



UNITED
NATIONS



**Convention to Combat
Desertification**

Distr.
GENERAL

ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.1
13 July 2009

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE FOR THE REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

Eighth session

Buenos Aires, 23–30 September 2009

Item 4 (a) of the provisional agenda

Improving the procedures for communication of information as well as the quality and format of reports to be submitted to the Conference of the Parties - consideration of draft reporting guidelines for reporting entities referred to in decision 8/COP.8

Indicators and monitoring of the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008–2018)

Improving the procedures for communication of information as well as the quality and format of reports to be submitted to the Conference of the Parties: consideration of draft reporting guidelines as referred to in decision 8/COP.8

Note by the secretariat

Addendum

Performance indicators for the review of implementation of The Strategy

Summary

Following decision 3/COP.8 on the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (The Strategy), Parties and Regional Implementation Annexes submitted proposals for the development of nationally- and regionally relevant indicators for implementation of The Strategy that were discussed at the seventh session of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention (CRIC 7). At CRIC 7, Parties requested the secretariat to finalize the process of consolidating performance indicators for measuring progress against the operational objectives of The Strategy, in line with decision 3/COP.8.

This document presents the set of consolidated performance indicators, including some proposed global targets, against which the CRIC will review the implementation of The Strategy, on the basis of reports received from Parties and other reporting entities. The document also outlines the methodological approach used for the identification of each indicator.

CRIC 8 is expected to review the consolidated list of indicators and their proposed targets with the aim of providing a draft decision to the ninth session of the Conference of the Parties. Once adopted by the COP, performance indicators will guide Parties in action programme implementation and give Convention's institutions and subsidiary bodies an orientation for framing their support to the implementation process. Performance indicators are one of the pillars of the new monitoring system put in place by the CRIC and should be reviewed with reference to the proposed performance review and assessment system as contained in document ICCD/CRIC(8)/4.

CONTENTS

		<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
	Abbreviations.....		3
I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1–3	3
II.	BACKGROUND.....	4–6	4
III.	METHODOLOGY.....	7–18	4
	A. Methodological steps.....	7	4
	B. Criteria for the selection of performance indicators.....	8–9	5
	C. Analysis and consolidation of the indicators.....	10	5
	D. Indicators' metadata, baseline and targets.....	11–15	6
	E. Harmonization.....	16–18	7
IV.	CONSOLIDATED PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.....	19–82	7
	A. Preliminary remarks.....	19–22	7
	B. Operational objective 1: Advocacy, awareness raising and education.....	23–36	10
	C. Operational objective 2: Policy framework.....	37–48	13
	D. Operational objective 3: Science, technology and knowledge.....	49–64	15
	E. Operational objective 4: Capacity building.....	65–68	19
	F. Operational objective 5: Financing and technology transfer.....	69–82	20
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	83	23

ABBREVIATIONS

CONS	consolidated indicator
COP	Conference of the Parties
CRIC	Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention
CSO	civil society organization
CST	Committee on Science and Technology
DLDD	desertification, land degradation and drought
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GM	Global Mechanism
IATF	Inter-Agency Task Force
IFS	Integrated Financing Strategy
IGO	intergovernmental organization
IIWG	Intergovernmental Intersessional Working Group
JLG	Joint Liaison Group
MEA	multilateral environmental agreement
NAP	national action programme
NCSA	national capacity self-assessment
PRAIS	performance review and assessment of implementation system
RAP	regional action programme
RBM	results-based management
SLM	sustainable land management
SO	strategic objective
SRAP	subregional action programme
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification

I. Introduction

1. The draft performance indicators for the operational objectives of the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (The Strategy) were not adopted as proposed by the Chairperson of the Intergovernmental Intersessional Working Group (IIWG).¹ Instead, decision 3/COP.8 invited Parties and the Regional Implementation Annexes to develop nationally- and regionally-relevant indicators for implementation of The Strategy for consideration at the seventh session of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention (CRIC 7). The decision also requested the secretariat to consolidate these indicators.

2. In accordance with that decision, the secretariat invited Parties to submit views and proposals on these draft indicators and submitted to CRIC 7 document ICCD/CRIC(7)/2/Add.7 containing an analysis of the feedback provided by Parties and Observers.² The present

¹ As contained in annex II of document ICCD/COP(8)/10/Add.2.

² The full text of the 49 submissions received by Parties and Observers in 2008 is published on the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification official website.

document builds upon the draft indicators as proposed by the Chairperson of the IIWG, the aforementioned document submitted at CRIC 7 and the recommendations of CRIC 7.³

3. This document presents the set of performance indicators as consolidated by the secretariat taking into account: (a) the draft performance indicators as proposed by the Chairperson of the IIWG, (b) the views of the Global Mechanism (GM), with particular regard to operational objectives 1, 2 and 5, (c) the guidance received from the Committee on Science and Technology (CST) Bureau at its meeting held on 4–5 March 2009, with particular regard to operational objective 3, and from the CRIC Bureau at its meeting held on 27–28 May 2009, and (d) the advice provided by the Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF) on reporting, which met in Bonn on 14–15 May 2009.

II. Background

4. Parties at CRIC 7 made specific recommendations on performance indicators by highlighting that the set of indicators to be identified should be limited, with flexibility to be expanded as the monitoring process evolves, and that the selected indicators should be measurable, implementable and clear to the stakeholders using them. It was also recommended that special emphasis be given to indicators dealing with financial issues, aimed at assisting the CRIC in the assessment of investment flows.

5. Harmonization of the various sets of indicators used by The Strategy was also requested with the ultimate goal of having a coherent indicator system within the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). In particular, national reporting should be coherent with the performance indicators used by the institutions implementing a results-based management (RBM) system, namely the Convention's institutions and subsidiary bodies. Accordingly, consolidated performance indicators should reflect the roles of the various stakeholders in the implementation of The Strategy and provide guidance not only to Parties in aligning/implementing action programmes but also to Convention's institutions and subsidiary bodies in preparing and implementing their work programmes and plans.

