the Convention and consider continuing to utilize them, possibly every four years (we consider that reporting every four years will improve the cost-benefit of the reporting process). It would be a way to harness the efforts made until now to gather the information and, obviously, the data series available would take advantage (if they are really valid) to better assess the trends and not start from scratch.

**Post-2015 sustainable development framework** (§19.b) – CRIC and reporting by Parties are about the implementation of the Convention. We agree that the UNCCD should be ready to adapt to whichever outcomes the post-2015 process delivers with regard to DLDD. It is also our understanding that this adjustment could mean changing the CRIC with possible consequences in the way Parties report to the UNCCD, namely on goals and targets agreed elsewhere but relevant to the implementation of the Convention.

**Enhancing the relevance of the review process, restoring the original mandate of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention and facilitating the integration of scientific advice into policy deliberations.**: The suggestion of one week for intersessional meetings of the CRIC focused only on the review of the implementation of the Convention, held in conjunction with the sessions of the CST seems reasonable. Annex IV is supportive of all efforts to improve the interaction between the two subsidiary bodies, as we consider it very necessary. Beyond reducing the impact of participation costs, we believe it constitutes an opportunity to take advantage of possible interactions between the two subsidiary bodies.

Regarding the proposal to convene the intersessional sessions of the CRIC back-to-back with other relevant meetings (other than CRIC), we think it would not be appropriate, among other reasons because it would undermine the relevance of the Convention.

**Ensuring regional governance and continuity of the review process in the period when the CRIC and the CST would not meet intersessionally, including by organizing stand-alone regional meetings and convening joint**

**meetings of the Bureaux of the CRIC and the CST every six months, supported by an additional officer from each regional and interest group** – Although we see the merits of having Regional Annexes Meetings as proposed in §24.a some questions must be raised. CRIC is composed of all Parties to the Convention. Regional Annexes are composed by affected Parties to the Convention, but do not comprehend all of them. Some Parties are not part of any Annex. However, all Parties to the Convention should be held accountable for its implementation, including non affected and donors and other reporting entities. So the question arises - what will be the setting for non-annex Parties to meet when CRIC/CST do not meet between sessions of the COP? Stand-alone regional meetings with the logistical and financial support of a host country could be viable namely as an alternative to overcome financial difficulties. Ideally it should encourage greater involvement by Parties according to their needs and political priorities. However, how can we ensure that these meetings actually take place when they rely on logistical and financial support of a host country which might never come forward. In this scheme, and bearing in mind the obvious risk that proper support is not ensured, Annex IV Parties believe the work of Regional Coordination Offices is essential as they should play a key role in obtaining these supports.

We believe that, in principle, the idea of strengthening the work between sessions with an increased activity of the *Bureaux* of CRIC and CST (conveniently reinforced), could be highly beneficial, provided that an appropriate, and well organized in time, exchange of information with regional and interest groups is ensured.

To conclude, let us express that as a matter of principle, Annex IV Parties support changes to adapt the current CRIC format taking into account the need to improve efficacy as well as to overcome current financial constraints. We agree that there is always room for improvements, and it is our firm belief that any structural changes to the way Parties report on implementation must be discussed along with the possible revision/extension of the Strategy which is why we think that, at COP 12 in Ankara, Parties should focus on discussing and agreeing on a process to properly consider all options. In our view this proposal would allow COP 13 to take an informed decision on all necessary changes to procedures and institutional mechanisms to regularly review the implementation of the convention.

## Argentina

[Original: Spanish]

"Procedimientos adicionales mecanismos institucionales para asistir a la Conferencia de las Partes en la revisión regular de la aplicación de la Convención"

Dentro del contexto del punto I y II (pf 3 y 8) se resalta la importancia que tuvo la inclusión de la Estrategia Decenal en la implementación de la Convención. Así también el rol que tuvo el CRIC / PRAIS en la medición y seguimiento de los objetivos operacionales a través de los indicadores de seguimiento (Cuestiones institucionales) que a través de este mismo documento se pretende modificar a causa de los limitados resultados alcanzados con la información obtenida sobre los indicadores de impacto o progreso, luego de la COP11 (pf. 9/11).

Ante esto, no podemos dejar de observar que los Países afectados han tenido singulares limitaciones para poner en acción estas nuevas herramientas y que con el esfuerzo y tiempo han ido logrando resultados tales como los alcanzados en el primer y único reporte de indicadores de progreso de 2012. Por lo tanto, consideramos que no se puede descartar lo alcanzado hasta ahora. Se deberán redoblar los esfuerzos en la dirección adoptada por las Partes hasta completar el ciclo originalmente acordado.

Dentro del ítem III "Justificación y opciones para el cambio" Punto III (pf. 19 b): En cuanto al rol de la Asamblea General no es posible que la vinculación entre desertificación y degradación del suelo a escala global incida en los mandatos propios de esta Convención. Por lo tanto las Tierras Secas deben seguir siendo el foco de atención y principal objetivo en la lucha contra la desertificación y la sequía.

En el párrafo 20.a se hace referencia a una revisión en lo sustancial más que en procesos institucionales y no se explicita a qué se haría referencia con ello, pudiendo generar diversas interpretaciones, por otro lado, en el punto b. se menciona el restablecimiento del mandato original del CRIC, el cual no se ha tratado en el marco de la COP como corresponde.

Es importante continuar con los indicadores de desempeño midiendo los objetivos operacionales que hacen a la ejecución de los programas nacionales de LCD y que cada Parte está obligada a informar como resultado de su compromiso hacia la Convención.

Punto III A (pf. 21 b): Observamos que no se puede permitir que los indicadores de progreso, sean medidos y analizados en forma centralizada por la Secretaría, basados en información NO proveniente de las Partes, Sino de informantes globales.

Asimismo, en el párrafo 21.c: se hace referencia a la solicitud que se realizara a los países Parte afectados sobre la necesidad de informar "metas voluntarias de neutralidad en la degradación de tierras ... " sin establecer los mecanismos ni las metas esperadas y sin tener en cuenta que aún no se ha adoptado dicho término en el marco de la UNCCD ni los ODS

Dentro del apartado B, en el párrafo 24.a y b: hace referencia a las reuniones sobre los Anexos de Aplicación regional, estableciendo que serán los países quienes tendrán que organizar dichas reuniones, como así también incluir los costos de participación de los países elegibles, sin mencionar el rol de las UCR ni el mandato específico de la Secretaría en la organización de estas reuniones. Por último, en el punto D, párrafo 25 hace mención a las " ... medidas que busquen incrementar la eficiencia del proceso de revisión... " en donde no se explicita a que se hace referencia con la disminución de las formalidades de las sesiones del CRIC, e cual, nuevamente es un tema a tratar en el marco de la COP y no a través de un nuevo formato de documento en donde se tocan temas sensibles sin la debida presentación a los países Parte. Consideramos asimismo que no se puede permitir que organismos externos a la Convención sin injerencia directa de las Partes, sean los encargados de monitorear las obligaciones procedentes de los países desarrollados.

Estamos de acuerdo que hay que mejorar la implementación regional, pero con recursos que se encuentren dentro de los compromisos asumidos por las Partes en esta Convención, tanto de los aportes voluntarios (Partes afectada y Desarrollados), como de los provenientes del presupuesto general de la Secretaría que son los movilizados y facilitadores de los procesos complejos y multilaterales, al igual que existe una facilitación regional a través de un Mecanismo de Coordinación aprobado por las Partes. El presupuesto para las reuniones regionales debe respetarse e incluirse dentro de los necesarios para llevar a cabo el desempeño de los Mecanismos Regionales de Coordinación contemplados en la Estrategia Decenal (COP 8).

[English]

*"Additional procedures [and/or] institutional mechanisms to assist in the Conference of the Parties for their regular review of the Implementation of the Convention."*

*Within the context of points I and II (para. 3 and 8), the importance of including the 10 Year Strategy in the implementation of the Convention is highlighted. As well as the role that CRIC/PRAIS had in measuring and monitoring the operational objectives by means of the follow-up indicators (Institutional issues) that this very document attempts to modify due to the limited results achieved with the information obtained on the impact or progress indicators, after the COP11 (para. 9/11).*

*Faced with this, we cannot ignore that the affected Countries have specific problems in implementing these new tools and that with time and effort they have achieved such results as those reported in the first and only progress indicator report of 2012. Therefore, we feel that we cannot dismiss what has been achieved so far. We should double our efforts in the course agreed to by the Parties until we have completed the originally agreed cycle.*

*Within item III "Reasons and Options for the Change" Point III (para. 19 b): Regarding the role of the General Assembly, it is not possible for the link between desertification and soil degradation on a global scale to have an impact on the very mandates of this Convention. Therefore, the Dry Lands must continue to be the focus of attention and main objective of the fight against desertification and drought.*

*Paragraph 20.a makes reference to a review more of the substance than of institutional processes and offers no explanation of what it would refer to, which may be given to different interpretations, on the other hand, point b. mentions the reestablishment of the original CRIC mandate, which has not been accordingly addressed within the COP framework.*

*It is important for the performance indicators to continue measuring the operational objectives for the execution of the national LCD programs and which each Party is required to report as part of their commitment to the Convention.*

*Point III A (para. 21 b): We point out that the progress indicators cannot be allowed to be measured and analyzed in a centralized way by the Secretariat, based on information that is NOT provided by the Parties, but rather by global informants.*

*Likewise, paragraph 21.c: where reference is made to a request that is made to the affected Member Countries regarding the need to report "voluntary targets for land degradation neutrality ... " without establishing the mechanisms or the expected targets, and without taking into account that said term has yet to be adopted within the framework of the UNCCD or in the SDGs.*

*Within section B, in paragraph 24.a and b: reference is made to the meetings regarding the Annexes on Regional Implementation, establishing that the countries themselves shall have to organize said meetings, as well as to also include the cost of attendance for eligible countries, not to mention the role of the RCU or the specific mandate issued by the Secretariat regarding the organization of these meetings. Lastly, in point D, paragraph 25, mention is made of the " ... measures aimed at increasing the efficiency of the review process... " which is not explicit as to what the reduction in formalities for CRIC sessions is in reference to, which, once again, is a topic to be addressed within the COP framework and not through a new document format that touches upon sensitive subjects without properly submitting them to the Member Countries. We likewise feel that organizations outside the Convention and not directly involved with the Parties cannot be permitted to be the ones in charge of monitoring the compliance of the developed countries.*

*We agree that regional implementation must be improved, as long as it is done with the resources found within the commitments assumed by the Parties in this Convention; as much by voluntary contributions (from affected and Developed Parties), as by those originating from the Secretariat's General Budget, who are the movers and facilitators of complex and multilateral processes, just as regional facilitation is available by means of a Coordination Mechanism approved by the Parties. The budget for regional meetings must be respected and included within those that are necessary to ensure the proper performance of the Regional Coordination Mechanisms contemplated in the 10 Year Strategy (COP 8).*

## Armenia

[Original: Russian]

Номер пункта	Содержание	Анализ	Предложения и вопросы
14	В тоже время , региональные встречи , являющиеся составным элементом процесса обзора и зарекомендовавшие себя как очень эффективный и действенный способ поддержки процесса, должны проводиться в укороченное время и непосредственно перед КРОК.	Если региональные встречи являются как очень эффективный и действенный способ поддержки процесса, то необходимо четко выделить время на его проведение перед сессией КРОК.	На проведение региональных встреч предлагаю выделить как минимум 2 дня непосредственно перед сессией КРОК.
22	Затронутые страны будут отчитываться раз в 4 года; КРОК будет рассматривать отчеты с той же периодичностью, раз в 4 года.	В таком случае надо разъяснить когда будет следующий отчетный цикл. Согласно существующему	КС должен утвердить время представления отчетов. По новым предложениям следующий 6-ой отчетный

		порядку следующий отчетный цикл намечен на 2016 год.	цикл состоится в 2018 году?
23	- КРОК будут проводить свои меж-сессионные сессии совместно или последовательно с сессиями КНТ...  - Сессии КРОК, которые проходят между обычными сессиями КС совместно с сессиями КНТ, будут длиться неделю, включая сессию КНТ;	За одну неделю последовательно проводить региональную встречу, сессии КРОК и КНТ не реально.	Реальнее проводить сессии КРОК и КНТ параллельно и совместно.
24	Встречи региональных приложений будут организованы как самостоятельные встречи в регионе с логистической и финансовой поддержкой от принимающей страны из региона, включая покрытие расходов полномочных участников;	Такая формулировка ставит под вопрос организацию региональных встреч. Финансовая поддержка может быть не только от принимающей страны из региона, включая покрытие расходов полномочных участников.	Финансовая поддержка может быть от принимающей страны из региона, других организаций и фондов, включая покрытие расходов полномочных участников.
25	- проведение меж-сессионных сессий КРОК вплотную с другими подходящими встречами, тем самым сокращая расходы на процесс обзора.	Если региональная встреча, сессии КРОК и КНТ будут проводиться за одну неделю то этот пункт теряет смысл.	Предлагается снять этот пункт.

[English]

<b>Para</b>	<b>As contained in the document</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>Comments and recommendations</b>
14	<i>...At the same time, the meetings of the regional implementation annexes, which are an integral part of the review process and have proved to be a very effective and efficient way to support the process, had to be organized for a limited duration and back-to-back with the session of the CRIC</i>	<i>If the regional meeting judged as efficient and effective, the sufficient amount of time should be allocated for such meeting</i>	<i>I propose to allocate minimum 2 days for the regional meeting</i>
22	<i>...affected country Parties, and other reporting entities as relevant, would be requested to report every four years; the CRIC would review this information with the same frequency, convening its intersessional sessions every four years.</i>	<i>In this case it should be clear when will be the next reporting year? According to current arrangement the next reporting year is 2016</i>	<i>COP has to decide on the reporting cycle and next submission of the report. As proposed the next 6<sup>th</sup> reporting and review cycle will be organized in 2018?</i>
23	<i>(b)The CRIC would convene its</i>	<i>It is not realistic to organize</i>	<i>It is recommended to organize</i>

	<i>intersessional sessions jointly with, or subsequent to, sessions of the CST,...</i>  <i>(c) CRIC sessions held between ordinary sessions of the COP (intersessional sessions) and held in conjunction with the sessions of the CST would last one week, including the duration of the session of the CST;</i>	<i>CRIC and CST sessions subsequently within one week</i>	<i>CRIC and CST sessions either in parallel or jointly (for some sessions)</i>
24	<i>(a) Meetings of the Regional Implementation Annexes would be organized as stand-alone meetings, to be convened in the regions with the logistical and financial support of a host country from the region, including for the cost of participation of entitled countries;</i>	<i>Such wording puts the organization of the meeting under the risk. Financial support should be encouraged not only from host country, including for the cost of participation of entitled countries</i>	<i>Financial support for the regional meetings should be encouraged from other funds, including for the cost of participation of entitled countries</i>
25	<i>Convening the intersessional sessions of the CRIC back-to-back with other relevant meetings, reducing the impact of the participation costs on the review process.</i>	<i>If the regional meeting, sessions of CRIC and CST will be organized within one week this para makes no sense</i>	<i>I propose to delete this para.</i>

## Australia

Australia appreciates the action taken with regard to the improved accessibility of information on best practices. We also agree with the proposed improvement in processes to review the implementation of the Convention. The move to report on the implementation of national action programmes rather than institutional processes is a sound move and provides a benchmark for subsequent reporting.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the documents. Note that Australia's Department of Agriculture has been consulted in providing our comments.

## Bangladesh

**General comments:** Preparation of database on Sustainable Land Management (SLM) best practices and access to it is very encouraging. It would benefit Country Parties especially affected Parties to handle Desertification, Land Degradation and Drought (DLDD) issues at country level as well as regional level. Also it would serve as a platform for exchange and sharing of experience and knowledge.

**Specific comments:** Comments furnished in the table below:

Sl.No.	Items	Comments
1	I B (9): In January 2014, the secretariat initiated consultations with the University of Bern	According to para B (7, 8), World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies



Sl.No.	Items	Comments
	(Switzerland) and WOCAT with a view to concluding the required administrative and legal arrangements in order to transfer the data and information on SLM best practices that are stored in the Performance Review and Assessment of Implementation System (PRAIS) database.	(WOCAT) is one of the two institutions whose proposal was positively considered for the services. However, involvement of University of Bern at this point needs clarification.
2	I B (10): An agreement was signed on 15 April 2014 between the Centre for Development and Environment (CDE) of the University of Bern and the Secretariat on improving accessibility to information on SLM best practices. The University of Bern/CDE identified the World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT) secretariat as executing agency of the agreement, while remaining accountable for the implementation of, and meeting its obligations under, the agreement.	It is unclear whether a Party needs to obtain permission from CDE/WOCAT in order to access to the database.  Provision should be kept for providing detail information on one or more SLM best practices if asked by any Party. Also capacity building program on SLM best practices should be included.
3	I B (13b): Establishment of an online facility to allow Parties to continue submitting SLM best practices and retrieving the information.	A suitable format for submitting SLM best practices should be developed
4	I B (13c): Involvement of the other interested organizations:	As Affected Countries Parties (ACP), Bangladesh would like to be involved in the testing of the online facility.
5	II. A. Reporting	UNCCD secretariat / GEF should arrange extensive/appropriate training workshop on reporting template (PRAIS portal) in terms of duration; and ensure participation of Country Reporting Officers. Because there are items in the reporting template those need explanation for clarification in order to report appropriately
6	II. A. Para 11:	For 2016 reporting, the secretariat should allow sufficient time along with financial (The GEF) and capacity building support for the ACPs.
	II. A. Para 10:	The secretariat should come forward with financial and technical support for conducting research on land degradation as well as capacity building of the researches in LDCs. To get data in consistent manner, a research protocol could be developed to get solid information on land degradation.
7	III. A. Para 22:	Reporting every four years may give feeling to reporting officers that there is ample time. Then it will be difficult for collection of four years data at a time from different organizations (GOs/NGOs, STCs, CSOs etc.). However, UNCCD should keep pace with other Rio

Sl.No.	Items	Comments
		conventions.
8	III. C. 24C:	Need to ensure participation of Science and Technology Correspondent (STC) and additional officers.

