



UNITED
NATIONS



**Convention to Combat
Desertification**

Distr.
GENERAL

ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.2
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

Methodological guide on the use of performance indicators for the review of implementation of The Strategy and related metadata

Summary

Following decision 3/COP.8 on the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008–2018) (The Strategy), the secretariat was requested to finalize the process of consolidating performance indicators for measuring progress against the operational objectives of The Strategy. The set of consolidated performance indicators is presented in document ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.1.

The Committee for the Review of Implementation of the Convention at its seventh session requested the secretariat to develop a methodology to guide Parties in the use of performance indicators, aiming at a common understanding of the process and of the implementation modalities on the part of all reporting entities.

The present document provides relevant background information pertaining to each of the eighteen consolidated performance indicators, including the rationale for the indicators' selection, data needed and sources, computation method, unit, geographical level of application and reporting entities in charge.

While the Conference of the Parties is expected to take action on the set of performance indicators, this document provides relevant information to facilitate understanding of the context in which indicators will be applied, and will assist in the review and adoption of the performance indicators. A glossary of the terminology and definitions used in the formulation of the indicators is presented in document ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.3.

CONTENTS

| | <u>Paragraphs</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------------|-------------|
| Abbreviations..... | | 3 |
| I. INTRODUCTION..... | 1-4 | 3 |
| II. METADATA OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS..... | | 4 |
| A. Operational objective 1: Advocacy, awareness raising and Education..... | | 4 |
| B. Operational objective 2: Policy framework..... | | 8 |
| C. Operational objective 3: Science, technology and knowledge..... | | 11 |
| D. Operational objective 4: Capacity building..... | | 16 |
| E. Operational objective 5: Financing and technology transfer . | | 17 |
| III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 5-7 | 22 |

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|--------------|--|
| CONS | Consolidated performance indicator |
| COP | Conference of the Parties |
| CSO | civil society organization |
| CST | Committee on Science and Technology |
| DLDD | desertification/land degradation and drought |
| e-SMART | economic- Specific – Measurable – Achievable – Relevant – Time-bound |
| GDP | gross domestic product |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| GM | Global Mechanism |
| IFS | Integrated Financing Strategy |
| IGO | intergovernmental organization |
| NAP | national action programme |
| NCSA | national capacity self-assessment |
| NGO | nongovernmental organization |
| RAP | regional action programme |
| SLM | sustainable land management |
| SRAP | subregional action programme |
| The Strategy | 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008–2018) |
| UNCCD | United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification |

I. Introduction

1. This document responds to the request made by Parties to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) at the seventh session of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention (CRIC 7), to develop a methodology guiding Parties in the use of performance indicators, with the aim of pursuing a common understanding of the process and of the implementation modalities on the part of all reporting entities.¹ The background information provided in the present document refers to the context in which performance indicators will be collected and used. A glossary clarifying the terminology and definitions used in the formulation of the indicators, as additionally requested by CRIC 7, is presented in document ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.3.

2. For each indicator, the background information (metadata) includes: the indicator's name, number and type (quantitative or qualitative), the rationale for the indicators' selection, the level of compliance of the indicator to the e-SMART criteria, the data required and the method of computation of these data, the unit of measurement, the data sources (or means of verification), the geographical level of application of the indicator, and the reporting entities in charge.²

¹ ICCD/CRIC(7)/5, paragraph 110.

² The acronym e- SMART stands for 'economic- Specific – Measurable – Achievable – Relevant – Time-bound'.

3. While the proposed performance indicators are mostly quantitative indicators (with the exception of CONS-O16), Parties and reporting entities will be requested to provide in their report a short qualitative assessment of the activities reported on by outcome area in order to provide further details on implementation efforts and allowing for flexibility in reporting, as requested by Parties at CRIC 7.

4. The metadata are presented in sections from A to E below, each section corresponding to one of the operational objectives of The Strategy.

II. Metadata of performance indicators

A. Operational objective 1: Advocacy, awareness-raising and education

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Indicator name | 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. | | |
| Indicator °no. | CONS-O-1 | Type | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative |
| Rationale | The indicator measures the performance of communication processes. Performance is measured through the number of events organized, the size of these events, and the audience reached by the media, and is measured directly by the stakeholders reporting to the Convention or by third parties. The level 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. | | |
| Compliance with e-SMART criteria³ | | | |
| economic | + / - | Information needs to be collected from several sources; some compilation work by the focal points is thus required and this may involve some costs. | |
| Specific | + | The indicator relates directly to outcome 1.1. | |
| Measurable | + | The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable statistics (information events and people). | |
| Achievable | + / - | Estimates of audience numbers reached by the media may be difficult to gather. | |
| Relevant | + | The indicator focuses on information activities specifically dedicated to DLDD and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity. It facilitates the monitoring of Convention-related communication strategies at all levels. An assessment of the audience reached by media dealing with DLDD issues provides a broad insight into the level of effectiveness of communication; the assumption is that the stronger the media campaigns on DLDD issues and synergies (intensity of the role played by the media), the higher the probability of passing the messages on to the target audience. | |
| Time-bound | + | The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time as necessary. | |