6. In addition to the development of a minimum set of performance indicators, the secretariat was also requested by CRIC 7 to devise a methodology guiding Parties in the use of performance indicators, and a glossary clarifying the terminology and definitions of indicators, aiming at a common understanding of the process and of the implementation modalities by all reporting entities.

III. Methodology

A. Methodological steps

7. The consolidation of performance indicators aimed at identifying a minimum set, underwent four main steps: (a) identification of a methodology to assess draft indicators, (b) analysis and consolidation of the indicators, (c) definition of indicators' metadata, and of the

³ As contained in its final report, ICCD/CRIC(7)/5.

baseline and targets, and (d) harmonization of the consolidated performance indicators with the other sets of indicators used within the Convention.

B. Criteria for the selection of performance indicators

8. A review of the internationally recognized methodological tools for the assessment of objectives and indicators revealed that use of the “SMART”⁴ criteria would be an appropriate methodology for identifying good quality performance indicators under the UNCCD. In order to have a simple and cost-effective monitoring system, which does not require complex and expensive collection of data and information, an “economic” criterion was added to the recognized set of SMART criteria. This would facilitate meeting the desired frequency of measurement of performance indicators (every two years), as recommended by CRIC 7.⁵

9. The definitions of e-SMART criteria, adapted from the translations available in international literature in order to refer specifically to the UNCCD context, are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Definitions of e-smart criteria

<i>Criterion</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
Economic	The data and information required for the indicator are available at a reasonable cost. The cost is affordable and worthwhile.
Specific	The indicator clearly and directly relates to the outcome. It is described without ambiguities. Parties have a common understanding of the indicator.
Measurable	The indicator is preferably quantifiable and objectively verifiable. ⁶ Parties have a common understanding of the ways of measuring the indicator.
Achievable	The required data and information can actually be collected.
Relevant	The indicator must provide information which is relevant to the process and its stakeholders.
Time-bound	The indicator is time-referenced, and is thus able to reflect changes. It can be reported at the requested time.

C. Analysis and consolidation of the indicators

10. The process leading to the identification of a minimum set of performance indicators was based on the following main principles:

⁴ Among the existing slightly different definitions of the acronym SMART, the following was considered the most suitable for the purposes of the Convention: Specific – Measurable – Achievable – Relevant – and Time-bound.

⁵ ICCD/CRIC(7)/5, paragraph 131.

⁶ Although quantitative indicators shall be preferred in terms of objectivity and precision (the “measurability” criteria), qualitative indicators might add value to the quantitative information in specific cases.

(a) The operational objectives and the outcomes set by The Strategy shall not be altered;

(b) A preliminary definition of the outcomes, and of the processes referred to in the outcomes, shall be determined;

(c) The selection of indicators shall be made according to their compliance with the e-SMART criteria. Selected indicators shall be measurable, implementable (economic and achievable) and clear to the stakeholders using them (specific and relevant);

(d) The set of performance indicators shall be limited, with flexibility to expand them where necessary and as the monitoring process evolves.

D. Indicators' metadata, baseline and targets

11. The formulation of each indicator is accompanied by relevant information relating to the indicator, or "metadata".⁷ This includes: the indicator's name, number and type (quantitative or qualitative), the rationale of the indicator and justification for its selection, the level of compliance of the indicator to the e-SMART criteria, the data needed and the method of their computation, the unit of measurement, the data sources (and the means of verification), and the geographical level of application.

12. The indicators' metadata respond to the need for a common understanding of the main concepts and terminology, and provide guidance on data identification and sources. A glossary clarifying the terminology and definitions used is presented in document ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.3.

13. The establishment of an overall performance review and assessment system geared towards quantifiable indicators requires the setting up of voluntary baseline and targets, in order to fully meet the need for an effective monitoring and mid-term review of the Strategy. Targets are quantitative values generally referring to policy objectives and to a deadline to be met. With regard to performance indicators, targets express "desired situations", while indicators measure the "gap" between the existing and the desired situation.

14. A set of specific targets is proposed, wherever applicable, with the understanding that values are purely indicative and that each Party may wish to indicate what would be a reasonable target at national level and its commitment to reach that target in a given timeframe. Some targets are also proposed at global level, as required, and guidance from Parties is again essential in order to fix a framework of global targets and ensure effectiveness of the review and monitoring system.

15. The baseline indicates the point of reference against which measurements are compared and changes monitored. For performance indicators the baseline reference is proposed as January 2008.

⁷ Metadata are contained in document ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.2.

E. Harmonization

16. Harmonization requires a common understanding of the terms, a common agreement on definitions, and a consistency in the use of terminology among all the sets of indicators used within the UNCCD. This is pursued through the establishment of an agreed glossary.

17. Within The Strategy, the operational objectives measure the processes and the strategic objectives measure the impacts. Theoretically, overlapping areas between the two sets shall not occur, except for strategic objective 4⁸ that deals with resources and policy frameworks, as do several of the operational objectives. Harmonization aims at avoiding duplication of data collection and analysis between the two sets of indicators.

18. The outcomes of the operational objectives are common to all reporting entities, the accomplishment of one outcome often requiring the simultaneous contribution of a number of stakeholders. Hence, harmonization was necessary with the set of indicators used by the Convention's institutions implementing a RBM system. This harmonization has been tackled alongside the process of formulating the different sets of indicators and implies a common interpretation of the outcomes, and the correct reflection of the role of the reporting stakeholders, according to their "mandate" as established by the Convention.

IV. Consolidated performance indicators

A. Preliminary remarks

19. Parties called for the establishment of a limited set of performance indicators. In line with this request, indicators measuring more than one outcome have been proposed, wherever possible. In some cases, however, it was necessary to select two indicators for one outcome in order to obtain comprehensive information. Altogether, 18 consolidated performance indicators have been formulated. An overview of these indicators and their attribution to the various reporting entities is provided in Table 2.