**Note:** Comments have been given on behalf of the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Bangladesh

## Belarus

[Original: Russian]

### Комментарии NFP Республики Беларусь

#### по документу “Non-paper 2”

Пункт 22:

требует уточнения вопрос начала 4-хлетнего периода отчетности: из пункта 21 можно судить, что такой период начнется в 2016 году, т.е. далее отчетность будет предоставляться в 2020, 2024... годах – это правильное понимание?

сможет ли новый формат отчетности быть установлен на КС 12, чтобы использоваться уже с 2016 года?

скоординированы ли указанные сроки с предоставлением финансовой поддержки ГЭФ на подготовку отчетности?

Пункт 23:

КНТ и КРОК могут проводиться последовательно, непосредственно один за другим, чтобы рекомендации КНТ могли использоваться в работе КРОК.

В случае параллельного проведения – это может означать фактическое слияние двух мероприятий в одно, в котором будут участвовать национальные координаторы и научно-технические корреспонденты.

Пункт 24:

встречи региональных приложений могут быть организованы не только как самостоятельные встречи, но также должны предварять КРОК и КС в целях выработки региональных позиций;

времени, отведенного на проведение региональных встреч на прошедшем КРОК (1,5 дня), не вполне достаточно для рассмотрения всех необходимых вопросов и выработки региональной позиции по всем проектам документов;

намерения стран о принятии КС, КНТ+КРОК и встреч региональных приложений должны учитываться при выделении средств ГЭФ, этому может способствовать заблаговременное (например, на предстоящий 4-хлетний период) определение принимающих стран.

Для более четкого понимания, возможно, стоит сделать обобщение предполагаемой 4-хлетней цикличности встреч и подготовки отчетности, скоординированной с цикличностью, установленной в ГЭФ.

Например, в табличном виде:

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	...
организация предоставления странам финансовой поддержки ГЭФ для подготовки отчетности	x	x			x				
проведение семинаров по подготовке отчетности		x				x			
предоставление отчетности		x				x			

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	...
КНТ+КРОК	x		x				x		
КС	x			x				x	
встречи региональных приложений	x	x КРОК	x КС	x	x	x КРО К	x КС	x	
...									

[English]

*Para 22: clarification is needed for the reporting cycle. Para 21 proposes that reporting could start in 2016 which means that next reporting year will be 2020, 2024 – is it so?*

*Could COP 12 adopt new format of reporting which could be applied in 2016?*

*Was the proposed reporting cycled discussed and coordinated with GEF in respect of financial support?*

*Para 23: CST and CRIC sessions could be organized jointly or subsequently in order to enable provision of scientific advise to CRIC. In case of parallel sessions it will mean in practice the merge of two sessions in one which will require participation of NFPs and STCs.*

*Para 24: The regional Meetings should be organized not only as a stand-alone event but also in preparation to CRIC and COP in order to formulate the regional positions.*

*Time allocated for the last regional meeting prior to CRIC 13 was not sufficient for consideration of all necessary agenda items and formulation of the regional position.*

*The intention of countries to host session of COP, CST+CRIC and the regional meeting should be considered when allocating GEF resources. The advance schedule of the meeting and host counties (i.e. for next 4 years) could facilitate the process.*

*For the clarity of the reporting cycle it is proposed to prepare the scheme of reporting:*

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	...
<i>Ensure the GEF financial support to the countries for reporting process</i>	x	x			x				
<i>Organization of the reporting training</i>		x				x			
<i>Submission of the reports</i>		x				x			
<i>CST +CRIC</i>	x		x				x		
<i>COP</i>	x			x				x	
<i>Meetings of the Regional Implementation Annexes</i>	x	x CRIC	x COP	x	x	x CRIC	x COP	x	
...									

## Benin

[Original: French]

Après lecture et analyse du document soumis à notre appréciation relatif aux procédures d'évaluation de la mise en oeuvre de la convention, nous avons noté qu'après l'année 2015, un nouveau système d'examen sera instauré vu que les principaux objectifs visés depuis l'adoption de la stratégie décennale sont atteints et qu'il faille à l'heure actuelle réduire les contraintes liées aux financements des réunions et du fonctionnement des organes de la convention.

Le nouveau système proposé à partir de l'année 2016 mettra l'accent sur les points suivants:

- ✓ Axer l'exercice d'examen sur le fond: les propositions formulées à cet effet nous paraissent pertinentes étant donné que les ressources financières s'amenuisent et qu'il faille après vingt ans de mise en œuvre, procéder à une évaluation qualitative et réorienter les choses pour de meilleurs résultats prenant en compte les recommandations de la Conférence sur le Développement Durable (Rio+20).
- ✓ Dans ce cadre, établir des rapports sur la mise en œuvre des Programmes Nationaux de Gestion Durable des Terres en cours de finalisation dans certains pays et déjà adoptés serait pertinent.
- ✓ Le Bénin souscrit à la proposition relative à la continuité de la gouvernance régionale pour l'organisation des réunions régionales qui ont montré leur efficacité, mais nous suggérons cela avec le soutien financier du Secrétariat de la convention pour la prise en compte de la participation des points focaux si leur collaboration et partition à jouer pour les Etats- parties est toujours nécessaire.
- ✓ Enfin, il est souhaitable d'adopter des dispositions favorisant la réduction des coûts liés à l'organisation des différentes rencontres et fonctionnement des organes, mais il faut analyser tous les contours et aspects y relatifs pour garantir les créneaux d'échanges bénéfiques aux pays et institutions concernés.

[English]

*After reading and analyzing the document submitted for our evaluation regarding the procedures for review of the implementation of the convention, we noted that after 2015, a new review system will be instituted given that the main objectives targeted since the adoption of the 10-year strategy are affected and since it is necessary at this time to reduce the constraints connected with the funding of meetings and the operation of the bodies of the convention.*

*The new system proposed beginning in 2016 will emphasize the following points:*

- ✓ *Focusing the review exercise on the substance: the proposals made to this effect seem to us relevant given that the financial resources are dwindling and that, after twenty years of implementation, we need to make a qualitative evaluation and redirect things for better results taking into account the recommendations of the Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20).*
- ✓ *In this context, reporting on the implementation of National Programs on Sustainable Land Management currently being finalized in some countries and already adopted would be relevant.*
- ✓ *Benin subscribes to the proposal regarding the continuance of regional governance for the organization of regional meetings which have shown their effectiveness, but we suggest this with the financial support of the Convention's Secretariat in order to take into account the participation of the focal points if their collaboration and role to be played for the Party-States is still needed.*
- ✓ *Finally, it would be desirable to adopt provisions promoting the reduction of the costs connected with the organization of various meetings and the operation of the bodies, but all of the aspects pertaining thereto need to be analyzed to guarantee beneficial exchange opportunities for the countries and institutions concerned.*

## **Brazil**

Non Paper 2 reflects the views of the Secretariat on the functioning of UNCCD institutions and the implementation of the Convention and suggests changes to the existing procedures and institutional mechanisms. The Non Paper suggests, inter alia, the following changes: a) a discontinuation of reporting against performance indicators; b) the use of data from "accredited global sources" for progress indicators; c) the reporting on voluntary targets for land degradation

neutrality; d) integration of post-2015 sustainable development targets into the convention; e) convening of CRIC inter-sessional sessions only every four years; f) creating stand alone meetings of the regional Implementation Annexes;

Although there is always room for improvement, the current reporting system seems to function adequately and the simplification of the PRAIS, which was requested by GRULAC countries, has made it easier for Parties to carry out their reporting obligations. A significant number of Parties have managed to integrate UNCCD reporting into their national policies on combating desertification. It would be counterproductive and costly to proceed to a complete overhaul of the reporting system within the UNCCD.

The organization should continue to use information provided by Member countries in its reporting and monitoring system. The monitoring and information systems should remain within the framework of the Convention and its institutions. The performance or progress indicators should be established by the Member states and not by external sources.

The negotiation of the post-2015 development goals does not affect the UNCCD Treaty and its main goal, namely: "to combat desertification and mitigate the effects of drought in countries experiencing serious drought and/or desertification, particularly in Africa, through effective action at all levels, supported by international cooperation and partnership arrangements, in the framework of an integrated approach which is consistent with Agenda 21, with a view to contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in affected areas." Although there is room to coordinate efforts with other multilateral processes, the UNCCD should make it a priority to overcome the implementation deficit of its original mandate.

The CRIC is and should remain the main body which analyses the implementation of the Convention. The work of CRIC, of other UNCCD institutions and of Parties should focus less on issues relating to reporting and more on the implementation of sustainable land management practices, technology transfer, and on the ground initiatives which have concrete effects on the lives of families affected by desertification, land degradation and drought. The convening of CRIC sessions every four years would considerably weaken the Committee and affect its ability to carry out its mandate. Although organizing stand-alone regional meetings may prove to be a cost-effective proposal, these regional meetings should not be organized at the expense of CRIC. The UNCCD is an international organization with a global reach and the dialogue between regions, within the CRIC, is necessary. The organization of a week-long regional coordination/CRIC meeting, as was the case during CRIC 13, seemed an efficient, cost-efficient and productive format and may be the solution to the financial issues raised by the Secretariat.

As was made clear during the CRIC 13 meetings, one of the main causes of the deficit in implementation of the Convention is the lack of financial commitment by developed country Parties. As outlined in the "Review of financial support for the implementation of the Convention" (paragraphs 31-35 in document ICCD/CRIC(13)/7/Rev.1) , for the 2012–2013 biennium, United Nations agencies and IGOs reported a nominal commitment of USD 5.1 billion, developed country Parties reported contributions of USD 5.6 billion and affected country Parties contributed USD 123 billion to activities related to the implementation of the Convention. In other words, despite having significantly higher levels of financial capacity, developed country Parties' contribution amounts to less than 5% of the resources invested by affected Parties in implementing the commitments in the UNCCD Convention.

More than reviewing reporting procedures and creating new commitments for UNCCD Parties, in order to reduce the Convention's implementation deficit it is necessary that developed country Parties carry out their treaty obligations, consistent with Article 6 (b) of the Convention: " provide substantial financial resources and other forms of support to assist affected developing country Parties, particularly those in Africa, effectively to develop and implement their own long-term plans and strategies to combat desertification and mitigate the effects of drought".

There should not be an increase in the obligations on affected Parties by creating new goals, pertaining to reporting or land degradation neutrality, without corresponding additional funding from developed country Parties and multilateral sources.

# Burundi

[Original: French]

## I. Contexte

En signant ou en ratifiant la Convention les pays se sont engagés à produire et communiquer à la Conférence des Parties (COP) les mesures prises en vue de mettre en œuvre la Convention.

Par manque de mécanisme spécifique y relatif, c'est au départ la COP qui analysait les rapports. Depuis 2002, un Comité chargé de l'examen de la mise en œuvre de la Convention (CRIC) a été créé.

Avec l'entrée en vigueur du Plan-stratégique décennal, visant à renforcer la mise en œuvre de la Convention, il y a eu révision du mandat du CRIC afin d'examiner la mise en œuvre de la Convention dans le cadre des résultats de la Stratégie.

En même temps, la COP a adopté le système PRAIS, système d'examen des résultats et d'évaluation de la mise en œuvre de la Convention en établissant des rapports quantitatifs et non qualitatifs, basés sur des indicateurs.

## II. Atouts et limites des mécanismes actuels d'examen des rapports

### A. Etablissement des rapports

Sans commentaire

### B. Processus d'examen

Nos commentaires vont porter sur les ressources financières pour les sessions des organes subsidiaires, la pertinence des indicateurs d'impact permettant d'examiner les progrès accomplis dans la réalisation des objectifs stratégiques de la Stratégie, sur l'évolution du mandat du CRIC et la participation aux réunions intersessions du CRIC:

- 1) *Certaines fois, les moyens font défaut pour organiser les sessions des organes subsidiaires, il est donc important de discuter sur les mécanismes de mobiliser des fonds pour appuyer financièrement l'organisation de telles sessions (point 14) ;*
- 2) *La compilation des indicateurs s'impose, en effet la liste des indicateurs ne doit pas être trop longue car le suivi de plusieurs indicateurs nécessite beaucoup d'efforts et de temps pour produire des informations de suivi précis et au moment opportun. En outre, il faudra également considérer des aspects autres que les mécanismes institutionnels (point 16) ;*
- 3) *Avec l'évolution de son mandat, le CRIC traite de nombreux points et souvent il écourte le temps réservé pour l'examen des rapports nationaux, il serait important d'envisager l'élargissement du CRIC afin de lui permettre d'analyser à fond les rapports nationaux, tâche essentielle du CRIC (point 17) ;*
- 4) *La participation aux réunions intersessions du CRIC tend à diminuer, face à cela il faut mener des actions de sensibilisation des Pays, en les mettant devant leur responsabilité (point 18).*

## III. Logique suivie et options pour le changement

Nos commentaires vont porter sur les éléments nouveaux devant être intégrés dans les rapports des Pays touchés :

- 1) *Autant les objectifs et les résultats doivent être concrets, autant les sources de données (internationales autorisées) doivent être précisées ; données à compiler par le secrétariat, afin d'établir un ensemble d'indicateurs de progrès de base à valider et compléter par les pays parties touchés (point 19, b) ;*
- 2) *Les indicateurs pour les questions liées à la terre ayant été déjà établis pour les autres conventions de Rio (CCNUCC, CBD), il serait important de se référer à ces derniers afin de mettre en place les indicateurs dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre de la Convention de lutte contre la désertification (point 19, c).*
- 3) *Il est important de noter qu'en plus des trois nouveaux éléments devant être intégrés dans les rapports, le processus reste ouvert à toute autre mesure possible pour accroître l'efficacité des procédures institutionnelles et mécanismes de la Convention (point 20 d).*

La proposition d'établir les rapports tous les quatre ans vient répondre au problème soulevé au point 17 lié à l'insuffisance du temps réservé à l'examen des rapports nationaux par le CRIC.

[English]

## **I. Context**

*By signing or ratifying the Convention, the countries undertook to produce and to communicate to the Conference of the Parties (COP) the measures taken in view of implementing the Convention.*

*Due to lack of a specific mechanism relating thereto, at the beginning, it was the COP which analyzed the reports. Beginning in 2002, a Committee charged with reviewing the implementation of the Convention (CRIC) was created.*

*With the entry into force of the ten-year strategic plan, aimed at strengthening the implementation of the Convention, there was a revision of the CRIC's mandate in order to review the implementation of the Convention in the context of the outcomes of the Strategic Plan.*

*At the same time, the COP adopted the PRAIS system, a system for reviewing the outcomes and for assessing the implementation of the Convention by quantitative and non-quantitative reporting, based on indicators.*

## **II. Strengths and limitations of the current mechanism for reviewing reports**

### **A. Reporting**

*No comment*

### **B. Reviewing process**

*Our comments are going to address the financial resources for the sessions of the subsidiary bodies, the relevance of the impact indicators enabling the review of the progress made in achieving the strategic objectives of the Strategic Plan, the change in the CRIC's mandate and the participation in intersession meetings of the CRIC:*

- 1) At times, the means are lacking for organizing sessions of the subsidiary bodies, so it is important to discuss the mechanisms for raising funds to financially support the organization of these sessions (point 14);*
- 2) Compilation of the indicators is needed, although the list of indicators should not be too long because monitoring several indicators requires a lot of effort and time for producing precise follow-up information in a timely manner. Moreover, aspects other than institutional mechanisms also need to be considered (point 16);*
- 3) With the change in its mandate, the CRIC deals with numerous issues and often the time reserved for reviewing national reports runs short ; it would be important to consider the expansion of the CRIC in order to allow it to conduct in-depth analysis of the national reports, an essential task of the CRIC (point 17) ;*
- 4) Participation in the intersession meetings of the CRIC tends to diminish; given this, measures to make the Countries aware need to be taken, by confronting them with their responsibility (point 18).*

### **III. Our logic and options for change**

*Our comments will address the new elements to be included in the reports of the Countries affected:*

- 1) The greater the need for the objectives and outcomes to be concrete, the greater the need for the data sources (authorized internationals) to be specified; data to be compiled by the secretariat, in order to establish a set of basic progress indicators to be validated and completed by the Country-Parties affected (point 19, b).*
- 2) The indicators for issues connected with the land having already been established for the other Rio conventions (CCNUCC, CBD), it would be important to refer to the latter in order to develop the indicators in the context of the implementation of the Convention for combatting desertification (point 19, c).*
- 3) It is important to note that in addition to the three new elements which are to be included in the reports, the process remains open to any other possible measure to increase the effectiveness of the institutional procedures and mechanisms of the Convention (point 20 d).*

*The proposal to report every four years responds to the problem raised in point 17 related to the insufficient time reserved for the CRIC's review of the national reports.*

## Chile

[Original: Spanish]

El documento describe las limitaciones del proceso de comunicaciones del Artículo 26 de la Convención, específicamente la presentación y revisión de informes a la Convención. A pesar de los avances, la Convención no cuenta con una línea base ni tendencia de los procesos de desertificación, degradación de la tierra e impactos de la sequía a nivel global. El documento propone focalizar la presentación de informes en el objetivo de lucha contra la desertificación en vez del proceso de la convención misma. Asimismo, se propone la revisión conjunta de los informes por parte del CRIC y CST, así como asegurar la continuidad y gobernanza regional y otras medidas para aumentar la eficacia de los órganos subsidiarios. Si bien Chile no participó de la sesión del CRIC-13, nuestro país ha sido parte activa en el proceso de la Convención, especialmente en la negociación, formulación y adopción de la Estrategia Decenal, en cuyo contexto se indican los siguientes comentarios.