³ Compliance with e-SMART criteria: the three signs used here (+, +/- and -) reflect degrees of effectiveness of indicators where + is the most effective.

| Data required and method of computation | Unit of measurement | Number |
|--|---------------------|--------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data needed: only events/media specifically addressing DLDD and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity are to be included. ▪ Events and media shall be those directly organized/produced by the stakeholders reporting to the Convention and by third parties not directly reporting to the Convention (for example, television channels, newspapers.). ▪ Definitions of “information events”, “media product” and “key stakeholders” are provided in the glossary. ▪ Computation, on a yearly basis, from 2008: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Count the information events; give the total number of events. - For those events with recorded attendance (meetings, workshops, seminars) count the number of participants to the events; give the total number of participants. - Estimate the number of key stakeholders reached by the media; give the total number of people reached, by key stakeholder group and by media product. | | |
| Data sources (means of verification) | | |
| International and national media (newspapers) advertising the events, the Internet, attendance lists of events, projects’ final reports, estimates of target audience for major media events (campaigns, radio and television programmes, etc.) provided by the organizers of the events. | | |
| Geographical level of application | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> International <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local | | |
| Entities reporting on the indicators | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affected country Parties <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Developed country Parties <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UN and IGOs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GEF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities <input type="checkbox"/> Secretariat <input type="checkbox"/> GM | | |

| Indicator name | Number of official documents and decisions at international, regional and subregional level relating to DLDD issues. | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Indicator no. | CONS-O-2 | Type | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative |
| Rationale | The indicator measures the performance of advocacy activities carried out by the various Convention stakeholders. Performance is measured through the frequency with which DLDD issues are treated in international, regional and subregional forums and by the number of DLDD-related official decisions/documents. The level of 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. | | |
| Compliance with e-SMART criteria | | | |
| economic | - | The indicator requires systematic compilation work by the secretariat, the restructuring of the Convention website and its regular updating. This involves costs. Other stakeholders will have no financial burden, their role being limited to alerting the secretariat of documents and decisions, at any time. | |
| Specific | + | The indicator relates directly to outcome 1.2. By compiling a list of relevant forums, upon approval of this list by COP 9 there will be no ambiguities regarding the sources of decisions and documents. | |
| Measurable | + | The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable figures (relevant official documents and decisions referring to DLDD). | |
| Achievable | + | No major difficulties are foreseen in tracking decisions and documents. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Relevant | + | The indicator provides a measure of the recognition of DLDD issues at the international, regional and subregional level, and is thus an assessment of advocacy activities. The analysis of the decisions taken, and in particular of binding ones which may impact on implementation, and the analysis of the number and type of documents, may reveal whether the Convention receives enough attention in different contexts, including the political arena, the scientific community and civil society. |
| Time-bound | + | The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time as necessary. |
| Data required and method of computation | | Unit of measurement |
| | | Number |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only decisions and documents directly or indirectly related to DLDD issues are to be considered and uploaded onto the Convention website. Priority shall be given to those directly relating to DLDD. Decisions shall be “official”. Definitions of “decisions and documents” and “official” are provided in the glossary. Decisions can be classified according to their binding or voluntary character. Documents can be classified according to the type of source (international organizations, governmental organizations, CSOs, science and technology institutions etc.), thus measuring the level of involvement in advocacy by the different stakeholders. Computation, on a yearly basis, from 2008: count the decisions and documents uploaded onto the Convention website. | | |
| Data sources (means of verification) | | |
| The Internet, the web sites of the forums included in the list submitted to COP 9 for approval, the websites of organizations dealing with DLDD, hard copies of decisions and documents. | | |
| Geographical level of application | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> International <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub-regional <input type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Local | | |
| Entities reporting on the indicators | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Affected country Parties <input type="checkbox"/> Developed country Parties <input type="checkbox"/> UN and IGOs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GEF <input type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Secretariat <input type="checkbox"/> GM | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| Indicator name | Number of CSOs and science and technology institutions participating in the Convention processes | | |
| Indicator no. | CONS-O-3 | Type | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative |
| Rationale | The indicator measures the performance of engagement processes of CSOs and science and technology institutions in the Convention. Performance is measured through quantification of the participation of these stakeholders in the institutional processes, in the IFS devised by the GM, and in DLDD-related programmes and projects. The level of performance will indicate whether the involvement of CSOs and the scientific community increases over time. | | |
| Compliance with e-SMART criteria | | | |
| economic | +/- | Some compilation work by the Convention stakeholders (at the field level) and by the secretariat and the GM (at the institutional level) is required. This may involve some costs. | |
| Specific | + | The indicator directly refers to the “engagement” component of outcome 1.3. Engagement is meant both at the field level and at the institutional level, including the IFS of the GM. | |
| Measurable | + | The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable parameters (participation in meetings and strategic processes, and in programmes/projects). | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Achievable | + | At field level, information on DLDD-related programmes/projects is needed in order to report on this indicator; details of the implementing partners of programmes and projects is usually included in the main information about each programme/project and should be easily retrievable. At the institutional level, the information necessary for reporting on the indicator shall be readily available to the secretariat and the GM. |
| Relevant | + | The indicator provides a measure of the level of participation of CSOs and science and technology institutions in the Convention processes. Institutionally, it assesses the performance of those meant to facilitate the participation of these target groups. At field level, it assesses the validity of programmes/projects as tools for the engagement of, and contributions from, by CSOs and the scientific community. |
| Time-bound | + | The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time as necessary. |
| Data required and method of computation | | Unit of measurement |
| | | Number |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only formal engagement is to be considered. At the institutional level, this implies registration of the stakeholders among the participants and their actual participation in the meetings; at the field level, it implies that the stakeholders are included in the partnerships implementing the programmes/projects. Within the IFS, formal engagement is determined by the GM. ▪ Definitions of “Convention processes”, “science and technology institutions” and “CSOs” are included in the glossary. ▪ Computation, on a yearly basis, from 2008: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For meetings (institutional level: CRIC, COP, regional level, IFS): count the number of registered organizations/institutions and the number of participating organizations/institutions. - For programmes/projects (field level): count the number of CSOs and science and technology institutions participating in the implementing partnership, either as leaders or as partners. | | |
| Data sources (means of verification) | | |
| At the field level: programmes/project sheets, or programmes’/projects’ interim or final reports. At the institutional level: registration lists, meetings’ lists of attendance, GM reports. | | |
| Geographical level of application | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> International <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub-regional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Local | | |
| Entities reporting on the indicators | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affected country Parties <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Developed country Parties <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UN and IGOs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GEF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Secretariat <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GM | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| Indicator name | Number and type of DLDD-related initiatives of CSOs and science and technology institutions in the field of education. | | |
| Indicator no. | CONS-O-4 | Type | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative |
| Rationale | The indicator measures the performance of CSOs and science and technology institutions in the education sector. Performance is measured through the number and type of their education-related initiatives. The level of performance will indicate the commitment of these stakeholders to addressing DLDD problems. | | |
| Compliance with e-SMART criteria | | | |
| economic | +/- | Information needs to be collected from several sources and stakeholders; this compilation work by reporting entities may involve some costs. | |
| Specific | + | The indicator refers to the “initiatives undertaken” component of outcome 1.3, focusing on the education sector since awareness and advocacy initiatives are addressed by CONS-O-1 and CONS-O-2. | |
| Measurable | + | The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable statistics (number and type of interventions). | |