20. Reporting of absolute values (e.g. "number of") has usually been preferred to reporting an "increase" or "percentage". Absolute values allow the compilation of statistics (including the calculation of variations and trends).

21. Some of the proposed consolidated performance indicators should be compiled by Parties and other reporting entities, on the basis of national and regional information. Other indicators should be compiled by Convention institutions (either the secretariat or the GM, according to their mandate), using information to be provided in national reports or other available official sources of information.

22. Real progress in the implementation of The Strategy and of the Convention will be measurable only by linking performance to impact. By proposing targets for each performance indicator, it will be possible to measure objectively the performance of the processes against

⁸ Strategic objective 4: To mobilize resources to support implementation of the Convention through building effective partnerships between national and international actors.

“desired situations” and possibly to detect a relation between the level of the performance and the impact achieved.

Table 2. Overview and attribution of performance indicators

Outcome	Indicator n°	Indicator name	Affected	SRAPs & RAPs	Developed	UN & IGOs	GEF	Secretariat	GM
1.1	CONS-O-1	Number and size of information events organized on the subject of DLDD and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity, and audience reached by media addressing DLDD and DLDD synergies.							
1.2	CONS-O-2	Number of official documents and decisions at international, regional and subregional level relating to DLDD issues.							
1.3	CONS-O-3	Number of CSOs and science and technology institutions participating in the Convention processes.							
	CONS-O-4	Number and type of DLDD-related initiatives of CSOs and science and technology institutions in the field of education.							
2.1 2.2 2.3	CONS-O-5	Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities to have finalized the formulation/revision of NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs aligned to The Strategy, taking into account biophysical and socio-economic information, national planning and policies, and integration into investment frameworks.							
2.4	CONS-O-6	Number of partnership agreements established within the framework of the Convention between developed country Parties/United Nations and IGOs and affected country Parties.							
2.5	CONS-O-7	Number of initiatives for synergistic planning/programming of the three Rio conventions or mechanisms for joint implementation, at all levels.							
3.1 3.2	CONS-O-8	Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities to have established and supported a national/subregional/ regional monitoring system for DLDD.							
	CONS-O-9	Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities reporting to the Convention along revised reporting guidelines on the basis of agreed indicators.							
3.3 3.4	CONS-O-10	Number of revised NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs reflecting knowledge of DLDD drivers and their interactions, and of the interaction of DLDD with climate change and biodiversity.							
3.5	CONS-O-11	Type, number and users of DLDD-relevant knowledge-sharing systems at the global, regional, subregional and national levels described on the Convention website.							
3.6	CONS-O-12	Number of science and technology networks, institutions or scientists engaged in research mandated by the COP.							
4.1 4.2	CONS-O-13	Number of countries, subregional and regional reporting entities engaged in building capacity to combat DLDD on the basis of NCSA or other methodologies and instruments.							
5.1	CONS-O-14	Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities whose investment frameworks, established within the IFS devised by the GM or within other integrated financing strategies, reflect leveraging national, bilateral and multilateral resources for combating desertification and land degradation.							
5.2	CONS-O-15	Amount of financial resources made available by developed country Parties to combat DLDD.							
	CONS-O-16	Degree of adequacy, timeliness and predictability of financial resources made available by developed country Parties to combat DLDD.							
5.3	CONS-O-17	Number of DLDD-related project proposals successfully submitted for financing to international financial institutions, facilities and funds, including the GEF.							
5.5	CONS-O-18	Amount of financial resources and type of incentives which have enabled access to technology by affected country Parties.							

B. Operational objective 1: Advocacy, awareness raising and education

Outcome 1.1: Desertification/land degradation and drought issues and the synergies with climate change adaptation/mitigation and biodiversity conservation are effectively communicated among key constituencies at the international, national and local levels.

Consolidated indicator CONS-O-1: Number and size of information events organized on the subject of DLDD and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity, and audience reached by media addressing DLDD and DLDD synergies.

Tentative target: By 2018, 30% of the global population is informed about DLDD and DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity.

23. Draft indicator IIWG-O-1 is based on the measurement of presence/absence of awareness within key stakeholders.^{9,10} “Awareness” is a perception-based parameter whose measurement requires the undertaking of interviews, while the outcome requires the measurement of the communication processes.

24. Thus, the consolidated indicator CONS-O-1 focuses on communication, and in particular on information events and on the role of the media in fostering communication. The number of information events will provide a measurement of the volume of communication activities, while the number of people attending these events will provide a measure of their reach. An assessment of the audience reached by media dealing with DLDD issues will provide a broad insight into the level of effectiveness of communication, the underlying assumption being that the stronger the media campaigns on DLDD and synergies, the higher the probability of passing the messages on to the target audience.

25. CONS-O-1 will measure the performance of communication processes directly implemented by the Convention stakeholders or by relevant third parties such as media editors or producers. This assessment of performance will indicate whether DLDD issues and synergies are being communicated and, through an appraisal of the media campaigns carried out, whether effectiveness in communication can be expected.

26. Only those events and media addressing DLDD issues or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity, and concerning information sharing, dissemination, and demonstration shall be considered (thus disregarding, for example, training and education activities that pertain to outcome 1.3).

⁹ Draft indicators proposed by the Chairperson of the IIWG are referred to as “IIWG” indicators in this document, while the proposed consolidated indicators are referred to as “CONS” indicators to differentiate clearly the two sets of indicators.

¹⁰ IIWG-O-1: Percentage of key stakeholders at international, national and local levels who are aware of DLDD issues and the synergies with climate change adaptation/mitigation and biodiversity conservation.