### Comentarios

#### I. Contexto.

Punto 3. El cambio de paradigma en la revisión de la aplicación de la Convención desde un sistema de presentación de informes cualitativo a un sistema de presentación de informes cuantitativo basado en indicadores, ha sido resultado de la aplicación de la Estrategia Decenal UNCCD y no del sistema PRAIS como indica el documento.

#### II. Análisis de los mecanismos de presentación y revisión de informes.

##### A. Presentación de informes.

Punto 5. El documento señala que no se incluyeron metas para los objetivos de impacto, lo cual es efectivo pero corresponde a un tema metodológico de la formulación de la Estrategia Decenal. A este respecto, se entendió que el cumplimiento de los indicadores de resultado de los objetivos operacionales aportaría por inducción al logro de los objetivos estratégicos, por lo que los objetivos estratégicos son un fin superior a los que la Convención contribuiría (mejoramiento de ecosistemas y poblaciones, beneficios globales y movilización de recursos), pero que en definitiva la evaluación de la labor de la Convención debería ser contra el cumplimiento de los objetivos operacionales, sus indicadores de resultados y metas. Posiblemente, en la perspectiva del tiempo, este enfoque merece ser mejorado.

Punto 6. El documento destaca que el GEF debe reportar cada dos años en tanto el resto de observadores debe presentar únicamente información complementaria. A este respecto, se debe señalar que el GEF no es un observador sino que uno de los mecanismos de financiamiento de la Convención, rol que el GEF ha aceptado en derechos y obligaciones.

Punto 9. El documento señala que se obtuvieron resultados limitados en la evaluación de los impactos de la aplicación de la Convención a través de la compilación de los indicadores de progreso. Esto es efectivo, sin embargo se debe señalar en este párrafo lo indicado en el Punto 12, en el sentido que los países Parte afectados tuvieron un apoyo muy limitado por parte del GEF/PNUMA, principalmente por problemas de oportunidad del apoyo, apoyo que estaba comprometido con anterioridad, lo cual debiera ser indicado aquí para dimensionar las causas subyacentes de los resultados limitados obtenidos del proceso de reporte 2012. En este sentido, sería importante asegurar el apoyo del GEF de manera regular al proceso de reporte ante la Convención, especialmente en el reporte de indicadores de progreso.

Punto 10. El documento señala el aporte del GEF/PNUMA al proceso de reporte 2010 y 2014. En realidad el apoyo del GEF/PNUMA fue al proceso de reporte 2010 con PRAIS y al proceso 2012 de reporte y alineación de los PAN. Posiblemente los países hayan extendido la capacidad obtenida con ese apoyo al proceso de reporte 2014 y explicar así la alta respuesta de los países en ese año, pero en principio entendemos que no hubo ayuda comprometida del GEF/PNUMA para el proceso de reporte 2014.



Asimismo, el documento da a entender que en el proceso de reporte de 2012 sobre indicadores de impacto o progreso para el segundo ejercicio de presentación de informes bajo el sistema PRAIS, los resultados fueron limitados. En este caso se debe destacar que si bien este proceso de reporte fue el segundo bajo el sistema PRAIS, también debería indicar que el año 2012 se efectuó la primera evaluación de la presentación de informes sobre indicadores de impacto o progreso. En este caso el apoyo del GEF/PNUMA se restringió por diversas razones a un número muy limitado de países y los resultados están a la vista con la pobre presentación de informes del año 2012 sobre indicadores de impacto o progreso. En este sentido, debería asegurarse el apoyo financiero del GEF/PNUMA a los países Parte afectados en el segundo proceso de reporte 2016 y posteriores sobre indicadores de impacto, si se aspira a mejorar en el cumplimiento de objetivos estratégicos.

B. Proceso de revisión.

Punto 14. Precisar que las reuniones regionales preceden inmediatamente a las sesiones del CRIC, y que si bien se entienden las razones presupuestarias del formato vis-a-vis, es manifiesta la premura de tiempo con que se deben adoptar los acuerdos regionales ante los puntos de agenda del CRIC. Posiblemente sea necesario evaluar la conveniencia que las reuniones regionales tengan el carácter efectivamente preparatorio que tuvieron en su oportunidad.

Punto 16. Nuevamente es necesario incluir aquí el factor de apoyo financiero que limitó los resultados de la primera evaluación de los indicadores de progreso en el proceso de reporte 2012 para dimensionar exactamente la contribución del CCT.

Punto 17. La implementación de la Convención no sólo depende de la gestión de los países Parte contenida en sus reportes nacionales como sugiere el documento, sino del conjunto de instancias que la integran.

Punto 18. La declinación de la asistencia a las sesiones de CRIC no significa una falta de interés por los países Partes como sugiere el documento, sino por la falta de apoyo financiero para la participación de muchos actores relevantes en esta Convención que antes sí participaban, especialmente sociedad civil.

III. Justificación y opciones para el cambio.

Punto 19 c). Es necesario destacar el hecho que otras convenciones hayan adoptado metas globales sobre degradación de la tierra, no así la Convención UNCCD que tiene el mandato sobre el objeto jurídico Tierra que esta Convención define. Seguramente, este es una seria limitación que la Convención debe resolver.

A. Focalizar el proceso en lo substancial.

Punto 21 a). La presentación de informes sobre indicadores de desempeño no puede ser discontinua, debe ser regular y definidos los períodos en los cuales se debe reportar. El cumplimiento de metas en un punto del tiempo no asegura que se mantengan los efectos esperados indicados por la Estrategia Decenal, por lo que se debería mantener el impulso.

Punto 21 c). La solicitud de informe a los países sobre la aplicación de programas nacionales de acción debería ser sobre la base de metas globales que acuerde la misma Convención.

Punto 21 d). La información aportada por los países Parte desarrollado en otras obligaciones distintas de la lucha contra la desertificación, degradación de la tierra y mitigación de los efectos de la sequía no debieran ser parte de las obligaciones de estos países con la Convención UNCCD.

Punto 22. Con fines de coherencia y pertinencia, en este punto se debe tener en cuenta los acuerdos de la Convención sobre la continuidad de la Estrategia Decenal.

B. Relevar el proceso de revisión

Punto 23 a). Aclarar a qué mandato original se refiere. Si se pretende anular el acuerdo de la COP-9 que dio nuevo mandato al CRIC, esto pareciera muy prematuro en tanto no se acuerde un proceso intergubernamental que revise el mandato, considerando las potenciales demandas futuras a la Convención o una nueva Estrategia Decenal o una meta global.

Punto 23 b). Se requiere aclaración aquí sobre el rol que tendría la Interface Política-Ciencia.

C. Asegurar la continuidad y gobernanza regional.

Punto 24). Se debe explicitar aquí el mecanismo a adoptar en el evento no muy improbable que ningún país anfitrión esté en condiciones de organizar la reunión regional, incluidos los costos de la participación de los países elegibles.

D. Otras medidas para mejorar la eficacia.

Punto 25 a). Si las sesiones de CRIC se reducen a sesiones de “diálogo interactivo” informal como sugiere el documento, en ese caso es preferible asegurar que las formalidades de las sesiones del CRIC se enmarquen en un formato que facilite el intercambio de experiencias y el diálogo entre las Partes que asegure la formulación de decisiones relevantes sobre implementación del Convención para ser elevadas de manera formal a la Conferencia de las Partes.

Punto 25 b). Las únicas otras reuniones relevantes para el CRIC debieran ser las reuniones de CCT o de los anexos regionales de implementación. Esta propuesta sería aceptable sólo como mecanismo de solución en el caso que alguna de las reuniones regionales no pueda realizarse en la misma región.

[English]

*The document describes the limitations of the communications process established in Article 26 of the Convention, specifically, how reports are presented to the Convention and reviewed. In spite of advances, the Convention does not have any baseline or trend information for the process of desertification, land degradation or drought impacts on a global scale. The document proposes that, instead of the convention’s own process, reports should focus on the fight against desertification. Likewise, it proposes a joint report review by CRIC and STC, as well as ensuring regional continuity and governance and other measures to increase the effectiveness of subsidiary bodies. Although Chile was not present at the CRIC-13 session, our country has been an active part in the Convention process, especially during the negotiation, formulation and adoption of the 10 Year Strategy, in the context of which the following comments are made.*

*Comments*

*I. Context.*

*Point 3. The paradigm shift in Convention implementation reviews, from a qualitative report presentation system to a quantitative report presentation system based on indicators, is the result of implementing the UNCCD 10 Year Strategy and not of the PRAIS system as the document claims.*

*II. Analysis of the report presentation and review mechanisms.*

*A. Report Presentation.*

*Point 5. The document states that no goals were included for the impact objectives, which may be true but addresses the methodology expressed in the wording of the 10 Year Strategy. In that respect, we understood that the*

*attainment of the operational objectives as per the outcome indicators would imply the achievement of the strategic objectives, which places the strategic objectives as a goal above those that the Convention would contribute (population and ecosystem improvements, global benefits and resource mobilization), but that the review of the Convention's effort should definitely be counter to the fulfillment of the operational objectives, their outcome indicators and goals. It is possible that, in hindsight, this approach deserves improvement.*

*Point 6. The document highlights that the GEF must submit a report every two years while the rest of the observers only have to provide complementary information. In this respect, it should be noted that the GEF is not an observer but rather one of the funding mechanisms under the Convention, a role whose rights and obligations the GEF has accepted.*

*Point 9. The document states that limited results were obtained in the compiled progress indicators for the evaluation of the impacts of the implementation of the Convention. This is true, however this paragraph should have noted the statements under Point 12, in the sense that the affected Member Countries got very limited support from GEF/UNEP, mainly due to problems related to the opportunity for support, support that had been previously assured, which should be stated here to put the underlying causes of the limited results obtained from the 2012 report in perspective. In this sense, it would be important to ensure the regular support of the GEF to the reporting process under the Convention, especially in the case of the progress indicators report.*

*Point 10. The document denotes GEF/UNEP contributions to the 2010 and 2014 reporting process. In reality, GEF/UNEP support was for the 2010 process together with PRAIS and for the 2012 reporting and NAP alignment process. It is possible that the countries may have extended their capacity with that support of the 2014 reporting process, and that would explain the higher responses obtained by the countries for that year, but in principle we feel that no GEF/UNEP support was committed to the 2014 reporting process.*

*Likewise, the document seems to indicate that the 2012 reporting process for impact or progress indicators for the second reporting year under the PRAIS system showed limited results. In this case it should be stressed that although this reporting process was the second lowest of the PRAIS system, it should also state that 2012 was the first evaluation year of impact or progress indicator report presentations. In this case, GEF/UNEP support was restricted to a very limited number of countries for various reasons and the 2012 report presentations show poor impact or progress indicator results. In this sense, financial support by GEF/UNEP for the 2016 second and subsequent reporting processes on impact indicators must be assured for the affected Member Countries, if an improvement of the strategic objectives is to be hoped for.*

#### **B. Review Process.**

*Point 14. Point out that the regional meetings are held immediately before CRIC sessions, and although we can understand the budgetary reasons for the vis-à-vis format, time is of the essence for the adoption of the regional agreements established by the CRIC agenda. It is possible that it may be necessary to review the convenience of the regional meetings effectively having the preparatory function they had before.*

*Point 16. Once again, here it is necessary to include the financial support factor that limited the results of the first evaluation of the progress indicators for the 2012 reporting process to understand exactly what was contributed by the STC.*

*Point 17. The management of the Member Countries found in its national reports is not the only thing that the implementation of the Convention depends on, as the document suggests, but also in the set of instances that comprise it.*

*Point 18. The decline in attendance to CRIC sessions does not mean a lack of interest from the Member Countries as the document suggests, but rather a lack of financial support for many of the relevant entities in this Convention that previously did participate, especially the civil society.*

*Reasons and Options for the Change.*

*Point 19 c). It is necessary to point out the fact that other conventions have adopted global goals regarding land degradation, which is not the case with the UNCCD Convention whose mandate is the legal object Land as defined by this Convention. Surely, this is a serious limitation which the Convention must resolve.*

*A. Focus the process on substantial matters.*

*Point 21 a). Performance indicator reports cannot be irregularly presented, it must be done on a regular basis and the report periods must be defined. Achieving the goals at some point in time does not guarantee that the expected effects established in the 10 Year Strategy will be maintained; therefore the pace must be maintained.*

*Point 21 c). Asking the countries to report on the implementation of National Action Programs should be done on the basis of global targets agreed to under the Convention itself.*

*Point 21 d). The information contributed by the developed Member Countries for other obligations besides the fight against desertification, land degradation and the mitigation of drought effects should not be a part of their obligations under the UNCCD Convention.*

*Point 22. In the interest of coherence and relevance, this point should take into account Convention agreements regarding the continuity of the 10 Year Strategy.*

*B. Relegating the Review Process.*

*Point 23 a). Clarify which original mandate it refers to. If the purpose is to annul the COP-9 agreement which assigned CRIC a new mandate, so long as an intergovernmental process to review the mandate is not agreed to—considering potential future Convention demands or a new 10 Year Strategy or a global goal—that would seem very premature.*

*Point 23 b). Clarification is needed here regarding the role that the Science-to-Policy Interface would have.*

*C. Ensure Regional Continuity and Governance.*

*Point 24). This must explain the mechanism to be adopted in the unlikely event that none of the host countries is able to organize the regional meeting, including the cost associated with the participation of the eligible countries.*

*D. Other measures to improve effectiveness.*

*Point 25 a). If CRIC sessions are reduced to informal “interactive dialog” sessions as the document suggests, then it is preferable to ensure that CRIC session formalities are framed within a format that facilitates the exchange of experiences and dialog between the parties, which ensures that relevant decisions are formulated regarding the implementation of the Convention so that they can be formally submitted to the Conference of the Parties.*

*Point 25 b). The only other meetings that are relevant to CRIC should be the STC meetings or those of the regional implementation annexes. This proposal would be acceptable only as a solution mechanism in case that any of the regional meetings cannot be carried out within the same region.*

## Colombia

[Original: Spanish]

En el párrafo 21 del *Non-Paper 2*, la Secretaría solicita crear metas voluntarias de LDN, para lo cual es necesario establecer límites por parte de la Convención, así como definir alcances y estrategias de adopción para los países Parte. Igualmente, es importante resaltar que las posibles metas en LDN deben ser únicamente de carácter voluntario y de aplicación nacional. Un prerequisite para poder plantear cualquier meta, objetivo o acción relacionada con LDN es contar con una definición precisa y consensuada de LDN que permita tener claridad sobre las implicaciones de este término. Hasta la fecha no se cuenta con una definición de LDN en el marco de la Convención.

En referencia al párrafo 24 sobre la realización de reuniones regionales, consideramos que es conveniente facilitar la realización más frecuente de encuentros regionales entre las sesiones del CRIC y el Comité de Ciencia y Tecnología (CCT), ya que esto permitiría establecer un seguimiento y evaluación de los indicadores de desempeño y progreso, así como la creación de alianzas y mecanismos de transferencia de buenas prácticas para una mejor implementación de la Convención. Sin embargo, resulta fundamental que se garantice la financiación de estas reuniones por parte de la Convención, ya que en general los países de la región no cuentan con la capacidad financiera, ni logística para realizar este tipo de eventos.

Sobre los párrafos 12 y 22 en lo que respecta a la elaboración y presentación de informes, consideramos positivo que los reportes se realicen cada 4 años y no cada dos años como en la actualidad, ya que esto permitiría generar datos de mayor fiabilidad y calidad, y poder establecer un mecanismo de monitoreo y seguimiento confiable con estándares unificados entre la región. Sin embargo, es necesario que se mantenga la estructura actual del CRIC y que este sea el órgano encargado de la evaluación de la implementación de la Convención, ya que esto permite hacer ajustes oportunos de acuerdo al desarrollo que haya tenido la Convención, así como a nuevas circunstancias que requieran atención. Igualmente, los indicadores de desempeño permiten medir la implementación y gestión de la Convención en cada país, por lo que resulta de gran valor seguir realizando un seguimiento constante y periódico.

Del mismo modo, Colombia considera que es necesario establecer un marco de inversión que proporcione recursos económicos y técnicos constantes para la presentación de informes, así como la realización de un mayor seguimiento frente a los Planes de Acción Nacionales.

Es importante que los indicadores de progreso tengan criterios unificados de monitoreo y seguimiento, y tener en cuenta que los Países Parte Afectados puedan cumplir con los mismos de forma periódica. Así mismo, los objetivos de la estrategia decenal sobre estos indicadores debe establecer metas que promuevan y estimulen a las partes a que desarrollen acciones orientadas a la lucha contra la desertificación y la sequía, además de facilitar su medición. Un ejemplo claro de esto son las metas Aichi del Convenio sobre la Diversidad Biológica (CDB).

Por otra parte, consideramos pertinente la realización de reuniones conjuntas de los burós del CRIC y el CCT, ya que esto facilitaría el flujo de información entre ambos organismos y permitiría el desarrollo de mayores sinergias.

Finalmente, sobre el párrafo 19 del *Non-Paper 2* es importante señalar que si bien a nivel mundial los objetivos operacionales globales han sido o están próximos a ser alcanzados, en muchos países, entre ellos Colombia, no se han cumplido a cabalidad y resulta de gran importancia seguir haciendo un seguimiento en cada uno de los países Parte Afectados.