| | | |
|--|-----|---|
| Achievable | +/- | The compilation of this indicator is feasible if information flows exist between major CSOs, science and technology institutions; reporting entities, United Nations agencies/IGOs and the GEF may already have available sectoral databases that can be used for reporting against this indicator. |
| Relevant | + | The indicator provides a measure of the volume, by type, of the activities of target stakeholders in the education sector. The higher the number of initiatives undertaken by them, the stronger their interest in combating DLDD. Besides the level of commitment, it assesses the presence/absence of a balance between academic activities in the formal sector on the one hand, and on the other hand interventions at the grass-roots level meant to educate communities living in areas affected by DLDD. |
| Time-bound | + | The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time as necessary. |
| Data required and method of computation | | Unit of measurement |
| | | Number |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only the type of interventions directly relating to DLDD issues are to be considered. ▪ Definitions of “type of initiatives” in the field of education, of “science and technology institutions” and of “CSOs” are provided in the glossary. ▪ Computation, on a yearly basis, from 2008: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Count the initiatives undertaken by CSOs and science and technology institutions in the field of education, classified according to a list of interventions. - Give the total of initiatives per type of intervention and overall (all types of intervention) for CSOs, if possible distinguishing within the CSOs between the private sector, NGOs, grassroots organizations and others. - Give the total of initiatives per type of intervention and overall (all types of intervention) for science and technology institutions. | | |
| Data sources (means of verification) | | |
| Screening of documents at the various national and international levels and/or information provided by CSOs and science and technology institutions. | | |
| Geographical level of application | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> International <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Local | | |
| Entities reporting on the indicators | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affected country Parties <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Developed country Parties <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UN and IGOs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GEF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities <input type="checkbox"/> Secretariat <input type="checkbox"/> GM | | |