27. The indicator requires the definition of “information events”, “key stakeholders” and “media”, which are provided in the glossary.¹¹ The proposed overall target requires that Parties set national targets on a number of information events to be organized yearly and a minimum proportion of people to be reached by the media or by other DLDD-related information activities by the end of the implementation period of The Strategy. The secretariat and the GM will contribute to the overall target through their communication strategies and will report on achievements against the target within their RBM frameworks.

Outcome 1.2: Desertification/land degradation and drought issues are addressed in relevant international forums, including those pertaining to agricultural trade, climate change adaptation, biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, rural development, sustainable development and poverty reduction.

Consolidated indicator CONS-O-2: Number of official documents and decisions at international, regional and subregional level relating to DLDD issues.

Tentative target: By 2010 the Convention website has been restructured and includes a thematic database on relevant decisions and documents as part of the PRAIS¹².

28. There was a broad consensus among Parties on draft indicator O-2.¹³ The consolidated indicator builds upon this indicator, referring to a more practical unit of measurement than “percentage”.

29. CONS-O-2 requires the definition of the type of decisions and documents to be considered, the “official” nature of a document, and the “relevant international forums”. A list of “relevant forums” will be compiled by the secretariat.

30. The performance of advocacy activities carried out by the various Convention stakeholders is reflected in the frequency with which DLDD issues are treated in international forums and in the number of DLDD-related official decisions/documents. The assessment of the performance will indicate whether DLDD issues have the necessary visibility, and whether they are taken into account in relevant policy-making processes and dialogues/discussions.

31. Collection of the aforementioned documents and decisions is a task to be performed centrally by the secretariat. The Convention website is the most logical location for the information within the framework of the proposed PRAIS.

¹¹ All definitions referred to in this document are provided in the glossary proposed in ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.3.

¹² In full, “performance review and assessment of implementation system”.

¹³ IIWG-O-2: Percentage of relevant official international documents and decisions that contain substantial statements, conclusions and recommendations on DLDD issues.

Outcome 1.3: Civil society organizations (CSOs) and the scientific community in the North and the South are increasingly engaged as stakeholders in the Convention processes and desertification/land degradation and drought are addressed in their advocacy, awareness raising and education initiatives.

Consolidated indicator CONS-O-3: Number of CSOs and science and technology institutions participating in the Convention processes.

Tentative target: A steady growth in the participation of CSOs and science and technology institutions in the Convention processes is recorded along the implementation period of The Strategy.

Consolidated indicator CONS-O-4: Number and type of DLDD-related initiatives of CSOs and science and technology institutions in the field of education.

Tentative target: A steady growth in the number of DLDD-related education initiatives undertaken by CSOs and science and technology institutions is recorded along the implementation period of The Strategy

32. IIWG-O-3 is broad in its scope.¹⁴ Most of the Parties agreed that the outcome has two major components: “engagement” and “initiatives undertaken”.

33. ”Engagement” is measured by CONS-O-3 in terms of the participation of CSOs and science and technology institutions in the Convention processes, as required by the outcome. Convention processes are intended to take place at the institutional and at the field level. The assessment of the performance of the engagement process will indicate whether CSOs and the scientific community are sufficiently involved and whether this involvement increases over time.

34. The level of commitment of CSOs and science and technology institutions in combating DLDD is measured by CONS-O-4 in terms of the number and types of “initiatives undertaken”. This measurement is applied only to “education” because “awareness” and “advocacy” are already measured through indicators CONS-O-1 and CONS-O-2 respectively. CONS-O-1 and CONS-O-2 can provide specific information about the activities of CSOs and science and technology institutions through disaggregating the computed data according to group of stakeholders, as described in the metadata of the two indicators.

35. CONS-O-3 and CONS-O-4 require the definition of “Convention processes” and of “type of initiatives” in the field of education, as well as of “science and technology institutions” and “civil society organizations”. The private sector is included in the definition of CSOs, and for this reason it has not been explicitly mentioned in the wording of the indicators. Information specific to the private sector may be derived, while computing the indicators, as described in the metadata.

¹⁴ IIWG-O-3: Number, type, and area of DLDD related work (advocacy, awareness raising, education) of civil society organizations and science and technology institutions.

36. Country Parties may wish to set national targets at the project/programme level to reach the increasing trends envisaged by the overall target of CONS-O-4. The secretariat is expected to pursue CONS-O-3 target at the institutional level, with the GM focusing on the engagement into the Integrated Financing Strategy (IFS).

C. Operational objective 2: Policy framework

Outcome 2.1: Policy, institutional, financial and socio-economic drivers of desertification/land degradation and barriers to sustainable land management (SLM) are assessed, and appropriate measures to remove these barriers are recommended.

Outcome 2.2: Affected country Parties revise their national action programmes (NAPs) into strategic documents supported by biophysical and socio-economic baseline information and include them in integrated investment frameworks.

Outcome 2.3: Affected country Parties integrate their NAPs and SLM and land degradation issues into development planning and relevant sectoral and investment plans and policies.

Consolidated indicator CONS-O-5: Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities to have finalized the formulation/revision of NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs aligned to The Strategy, taking into account biophysical and socio-economic information, national planning and policies, and integration into investment frameworks.

Tentative target: By 2014, at least 80 per cent of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities have formulated/revise a NAP/SRAP/RAP aligned to The Strategy.

37. Outcomes 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 all refer, directly or indirectly, to the process of formulation/revision of the NAPs. The NAPs are strategic documents that shall be devised having in mind the drivers of the problems, the constraints (or barriers) to possible solutions and the possible measures to remove these barriers, i.e. outcome 2.1; the formulation of the NAPs shall also be based on biophysical and socio-economic information, i.e. outcome 2.2; and the integration of the NAPs with other existing planning, policies and investment frameworks shall be tackled alongside their formulation, i.e. outcome 2.3.