[English]

*In paragraph 21 of Non-Paper 2, the Secretariat requests the creation of voluntary LDN goals, which requires limits established by the Convention, as well as defining the scope and adoption strategies for the Member Countries. Likewise, it is important to point out that any possible LDN goals must be uniquely voluntary and applied on a national level. A prerequisite in order to propose any goal, objective or action related to the LDN is to have a precise and consensual definition of the LDN which allows us to have clarity with regard to the implications of this term. To this date no definition within the framework of the Convention has been defined for the LDN.*

*In reference to paragraph 24, regarding the implementation of regional meetings, we feel it is convenient to facilitate a more frequent occurrence of regional meetings between CRIC and Science and Technology Committee (STC) sessions, since that would allow us to monitor and evaluate the performance and progress indicators, as well as the creation of alliances and transfer mechanisms for good practices to better implement the Convention. However, it is essential that the financing of these meetings by the Convention is guaranteed, since the countries within the region do not generally have the financial or logistical capacity to carry out these types of events.*

*Regarding paragraphs 12 and 22, regarding report preparations and presentations, we feel that having the reports done every 4 years instead of every two years as it is done now is a positive step, since that would provide more reliable information, and of better quality, and allow the establishment of a more reliable monitoring and follow-up mechanism with unified standards between the regions. However, the current CRIC structure needs to be maintained as well as being the body in charge of evaluating the implementation of the Convention, since this allows for timely adjustments as the Convention develops, as well as to new circumstances that may require attention. Likewise, the performance indicators allow us to measure the implementation and management of the Convention in each country; therefore it is of great value to continue with a constant and periodic follow up.*

*Also, Colombia feels it is necessary to establish an investment framework to provide constant financial and technical resources for the report presentations, as well as implementing more follow ups for the National Action Plans.*

*It is important for the progress indicators to have unified monitoring and follow up criteria, and to take into account that the Affected Member Countries can comply with them on a regular basis. Likewise, the objectives of the 10 Year Strategy regarding these indicators must establish goals that promote and encourage the parties to develop actions oriented towards the fight against desertification and drought, besides facilitating their measurement. A clear example of this would be the Aichi goals of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).*

*On the other hand, we feel it is appropriate to hold Joint meetings of the CRIC and STC bureaus, since this would facilitate the flow of information between them and allow for greater synergies.*

*Finally, regarding paragraph 19 of Non-Paper 2, it is important to point out that although worldwide the global operational objectives have been or are soon to be reached, there are still many countries, including Colombia, that have yet to fully comply and it becomes highly important to continue with the follow ups for each of the Affected Member Countries.*

## **Cuba**

[Original: Spanish]

Sobre la Justificación y opciones para el cambio se considera lo siguiente:

- Párrafo 20 b): Si bien puede resultar conveniente retomar el mandato original del CRIC, sobre todo como órgano relevante para los procesos de revisión de informes de las Partes, no se deberá prejuzgar si será el original o no. Desde que fue adoptado el primer mandato del Comité han pasado varios años de trabajo y experiencia, lo cual deberá tenerse en cuenta para cualquier trabajo futuro de la Convención. Además, como parte de cualquier análisis de revisión del mandato del CRIC será importante tener en cuenta la necesidad de que juegue un papel más activo en la elaboración de propuestas para la toma de decisiones de la COP.
- Párrafo 21 b): Las Partes son las que deben proponer y decidir sobre cualquier indicador de progreso, y no la Secretaría utilizando información de fuentes internacionales acreditadas.
- Párrafo 21 e): No se deberá prejuzgar la información a solicitar a las Partes acerca de metas voluntarios de neutralidad de degradación de tierras u otro tipo de meta global. El futuro trabajo de la Convención en relación con esto deberá ser adoptado en la COP, con la consecuente definición de periodos de tiempo.
- Párrafo 22: Consideramos conveniente que, dadas las limitaciones financieras y dificultades para poder elaborarlos por las Partes, se establezcan cada 4 años como informe completo con indicadores de desempeño y de progreso y una preparación regional para la elaboración de los informes a partir del 2016. • Párrafo 23 a): No prejuzgar qué

tipo de información o asuntos se descartarán del mandato del CRIC. Las Partes deberán tener el derecho a revisar y decidir completamente sobre el mandato del CRIC en función del trabajo futuro de la Convención.

- Párrafo 23 b): Las sesiones del CCT y el CRIC pueden realizarse una a continuación de la otra, pero esto no podrá afectar la participación de los dos representantes de los países en desarrollo que asisten a este tipo de reuniones con el apoyo financiero de la Convención, ya que son dos órganos con mandatos diferentes y son atendidos por funcionarios de competencias distintas en cada uno de nuestros países.
- Párrafo 24 a): Se apoya la propuesta de fortalecer el trabajo de los anexos regionales y sus reuniones, pero no a cargo del financiamiento de los países en la Región. Esta actividad regional, incluyendo las reuniones deberán continuar planificándose y realizándose con el presupuesto de la Convención.
- Párrafo 25 b): Las sesiones del CRIC entre sesiones de la Conferencia de las Partes no podrán supeditarse a los períodos de reporte de informes, si se adopta la propuesta de que sean cada 4 años. Eso dependerá del mandato del CRIC y las propias decisiones que se adopten en cada COP. Tampoco se puede definir que se realicen junto con otras reuniones relevantes, pues constituiría otra variable más a tener en cuenta para entonces convocar o supeditar una sesión del CRIC.

[English]

*Regarding the Reasons and Options for the Change:*

- *Paragraph 20 b): Although it may be convenient to reinstate the original CRIC mandate, above all as the relevant body for the Parties' process for report reviews, it should not be decided beforehand if it shall be the original one or not. Since the first mandate for the Committee was adopted, several years of accumulated work and experience have passed, which must be taken into account for any future work by the Convention. Also, as a part of any review analysis of the CRIC mandate, it will be important to take into account the needs of those who play a more active role preparing the proposals for the COP decision making process.*
- *Paragraph 21 b): The Parties are the ones who should propose and decide with regard to any progress indicator, and not the Secretariat based on information from accredited international sources.*
- *Paragraph 21 e): The information that the Parties are to provide regarding the voluntary land degradation neutrality goals or for any other type of global goal should not be decided beforehand. Any future work by the Convention regarding this must be adopted in the COP, with the resulting definition of timeframes.*
- *Paragraph 22: We feel it is appropriate to implement full reports every 4 years with performance and progress indicators and a regional outlook as of 2016, given the Parties' financial limitations and difficulties in preparing them. The type of information or issues that shall be highlighted in the CRIC mandate should not be defined beforehand. The Parties must have the right to review and decide everything regarding the CRIC mandate with regard to any future work by the Convention.*
- *Paragraph 23 b): The STC and CRIC sessions may take place one after the other, but this may not affect the participation of the two representatives from the developed countries who attend to these types of meetings with the Convention's financial support, since these are not two separate bodies with different mandates and each one of our countries sends functionaries from different agencies to them.*
- *Paragraph 24 a): We support the proposal to strengthen the work of the regional annexes and their meetings, but not that the countries in the Region should be charged with their financing. This regional activity, including the meetings should continue to be planned and carried out under the Convention's budget.*
- *Paragraph 25 b): If the proposal to have report presentation periods every 4 years is adopted, CRIC sessions that take place between Conferences by the Parties may not be subject to them. That shall depend on the CRIC mandate and the decisions adopted at each COP. Neither should it be established for them to take place together with other relevant meetings, since that would mean one more variable to take into account before calling or be subjected to a CRIC session.*

## Dominican Republic

[Original: Spanish]

Excelente documento, elaborado con un alto sentido crítico respecto al proceso de información y revisión en el marco del convenio, donde se indican las limitaciones de los informes presentados por las Partes, en cuanto a la pertinencia, eficiencia y eficacia de la información y el hecho de que después de dos décadas la Convención no pueda contar con una evaluación de referencia e indicación de las tendencias de degradación de tierra, basada en datos sólidos y la información notificada por los países afectados. Consideramos es una crítica constructiva para mejorar.

En ese sentido, la Convención pide *más sustancia y menos información de los procesos institucionales*, por lo que se insta a suministrar datos técnicos específicos sobre degradación de tierra que permitan integrar recomendaciones científicas en las deliberaciones políticas. Entendemos que en ese sentido el documento insta a profundizar en investigaciones de campo y notificación correspondiente.

La República Dominicana aunque debe continuar con este mandato ha realizado importantes levantamientos de informaciones que directa e indirectamente se vinculan y aportan para la prevención de la Desertificación, entre los cuales citamos:

- a) El estudio de uso y cobertura de la tierra más reciente fue en el 2012, utilizando imágenes satelitales Landsat 5 del 2011 de la Agencia Geoespacial de los EEUU e imagen de radar ALOS PALSAR del año 2010 de la Agencia Geoespacial del Japón. Como herramienta complementaria se utilizó imágenes Google Earth profesional de los años 2009 al 2013.
- b) Evaluación del Estado Actual de la Degradación Desertificación de los Suelos en Cuatro Regiones de Desarrollo de la República Dominicana, Rep. Dom. 2012

### ***Reflexiones a la luz de la revisión de los documentos:***

La República Dominicana actualmente está en un proceso de revisión interna del Quinto Informe Nacional que fue enviado a la Secretaría y concomitante preparación de la solicitud de apoyo financiero para el inicio de la elaboración de su ***Sexto Informe Nacional*** y contamos con la ***Plataforma Prais*** para tal fin, por lo que cualquier innovación o modificación esperamos sea informada oportunamente.

Luego de consultas realizadas encontramos que se utilizó la Plataforma Prais observamos evidencia de notificación de fecha 17 de abril 2014 hecha a las Partes sobre la base de datos WOCAT, en ese sentido, estamos en la disposición de reiniciar los contactos de lugar para continuar con la compilación que sea requerida.

### ***De la Calidad de los informes***

Precisamente la revisión interna del último informe Prais (Quinto Informe y último enviado por República Dominicana a la Secretaría de la Convención) ha sido una iniciativa que persigue examinar los puntos que requieran ser fortalecidos en cuanto a la información científica que deba ser incorporada y establecer la mejora continua de la calidad de los próximos informes.

El Non-Paper 1 referente a la “evaluación de los informes enviados por las Partes” indica que existen determinados porcentajes de informes incompletos o duplicados, lagunas de datos y entradas que no se refieren a la cuestión, sin embargo, no especifica que países Partes de la Convención deben mejorar sus informes.

*El Sexto Informe país (Informe plataforma Prais)* sobre los resultados y la evaluación de la implementación de la Convención en República Dominicana, también se elaborará siguiendo los lineamientos indicados en el ***Programa de Acción Nacional Lucha Contra la Desertificación y los Efectos de la Sequía (PAN-LCD) de la República Dominicana*** y se espera que esté enfocado en las estrategias establecidas en su plan de acción, es decir verificando la ejecución de los programas, tal como establece el artículo 26 de la Convención.



*An excellent document, prepared with a highly critical sense of the information and review process within the framework of the Convention, stating the limitations of the reports that the Parties submit, with regard to the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the information and the fact that after two decades, the Convention still does not have a reference evaluation and an indicator for the land degradation trends, based on solid data and the information provided by the affected countries. We feel it is a constructive criticism, aimed at improvements.*

*In that sense, the Convention wants more substance and less information about the institutional processes, urging for specific technical data on land degradation to be provided, which would allow scientific recommendations to be integrated into political considerations. We understand that in that sense the document stresses the need for more detailed field research and reporting.*

*Although the Dominican Republic must continue with this mandate, it has collected important information that is linked directly and indirectly with, and supports Desertification prevention, of which we quote:*

- a) *The most recent land use and coverage study was made in 2012, using Landsat 5 satellite images from 2011, by the US Geospatial Intelligence Agency and ALOS PALSAR radar images from 2010, by the Geospatial Information Authority of Japan. As a complementary tool, Google Earth professional images from 2009 to 2013 were used.*
- b) *Evaluation of the Current State of Land Degradation and Desertification in the Four Regions under Development within the Dominican Republic, Dom. Rep. 2012*

***Our thoughts in light of our review of the documents:***

*The Dominican Republic is currently involved in a process of internal review of the Fifth National Report which was sent to the Secretariat and in the associated preparation of the request for financial support to begin preparation of the **Sixth National Report** for which we are counting on the **Prais Platform**, therefore we hope that any innovation or modification is notified in a timely manner.*

*After some consultations we found that the Prais Platform was used based on a notice to the Parties dated April 17, 2014 regarding the WOCAT database, in this sense, we are willing to reestablish our contacts to continue reporting as may be required.*

***Regarding the quality of the reports***

*The internal review of the last Prais report (Fifth and last report sent by the Dominican Republic to the Secretariat of the Convention) is precisely the reason that motivates us to examine the points that need to be strengthened with regard to the scientific information that should be included and to continuously improve on the quality of subsequent reports.*

*Non-Paper 1 which refers to the “evaluation of the reports sent by the Parties” states that there are specific percentages of reports that are incomplete or duplicate, gaps in the data and entries that do not address the issue, however, it does not specify which Convention Parties must improve their reports.*

*The Sixth National Report (Prais Platform Report) regarding the results and the evaluation of how the Convention has been implemented in the Dominican Republic, was also prepared following the guidelines established under the National Action Program for the Fight Against Desertification and **the Effects of the Drought (NAP-LCD) for the Dominican Republic** and is expected to be focused on the strategies established in its action plan, that is by verifying the implementation of the programs, as was established under Article 26 of the Convention.*

## Ecuador

[Original: Spanish]

### *Para II.A.6*

En cuanto a la utilización de indicadores y/o marcos comunes de seguimiento y evaluación, las Convenciones de Río y sus mecanismos financieros como el FMAM estarían en mejores condiciones de evaluar y comparar la eficacia de las políticas y prácticas de ordenación de tierras en el cumplimiento de sus objetivos comunes

### *Para II.B. 16*

Durante las sesiones de CST y CRIC deberían participar delegados de empresa privada y multinacionales a fin de establecer un verdadero proceso de sensibilización

### *Para II.B. 17*

Resulta importante insistir en que el Mecanismo Mundial intensifique sus esfuerzos que permitan fomentar la capacidad nacional para acceder a la financiación contra el cambio climático y aumentar los conocimientos sobre las medidas de adaptación basadas en los ecosistemas y las tierras, es decir ayudar a los Estados Partes involucrados en la elaboración de proyectos a que mejoren la productividad de los recursos de las tierras y que al mismo tiempo proporcionen beneficios secundarios en materia de mitigación.

### *Para III.19 (b)*

Los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible (ODS) y la agenda para desarrollo después de 2015 pueden ayudar a promover la adopción de medidas basadas en el tema de tierras. En lo que respecta a la ordenación sostenible de los recursos de la tierra, los objetivos estratégicos comunes de las Convenciones de Río (CC, CBD, UNCCD) ofrecen una oportunidad única de fomentar sinergias, aumentar la eficiencia y evitar la duplicación en los procesos nacionales de aplicación y presentación de informes.

### *Para III.19 (c)*

Obviamente este cumplimiento debería ir acompañado con una serie de procesos de fortalecimiento de capacidades y facilitación de recursos financieros

### *Nota a pie de página 24*

Resulta importante insistir en que el Mecanismo Mundial intensifique sus esfuerzos que permitan fomentar la capacidad nacional para acceder a la financiación contra el cambio climático y aumentar los conocimientos sobre las medidas de adaptación basadas en los ecosistemas y las tierras, es decir ayudar a los Estados Partes involucrados en la elaboración de proyectos a que mejoren la productividad de los recursos de las tierras y que al mismo tiempo proporcionen beneficios secundarios en materia de mitigación.

### *Para B. 23 (b)*

El CRIC convocaría sus reuniones de manera consecutiva o junto con las reuniones del CCT, o de manera consecutiva con otras reuniones relevantes, reduciendo el impacto de los costes de participación sobre los procesos de revisión.

### Anexo: Comentarios adicionales los documentos Non Paper 1 y 2

Los Non paper 1 y 2 hacen referencia a la Degradación Neutral, lo cual deja algunas interrogantes dado que es un concepto que sigue estudiándose en el seno del grupo intergubernamental de trabajo y no está consensuado a qué se refiere específicamente y aún no se ha optado en el concepto dentro del marco de la Convención de Lucha contra la desertificación, degradación y sequía.

El rol de cada país es reportar los avances sobre la temática de acuerdo a los objetivos operacionales de la estrategia decenal por tanto, se deberán hacer los esfuerzos del caso para contar con los procedimientos y un marco de

financiamiento para cumplir con el proceso de reporte y medición los indicadores para verificar la implementación de la Convención en el CRIC y no de informantes globales.

Todavía existe un trabajo a ser realizado por los países Partes afectados que contribuyan a la reducción de la degradación, desertificación y sequía, de acuerdo a los objetivos operacionales, en ese sentido un llamado a la Convención a buscar los mecanismos de financiamiento para el cumplimiento de estos fines. En este sentido, vemos que la justificación para el cambio estructural de la convención no es lo suficientemente robusto.

Las reuniones regionales que se plantean en estos documentos deben ser financiadas por las partes de la Convención así como del presupuesto general de la Secretaria. Este presupuesto debe incluirse para el desempeño de los mecanismos regionales de coordinación de la Estrategia Decenal.

En el párrafo 20<sup>a</sup> del Non Paper 2, hace referencia a una revisión sustancial más que en los procesos institucionales. Este párrafo da lugar a varias interpretaciones y consideraciones por lo que existe preocupación sobre el contexto y alcance.