B. Operational objective 2: Policy framework

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---|-------------|---|
| Indicator name | 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 | | |
| Indicator no. | CONS-O-5 | Type | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative |
| Rationale | The indicator measures the performance of one integrated process by analysis of DLDD drivers, barriers to possible solutions, and measures that may eventually overcome the barriers (outcome 2.1), by integrating these measures with other existing planning, policies and investment frameworks (outcome 2.3), and by formulating/revising NAPs (outcome 2.2). Performance is measured through the actual formulation/revision of NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs aligned to The Strategy. The level of performance will indicate the responsiveness of the Parties to COP decision 3/COP.8. | | |

| Compliance with e-SMART criteria | | |
|---|---|--|
| economic | + | The measurement of this indicator involves no cost for the reporting Parties. |
| Specific | + | The indicator refers to NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs either explicitly (outcomes 2.2. and 2.3) or inexplicitly (outcome 2.1). |
| Measurable | + | The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable documents (NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs). |
| Achievable | + | The information needed to compile the indicator is directly available to reporting entities. |
| Relevant | + | The indicator provides a measure of the extent to which the Parties have responded to decision 3/COP.8, paragraph 45, and of the feasibility of assessing the progress of The Strategy over its implementation period (2008–2018). |
| Time-bound | + | The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time as necessary. |
| Data required and method of computation | | Unit of measurement |
| | | Number |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only those NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs formally approved by the relevant governmental authorities are to be considered to be finalized. ▪ Computation: reporting entities shall indicate whether they have formulated or revised their NAPs, SRAPs, RAPs in line with The Strategy, according to the instructions given in the reporting guidelines. | | |
| Data sources (means of verification) | | |
| NAPs, SRAPs and RAPs. | | |
| Geographical level of application | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> International <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Local | | |
| Entities reporting on the indicators | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affected country Parties <input type="checkbox"/> Developed country Parties <input type="checkbox"/> UN and IGOs <input type="checkbox"/> GEF | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities <input type="checkbox"/> Secretariat <input type="checkbox"/> GM | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| Indicator name | Number of partnership agreements established within the framework of the Convention between developed country Parties/United Nations and other IGOs and affected country Parties. | | |
| Indicator no. | CONS-O-6 | Type | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative |
| Rationale | The indicator measures the performance of policy-enabling processes. Performance is measured through the number of partnership agreements established between developed country Parties/United Nations and other IGOs on one side, and affected country Parties on the other, on a bilateral or a multilateral basis but always and only within the framework of the Convention. The level of performance will indicate whether affected country Parties may count on sufficiently enabling environments facilitating a regular flow of resources. | | |
| Compliance with e-SMART criteria | | | |
| economic | + | The measurement of this indicator involves no cost for the reporting Parties. | |
| Specific | +/- | The indicator refers to outcome 2.4 by considering the partnership agreements as the tools through which developed country Parties incorporate UNCCD objectives (and SLM) into their development cooperation activities. Besides developed country Parties, the indicator also includes United Nations organizations and other IGOs in order to obtain a comprehensive picture of the existing frameworks that may support each affected country Party in implementing the Convention. | |
| Measurable | + | The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable documents. | |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Achievable | + | No major difficulties are foreseen in tracking relevant documents and in extracting the necessary information. Developed country Parties, United Nations and other IGOs are expected to keep an accurate record of partnership agreements. |
| Relevant | + | The indicator provides a measure of the existing policy frameworks through which UNCCD objectives are mainstreamed by developed country Parties and international organizations. The assumption is that partnership agreements may allow for a regular flow of resources to affected country Parties according to written terms and conditions. The higher the number of partnerships agreements on which affected country Parties may count, the higher their chance of relying on diverse resources to tackle the objectives of the Convention. |
| Time-bound | + | The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time as necessary. |