38. As a consequence, one consolidated indicator has been proposed to assess the performance of the whole process. CONS-O-5 is an improved version of IIWG-O-5.¹⁵ It is meant to complement the information gathered through two other indicators under OO 3 (CONS-O-9) and OO 5 (CONS-O-14), measuring the development process of biophysical and socio-economic information, and of integrated investment plans, respectively.

39. To take into account that not all affected country Parties have developed a NAP, the indicator refers to "formulation" for those countries not yet having a NAP and to "revision" for those countries already having adopted a NAP.

¹⁵ IIWG-O-5: Number of affected country Parties that have revised their national action programmes into strategic documents and integrated them into development planning and relevant sectoral and investment plans and policies.

40. The indicator requires the definition of “finalized”, while NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs are defined under articles 10 and 11 of the Convention.

Outcome 2.4: Developed country Parties mainstream UNCCD objectives and SLM interventions into their development cooperation programmes/projects in line with their support to national sectoral and investment plans.

Consolidated indicator CONS-O-6: Number of partnership agreements established within the framework of the Convention between developed country Parties, United Nations agencies and IGOs, and affected country Parties.

Tentative target: By 2014, at least two UNCCD-related partnership agreements are active in each affected country Party.

41. The measurement of mainstreaming by developed country Parties through the assessment of the use of the CCD marker – qualitative, as envisaged by IIWG-O-6¹⁶, or quantitative, as envisaged by IIWG-O-7¹⁷ – is a proxy. Both draft indicators provide a measure of the results of mainstreaming but not of the mainstreaming process itself.

42. A direct measurement of the process is preferred and in particular of the policy frameworks allowing the mainstreaming of UNCCD objectives and SLM interventions into the development cooperation programmes and projects of developed country Parties. These policy frameworks are represented by the partnership agreements established within the context of the Convention. CONS-O-6 focuses on the quantification of these agreements, while the financial measure of the mainstreaming of UNCCD objectives into developed country Parties’ cooperation is provided under outcome 5.2 (CONS-O-15).

43. Partnership agreements are those established between developed country Parties, United Nations agencies and IGOs on one side, and affected country Parties on the other, on a bilateral or a multilateral basis. Although the outcome refers only to developed country Parties, the consolidated indicator also refers to United Nations agencies and IGOs in order to obtain comprehensive information on the existing frameworks intended to support affected country Parties in the implementation of the Convention.

44. The indicator requires the definition of “partnership agreement”. Reaching the overall target will need a coordinated effort by developed country Parties and United Nations and intergovernmental organizations.

¹⁶ IIWG-O-6: Number of developed country Parties and their bilateral development agencies which apply the CCD marker (as part of the OECD Rio markers) to screen their aid activities against the objectives of the Convention.

¹⁷ IIWG-O-7: Number of developed country Parties development initiatives that have integrated UNCCD objectives.

Outcome 2.5: Mutually reinforcing measures among desertification/land degradation action programmes and biodiversity and climate change mitigation and adaptation are introduced or strengthened so as to enhance the impact of interventions.

Consolidated indicator CONS-O-7: Number of initiatives for synergistic planning/programming of the three Rio Conventions or mechanisms for joint implementation, at all levels.

Tentative target: By 2014, each affected country Party has either one joint national plan in place or functional mechanism(s) to ensure synergies among the three Rio Conventions

45. Direct measurement of initiatives for joint implementation was preferred for outcome 2.5.¹⁸ Consolidated indicator CONS-O-7 is based on the assumption that “mutually reinforcing measures” can be introduced or strengthened if the right “instruments” fostering these measures are in place.

46. The performance of the stakeholders reporting to the Convention is measured through the quantification of instruments in place. The higher the number of enabling instruments in place, the higher the possibility of having reinforcing measures implemented and synergies among the three Rio Conventions achieved.

47. These “instruments” have been grouped into two main categories according to the suggestions by Parties: (i) joint planning/programming and (ii) operational mechanisms for joint implementation or mutual reinforcement. The consolidated indicator focuses on the quantification of these two groups of “instruments”.

48. The Joint Liaison Group (JLG) may prepare a list of examples of operational mechanisms able to concretely fostering the introduction or strengthening of mutually reinforcing measures among the Rio Conventions; the JLG may also define ‘eligible’ joint planning/programming initiatives, to facilitate a common understanding of the indicator and a coherent reporting by stakeholders.

D. Operational objective 3: Science, technology and knowledge

Outcome 3.1: National monitoring and vulnerability assessment on biophysical and socio-economic trends in affected countries are supported.

Consolidated indicator CONS-O-8: Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities to have established and supported a national/subregional/regional monitoring system for DLDD.

¹⁸ IIWG-O-8: Number of initiatives for joint implementation efforts of the UNCCD, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and Convention on Biological Diversity/Number of adaptation programmes in drylands operational at local and national level which integrate desertification and adaptation.

Tentative target: By 2018, at least 60 per cent of affected country Parties, subregional and regional reporting entities have established and supported national monitoring systems for DLDD

49. A monitoring system ensures that reporting is based on coherent rules, and that regular assessments against the data collected can be actually performed. CONS-O-8 builds upon one of the two draft indicators proposed for outcome 3.1 although referring to the absolute number of countries rather than to their increase.¹⁹ Through CONS-O-8 the performance of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities is measured by verifying whether a monitoring system specifically or partially (in the case of environmental monitoring systems) dedicated to UNCCD reporting has been established and is supported either by domestic or international assistance. The assessment of the performance will indicate to which extent it is realistic to expect regular and coherent reporting by affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities during the implementation of The Strategy and beyond.

50. The indicator requires the definition of “monitoring system”. The definition provided in the glossary may prove to be broad but it is meant to fit the several situations that may occur at country level.

Outcome 3.2: A baseline based on the most robust data available on biophysical and socio-economic trends is developed and relevant scientific approaches are gradually harmonized.

Consolidated indicator CONS-O-9: Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities reporting to the Convention along revised reporting guidelines on the basis of agreed indicators.