[English]

*Para. II.A.6*

*As for the use of indicators and / or common frameworks for monitoring and evaluation, the Rio conventions and financial mechanisms such as GEF would be better able to evaluate and compare the effectiveness of policies and land management practices in compliance their common goals*

*Regarding the use of common indicators and/or follow up and evaluation marks, the Rio Conventions and their financial mechanisms such as the FMAM would be in a better position to evaluate and compare the effectiveness of land use policies and practices with regard to their compliance with common objectives*

*Para. II.B. 16*

*in order to establish a process that truly raises awareness, delegates from private and multinational companies should participate in STC and CRIC sessions.*

*Para. II.B. 17*

*It is important to stress that the GM increase its efforts to allow build national capacity to access funding to combat climate change and increase knowledge about adaptation measures based on ecosystems and lands, is to say to assist States Parties involved in the development of projects to improve the productivity of land resources and at the same time provide secondary benefits in mitigation.*

*It is important to insist that the Global Mechanism intensifies its efforts to promote the national capacity to access financing against climate change and increase awareness on ecosystem and land based means to adapt, that is, to help the Member Countries involved in the implementation of the projects, to improve the productivity of land resources and thus provide secondary mitigation benefits.*

*Para III.19 (b)*

*The Sustainable Development Goals (ODS) and the agenda for development after 2015 can help promote the adoption of measures based on the land issues. Refer to the sustainable management of land resources, the common strategic objectives of the Rio Conventions (CC, CBD, UNCCD) offer a unique opportunity to promote synergies, increase efficiency and avoid duplication in national processes implementation and reporting.*

*The Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) and the development agenda for after 2015 may help to encourage the adoption of land based measures. With regard to the sustainable use of land resources, the common strategic goals of*

*the Rio Conventions (CC, CBD, UNCCD) offer a unique opportunity to promote synergies, increase efficiency, and avoid the duplication of national implementation and reporting processes.*

*Para. III.19 (c)*

*Obviously, this compliance should be accompanied by a series of processes to strengthen and facilitate financial resource capacities*

*Footnote 24*

*It is important to stress that the GM increase its efforts to allow build national capacity to access funding to combat climate change and increase knowledge about adaptation measures based on ecosystems and lands, is to sayis to assist States Parties involved in the development of projects to improve the productivity of land resources and at the same time provide secondary benefits in mitigation.*

*It is important to insist that the Global Mechanism intensifies its efforts to promote the national capacity to access financing against climate change and increase awareness on ecosystem and land based means to adapt, that is, to help the Member Countries involved in the implementation of the projects, to improve the productivity of land resources and thus provide secondary mitigation benefits.*

*Para B. 23 (b)*

*The CRIC meetings should take place back to back CST ones or convene joint meetings or back to back with other relevant meetings, reducing the impact of the participation costs on the review process.*

*Annex: Additional Comments on Non Paper Documents 1 and 2*

*Non Papers 1 and 2 make reference to a Neutral Degradation, which raises some questions given that it is a concept that is still being studied by the intergovernmental workgroup and is yet to reach a consensus as to what it means specifically and is yet to be a conceptual option in the Fight Against Desertification, Degradation and Drought within the framework of the Convention.*

*Every country's role is to report on the advances on the matter with regard to the operational objectives of the 10 Year Strategy and therefore, the relevant efforts must be made to have the procedures and financing framework that is needed to comply with the reporting and indicator monitoring process that is necessary to verify the implementation of the Convention with CRIC and not from global informants.*

*According to the operational objectives, there is still work to be done for the affected Member Countries that contributes to the reduction of degradation, desertification and drought, in this sense; we call upon the Convention to find the financing mechanisms needed to achieve these goals. In that sense, we find that the justification for a structural change in the Convention is not sufficiently robust.*

*The regional meetings being proposed in these documents, as well as the general budget for the Secretariat must be financed by the Parties of the Convention. This budget must be included for the proper performance of the regional coordination mechanisms of the 10 Year Strategy.*

*In paragraph 20<sup>a</sup> of Non Paper 2, more reference is made to a substantial review than to institutional processes. This paragraph is given to several interpretations and considerations, which raises concerns regarding its context and scope.*

## **European Union**

The EU and its Member States welcome the UNCCD Secretariat's intention to rationalize the review process and reporting obligations trying to make it more cost-efficient. However some points would need to be clarified.

We can share most of the analysis of the Executive Secretariat on the technical and financial difficulties for the reporting and the review of the implementation of the Convention. The effects of the adoption of SDGs on UNCCD reporting obligation should be further and more precisely explored.

We welcome efforts made to increase efficiency of the conventions processes including the CRIC. The Secretariat should further explore the effects of changing the frequency of CRIC sessions on the mandate of the CRIC. CRIC would certainly gain in efficiency if it focused on its core mandate.

CRIC has an important role in the preparation of the COP. In this regard a condensed format of the CRIC (less participants, less time) which would however deliver valuable deliberations to the subsequent COP is certainly an option which in the view of the EU should be considered with much interest.

The EU would like to share a number of additional comments:

#### **Comments concerning CRIC and reporting period**

- CRIC should be focused on the convention implementation review against agreed objectives/targets
- CRIC should give impetus and inspiration to COP, enrich the discussion and negotiation during the COP
- Inter-sessional CRIC should be aligned with national report + scientific analyses (like the proposed World Outlook on Land Degradation and Management (WOLDM)) – in order to have more solid substance for strategic decisions
- The Post-2015 sustainable development framework (related to desertification and land degradation) could “give a helping hand”
- If a 4 year rhythm of CRIC is adopted and affected country parties report against a LDN target, than the format of the CRIC must allow enough “room” for exchange of experience in implementation of LDN.
- In this logic (reporting every 4 years, scientific report every 4 years) a well prepared inter-sessional CRIC every 4 years seems reasonable. A 4-year process and reporting period in order to give more time and space to discussions and lessons learnt on LDN and its targets (in affected countries) should therefore be considered.

Saying so we see a task for UNCCD secretariat: the above mentioned issues must be well communicated to find support – define the (strategic and technical) vision of the system in a positive, constructive way (reporting, WOLDM, CRIC etc.).

A condensed format organization of the CRIC with a CST-introduction and backstopped by regularly and formally transmitted SPI-input seems an adequate approach. CRIC-discussions are the input for the preparations and the agenda of the COP where discussions and negotiations take place and decisions are taken. An adapted and agreed full-functioning science-to-policy-framework will need to be engineered

The non-paper envisions regional governance based on the regular meetings of Regional Implementation Annexes. One issue in this regard is that for the non-annex countries the CRIC and CST Bureaus are the only forum to raise issues through their appointed Bureau members. There is also a concern that if no host country can be easily identified in some regions due to financial constraints that these meetings cannot be organized through the proposed way.

Continuous reporting is essential to assess the implementation of the Convention. However the number and quality of reports submitted significantly depend on the financial support provided by GEF which is following the 4 years frequency of the replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund.

With regards to the 2016 reporting, there is a concern that parties will be faced with the same problem as in the previous years, with new templates made available without the necessary time for Parties to collect data and compile their reports. The periodic adjustment of the reporting obligation still remains a limiting factor.

Finally, whilst appreciating the direction the Secretariat would like to move Parties should consider that the 10 Year Strategy of the Convention is still in place until 2018 and the process of adopting SDGs is ongoing, therefore the timing of the proposed changes should be carefully considered.

- The introduction, full analysis, interpretation, recommendations and communication-system(s) of the PRAIS-reports should be in relation with the CRIC and COP-deadline. Respect of time-deadline is therefore crucial ;

- The fact that many actual operational objectives have already been achieved is not an issue as such but it stresses the need for real performance and impact indicators ;
- Harmonizing the UNCCD reporting cycle of 4 years with the 4-year replenishment cycle of the GEF - the biggest multilateral fund for the convention – would be useful in order to ensure that the results of the UNCCD reporting inform the GEF replenishment process in a timely manner.

The EU would be grateful for an answer to the following question:

A question arises in relation to the proposed stand-alone regional meetings (approx. cost +/- 453.000 USD): is it envisaged that this cost will be supported by the respective regions themselves?

### **Comments concerning improvement of the quality of the reports**

We support the cooperation with international financial reporting systems, notably, the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in order to improve the quantity and quality of financial data produced. However, as mentioned in the non-paper 2, the use of the OECD data is limited because some of the developed country parties do not report to the OECD and financial data collected include neither the national budget allocation of affected Parties, nor investments from foundations, CSOs or private sector. Moreover, considering the work in progress in OECD in order to improve the Rio markers and financial statistics on environment, considers to give the opportunities to developed country parties to validate and potentially complement financial flow allocated to the implementation of the Convention.

The Executive Secretariat might work on a methodology to ensure that financial flows take into consideration national budget allocation of affected Parties.

In order to ensure that financial data provided are comparable, harmonizing the type of activities to be included in the desertification and land degradation sector might be considered. For instance, the following items are taken into account by some countries to report to the Convention:

- Natural resources management, land management and soil conservation;
- Improving of agricultural and livestock farming systems : only the upstream part of the value chain except for projects supporting sustainable value chain with sustainable natural resources management;
- Sustainable management of agricultural water, grazing resources and ligneous resources;
- Watershed management;
- Environmental monitoring, early warning system, forecasting droughts, management of droughts and monitoring and evaluation of desertification;
- Climate change adaptation and biodiversity conservation on arid, semi-arid and dry sub humid areas;
- Diversification of the income sources in rural areas affected by desertification;
- Support to define and implement strategic plans to combat desertification, land degradation and drought;
- Improvement of local governance and support to decentralization in the sectors mentioned above, capacity building of local, national and regional stakeholders on natural resources management;

There is a need to clarify the link between the « Global Land Outlook » and the suggested new reporting procedures.

Globally, the Executive Secretariat's suggestions seem conducive to improving the efficiency of the review of the Convention implementation.

## **Ghana**

I write to submit that all recommendations are in place for both Non papers 1 and 2. However consideration should be given to the new UNCCD Focal Point in Ghana in terms of capacity building on reporting.

## Grenada

Para 22. The reporting process is probably the most important indicator of how well the convention is being implemented by the parties. Therefore a four-year reporting cycle is way too infrequent to measure such progress. In this regard, the two-year reporting cycle should be maintained. Country parties must be encouraged to make data collection for reporting purposes a routine process, which can be consolidated on an annual basis. By doing this there won't be the need for large financial resources for end of cycle reporting activities. In fact, country parties must consider the collection of data on a regular basis, as a financial and technical obligation in their fulfilment of the Convention. The Secretariat, in collaboration with the Convention's financing mechanisms must continue to find ways to strengthen the reporting capacities of Parties. If resources are available the Secretariat through the GEF can provide a nominal amount to country parties to compile the routinely collected data, and populate and submit the report.

Grenada believes that convening the CRIC intersessional sessions ever four years, may signal the end of this important subsidiary body. Being the main body that review the implementation of the Convention, this time laps in intersession sessions can seriously affect its implementation. If the COP continues to meet every two years and the CRIC intersessionals are every four years, then two COP sessions will be held before another intersessional CRIC. This somewhat contradicts the very meaning of intersessional CRICs. Grenada wishes to propose the following:

1. The CRIC should continue to meet ever year. One session in the year before the COP, strictly to review progress in the implementation of the Convention and the other in the year of the COP (not joint sessions with the COP). The Session in the year of the COP should be held no more than three months before the COP. At this Session, the focus should be on finalizing proposals from Parties that will be decided at the COP.
2. All CST sessions should be held annually and jointly with the CRIC. At the joint CRIC and CST Sessions, the participation of both the STC and the Focal Points (FP) should be funded. Given the close working relations that needs to exist between the STC and FP, the Convention should encourage the presence of both at all major meetings. In fact, this would erase the feelings of lack of influence on the part of Parties which lacks the financial resources to fund additional delegate.
3. The COP should be a standalone session, (not held jointly with either the CRIC or the CST sessions). The COP session should not exceed one week and should focus on its intended task of "decision making."
4. Where practical regional annual stand-alone meetings should be encouraged and supported.

## Guatemala

[Original: Spanish]

Estamos de acuerdo en la importancia de obtener indicadores y datos sólidos en materia de degradación de tierras, pero no estamos de acuerdo con el comentario de que la convención no puede confiar en una referencia de base ni en indicadores de tendencia en materia de degradación de la tierra basados en datos sólido provenientes de los países afectados.

En función a lo anterior en el párrafo 11.a hace mención de adoptar un marco de monitorio y evaluación para los objetivos estratégicos de la estrategia, por tal motivo solicitamos a la Secretaría aclarar cuáles serán los procedimientos para adoptar el monitoreo y evaluación, debido a que deben ser viables para todos los países parte.

En la mayoría de las regiones en desarrollo es complicado llevar a cabo la sugerencia del párrafo 11.b que se refiere a Invitar a los países afectado a establecer objetivos nacionales voluntarios en sus políticas nacionales y planificar mecanismos y procesos de monitoreo para alcanzar tales objetivos haciendo uso de indicadores de progreso.

En el párrafo 18. expone que las reuniones del CRIC celebradas entre períodos de sesiones disminuye cada año; se sugiere a la Secretaría que indique cuál es el objetivo de éste párrafo.

El párrafo 19.c hace mención a, las cada vez más reconocida conexiones entre la tierra y los asuntos asociados a ella así como otros acuerdos multilaterales sobre medio ambiente. En ese sentido es importante tomar en cuenta que si la Secretaría busca sinergias con otras convenciones es importante darle mayores oportunidades, recursos financieros y humanos a la Convención de Lucha contra la Desertificación, para que ésta no se diluya y tienda a desaparecer.

En mención al párrafo 21.c la Secretaría indica que compilará la información proveniente de “recursos globales acreditados para la elaboración de un conjunto básico de indicadores de progreso”, en virtud a lo anterior le solicitamos a la Secretaría que explique o defina a que se refiere con eso y cuáles son.

En el párrafo 22. describe la emisión de informes de los países partes afectados cada cuatro años, es importante tomar en cuenta antes de sugerir la periodicidad de los informes el periodo de gobierno de cada país parte, debido a que algunos son de 4 años y al término éstos generalmente se hace una reestructuración de gobierno; además otros factores que se deben tomar en cuenta son las metas, objetivos y compromisos de país.

Manifestamos nuestra preocupación sobre lo expuesto en el párrafo 21.a el cual indica que las reuniones sobre los Anexos de Aplicación Regional se realizarán con el apoyo financiero de un país anfitrión de la región; si bien se puede asumir parte de los costos consideramos que es muy difícil tener la capacidad para financiar la totalidad de los gastos que implicarían realizar las reuniones.

Finalmente reconocemos y agradecemos el esfuerzo que la Secretaría realiza para la Convención de Lucha contra la Desertificación articulando todos los esfuerzos que cada uno de los países partes realizan en la búsqueda de soluciones y alternativas, teniendo como objetivo priorizado la luchar contra la degradación de tierras, la desertificación y la sequía que nuestras regiones sufren.

[English]

*We agree on the importance of obtaining solid land degradation indicators and data, but not with the comment that the Convention cannot rely on a base reference or on land degradation trend indicators based on solid data that was provided by the affected countries.*

*Pursuant to the above, paragraph 11.a mentions the adoption of a monitoring and evaluation framework for the strategic objectives of the Strategy, therefore we ask that the Secretariat clarifies what procedures will be followed to adopt said monitoring and evaluation framework, since these must be viable for all Member Countries.*

*For most of the developing regions, it would be complicated to carry out the suggestions under paragraph 11.b, in reference to inviting the affected countries to establish voluntary national objectives for their national policies and plan monitoring mechanisms and procedures to reach said objectives while using the progress indicators.*

*Paragraph 18 poses that CRIC meetings held between session periods have diminished every year; we suggest that the Secretariat states what the purpose of this paragraph is.*

*Paragraph 19.c mentions the progressively more widely acknowledged connections between land and the issues related to them, as well as other multilateral environmental agreements. In this sense it is important to take into account that if the Secretariat is hoping for synergy with other conventions, it becomes important to grant greater financing and human resource opportunities to the Convention for the Fight against Desertification, so that it may not become diluted and thus tend to disappear.*

*In reference to paragraph 21.c, the Secretariat states that it will compile the information provided from “accredited global sources to prepare a basic set of progress indicators,” in virtue of the foregoing we request that the Secretariat explains or defines what it means by that and who they are.*

*Paragraph 22 describes the affected countries issuing reports every four years, it is important to take into account the government terms in office for each Member Country before suggesting any periodicity for the reports, since some of them have 4 year terms and governments are generally restructured at the end of these terms; other factors that must also be taken into account are the goals, objectives and commitments of those countries.*



*We are concerned about the contents of paragraph 21.a which states that meetings regarding the Annexes on Regional Implementation shall be financially supported by a host nation within the region; although part of the costs may be assumed, we feel it would be very difficult to finance all of the expenses that said meetings would imply.*

*Finally we acknowledge and appreciate the effort that the Secretariat is making in favor of the Convention for the Fight against Desertification by stating all of the efforts that each of the Member Countries is making to find solutions and alternatives, in keeping the fight against land degradation, desertification and drought that our regions are enduring as the first priority.*

## Guyana

Page No.	Statement in CRP 2	Comment
6 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“14. The frequency of the sessions of the CRIC follows the frequency of the reporting exercise, and the CRIC is currently convened every two years to review reports on performance, and every four years – jointly with the Committee on Science and Technology (CST)<sup>17</sup> – to review reports on performance and progress indicators, in addition to the sessions convened during sessions of the COP.”</li> </ul>	CRIC would only be able to provide a review of the 4 year period of reporting and implementation of the Convention.
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“(a) Meetings of the Regional Implementation Annexes would be organized as stand-alone meetings, to be convened in the regions with the logistical and financial support of a host country from the region, including for the cost of participation of entitled countries;”</li> <li>“(b) Convening the intersessional sessions of the CRIC back-to-back with other relevant meetings, reducing the impact of the participation costs on the review process.”</li> </ul>	<p>Is there a plan if there is no host country? CRIC13 was expected to have been convened by a Host country but this has not occurred. A plan was in place which ensured that CRIC13 was hosted in Germany and financial support was provided by UNCCD.</p> <p>Some country parties in the Caribbean and Latin America may have financial and economic difficulties so being a host country is very challenging.</p> <p>It is recommended that there should be a plan in case the Regional Meetings do not receive the required logistical and financial support.</p>

## Iran

- As you are well informed all key decisions and major changes in trends and procedures of the Convention must be approved by the COP which serves as the main decision-making body.
- With regard to the paragraph21:
  - a) It seems that as it was reported officially during the recent CRIC13 by the secretariat, many operational objectives may be just partly achieved even beyond 2018. In addition, at the moment, just 32 countries have claimed to have a land degradation M&E system. Then, it is suggested to keep the recent mechanism of monitoring of performance indicators still running. Clearly, expecting the reports to reveal land degradation status in the fields, needs further capacity

building and providing knowledge as well as technic-sharing facilities for ACPs through to the secretariat. Also, setting up field indicators will be essential.

b) The source of information provided by these accredited sources is questioned by my delegation. Getting the preliminary information from the ACPs based on the current procedure is recommended; however while reviewing the reliability and accuracy of data, using the other sources of information by CRIC bureau is applicable.

c) The reports can alternatively include implementation of the NAPs but the review will be difficult for CRIC.

d) In the case that these data has not been provided by focal institutes of UNCCD in ACPs, it would be most likely that contradictions could happen and it surely will affect the review process of the reports making it confusing and challenging.