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|--------|
| Data required and method of computation | Unit of measurement | Number |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only partnership agreements directly relating to the UNCCD are to be considered. ▪ Only ongoing agreements will be considered. ▪ A distinction is to be made between those agreements which relate to integrated investment frameworks and those which do not. ▪ Partnership agreements should be in written form. ▪ The definition of “partnership agreement” is provided in the glossary. ▪ Computation: count the number of ongoing agreements established with affected country Parties. Provide the list, specifying the beneficiary country/ies, the date of finalization of the agreement and whether the agreement refers to integrated investment frameworks. | | |
| Data sources (means of verification) | | |
| Developed country Parties and international agencies records. | | |
| Geographical level of application | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> International <input type="checkbox"/> Regional <input type="checkbox"/> Subregional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Local | | |
| Entities reporting on the indicators | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Affected country Parties <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Developed country Parties <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UN and IGOs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GEF <input type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities <input type="checkbox"/> Secretariat <input type="checkbox"/> GM | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Indicator name | Number of initiatives for synergistic planning/programming of the three Rio Conventions or mechanisms for joint implementation, at all levels. | | |
| Indicator no. | CONS-O-7 | Type | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative |
| Rationale | The indicator measures the performance of synergistic processes. Performance is measured through the number of instruments in place fostering the introduction or strengthening of mutually reinforcing measures among the three Rio conventions. The level of performance will indicate whether it is realistic to expect the achievement of synergies in implementation. | | |
| Compliance with e-SMART criteria | | | |
| economic | +/- | Some screening work by reporting entities is required and this may involve some costs. | |
| Specific | +/- | The indicator is a proxy to outcome 2.5. It refers to the instruments which are necessary in order to achieve mutually reinforcing measures among the Rio Conventions and not to the direct measurement of these mutually reinforcing measures. | |
| Measurable | + | The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable statistics/entities (planning documents and operational mechanisms such as committees, forums, etc.). | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Achievable | + | The necessary information is assumed to be available to reporting entities and no major difficulties are foreseen in tracking relevant documents. |
| Relevant | + | The indicator provides a measure of the presence/absence at all levels of operational mechanisms established for the introduction and/or strengthening of mutually reinforcing measures between the UNCCD and the other Rio Conventions. It assesses the feasibility of synergistic implementation at national level. The higher the number of enabling instruments in place, the higher the possibility of achieving synergies. |
| Time-bound | + | The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time as necessary. |
| Data required and method of computation | | Unit of measurement |
| | | Number |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only those mechanisms which have clearly spelled out in their objectives the achievement of joint implementation, synergies, convergence, and the introduction or strengthening of reinforcing measures among the Rio Conventions are to be considered eligible for counting. ▪ There are two major groups of “instruments” considered appropriate for introducing and strengthening mutually reinforcing measures among the Rio Conventions: (a) joint planning/programming, and (b) operational mechanisms for joint implementation or mutual reinforcement. Eligible instruments may be further defined by the Joint Liaison Group. ▪ Reporting entities should indicate whether there are: (a) planning/programming tools referring to the joint implementation of the Rio Conventions, and (b) operational mechanisms to ensure joint implementation, synergies, convergence, and the introduction or strengthening of reinforcing measures. | | |
| Data sources (means of verification) | | |
| Planning/programming documents, legislative/regulatory documents. | | |
| Geographical level of application | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> International <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Local | | |
| Entities reporting on the indicators | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affected country Parties <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Developed country Parties <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UN and IGOs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GEF | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Secretariat <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GM | | |

C. Operational objective 3: Science, technology and knowledge

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| Indicator name | Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities to have established and supported a national/subregional/regional monitoring system for DLDD | | |
| Indicator no. | CONS-O-8 | Type | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative |
| Rationale | The indicator measures the performance of monitoring processes. Performance is measured through the number of monitoring systems established and supported, through either national or external assistance, and specifically or partially (in the case of environmental monitoring systems) dedicated to UNCCD reporting. The level of performance will indicate to what extent it is realistic to expect regular and coherent reporting by affected country Parties and subregional and regional entities during the implementation of The Strategy and beyond. | | |
| Compliance with e-SMART criteria | | | |
| Economic | + | The measurement of this indicator involves no cost for the reporting entities. | |
| Specific | + | The indicator refers directly to outcome 3.1. It is also meant to provide direct information as to whether these systems are financially and professionally sustainable. | |
| Measurable | + | The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable statistics (presence/absence of a monitoring system). | |

| | | |
|--|-----|--|
| Achievable | +/- | Misunderstandings may arise regarding the meaning of “monitoring system” since the definition provided in the glossary is broad in order to fit the various situations that may occur at country level. |
| Relevant | + | The indicator provides a measure of the sustainability of the monitoring exercise. In the absence of monitoring systems and/or regular support to monitoring system maintenance, regularity and consistency in the provision of information to the Convention is unlikely. |
| Time-bound | + | The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time as necessary. |
| Data required and method of computation | | Unit of measurement Number |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only those monitoring systems storing all or most of the relevant information needed for reporting to the UNCCD are to be counted. The definition of “monitoring system” is provided in the glossary. Reporting entities should indicate whether: (a) they have established/contributed to establishing a monitoring system fully or partially (but substantially) dedicated to UNCCD reporting, (b) the monitoring systems are supported to ensure their financial and professional sustainability. | | |
| Data sources (means of verification) | | |
| National documents, international agencies records, programmes/projects sheets and reports. | | |
| Geographical level of application | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> International <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Local | | |
| Entities reporting on the indicators | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affected country Parties <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Developed country Parties <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UN and IGOs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GEF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities <input type="checkbox"/> Secretariat <input type="checkbox"/> GM | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Indicator name | Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities reporting to the Convention along revised reporting guidelines on the basis of agreed indicators | | |
| Indicator no. | CONS-O-9 | Type | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative |
| Rationale | The indicator measures the performance of the development process of biophysical and socio-economic information at the national level. Performance is measured through the number of Parties reporting against the commonly agreed core set of impact indicators for the UNCCD, using harmonized methodologies. The level of performance will indicate to what extent it will be possible to compile a comparable and global assessment of UNCCD impact. | | |
| Compliance with e-SMART criteria | | | |
| economic | + | The measurement of this indicator involves no cost for the reporting Parties. | |
| Specific | + | The indicator refers to outcome 3.2 in the light of the mandate of the CST for developing a core set of impact indicators and for suggesting common baselines and methodologies, all of which imply the gradual harmonization of approaches referred to in the outcome. | |
| Measurable | + | The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable statistics (quantitative and qualitative information provided against the core set of impact indicators of the UNCCD). | |
| Achievable | + | No major difficulties are foreseen in the self-assessment to be carried out by reporting entities along the reporting guidelines. | |
| Relevant | + | The indicator provides a measure of the adoption by affected country Parties of the new reporting requirements of the Convention. Indirectly, it shows whether comprehensive and comparable monitoring of the impact will be feasible during the implementation of The Strategy and beyond. | |
| Timescale | + | The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time as necessary. | |