Tentative target: By 2018, at least 90 per cent of affected country Parties, subregional and regional reporting entities report to the Convention in compliance with the new reporting guidelines.

51. The work of the CST is guiding the development of biophysical and socio-economic information at national level and its gradual harmonization. It is meant to produce a core and common set of impact indicators using common methodologies for their computation, in order to foster a steady convergence of approaches and thus increased comparability. The use of a core set of indicators will allow for a global assessment of DLDD.

52. The process referred to in the outcome can be considered successfully concluded if, after the identification of a core set of impact indicators, affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities report against these indicators. This is what consolidated indicator CONS-O-9 is

¹⁹ IIWG-O-9: Number of reports from affected Parties submitted to the COP/CRIC (and available to policy makers and other end users) that contain information on biophysical and socio-economic trends in affected areas. Alternative indicator: Increase in number of affected countries relaying their national reporting on relevant indicators and effective monitoring system for land degradation and desertification.

meant to measure. CONS-O-9 builds upon one of the two draft indicators.²⁰ The assessment of the performance of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities will indicate to what extent it will be possible to measure the impact of The Strategy during its implementation period (2008–2018).

Outcome 3.3: Knowledge on biophysical and socio-economic factors and on their interactions in affected areas is improved to enable better decision-making.

Outcome 3.4: Knowledge of the interactions between climate change adaptation, drought mitigation and restoration of degraded land in affected areas is improved to develop tools to assist decision-making.

Consolidated indicator CONS-O-10: Number of revised NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs reflecting knowledge of DLDD drivers and their interactions, and of the interaction of DLDD with climate change and biodiversity.

Tentative target: By 2018, at least 70 per cent of revised NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs have successfully gone through a quality self-assessment.

53. Both outcomes refer to the improvement of knowledge and to the facilitation of decision-making on the basis of knowledge transfer from the scientific level to the operative level. Because of this similarity in scope, it has been considered appropriate to propose only one indicator for the two outcomes.

54. IIWG-O-11 and IIWG-O-12 are perception-based indicators whose measurement requires the undertaking of interviews.²¹ Several of the alternative indicators for the two outcomes are based on the quantification of reports and published papers.²² Although these indicators are quantitative, they pertain more to a global assessment of the process of knowledge transfer than to an assessment at the national level; thus they seem more suitable for measuring the performance of the CST than for measuring the performance of country Parties.

²⁰ IIWG-O-10: Number of internationally recognized reports on biophysical and socio-economic trends. Alternative indicator: Increase in number of country Parties reporting on relevant reliable indicators and its associated baseline values.

²¹ IIWG-O-11: Percentage of decision-makers at global, regional, subregional and national levels who can explain interactions between biophysical and socio-economic factors. IIWG-O-12: Percentage of decision-makers at global, regional, sub/regional and national levels who can explain interactions between climate change adaptation, drought mitigation and restoration of degraded land in affected areas.

²² Alternatives to indicator O-11: Knowledge management system of the Committee on Science and Technology in place and used; thematic programme networks satisfy user needs; number of scientific reports, published papers, experts, scientists, networks and bodies dealing with interaction between biophysical and socio-economic factors in affected areas; procedures on decision-making as well as institutional and legislative frameworks are available. Alternatives to indicator O-12: Number of scientific reports, published papers dealing with cause-effect relation between biophysical and socio-economic factors in affected areas; good practice guidelines for prevention and rehabilitation of degraded lands and related economical activities are available.

55. Decisions and decision-making do not exclusively pertain to the policy level; decisions can be taken at any level, including at the field level. Since the outcomes do not specify the level of decision-making to be targeted, it was preferred to refer the indicator to the action programmes that are pertinent for the implementation of the Convention and supposed to guide DLDD-related decision-making at all levels within each affected country.

56. Thus, CONS-O-10 aims to assess whether the action programmes at national, subregional and regional level reflect the knowledge (both traditional and scientific) of DLDD issues. The assumption is that action programmes based on sound scientific and traditional knowledge will propose more significant and effective strategies and activities for implementation and will, ultimately, perform better than those action programmes that do not take into account available knowledge on DLDD and DLDD synergies.

57. The measurement of DLDD knowledge reflected in the NAPs, SRAPs and RAPs will be implemented through a quality control of these documents, to be performed by country Parties against a set of predetermined criteria that will be specified in the reporting guidelines. This indicator will complement the information gathered through CONS-O-5.

Outcome 3.5: Effective knowledge-sharing systems, including traditional knowledge, are in place at the global, regional, subregional and national levels to support policymakers and end users, including through the identification and sharing of best practices and success stories.

Consolidated indicator CONS-O-11: Type, number and users of DLDD-relevant knowledge-sharing systems at the global, regional, subregional and national levels described on the Convention website.

Tentative target: By 2010 the Convention website has been restructured and includes a thematic database on knowledge-sharing systems as part of the PRAIS.

58. IIWG-O-13²³ refers to best practices, while the outcome refers to knowledge-sharing systems. Best practices are only one part of the knowledge to be shared. Additionally, "being able to tell" is a skill whose measurement requires the undertaking of interviews.

59. CONS-O-11 directly refers to the outcome, providing a measure of existing knowledge-sharing systems. For the purposes of this indicator, a "knowledge-sharing system" has been defined as a web-based system comprising structured information provided by diverse sources, or a network facilitating knowledge-sharing among its members, including the compilation of best practices and success stories.

60. CONS-O-11 aims to measure the performance of the Convention as the "depository" of DLDD-related knowledge, together with its ability to disseminate the information. The effectiveness of the knowledge-sharing systems will be assessed through quality control of the systems by the secretariat before their description and uploading onto the Convention website.

²³ IIWG-O-13: Percentage of decision-makers at global, regional, subregional and national levels who can tell best practices and success stories of combating desertification/land degradation.