With regard to paragraph 22, it is suggested to have at least two reporting processes for reported alternatively every 2 years.

23- a) It is requested to mention the recently added tasks of CRIC to provide more clarification to clarify

b) Given that CST must feed CRIC meetings, having an interval between CST and CRIC meetings is recommended.

c) The timetable of any event will definitely be in compliance with the proposed agenda.

24- Provided that regional annexes meetings should be funded by donor ACPs, there might be considerable decrease in regional consultation meetings, so and concluding in CRIC and COP will get more difficult. Furthermore, bearing in mind that regional/sub-regional ACPs have generally similar socio-economic and climatic conditions, annex meetings should be considered as a platform to facilitate coordination, consultation, knowledge sharing and cooperation leverage and as a result, it is strongly recommended that the Secretariat should keep on its continued support this forum.

25- We would like to express its voluntarily preparedness for any involvement in developing the needed tools to increase efficiency of reporting process.

## Japan

About the joint meeting (Para 24-b)

Cost-effectiveness should be taken into account in considering additional officer.

## Kyrgyzstan

[Original: Russian]

Внимательно изучив документы по реформированию КРОК, поддерживаю рекомендаций по улучшению оценки выполнения Конвенции, описанные в разделе III «Обоснование и опции для изменений». К примеру, в п. 20а «фокусировать отчетность на содержание/сути, нежели на институциональные процессы, и изменить соответственным образом периодичность отчетности», п. 21 «отчетность по индикаторам выполнения (performance indicators) будет прекращена». Фокусирование на содержательной части лучше отражает качество осуществления Конвенции, а институциональные процессы – это больше форма, внешняя статика процесса. Можно создать какие-либо институты, НПА, которые не обязательно приведут к результативности работы по противодействию опустыниванию.

Обоснованы рекомендации в части восстановления первоначального мандата КРОК и интеграции научного совета в политические материалы, обеспечения регионального управления и продолжения процесса в период, когда КРОК и КНТ не проводят совместные межсессионные встречи, также, посредством проведения самостоятельных региональных встреч, принятия любых других мер для повышения эффективности процедуры и механизмом Конвенции, которые сократят формальные встречи и тем самым сокращая расходы на процесс обзора.

С уважением, Рысбек Апасов, фокал поинт КБО-Кыргызстан.

*After having carefully studied non-paper 2, i support the recommendations on the improvement of review of implementation of the convention descried in the Section III Rational and options for change. In particular, para 20 (a) to focus the review on substance rather than on institutional processes and adjusting the reporting and review process accordingly; para 21 (a) reporting against performance indicators would be discontinued. Focus on substantive matter better reflects the impact of implementation of the convention whereas institutional processes represent rather external elements of the process. Creating new institutions, CSOs and integration of scientific advise do not necessarily led to the better outcomes of the anti-desertification activities.*

*I also find justified the recommendations to restore the original mandate of CRIC and integration of scientific advise in CRIC deliberations, ensuring continuity and regional governance, including the organization of stand-alone meetings and adopting any other possible measures to increase efficiency of procedures of the convention which allows optimizing the formalities and resources spend for review process.*

## Malaysia

Document No.:	Non-Paper 2
Document Title:	Additional procedures or institutional mechanisms to assist the Conference of the Parties in regularly reviewing the implementation of the Convention
Section:	
22 In accordance with paragraph 21 above, affected country Parties, and other reporting entities as relevant, would be requested to report every four years; the CRIC would review this information with the same frequency, convening its intersessional sessions every four years.	
Comments:	
Malaysia agrees and supports the changes made by UNCCD for the reporting exercise to be conducted by country Parties every four years starting 2016. We take note that the current reporting cycle period of every two years are facing technical and financial constraints. With respect to this, Malaysia welcomes the GEF allocations under the enabling activities funding provided every four years to assist country Parties in carrying out their reporting exercise.	

Document No.:	Non-Paper 2
Document Title:	Additional procedures or institutional mechanisms to assist the Conference of the Parties in regularly reviewing the implementation of the Convention
Section:	
23 (a) The provisional agenda and programme of work of the CRIC at intersessional sessions would focus on the review of the implementation of the Convention, discarding other matters that have recently been added to its original mandate; (b) The CRIC would convene its intersessional sessions jointly with, or subsequent to, sessions of the CST, which in turn would advise the CRIC on how best to review progress towards achieving strategic objectives and/or targets and ensure that the CRIC relies on solid, scientifically sound data; (c) CRIC sessions held between ordinary sessions of the COP (intersessional sessions) and held in conjunction	

with the sessions of the CST would last one week, including the duration of the session of the CST; (d) The provisional agenda of sessions of the CRIC held during sessions of the COP would remain as it currently stands, and focus mainly on the translation of policy recommendations into actionable decisions by the COP.
Comments:
Malaysia acknowledges and supports the UNCCD's effort in making CRIC more relevant in its role of reviewing the implementation of the Convention, to focus more on substance matters rather than institutional issues. Apart from that, Malaysia welcomes the CRIC and CST intersessional sessions to be held concurrently as this will make the review process more effective by taking into consideration the advice from scientific bodies or experts in deliberating the policy matters.

Document No.:	Non-Paper 2
Document Title:	Additional procedures or institutional mechanisms to assist the Conference of the Parties in regularly reviewing the implementation of the Convention
Section:	
	24 (a) Meetings of the Regional Implementation Annexes would be organized as stand-alone meetings, to be convened in the regions with the logistical and financial support of a host country from the region, including for the cost of participation of entitled countries.
Comments:	
	Malaysia has no objection on the measure taken by UNCCD for the meetings of Regional Implementation Annexes to be convened in the regions hosted by a country from the region. Meanwhile, Malaysia is more concerned on financial commitment that needs to be borne by the host country in organizing the regional meeting.

## Mexico

[Original: Spanish]

Reconocemos el valor de la creación y adopción del Sistema para el Examen del Desempeño y la Evaluación de la Aplicación de la Convención (PRAIS), el cual permitió pasar de la presentación de informes bajo un modelo principalmente cualitativo a uno de tipo cuantitativo basado en indicadores, a la vez que también permitió facilitar el proceso de integración y presentación de informes nacionales, el cual, conjuntamente con la implementación de un proceso de aseguramiento de la calidad de la información presentada, ha permitido evaluar, de mejor forma, los progresos de la implementación de la Convención y el avance hacia el cumplimiento de las metas establecidas en el Marco y Plan Estratégico Decenal.

Tomamos nota del análisis y conclusiones de la Secretaría sobre los procesos de presentación y revisión de informes conducidos a la fecha, con especial referencia a la identificación de las deficiencias que aun presenta este proceso (limitados resultados de evaluación de impactos y ausencia de líneas de base o referencia y/o de tendencias sobre la degradación, principalmente) y algunas de las causas que han limitado su eficiencia (insuficientes recursos humanos y financieros, ajustes periódicos de los indicadores, diferencia entre los ciclos de reporte y los de asignación de recursos del GEF para asistencia en este asunto, etc.).

Asimismo, se toma debida nota de las razones que han disminuido la eficacia de la labor del CRIC (entre otras, las dificultades financieras para organizar las reuniones intersesionales de este órgano subsidiario y de los anexos regionales, la encomienda de atención de temas emergentes - como el caso de la gobernanza del Mecanismo Mundial- y la falta de coordinación con el Comité de Ciencia y Tecnología que limito la efectividad de la revisión sobre indicadores de impacto progreso). Específicamente con respecto a las propuestas para incrementar la efectividad de la labor del CRIC, se expresa lo siguiente:

- a) **Focalizar el proceso de revisión en 10 substancial.** Coincidimos en la importancia de dirigir el proceso para la formulación y evaluación de reportes que conduzcan a una medición de la efectividad de los progresos e impacto de la implementación de la Convención sobre la base de indicadores sólidos e información confiable. En este sentido, se solicita a la Secretaría que defina cuales son "recursos globales acreditados para la elaboración de un conjunto básico de indicadores de progreso", a las que se refiere el párrafo 21.b del documento, y que se propone utilizar para la compilación de información. Por otra parte, se considera de la mayor importancia estar atentos a los resultados del proceso de negociación de los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible, sus metas e indicadores, a fin de complementar los esfuerzos de reporte y evaluación, en la medida de lo posible. Sobre la propuesta para que la Secretaría compile "información proveniente de recursos globales acreditados para la elaboración de un conjunto básico de indicadores de progreso, para ser posteriormente validado y completado por las Partes", se considera que la Secretaría está tomando atribuciones que no lo han sido conferidas por la Conferencia de las Partes y que el procedimiento propuesto debe analizarse con detenimiento en el marco de la COP, el CRIC y el CST, según corresponda.

Sobre la periodicidad de los reportes, antes de tomar una decisión al respecto, es conveniente que se analice la naturaleza de los objetivos, metas e indicadores que, en su caso se adopten como parte de la agenda de desarrollo post-2015, así como de los medios/procedimientos necesarios para la verificación de sus progresos, tomando en consideración no incrementar innecesariamente la carga de trabajo de las Partes.

- b) **Incrementar la relevancia del proceso de revisión.** En términos generales, estamos de acuerdo con las propuestas preliminares para reestructurar el proceso de revisión centrando los esfuerzos en la aplicación de la Convención, establecer una mejor programación de reuniones interregionales del CCT y el CRIC y definir con mayor claridad el propósito general de las reuniones interregionales y de las que se realicen conjuntamente con la COP.
- c) **Asegurar la continuidad y gobernanza regional.** Se da la bienvenida al reconocimiento de la importante labor que desempeñan los Anexos Regionales en el proceso de examen y evaluación de la Convención, así como a la propuesta para que tales anexos se reúnan en periodos intersesiones. Se considera que el fortalecimiento de la participación regional permitirá hacer un examen más detallado y exhaustivo, a la vez que hará más eficiente el debate y evaluación de los asuntos propuestos durante las sesiones del CRIC y CST, optimizando tiempos y recursos, siempre y cuando las reuniones de los anexos regionales se realicen previo a las sesiones intersesiones del CRIC y del CST y se cuente oportunamente con los insumos para su análisis correspondiente.

Manifestamos nuestra preocupación sobre la propuesta para que las reuniones de los Anexos Regionales se realicen con el apoyo financiero del país organizador; si bien, estos podría asumir parte de los costos relacionados (por ejemplo la renta del lugar sede, servicio de cafetería, interpretación, etc.), se considera que pocas veces estarían en capacidad de sufragar los costos de participación (transporte y viáticos) de los delegados nacionales convocados. Asimismo, manifestamos nuestra preocupación sobre la omisión al mencionar el rol y obligaciones de la Secretaría y la Unidad de Coordinación Regional, en la organización de las reuniones de los Anexos Regionales.

Finalmente, manifestamos nuestro acuerdo para que se realicen conjuntamente las reuniones conjuntas de los buros del CRIC y CCT, recomendándose que también se realicen en forma conjunta con reuniones del Buro de la COP cuando así se considere relevante.

- d) **Adoptar cualquier otra posible medida para mejorar la eficiencia.** Las propuestas pueden ser numerosas, por lo que es necesario realizar un análisis que permita evaluar su potencial impacto, para lo cual se exhorta a la Secretaría a determinar criterios para valorar tales propuestas.

En general, se considera que este documento es un insumo relevante para iniciar el análisis y debate y que, como tal, las propuestas mencionadas deben ser consideradas como preliminares en el marco del proceso para la mejora de la revisión de la implementación de la Convención.

*We acknowledge the value of creating and adopting the Performance Review and Assessment of Implementation System (PRAIS), which allowed the transition from a mainly qualitative model for reports presentations to a quantitative one based on indicators, which also facilitates the national report preparation and presentation process which, together with the implementation of a quality assurance process for the information being presented, has enabled a better evaluation of the progress in the implementation of the Convention and the advances towards the fulfillment of the goals established within the framework of the 10 Year Strategy.*

*We make reference to the analysis and conclusions by the Secretariat regarding the report presentation and review processes that have taken place so far, with special emphasis on the identification of the deficiencies in the process that still persist (limited impact evaluation results and the absence of a baseline or reference and/or of degradation trends, mainly) and of some of the causes that have limited its efficiency (insufficient human and financial resources, periodic indicator adjustments, differences between reporting cycles and the assignment of GEF resources to assist in this matter, etc.).*

*Likewise, the reasons that have diminished the effectiveness of the work done by CRIC are duly noted, such as the financial difficulties of organizing meetings between the session of this subsidiary body, and for the regional annexes; the need to attend emergent issues—such as the governance of the Global Mechanism—and the lack of coordination with the Science and Technology Committee that limited the effectiveness of the impact and progress indicator review, among others. Specifically with respect to the proposal to increase the effectiveness of the work done by CRIC, we offer the following comments:*

- a) ***Focus the review process on substantial matters.*** *We agree with the importance of steering the report preparation and evaluation process towards measuring the effectiveness of the progress and impacts of the implementation of the Convention based on solid indicators and reliable information. In this sense, we request that the Secretariat defines what are the "accredited global sources to prepare a basic set of progress indicators," that they refer to in paragraph 21.b of the document, and how they propose to compile the information. On the other hand, we feel it is of the highest importance to carefully monitor the results of the process of negotiation for the Sustainable Development Goals, their targets and indicators, in order to complement the report and evaluation efforts as much as possible. Regarding the proposal for the Secretariat to compile the "information provided by accredited global sources to prepare a basic set of progress indicators, for subsequent validation and completion by the Parties," we feel that the Secretariat is assuming powers that the Conference of the Parties has not conferred, and that the proposed procedure must be carefully analyzed within the COP, CRIC and STC framework, accordingly.*

*Regarding the periodicity of reports, before deciding in that respect, it would be useful to analyze the nature of the objectives, goals and indicators that would be adopted in said case as part of the post 2015 development agenda, as well as the means/procedures needed to verify their progress, while considering that the workload for the Parties should not be increased unnecessarily.*

- a) ***Increasing the Relevance of the Review Process.*** *We generally agree with the preliminary proposals to restructure the review process to concentrate efforts into the implementation of the Convention, establish better scheduling for interregional CTC and CRIC meetings, and more clearly define the general purpose of the interregional meetings and those that take place together with the COP.*
- b) ***Ensure Regional Continuity and Governance.*** *We welcome the acknowledgement of the important work being done by the Regional Annexes in the review and evaluation process of the Convention, as well as the proposal that said annexes should meet between sessions. We feel that the strengthening of regional participation will allow for a more detailed and exhaustive review while making the debate and evaluation of the issues proposed during the CRIC and STC sessions more efficient by optimizing timeframes and resources, provided that the meeting of the regional annexes are held prior to the CRIC and STC intersession meetings and the funding for their corresponding analysis is made available in timely manner.*

*We would like to express our concern regarding the proposal that the organizing country should finance the Regional Annex meetings; although these may be able to assume part of the related costs (for example the rental*

*expense for meeting headquarters, cafeteria services, interpreters, etc.), we feel that they would seldom have the capacity to undertake the costs associated with the invited national delegates' participation (transportation and travel expenses). Also a matter for concern is the omission of the role and obligations that the Secretariat and the Regional Coordination Unit shall play in organizing the Regional Annex meetings.*

*Finally, we agree that these be held together with the joint meetings of the CRIC and CTC bureaus, and the recommendation that they also be held together with the COP Bureau meetings when relevant.*

- c) ***To adopt any other possible measure to improve effectiveness.*** *Proposals may be numerous; therefore it is necessary to make an analysis that allows us to evaluate their potential impacts and therefore we urge the Secretariat to determine the criteria that will evaluate said proposals.*

*In general terms, we feel that this document is a relevant contribution as a starting point for the process of analysis and debate and as such, the aforementioned proposals must be considered as preliminary steps within the framework of the process to improve the reviews of the implementation of the Convention.*

## **Oman**

The Sultanate of Oman has no views and comments with regard to CRIC 13 deliberations with regard to Non Paper 2

## **Panama**

[Original: Spanish]

### **II. Ventajas y limitaciones de los actuales mecanismos de formulación y revisión de informes**

#### **A. Formulación de informes.**

Sugerimos que en el punto número 10 se revise el texto “En realidad, tras 20 años de aplicación de la Convención, las Partes todavía no cuentan con una referencia de base ni con una indicación de las tendencias en materia de degradación de la tierra basadas en información presentada por países afectados”, ya que esta aseveración, va en contra del progreso de aplicación de la Convención.

#### **B. El proceso de revisión.**

En el numeral 18: Es función de la secretaría velar por el cumplimiento de las funciones del CRIC y gestionar los fondos necesarios para la optimización de las reuniones del CRIC.

### **III. Justificación y opciones para el cambio**

Dentro del numeral 19:

Mencionar cuales opciones se sugieren para incrementar la eficiencia de los procesos y mecanismos institucionales

#### **C. Asegurar la continuidad y la gobernanza regional (eliminar texto propuesto)**

Se debe proceder con las reuniones regionales tal y como han sido establecidas por la COP. Previamente a la COP y previo a la CRIC.