| | | |
|--|----------------------------|--------|
| Data required and method of computation | Unit of measurement | Number |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The outcome refers only to impact indicators, thus the indicator will be measured only every four years. Computation: count the number of common impact indicators against which affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities have reported to the Convention. | | |
| Data sources (means of verification) | | |
| Reports to the Convention by affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities. | | |
| Geographical level of application | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> International <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Local | | |
| Entities reporting on the indicators | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affected country Parties <input type="checkbox"/> Developed country Parties <input type="checkbox"/> UN and IGOs <input type="checkbox"/> GEF | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities <input type="checkbox"/> Secretariat <input type="checkbox"/> GM | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Indicator name | 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. | | |
| Indicator no. | CONS-O-10 | Type | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative |
| Rationale | The indicator measures the performance of knowledge-transfer processes from the theoretical to the operational level. Performance is measured through the assessment of the traditional and scientific knowledge reflected in the NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs meant to guide DLDD-related decision-making at all levels within each affected country. The underlying assumption is that action programmes based on sound scientific knowledge will propose more significant and effective strategies and activities for implementation, and will, ultimately, perform better than those action plans that do not take into account available knowledge on DLDD and DLDD synergies. The level of performance will thus indicate whether UNCCD implementation is likely to achieve meaningful results. | | |
| Compliance with e-SMART criteria | | | |
| economic | + | The measurement of this indicator involves a thorough review of revised NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs by national focal points, but no major costs are foreseen. | |
| Specific | +/- | The indicator indirectly refers to outcomes 3.3 and 3.4 focusing on the knowledge reflected in the NAPs, SRAPs and RAPs. | |
| Measurable | + | The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable documents (action plans, reports). However, it also implies a quality control process. | |
| Achievable | +/- | A quality review implies the setting of clear criteria against which quality can be assessed. These criteria will be explained in the reporting guidelines and will guide the process of self-assessment by country Parties. | |
| Relevant | + | The indicator provides a measure of the quality of revised NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs. As the main instruments for implementing the Convention, good quality NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs represent a greater chance of successful implementation of the UNCCD and of the achievement of its goals. | |
| Time-bound | + | The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time as necessary. | |
| Data required and method of computation | Unit of measurement | Number | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only the revised NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs meeting the established quality criteria are to be measured by this indicator. Computation: number of NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs based on sound knowledge of DLDD drivers and their interactions, and of the interaction of DLDD with climate change and biodiversity, according to the established quality criteria. | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--------------------------------|
| Data sources (means of verification) | | | | |
| Revised NAPs/SRAPs/RAPs documents. | | | | |
| Geographical level of application | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> International | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National | <input type="checkbox"/> Local |
| Entities reporting on the indicators | | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affected country Parties | <input type="checkbox"/> Developed country Parties | <input type="checkbox"/> UN and IGOs | <input type="checkbox"/> GEF | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities | | <input type="checkbox"/> Secretariat | <input type="checkbox"/> GM | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| Indicator name | Type, number and users of DLDD-relevant knowledge-sharing systems at the global, regional, subregional and national levels | | |
| Indicator no. | CONS-O-11 | Type | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative |
| Rationale | The indicator measures the performance of DLDD-related knowledge-sharing processes. Performance is measured through the quantification of type and number of existing systems; effectiveness of these systems is measured through the quantification of users. The level of performance will indicate whether scientific and traditional knowledge, including best practices, is available to and sufficiently shared with end-users. | | |
| Compliance with e-SMART criteria | | | |
| economic | - | The indicator requires a systematic compilation work by the secretariat, the restructuring of the Convention website and its regular updating. This may involve costs. No major costs are foreseen for the other reporting entities. | |
| Specific | + | The indicator relates directly to outcome 3.5. | |
| Measurable | + | The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable information (knowledge-sharing systems/networks and users), although qualitative input is required for the quality control of these systems before their uploading onto the Convention website. | |
| Achievable | + | No major difficulties are foreseen in identifying relevant knowledge-sharing systems, provided that there is a common agreement by all stakeholders on their definition. | |
| Relevant | + | The indicator provides a measure of the Convention as “depository” of DLDD-related knowledge and an assessment of the geographical distribution and volume of existing knowledge sharing systems/networks relating to DLDD. By quantifying the number of users, a broad insight into the effectiveness of these systems is gathered. | |
| Time-bound | + | The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time as necessary. | |
| Data required and method of computation | | Unit of measurement | Number |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only DLDD-relevant knowledge-sharing systems and networks are to be considered eligible for uploading onto the Convention website. ▪ Only those knowledge-sharing systems/networks passing a quality control by the secretariat shall be eligible for inclusion/description onto the Convention website. ▪ The definition of “knowledge-sharing system” is provided in the glossary. ▪ Computation, on a yearly basis, from 2008: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Give the number of DLDD-related knowledge-sharing systems, together with a narrative description. - Give the number of users per system, by year. | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--------------------------------|
| Data sources (means of verification) | | | | |
| The Internet; the websites of relevant organizations, networks, and of all reporting entities; the “survey of networks” commissioned by the CST in the past. | | | | |
| Geographical level of application | | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> International | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National | <input type="checkbox"/> Local |
| Entities reporting on the indicators | | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affected country Parties | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Developed country Parties | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UN and IGOs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GEF | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Secretariat | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GM | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| Indicator name | Number of science and technology networks, institutions or scientists engaged in research mandated by the COP | | | |
| Indicator no. | CONS-O-12 | Type | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative | <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative |
| Rationale | The indicator measures the performance of Convention-driven research processes. Performance is measured through the number of technology networks, institutions or scientists to have contributed concretely in their research work to the implementation of the Convention. The level of performance will indicate to what extent the implementation of the Convention is guided by sound scientific evidence. | | | |
| Compliance with e-SMART criteria | | | | |
| economic | + | The measurement of this indicator involves no cost for the secretariat. | | |
| Specific | + | The indicator relates directly to outcome 3.6. | | |
| Measurable | + | The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable information (institutions, networks or scientists engaged through contracts). | | |
| Achievable | + | No major difficulties are foreseen in tracking and screening contractual documents/agreements. The secretariat will be able to retrieve this information easily. | | |
| Relevant | + | The indicator provides a measure of the level of research directly driven by the Convention. Thus the research included should be highly relevant for the Convention and contribute substantially to its implementation. | | |
| Time-bound | + | The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time as necessary. | | |
| Data required and method of computation | | Unit of measurement | Number | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only the “direct engagement” should be measured, and thus not claims for support and indirect contributions. ▪ Computation, on a yearly basis, from 2008: count the number of institutions, networks, or scientists to have been asked by the COP (upon the advice of the CST) to undertake research work. | | | | |
| Data sources (means of verification) | | | | |
| Contractual documents/agreements within the UNCCD. Institutions, networks or scientists may be registered as individual (national), regional or international organizations. | | | | |
| Geographical level of application | | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> International | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National | <input type="checkbox"/> Local |
| Entities reporting on the indicators | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Affected country Parties | <input type="checkbox"/> Developed country Parties | <input type="checkbox"/> UN and IGOs | <input type="checkbox"/> GEF | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Secretariat | <input type="checkbox"/> GM | |