Outcome 3.6: Science and technology networks and institutions relevant to desertification/land degradation and drought are engaged to support UNCCD implementation.

Consolidated indicator CONS-O-12: Number of science and technology networks, institutions or scientists engaged in research mandated by the COP.

61. The focus of the outcome is on the “engagement” of science and technology networks and institutions to support the implementation of the Convention. The draft indicators proposed by the IIWG do not refer to engagement; they also seem to duplicate the information collected under outcome 3.5 through CONS-O-11.²⁴

62. CONS-O-12 responds to the need highlighted by the Parties in their submissions to have demand-driven research within the Convention, thus disregarding claims for support and indirect contributions. Research driven by the needs of the Convention is expected to be highly significant and to impact on implementation.

63. CONS-O-12 aims to measure the direct contribution of science and technology networks and institutions, but also of individual scientists, to the Convention. Larger contributions will be reflected in a higher number of initiatives undertaken by the Convention stakeholders based on sound scientific evidence.

64. The indicator refers to research mandated by the COP upon the advice of the CST, as is done in other Rio Conventions. No target has been set for this indicator.

E. Operational objective 4: Capacity building

Outcome 4.1: Countries which have carried out the national capacity self assessment (NCSA) implement the resulting action plans to develop the necessary capacity at the individual, institutional and systemic levels to tackle desertification/land degradation and drought issues at the national and local levels.

Outcome 4.2: Those countries which have not previously undertaken capacity needs assessments engage in relevant assessments processes to identify capacity needs for tackling desertification/land degradation and drought at the national and local levels.

Consolidated indicator CONS-O-13: Number of countries, subregional and regional reporting entities engaged in building capacity to combat DLDD on the basis of NCSA or other methodologies and instruments.

Tentative target: By 2014, at least 90 per cent of affected country Parties, sub-regional and regional reporting entities implement DLDD specific capacity building plans or programs or projects.

²⁴ IIWG-O-14: Number, type and expertise of science and technology institutions organizations and networks dealing with specific knowledge domain that support UNCCD. Alternative indicator: Identified and well known organization that function as platforms for regional transfer of knowledge and technology.

65. Outcomes 4.1 and 4.2 are very similar in scope and the use of one indicator able to distinguish countries with and without NCSA is suggested. CONS-O-13 is based on the assumptions that NCSA cannot be considered the only instrument available at the national level to build capacities in the domain of DLDD, and that the derived capacity action plans are not the only plans. Additionally, capacity building and strengthening shall not be measured only at the implementation stage, as envisaged by the draft indicators proposed by the IIWG Chairperson.²⁵

66. Parties have high expectations with regard to capacity-building under the UNCCD. The quantification and determination of existing capacity-building initiatives will assist in identifying capacity-building gaps emerging from the Convention process, including forthcoming ones such as new reporting requirements, the establishment of environmental monitoring systems, and accessing innovative financing mechanisms.

67. NCSA action plans aim at strengthening national and regional capacities to fulfill the obligations arising from multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). NCSA action plans are not DLDD-specific but are important tools for reinforcing synergies among the Rio conventions. The focus on NCSA shall thus be maintained through UNCCD-tailored reporting by the GEF within the framework of the existing Memorandum of Understanding between the GEF and the Convention.

68. The GM will contribute to the overall target through its knowledge exchange and advisory services, reporting on the contribution to the achievement of the target within its RBM framework.

F. Operational objective 5: Financing and technology transfer

Outcome 5.1: Affected country Parties develop integrated investment frameworks for leveraging national, bilateral and multilateral resources with a view to increasing the effectiveness and impact of interventions.

Consolidated indicator CONS-O-14: Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities whose investment frameworks, established within the IFS devised by the GM or within other integrated financing strategies, reflect leveraging national, bilateral and multilateral resources for combating desertification and land degradation.

Tentative target: By 2014, at least 50 per cent of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities have developed integrated investment frameworks.

69. IIWG-O-17 is appropriate and reflects the understanding that integrated investment frameworks increase the effectiveness and impact of interventions. CONS-O-14 builds upon IIWG-O-17 and adds a reference to the IFS, the main methodological tool developed by the GM in order to assist affected countries in their resource mobilization efforts.

²⁵ IIWG-O-15: Number of countries that implement national capacity self-assessment (NCSA) action plans. IIWG-O-16: Number of countries (without NCSA process) that implement action plans to develop the identified necessary capacity to tackle desertification/land degradation issues at the national and local levels.

70. CONS-O-14 provides a direct measurement of the performance of the reporting Parties and of the implementation level of the IFS; indirectly, it also measures the performance of the GM and of other international financing institutions in promoting the development of integrated investment frameworks.

Outcome 5.2: Developed country Parties provide substantial, adequate, timely and predictable financial resources to support domestic initiatives to reverse and prevent desertification/land degradation and mitigate the effects of drought.

Consolidated indicator CONS-O-15: Amount of financial resources made available by developed country Parties to combat DLDD.

Consolidated indicator CONS-O-16: Degree of adequacy, timeliness and predictability of financial resources made available by developed country Parties to combat DLDD.

71. There is broad consensus by the Parties on IIWG-O-18.²⁶ CONS-O-15 builds upon IIWG-O-18, although simplifying its wording. Amounts are expressed in USD and as a percentage of a country gross domestic product (GDP), as requested by several country Parties. The indicator refers only to direct investments, considered by the Parties to be those that should be prioritized in measurement.

72. CONS-O-15 provides a direct measurement of the performance of developed country Parties according to the obligation foreseen by article 6 of the Convention, paragraph (b). It measures how “substantial” the financial resources provided by developed country Parties are, but it does not measure the “adequacy”, “timeliness” and “predictability” of these resources. An additional indicator (CONS-O-16) has been proposed to provide this information in a narrative form and against a qualitative ranking scale (from very poor to very good).

73. CONS-O-16 measures the performance of those providing the financial resources, and, indirectly, of those facilitating the financial flows.