## **II. Advantages and limitations of the current report preparation and review mechanisms**

### **A. Report Presentations.**

*In point number 10 we suggest a revision of the text “The truth is, that after 20 years of implementing the Convention, the Parties still don’t have a baseline reference nor any indication of land degradation trends based on the information submitted by the affected countries,” given that this statement, is counter to the progress of implementing the Convention.*

### **B. The Review Process.**

*In number 18: It is the function of the Secretariat to oversee compliance with CRIC functions and manage the funds that are necessary to optimize CRIC meetings.*

## **III. Reasons and Options for the Change.**

*In number 19:*

*State what are the suggested options that would increase the efficiency of institutional processes and mechanisms.*

### **C. Ensure Regional Continuity and Governance (eliminate the proponed text)**

*Regional meetings must proceed just as they were established by the COP. Before the COP and before CRIC.*

## **Paraguay**

[Original: Spanish]

Este documento sugiere cambios en los procedimientos existentes y los mecanismos institucionales, refleja la opinión de la Secretaría sobre el funcionamiento de las instituciones de la CLD y la aplicación de la Convención.

Queda claro para Paraguay que se debe seguir utilizando la información proporcionada por los países miembros en su sistema de información y seguimiento, como se viene haciendo con el PRAIS. Los sistemas de seguimiento y de información deben permanecer en el marco de la Convención y de sus instituciones. Los indicadores de desempeño o de progreso deben ser establecidos por los Estados miembros y no por fuentes externas.

Las negociaciones llevadas adelante por otras Convenciones como la negociación de los objetivos de desarrollo post-2015; no afecta al Tratado de la CLD ya que como bien se sabe su principal objetivo es: "luchar contra la desertificación y mitigar los efectos de la sequía en los países afectados por sequía grave y / o desertificación, en particular en África, a través de una acción eficaz a todos los niveles, apoyadas por acuerdos de cooperación y asociación internacionales, en el marco de un enfoque integrado que es acorde con el Programa 21, con el fin de contribuir al logro del desarrollo sostenible en las zonas afectadas".

Aunque Paraguay es consiente y celebra la coordinación de esfuerzos con otros procesos multilaterales, recuerda que es tarea de la CLD tener como prioridad superar el déficit de aplicación de su mandato original.

El CRIC es y debe seguir siendo el cuerpo principal, que analiza la aplicación de la Convención. El trabajo del CRIC, así como de otras instituciones de la CLD y de las Partes debe centrarse en las cuestiones relativas a la presentación de informes y más en la implementación de prácticas de manejo sostenible de la tierra, la transferencia de tecnología, y en las iniciativas de tierra que tienen efectos concretos en la vida de las personas, las familias y las comunidades afectadas por la desertificación, la degradación de las tierras y la sequía.



**La convocatoria de las reuniones del CRIC cada cuatro años debilitaría considerablemente el Comité y afectará su capacidad para llevar a cabo su mandato. Aunque la organización de reuniones regionales independientes puede llegar a ser una propuesta rentable, Paraguay manifiesta que estas reuniones regionales no deben organizarse a expensas del CRIC.**

Coincidiendo plenamente con otras delegaciones, Paraguay manifiesta que una de las principales causas del déficit en la aplicación de la Convención es la falta de compromiso financiero por las Partes que son países desarrollados. Como se indica en el "Examen de apoyo financiero para la aplicación de la Convención" (párrafos 31 a 35 en el documento ICCD / CRIC (13) /7/Rev.1), para el bienio 2012-2013, organismos de las Naciones Unidas y las organizaciones intergubernamentales informaron un compromiso nominal de USD 5,1 mil millones, los países Partes desarrollados reportó contribuciones de USD 5,6 mil millones y los países Partes afectados contribuyeron USD 123 mil millones a las actividades relacionadas con la aplicación de la Convención. En otras palabras, a pesar de tener niveles significativamente más altos de capacidad financiera, la contribución asciende a menos del 5% de los recursos invertidos en comparación con los Países Partes Afectados.

Es eminentemente necesario que los países Partes desarrollados lleven a cabo sus obligaciones en virtud al tratado, de conformidad con el artículo 6 (b) de la Convención: "proporcionar sustancial recursos financieros y otras formas de apoyo para ayudar a los países Partes afectados, en particular los de África en desarrollo, de manera efectiva para desarrollar e implementar sus propios planes a largo plazo y las estrategias de lucha contra la desertificación y mitigar los efectos de la sequía ".

No debe haber un aumento en las obligaciones de las Partes afectadas mediante la creación de nuevos objetivos, perteneciente a la presentación de informes, sin los correspondientes fondos adicionales que los países desarrollados y las fuentes multilaterales deben proporcionar.

[English]

*This document suggests changes to existing procedures and institutional mechanisms, reflecting the views of the Secretariat on the functioning of the institutions of the UNCCD and the implementation of the Convention.*

*It is clear for Paraguay that the information provided by Parties shall continue to be used in the reporting and monitoring system, as it is being done with the PRAIS. Monitoring systems and information must remain within the framework of the Convention and its institutions. Performance and progress indicators should be established by Member States and not by external sources.*

*The negotiations carried out by other conventions such as negotiating objectives post-2015 development does not affect the Treaty of the UNCCD since its main objective is "to combat desertification and mitigate the effects of drought in countries experiencing serious drought and / or desertification, particularly in Africa, through effective action at all levels, supported by international cooperation agreements and association, as part of an integrated approach which is consistent with Agenda 21, with a view to contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in affected areas."*

*Although Paraguay is aware and welcomes the coordination of efforts with other multilateral processes, it should be reminded that the main task of the UNCCD is to keep its priority to overcome the lack of enforcement of its original mandate.*

*The CRIC is and should remain the main body to analyze the implementation of the Convention. The work of the CRIC, as well as other institutions of the UNCCD and Parties should focus on the issues related to reporting and the implementation of sustainable land management practices, technology transfer, and the initiatives related to land which can have concrete positive effects on the lives of individuals, families and communities affected by desertification, land degradation and drought.*

*To convene the CRIC meetings at every four years would considerably weaken the Committee and would affect its ability to carry out its mandate. Although the organization of independent regional meetings can become a profitable proposition, Paraguay states that these regional meetings should not be organized to replace the CRIC meetings.*

*Coinciding fully with other delegations, Paraguay states that one of the main causes of the deficit in the implementation of the Convention is the lack of financial commitment by developed country Parties. As it is indicated in the document "Review of financial support for the implementation of the Convention" (paragraphs 31-35 in ICCD / CRIC (13) /7/Rev.1), for 2012-2013, UN agencies UN and intergovernmental organizations reported a nominal commitment of USD 5.1 billion, the developed country Parties reported contributions of USD 5.6 billion and affected country Parties contributed with USD 123 billion for activities related to the implementation of the Convention. In other words, despite having significantly higher levels of financial capacity, the contribution of developed country Parties amounts to less than 5% of the funds invested by affected country Parties.*

*It is fundamental that developed country Parties carry out their obligations under the treaty, in accordance with Article 6 (b) of the Convention: "provide substantial financial resources and other forms of support to assist affected country Parties in particularly those in developing Africa, to effectively develop and implement their own long-term plans and strategies to combat desertification and mitigate the effects of drought".*

*There shouldn't be an increase in the obligations of the affected Parties through the establishment of new objectives related to the reporting without the respective additional funding provided by developed countries and other multilateral sources.*

## Peru

[Original: Spanish]

### **Comentario general:**

Si bien resulta positiva la evaluación sobre la efectividad de los procesos de revisión en la implementación de la Convención que se realiza en el texto, causa sorpresa ver un texto que contiene un desbalance marcado en obligaciones para los países afectados y países desarrollados. Con este texto se pretende reforzar los compromisos de los países afectados, sin contener un sólo acuerdo de cómo los países desarrollados pueden fortalecer los suyos.

### **Comentarios específicos:**

#### **Sección III**

#### **Párrafo 20, literal (a):**

*"Focalizar el ejercicio de revisión en lo substancial más que en procesos institucionales y ajustar la frecuencia del proceso de formulación y revisión de informes de manera acorde;"*

**Comentario:** Se debe definir qué cosa es "substancial", si es que los procesos institucionales no lo son.

#### **Párrafo 20, literal (c):**

*"mejorar la gobernanza regional y la continuidad del proceso en el periodo cuando el CRIC y el CCT no se reúnan entre periodos de sesiones, organizando reuniones regionales independientes;"*

**Comentario:** Se debe evaluar si reuniones regionales son eficientes en comparación a la posibilidad de realizar plataformas de intercambio de información virtuales.

#### **Párrafo 21, literal (a):**

*"a) La formulación de informes sobre indicadores de desempeño sería discontinua ya que muchos de los objetivos operacionales han sido ya alcanzados o lo serán antes de finales de 2015;"*

**Comentario:** Esto no se aplicaría al caso del Perú, que recién habría alcanzado los objetivos operacionales a nivel nacional a fines de 2016 mediante su proceso de actualización del Programa de Acción Nacional.

**Párrafo 21, literal (b):**

*“La secretaría compilará la información proveniente de recursos globales acreditados para la elaboración de un conjunto básico de indicadores de progreso, para ser posteriormente validado y completado por los países Partes afectados;”*

**Comentario:** Se debe evaluar el costo-beneficio que implicaría la elaboración y posterior validación de indicadores para los países afectados.

**Párrafo 21, literal (c):**

*“Se solicitará a los países Partes afectados que informen sobre la aplicación de programas de acción nacionales así como de la consecución de metas voluntarias de neutralidad en la degradación de las tierras o cualquier otra meta global relevante para la Convención que adopte la Asamblea General dentro de los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible;”*

**Comentarios:**

- Se requiere mayor precisión sobre el significado de “metas voluntarias de neutralidad en la degradación”.
- En la segunda parte de este párrafo, se está prejuzgando el resultado del proceso de negociación que se lleva a cabo en el marco de los ODS.
- Se sugiere que este párrafo sólo se refiera a “Se solicitará a los países Partes afectados que informen sobre la aplicación de programas de acción nacionales.” y borrar lo demás.

**Párrafo 22:**

*“De acuerdo con el párrafo 21 arriba descrito, se solicitará a los países Partes afectados, así como a otras entidades relevantes en la emisión de informes, que presenten informes cada cuatro años. El CRIC revisará esta información con la misma frecuencia, convocando sus reuniones entre períodos de sesiones cada cuatro años.”*

**Comentario:** De acuerdo con la ampliación del plazo para la emisión de informes nacionales.

**Párrafo 23, literal (a):**

*“La agenda provisional y el programa de trabajo del CRIC en las reuniones a celebrar entre períodos de sesiones se centrará en la revisión de la aplicación de la Convención, descartando otros asuntos que han sido añadidos a su mandato original;”*

**Comentario:** Se requiere precisión sobre los “asuntos que han sido añadidos” y que se pretenden descartar.

**Párrafo 24, literal (a):**

*“Las reuniones sobre los Anexos de Aplicación Regional se organizarán como reuniones por separado y serán organizadas en las regiones con el apoyo logístico y financiero de un país anfitrión de la región, incluyendo los costos de la participación de los países elegibles;”*

**Comentario:** Si bien la realización de reuniones regionales está establecida en el Artículo 7 del

Anexo III de la Convención, el Perú no acepta el compromiso de realizar reuniones regionales, sobre todo si es que ello implica que los países anfitriones deben asumir los costos logísticos y financieros.

**General Comments:**

*Although the evaluation of the effectiveness of the process of reviewing the implementation of the Convention that is stated in the text is a positive step, it is surprising to see a text that contains such a marked unbalance of obligations between affected and developed countries. This text attempts to reinforce the obligations of the affected countries, without stating a single agreement on how the developed countries can strengthen theirs.*

**Specific Comments:**

**Section III**

**Paragraph 20, Item (a):**

*“Focus the review process on substantial rather than institutional processes and adjust the frequency of the report preparation and review process accordingly;”*

**Comments:** *Provide definitions for what is “substantial”, if the institutional processes are not.*

**Paragraph 20, Item (c):**

*“improve the regional governance and continuity of the process during the period between sessions when the CRIC and the CTC are not meeting, organizing independent regional meetings;”*

**Comments:** *Regional meetings must be evaluated to see if they would be efficient when compared to the possibility of implementing virtual information exchange platforms.*

**Paragraph 21, Item (a):**

*“a) The preparation of performance indicator reports would be discontinuous since many of the operational objectives have either been reached or will be reached before the end of 2015;”*

**Comments:** *This would not apply in the case of Peru, which will have achieved its national operational objectives by the end of 2016 through the updating process of its National Action Program.*

**Paragraph 21, Item (b):**

*“The Secretariat shall compile the information provided by accredited global sources to prepare a basic set of progress indicators, for subsequent validation and completion by the affected Member Countries;”*

**Comments:** *An evaluation must be made of the cost-to-benefit ratios implied in the preparation and subsequent validation of the indicators for the affected countries.*

**Paragraph 21, Item (c):**

*“The affected Member Countries will be asked to report on the implementation of National Action Programs as well as on the continuation of voluntary land degradation neutrality goals or any other global goal that is relevant to the Convention and is adopted by the General Assembly within the Sustainable Development Goals;”*

**Comments:**

- *The meaning of “voluntary degradation neutrality goals” needs to be more precisely defined.*
- *In the second half of this paragraph, the result for the process of negotiation that takes place within the SDG framework is being judged beforehand.*
- *We suggest that this paragraph should only state that “The affected Member Countries will be asked to report on the implementation of National Action Programs.” and the rest should be deleted.*

**Paragraph 22:**

*“According to paragraph 21 as described above, the affected Member Countries, as well as other relevant entities that submit reports, shall be asked to submit their reports every four years. The CRIC shall review this information with the same frequency and call their meetings to be held between session periods every four years.”*

*Comments: According to the extension of the term for the issuance of national reports.*

**Paragraph 23, Item (a):**

*“The provisional agenda and the CRIC work program for the meetings to be held between session periods shall be centered on the review of the implementation of the Convention, discarding any other issues that have been added to its original mandate;”*

*Comments: The meaning of “issues that have been added” and what is intended to be discarded need to be more precisely defined.*

**Paragraph 24, Item (a):**

*“Meetings about the Regional Implementation Annexes shall be organized as separate meetings and shall be held within the regions with the logistical and financial support of a host country within the region, including the costs associated with the participation of eligible countries;”*

*Comments: Although the implementation of regional meetings is established in Article 7 of Convention Annex III, Peru does not accept the commitment of implementing regional meetings, especially if this implies that the hosting countries must assume the logistical and financial costs.*

## **Philippines<sup>1</sup>**

- a. In page 4, paragraph 5, we support that country Parties should report every four years against the progress indicators. However, considering that there were no targets set for the strategic objectives and parties still do not have baseline assessment and indication of trends (Par 10, pp 4-5), reporting of progress indicators may have no bases with respect to a specific target or baseline. Hence, this issue should be clarified.
- b. In page 8, paragraph, 21 sub-paragraphs (a), it is stated that reporting against performance indicators would be discontinued, as many targets on operational objectives have already been achieved or will be achieved by the end of 2015. In this case, does it mean that strategic objectives and operational objectives are not directly linked with each other? While the operational objectives have already been achieved, it seems that its achievement does not contribute to the attainment of the strategic objectives. This should also be clarified because we believe that the attainment of operational objectives is a key to achieving the strategic objectives too.

---

<sup>1</sup> Received by the secretariat on 3 July 2015.

## Republic of Moldova

	As contained in the document	Comments and recommendations
14	At the same time, the meetings of the regional implementation annexes, which are an integral part of the review process and have proved to be a very effective and efficient way to support the process, had to be organized for a limited duration and back-to-back with the session of the CRIC.	We support Ukraine's proposal that regional training meetings for CRIC sessions should be conducted for no more than 3 days to be able to examine all subjects and develop the region's position for each them
23	<u>In french</u> : A partir du 1 <sup>er</sup> janvier 2016, le processus d'examen serait restructuré selon le modele suivant : ... <u>In english</u> : Starting from <b>and including</b> 2016, national reporting would be streamlined along the following patterns:	The English version provides that the affected countries have to submit 4-year report already in 2016. In the event that the NAP will be confirmed only by the end of 2015, elaboration of report and finding financial resources would be very problematic. In this case, we believe that the report can be presented in 2018

## Russian Federation

[Original: Russian]

Извините за задержку с ответом - я только в воскресенье вернулся из Монреаля, а до этого был в отпуске.

Я прочитал документ и он у меня вызвал желание пересмотреть организационную структуру и работу КБО. Конечно, я не претендую на полноту знаний всех аспектов деятельности конвенции и некоторые мои соображения могут показаться повтором уже того, что имеется или наоборот, неприменимы в силу специфика (какой-то, мне неведомой) конвенции. Тем не менее, привожу ниже некоторые соображения по процессу реформирования КБО.

- Отчетность должна осуществляться по общепринятым ясным и не очень сложным (с точки зрения их выполнения/соответствия) критериям, при этом подготовка отчета не должна занимать много времени и ресурсов у страны.
- Комитет по соблюдению должен рассматривать отдельные случаи/страны, а не всю отчетность. Решение о передаче вопроса на рассмотрение в Комитет по соблюдению принимает СОР и/или иной конституционный орган КБО, если таковой будет создан в дальнейшем. При этом Комитет по соблюдению должен состоять из 10-12 стран, выбираемых решением СОР на двухлетний период с правом переизбрания один раз, т.е. максимум членство на 4 года. Членам этого комитета должно оплачиваться (суточные, дорога и проживание) участие в работе на сессии Комитета.
- Целесообразно создать Рабочую группу открытого состава (РГОС или OEWG), которая будет иметь две ветви по интересам: страны с проблемами опустынивания и страны с проблемами деградации почв, поскольку специфика проблем разводит экспертов в группы "по интересам". РГОС должна собираться ежегодно или раз в два года и рассматривать вопросы на экспертно-страновом уровне, готовить решения для СОР. Продолжительность сессии РГОС - 5 рабочих дней. Продолжительность сессии СОР также 5 дней, не больше. РГОС работает на пленарке общей для всех и параллельно или в перерывах между пленарками проводит работу групп по интересам и по проблемам, согласовывая и вырабатывая решения в контактных группах или целевых группах экспертов. Т.о. работа РГОС должна стать основным экспертным инструментом конвенции, который отвечает за выработку научно обоснованных и согласованных будущих решений Сторон КБО.