D. Operational objective 4: Capacity building

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Indicator name | 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 | | |
| Indicator no. | CONS-O-13 | Type | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative |
| Rationale | The indicator measures the performance of capacity-building processes. Performance is measured through the quantification of existing capacity-building initiatives. The level of performance will indicate whether affected country Parties may be expected to meet the obligations foreseen by the Convention, including forthcoming ones (new reporting requirements, establishment of environmental monitoring systems, accessing new financing mechanisms). | | |
| Compliance with e-SMART criteria | | | |
| economic | +/- | The measurement of this indicator involves screening a relevant number of documents and programmes and project reports; thus it may involve some costs for the reporting entities. | |
| Specific | +/- | The indicator relates directly to outcomes 4.1 and 4.2. | |
| Measurable | + | The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable information (capacity-building plans, programmes, projects). | |
| Achievable | +/- | At the national level, tracking relevant capacity-building plans, programmes and projects may require the establishment of cooperation or communication channels with line ministries to make the gathering exercise feasible. | |
| Relevant | + | The indicator provides a measure of the capacities of Parties to meet the obligations foreseen by the Convention. The indicator also measures the performance of all stakeholders in supporting capacity-building, and of the Convention institutional bodies in facilitating and promoting capacity-building in affected country Parties through the mobilization and/or provision of resources. This quantitative information is complemented and made more significant by the description of the processes and instruments used alongside with the reporting guidelines. | |
| Time-bound | + | The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time as necessary. | |
| Data required and method of computation | | Unit of measurement | Number |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only capacity-building plans/programmes/projects formally approved by the relevant governmental authorities/ organizations concerned and specifically directed to DLDD are to be considered. ▪ Computation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number of capacity-building plans/programmes/projects deriving from NCSAs or other instruments, methodologies or cooperation and directly addressing DLDD topics. A distinction shall be made between plans/programmes/projects (a) under implementation at the time of reporting, and (b) completed or finalized at the time of reporting. - Give the total for (a) plus (b) above. | | | |
| Data sources (means of verification) | | | |
| National, subregional, regional documents, programs/project documents. | | | |
| Geographical level of application | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> International <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local | | | |
| Entities reporting on the indicators | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affected country Parties <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Developed country Parties <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UN and IGOSs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GEF | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities <input type="checkbox"/> Secretariat <input type="checkbox"/> GM | | | |