74. No targets have been set for these two indicators. Developed country Parties may wish to define a minimum share of national GDP for the implementation of the UNCCD, or any other index able to measure the financial commitment towards supporting the implementation of the Convention.

Outcome 5.3: Parties increase their efforts to mobilize financial resources from international financial institutions, facilities and funds, including the GEF by promoting the UNCCD/ SLM agenda within the governing bodies of these institutions.

Consolidated indicator CONS-O-17: Number of DLDD-related project proposals successfully submitted for financing to international financial institutions, facilities and funds, including the GEF.

²⁶ IIWG-O-18: Volume of financial resources for measures to reverse and prevent desertification/land degradation and mitigate the effects of drought, provided by developed country parties according to agreed commitments, investment plans and payment schedules.

Tentative indicator: A steady growth in the number of DLDD-related successfully submitted project proposals is recorded along the implementation period of The Strategy.

75. According to outcome 5.3, Parties' performance in leveraging funds for SLM is to be assessed. Any assessment relating to the GM, the GEF or any other international financial institutions shall be dealt with in their respective management frameworks.

76. Measuring the "efforts for mobilizing financial resources", and possibly their increase, through the volume of financial resources actually mobilized, as proposed in IIWG-O-19, is a proxy.²⁷ The efforts made by Parties shall be measured directly and may be reflected by the number of DLDD-related project proposals submitted for financing to financial institutions, facilities and funds. However, these efforts may prove useless if project proposals are not funded. For this reason the indicator refers only to proposals successfully submitted. Country Parties may wish to set national targets to reach the increasing trend envisaged by the overall target of CONS-O-17.

Outcome 5.4: Innovative sources of finance and financing mechanisms are identified to combat desertification/land degradation and mitigate the effects of drought, including from the private sector, market-based mechanisms, trade, foundations and CSOs, and other financing mechanisms for climate change adaptation and mitigation, biodiversity conservation and sustainable use and for hunger and poverty reduction.

77. Parties agree that draft indicator O-20 is based on a correct interpretation of the outcome.²⁸ It is a qualitative indicator implying the narrative description of the innovative models identified. Its purpose is to highlight new sources of funding and financing mechanisms and to make all Parties aware of their existence, their functioning, accessibility and reliability, and whether they offer short or long term commitments.

78. Notwithstanding the broad consensus by Parties on IIWG-O-20, the advisory services on and the exploring of new and innovative sources of financing is a task of the GM within its two-year work programme (2010–2011) and four-year work plan (2010–2013). Thus, the measurement of performance against outcome 5.4 will be through the reporting of the GM within its RBM framework, while the information on the financial flows related to innovative sources of financing will be provided under strategic objective 4. Hence, no performance indicator is deemed necessary for outcome 5.4.²⁹

Outcome 5.5: Access to technology by affected country Parties is facilitated through adequate financing, effective economic and policy incentives and technical support, notably within the framework of South-South and North-South cooperation.

Consolidated indicator CONS-O-18: Amount of financial resources and type of incentives which have enabled access to technology by affected country Parties.

²⁷ IIWG-O-19: Number and type of funding sources from international financial institutions, facilities and funds, including the GEF, for combating desertification/land degradation.

²⁸ IIWG-O-20: Reported cases on innovative models (private sector, market/based mechanisms, trade, foundations CSOs etc.) for financing of land degradation or desertification.

²⁹ See document ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.7

Tentative targets:

A steady growth in the financial resources allocated to facilitate access to technology by affected country Parties is recorded along the implementation period of The Strategy.

A steady growth in the number of economic and policy incentives reported upon is recorded along the implementation period of The Strategy.

79. The outcome is ambitious in its ultimate target of obtaining a measurement of initiatives that enable access to technology and also an assessment of their adequacy and effectiveness. A focus on the measurement and description of initiatives is proposed.

80. Consolidated indicator CONS-O-18 overcomes two major shortcomings of draft indicator O-21: the lack of reference to financing and economic and policy incentives, and the lack of measurement of the volume of financing.³⁰ CONS-O-18 measures the volume of financing allocated to facilitating access to technology and it reports on the existence of economic and policy incentives facilitating access to technology at national, sub-regional and regional level. The consolidated indicator is both quantitative and qualitative. In measuring the financial resources, those allocated to “technical support” (both physical aid and knowledge aid) will be disaggregated, so as to report on the three main types of support measures referred to by the outcome: (a) financing, (b) technical support, and (c) economic and policy incentives.

81. CONS-O-18 provides a measure of the performance of affected country Parties in creating an enabling environment for technology transfer, according to article 12 of the Convention. However, it also measures the performance of developed country Parties in complying with the obligation foreseen by article 6 of the Convention, paragraph (e), if low levels of financial resources dedicated to technology transfer occur. Additionally, the narrative description of incentives will allow the sharing of information among Parties, thus increasing the possibility for affected country Parties to learn about measures facilitating access to technology.

82. Country Parties may wish to set national targets to reach the increasing trend envisaged by the overall targets of CONS-O-18.

V. Conclusions and recommendations

83. Performance indicators, once adopted, will become a mainstay of the new performance review and assessment system applied by the CRIC. They will guide affected country Parties in the implementation of action programmes as well as orient developed country Parties and other UNCCD stakeholders in supportive actions to be taken. In this regard, the CRIC may wish:

(a) To consider draft consolidated performance indicators and their proposed global targets, and to recommend their adoption by the COP;

³⁰ IIWG-O-21: Number and type of technical support measures received from South-South and North-South cooperation.

(b) To indicate a date by which national targets for those indicators not needing global targets should be communicated to the secretariat;

(c) To invite the COP to request the JLG to provide technical assistance on outcome 2.5;

(d) To provide guidance to the secretariat in assessing capacity-building needs for the performance review and assessment of implementation of the Convention and The Strategy.