- При этом научный орган КБО необходимо упразднить и перевести экспертов в лице назначенных научных корреспондентов в специальную группу научных экспертов (условно назовем её СГНЭ), которая должна работать в рамках РГОС, имея свой трек вопросов. При этом эта группа экспертов будет рассматривать специальные вопросы (которые будут передаваться ей на рассмотрение решениями РГОС/СОР или по представлению Сторон КБО по специальной процедуре и готовить рекомендации для рассмотрения сначала на РГОС, а затем СОР.

В перечень вопросов должны входить все стратегические документы (планы, стратегии развития, критерии оценки и т.д.), а также научно-прикладные аспекты деятельности стран по достижению целей КБО. Кроме того, целевые группы в составе СГНЭ должны рассматривать "свои" вопросы и отвечать на вопросы на сессии на пленарке в рамках повестки дня сессии. Таким образом будет поддерживаться престиж этой группы и её значение для делегаций Сторон и для всего процесса работы КБО на сессиях и в межсессионный период, когда СГНЭ будет собираться для рассмотрения поступивших к ней вопросов, составлять планы работы, готовить и согласовывать свои отчеты перед СОР и промежуточные отчеты перед РГОС.

- Укрепить институционально региональную составляющую КБО, поскольку на сегодняшний день отсутствует достаточная правовая база для регионального сотрудничества, которому должно придаваться большее значение. Региональные совещания могут проводиться в рамках работы сессий РГОС (см. ниже) и СОР. Совещания проводит сопредседатель (всего 2 - избираются на 2-х летний срок) региональной группы и представитель секретариата, курирующий данный регион.

- Проведение оценки базовой линии для страны должно проводиться по единой методике с привлечением экспертов, способных оказать помощь странам. Для этого необходимо привлечь ресурсы ГЭФ. Причем проекты ГЭФ необходимо строить на региональном подходе, для облегчения странам получения ресурсов и экспертов и для экономии ресурсов.

Понимаю, что это не совсем то, что можно назвать комментарием документа. Но мне сложно это сделать в силу запутанности документа и его не совсем четкой концепции. Если мои соображения могут пригодиться Вам для работы, буду рад поделиться с Вами дальнейшими соображениями.

[English]

*- Reporting should be carried out according to the clear and feasible/measurable criteria and should not be too time and resources-consuming for the country.*

*- The committee on review of implementation should review the individual cases /countries, but not all reports. The decision on passing the reports to the committee shall be taken by COP and/or other constitutional authority of COP if such is established in future. The Committee on review of implementation should be composed of 10-12 countries, elected by COP decision for 2 years period with the right to be re-elected once. The cost of travel of the members of the Committee should be covered.*

*- It is meaningful to set up Open-end Working Group which (OEWG) which would operate through two groups by interests, i.e. countries affected by desertification and countries with land degradation. OEWG should be convened annually or biannually and to work at the expert- country level and prepare decisions for COP. Duration of the OEWG sessions is 5 working days. Duration of COP is also 5 working days. Thus, the work of the OEWG should be the main expert tool of the convention which is responsible for the elaboration of the science based and negotiated draft decisions for COP.*

*- At the same time, the scientific body of the convention should be restructured and minimized. The experts represented by the nominated STCs should be transferred to the specialized group which should work in the framework of the OEWG. The group of specialized experts shall work on the specific issues at the request of the OEWG/COP and upon submission of the country Parties according to the established procedures to transfer the recommendations to OEWG*

and then to the COP. The group shall cover all strategic documents as well as scientific aspects of the convention implementation.

- To strengthen the institutional basis of the regional coordination of the UNCCD. Presently, the available legal status of the regional cooperation is lacking and should be more emphasized in future. The regional meetings could be organized in the frame of the OEWG sessions and the COP. The meeting is chaired by the co-chairs (2 in total for 2 years period) and facilitated by the respective regional officer.

- Assessment of the baseline for each country should be carried out using the unified methodology engaging experts who could assist the countries. EGF resources are required and shall be distributed regionally in order to facilitate the access to resources and experts and for economy of scale.

I understand that the provided recommendations do not address only non-paper 2. It is difficult for me to focus on the document due to its complexity and somewhat unclear structure, I will be happy to share further clarification if you find it needed.

## **Serbia**

Process of reviewing implementation of the Convention should be highly improved by taking proposed measures. We want to stress that Serbia supports meetings on regional level, but, at this moment, we do not have sufficient planned financial resources for organization of such a meeting.

## **Slovakia**

The Slovak statement is as follows:

- We would like to know the procedure organization of regional meetings, if it is supported by respected regions themselves.
- We support the reporting against the performance indicators rather than quantitative data, the representativeness of which is difficult to entirely guarantee.
- In case of small delegation representing Slovakia it is difficult to cover all sessions.

## **Switzerland**

*(Summary a) – d))*

Basically Switzerland agrees on all these suggestions a) - d) and welcomes in principle the suggestions of the non-paper No 2.

However, harmonizing reporting processes of the three Rio conventions is hypothetically and theoretically a very good idea to boost the efficiency and the effectiveness of reporting and to avoid double and triple workloads, but in practice harmonization is very difficult after so many years have passed without trying to harmonize and build synergies between the three Rio conventions. Actually, the objective and factual rules and regulations of the conventions, including reporting, have become too different and hence the requirements for reporting.

### *II. A. paragraph 12*

Switzerland would also favor a 4 year reporting cycle as it is done for the CBD. Even for Switzerland such reporting exercise takes up a lot of time and human and financial resources.

### *III. paragraph 19 - 20*

All the below suggested options for change are valuable, particularly the cooperation with the other two Rio conventions reporting processes of the UNFCCC and the CBD. However, even though Switzerland is in favor of such



synergies between the three Rio conventions and the reporting of the progress, Switzerland itself did not manage whatsoever to build synergies between the reporting processes. Not even between the Department and Offices that are responsible for the reporting processes, i.e. Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and the Federal Office of the Environment (FOEN).

*III. paragraph 19 (b)*

Very necessary and the COP 12 would be a perfect venue also in timing.

*III. A.*

Switzerland is in full line with the below suggestions.

*III.B. paragraph 23 (a)*

Switzerland would welcome if the review process for the implementation of the Convention would concentrate on substance and what really matters rather than as it happened during the last five years, i.e. admin. and legal matters concerning the GM, that non-implementation related issues take up considerable time and distort the implementation of the strategy.

## **Thailand**

- The new assessment and review system after 2015 should focus on the substantive issues of land degradation, sustainable land management and their link with livelihood, agriculture and food security, climate change adaptation and mitigation, and conservation of biodiversity.

- In responding to the 4 year replenishment period of the GEF which results in once in four year the availability of financial support to UNCCD, therefore, the UNCCD may adjust the period for the main report, including both performance and progress indicators, to four years and the two years minor report (like the UNFCCC Parties reporting on GHG inventory) with particular focus on cooperation to improve implementation capacity. The sessions of the CRIC should remain the same in order to match with the two-year COP and to keep the ball rolling by reviewing the main report and the progress on cooperation and effectiveness at national, regional, and regional levels in terms of technology transfer, financial mobilization, capacity building, and so on. In this regard, there is a need to add in the TOR of the CRIC based on the obligation of Parties in the Convention.

## **Trinidad and Tobago**

Kindly be informed that the Ministry has reviewed Non-Papers 1 and 2, the “Consideration of best practice in the implementation of the Convention” and “Additional procedures or institutional mechanisms to assist the COP in review of implementation” respectively.

The Government of Trinidad and Tobago has no substantive comments or objections to the premises and suggested options Non-Papers 1 and 2 as presented. There is however some level of concern regarding section C, paragraph 24 (a) of Non-Paper 2 which pertains to “ensuring continuity and regional governance”. Whilst the option for increased frequency of meetings of the Regional Implementation Annexes is welcomed, previous attempts at regional meetings have been impeded by financial constraints experienced by potential host countries.

In light of this, it is suggested that information on the modalities of the paper’s proposals be presented in the appropriate document format for more detailed discussion (or possibly negotiation) at the earliest opportunity.

## Ukraine

### On Para 12

It can be a subject for negotiations/consultations with the GEF of how to envisage a financial assistance for two review and reporting cycles of the UNCCD (one per 2 years) within each replenishment cycle of the GEF.

In particular, it can be discussed during consideration of the amendments to the MoU with the GEF at COP 12.

The GEF funding is not the only reason for increase in a number of national reports submitted by Parties during fifth review and reporting cycle. Simplification of templates, decrease of a number of indicators and other measures aimed at improving the reporting process also played a substantial role.

### On para 14, 24

Regional meetings preparatory to CRIC sessions, which have proved to be efficient and effective instrument, should be conducted for not less than 3 days (depending on the agenda of the CRIC session).

If there is no country wishing to host a regional meeting (and provide financial and logistical support) there will be the same kind of problem like it was with organization of CRIC 13 (para 24 (a)).

It is not clear which tasks are envisaged for the meetings of the Bureaux of the CRIC and the CST together with the additional officer from each regional group according to para 24 (b).

### On para 18

Given the fact that report of the CRIC session is a summary of a chair (non - negotiation text) all conclusions and recommendation of the intercessional CRIC are subject of discussion at COP level. The same principle has been used for a long time, including the sessions of the CRIC with a high level of attendance.

The level of attendance substantially depends on availability of resources for funding of eligible participants and economic situation in the countries.

For instance, COP 11 was attended by representatives of **144 Parties** to the UNCCD; **122 Parties** to the UNCCD attended the CRIC 13. The difference is not so huge to make a conclusion about lack of interest of the Parties to attend the CRIC sessions.

### On para 21

Some quantitative data on performance indicators, for instance – percentage of population informed about DLDD, seem to be not reliable or difficult to collect. That is why it is difficult to guarantee that targets on operational objectives have already been achieved or will be achieved by the end of 2015 (para 21 (a)).

Parties will continue implementing the current Strategy by 2018. Some of them have already aligned their NAPs accordingly. Many others are in the process of NAP alignment.

Intercessional sessions of the CRIC, among others, provides a platform for interactive dialogue and sharing the experience among the Parties. In this regard they can not be substituted by sessional sessions of the CRIC (see comments to para 23) or meetings of expended Bureaux.

Therefore, it seems that until COP decides on the future Strategy, it will be better to continue reporting against performance indicators, describing rather successful experience and lessons learned rather than unreliable quantitative data.

It a rather difficult task to validate and complement the data from accredited global sources (para 21 (b)). In this regard, capacity building and other support should be provided to affect country Parties to fulfill this task.

### On para 23

It is a useful idea to convene intercessional sessions of the CRIC jointly with sessions of the CST to improve interlinkage between science and policy.

Usually many participants, in particular from affected country Parties (small delegations, consist of one NFP - for COP, CRIC, COW... and one STC – for CST ), can not normally participate at the CRIC sessions held during the sessions of the COP because they need to participate in sessions of the COW, work of contact groups etc which are conducted in parallel. Therefore, during the sessional CRIC sessions it is impossible to ensure an appropriate experience-sharing and lessons-learning exercise in an interactive format. This situation needs to be addressed.

## **United Republic of Tanzania**

- We recommend that the CRIC should be held every year, as is the current practice, and not once between each Ordinary Session of the COP which means to be held after 2 years as it is being suggested.
- We also recommend that the COP should be conducted every year as opposed to the current practice of having the COP after every two years because of the seriousness of the problems related to desertification in Tanzania, Africa and developing countries and the need for the international community to regularly work together for a sustainable solution. We need to emulate the example of UNFCCC and CBD COPs since these are sister conventions agreed in Rio for development sustainability globally.
- Flow of funds for the implementation of the Convention activities are not available like other sister Conventions (UNFCCC and CBD). As a consequence there is lack of adequate implementation of NAPs as mandated under the Convention. Annual COPs and CRICs should focus on the availability of financial resources and other means of implementation for the implementation of the Convention in its totality. Parties should have clear milestones and achievable indicators in this regard.
- CST and CRIC should meet together and every year since they have to share the information and align the strategic areas for the implementation of the Convention. . So it is important to convene these meetings at the same venue, an allocation of not less than seven days should be allocated to be able to cover all the important agenda for these two subsidiary bodies of the Convention. The GEF should be requested to support these meetings. Developed country parties should also be urged to support the participation of developing country parties to these meetings.
- The UNCCD is a universally accepted UN Convention with more than 100 ratifications. It is not a regional Convention such as the Nairobi Convention or the Bamako Convention. Its implementation cannot be subjected to regional meetings only with a host country footing all the bills for participation. Regional meeting will not be effective and efficient since one regional will not be in position to share or understand what is going on in other regions for a coordinated approach for the needed actions as in any UN Convention. Stand-alone regional meeting will not address the objectives of the UNCCD.
- Time for CRIC and CST should be increased and the number of funded participants should be at least 2 per each African Country Party since the Convention puts particularity to Africa.
- There is a need to develop a protocol for financial and other means of implementation commitment from Developed Country parties to fund the Convention like other sister Conventions - UNFCCC and CBD.
- On the issues of the obligation to the countries to host the Regional meeting and fund everything, as explained we believe this is not possible and inconsistent with the provisions of the convention itself. We have to draw some experience from the other sister Rio Conventions and propose an approach which does not go contrary to the provisions and the spirit and letter of the UNCCD.

## **United States of America**

The United States is generally comfortable with the contents of this document, but we have specific requests for edits as indicated below.

Paragraph 13. While we appreciate the challenges inherent in adjustments being made to the reporting guidelines, we believe that the problem has not been the changes, but instead has been the guidelines themselves. We note that many of the adjustments involved removing elements on which Parties found themselves unable to report, despite the possible merits of any individual requirement. We consider that the end result of the changes in reporting – notably including the ones resulting from the outcome of the mid-term evaluation of the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008–2018) – have in fact led to the recent increase in reporting, which is unusual among multilateral environmental agreements including the other two Rio Conventions. We would request that this paragraph be recast from describing the periodic adjustments as a limiting factor and instead indicate that while this may cause some challenges, that ultimately the revisions have helped contribute to the high rate of reporting the UNCCD enjoyed in its most recent reporting period.

Paragraph 14. While we appreciate the challenges in finding meeting hosts, we were very concerned to see the reference in this paragraph to resources being drawn from the reserve to fund the 2015 CRIC meeting. Since paragraph 11 of decision 10/COP.11 specifically precludes the Secretariat from using the reserve to fund the CRIC or CST meetings, such a reprogramming of funds as is described here would have been conducted against the clear and express wishes of the COP. We recognize, however, that this text may also be a clerical error in the non-paper. Whether blatant disregard for the COP's wishes or a clerical error occurred, this reference should not be included in the non-paper. As a result we request that “, and has even obliged the secretariat to use the capital reserve to convene the last CRIC session in Bonn” be deleted from this paragraph.

Paragraph 16. While we do not necessarily disagree with the contents of this paragraph, we do not believe that revisiting the history helps advance the discussion or provides us with a way forward and we consider that this paragraph could usefully be deleted altogether or at least considerably shortened.

Paragraph 21. We would like to request some amendments to this paragraph so it would read: (c) Affected country Parties...national action programmes and, as appropriate, the achievement of voluntary targets ~~of~~ such as those related to land degradation neutrality, or any other global target... Sustainable Development Goals.

Paragraph 22. While reporting creates a necessary burden for all Parties, we have some concerns with the potential for loss of ongoing capacity in developing countries if we shift from two to four years and thus remove the need for them to be reporting on a relatively frequent basis. We anticipate that the anticipated loss in capacity may negatively impact both the quality of the reporting and ability to report in the first place.

## Uzbekistan

[Original: Russian]

Дополнительно отмечаем:

1. Согласно с заключением, что "После 20 лет выполнения конвенции , страны до сих пор не имеют оценки базовой/исходной ситуации (baseline assessment) и трендов деградации земель, основанных на точных данных и информации " (стр. 10), также как и нет четких индикаторов (количественных) для такой оценки и целей. Цель "Нулевая деградация земель" несколько размыта и не очень понятно как оценивать прогресс. Потому радует пункт " секретариат конвенции из признанных глобальных источников соберет данные по индикаторам прогресса для последующей валидации и дополнения затронутыми странами".

2. Мы также поддерживаем рекомендации по улучшению оценки выполнения Конвенции (раздел III) <Обоснование и опции для изменений>: <фокусировать отчетность на содержание/сути", изменить соответственным образом периодичность отчетности с 2-х до 4-х лет>.

3. Абсолютно поддерживаем решение восстановить первоначальный мандат КРОК и, в частности, проводить меж-сессийные сессии КРОК совместно или последовательно с сессиями КНТ,

поскольку участие фокал поинтов в сессиях КНТ крайне важно, если речь идет об интеграции науки в политические процессы

[English]

1. *We agree with assessment that "after 20 years of implementation, the Convention cannot rely on a baseline assessment and indication of trends of land degradation based on solid data and information". Therefore, we support the idea of secretariat proving data from the accredited global sources for further validation and completion by ACPs.*
2. *We support recommendation for CRIC to focus on substance and therefore to convene the intersessional session every four years*
3. *We absolutely agree with restoring the original mandate of CRIC and convening CST session jointly or subsequently with CRIC, as it is important for the NFPs to take part in the CST.*

## Vietnam

+ Part II: Assets and limitations of current reporting and review mechanisms

### A. Reporting

10. At highlight text: **"Parties still do not have a baseline assessment and indicator of trends of land degradation based on solid data and information reported by affected countries"**. We understand that baseline assessment and indicator of trend of Land degradation (LD) are importance data, however the convention should be build a guild for reporting indicator of LD such as total areas in country, identify affected areas should be updated. Because determination on soild data and information of LD may did not implemented at many party. So we want to replace the highlight text by: ***In the next time, Parties will be add a baseline assessment and indicator of trends of land degradation based on solid data and information reported by affected countries under guidance for new indicator of CRIC and other support of convention.***

---