E. Operational objective 5: Financing and technology transfer

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| Indicator name | 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. | | |
| Indicator no. | CONS-O-14 | Type | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative |
| Rationale | The indicator measures the performance of integrated financing processes. Performance is measured through the quantification of integrated investment frameworks developed by country Parties within the IFS devised by the GM or other integrated financing strategies promoted by diverse international institutions. The level of performance will indicate whether leveraging of resources may be expected at the implementation level. | | |
| Compliance with e-SMART criteria | | | |
| economic | + | The measurement of this indicator involves no cost for the reporting entities. | |
| Specific | + | The indicator directly relates to outcome 5.1. | |
| Measurable | + | The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable documents (investment frameworks). | |
| Achievable | + | Existing integrated investment frameworks are supposed to be readily available to focal points on one side, and to those promoting them on the other side. | |
| Relevant | + | The indicator measures the level of implementation of the IFS or of other integrated financing strategies promoted by diverse international institutions. The IFS is an instrument directly relevant to the Convention, its level of implementation directly influencing the level of achievement of the goals of the Convention. Integrated investment frameworks developed according to the GM or other international institutions' guidelines are assumed to reflect leveraging of resources, thus increasing the probability of higher efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources and, ultimately, fostering a more significant impact at the field level. The indicator directly measures the performance of the reporting Parties; indirectly, it also measures the performance of the GM and of other international financing institutions in promoting these integrated tools. | |
| Time-bound | + | The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time as necessary. | |
| Data required and method of computation | | Unit of measurement | Number |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Investment frameworks prepared along the guidelines devised within integrated financing strategies shall be considered by this indicator. A distinction shall be made between those relating to the IFS devised by the GM and those not. ▪ Computation: count the integrated investment frameworks developed by affected country Parties and subregional and regional entities. | | | |
| Data sources (means of verification) | | | |
| The developed integrated investment frameworks. | | | |
| Geographical level of application | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> International <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Local | | | |
| Entities reporting on the indicators | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affected country Parties <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Developed country Parties <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UN and IGOSs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GEF | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities <input type="checkbox"/> Secretariat <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GM | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Indicator name | Amount of financial resources made available by developed country Parties to combat DLDD. | | |
| Indicator no. | CONS-O-15 | Type | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative |
| Rationale | The indicator measures the performance of the bilateral contribution process. Performance is measured through quantification of the flow of financial resources from developed country Parties to affected country Parties for the implementation of the Convention. The level of performance will indicate whether financial resources contributed by developed country Parties are substantial enough. | | |
| Compliance with e-SMART criteria | | | |
| economic | + | The measurement of this indicator involves no costs for developed country Parties. It is based mainly on the information contained in the Financial Annex, with the exception of the calculation of the GDP share. | |
| Specific | + | The indicator responds to the “substantial” character of the financial resources referred to in outcome 5.2. | |
| Measurable | + | The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable amounts. | |
| Achievable | + | Developed country Parties are supposed to have available the necessary information for completing the Financial Annex. | |
| Relevant | + | The indicator provides a measure of the financial flows from developed country Parties to affected country Parties, and thus of the level of compliance of the obligation foreseen by article 6 of the Convention, paragraph (b), and of the feasibility of the implementation of the Convention at national levels | |
| Time-bound | + | The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time as necessary. | |
| Data required and method of computation | | Unit of measurement | US\$ and % |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only financial resources provided in terms of direct investments for the implementation of the Convention are to be counted. ▪ Computation on a yearly basis, from 2008: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add the amounts provided to each affected country Party and give the total by country. - For those amounts made available at subregional and regional level, add the amounts provided to each subregion and region and give the total by subregion and region. - Add the above totals and calculate the overall total provided to all affected country Parties, subregions and regions. - Divide the overall total above by the developed country Party GDP to obtain a share figure. | | | |
| Data sources (means of verification) | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Financial Annex. ▪ For the GDP: World Bank – World Development Indicators, GDP, PPP in million international dollars available at: http://go.worldbank.org/V9DZ379BV0. ▪ As at April 2009, GDP PPP 2007 values have been published by the World Bank at: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/GDP_PPP.pdf. | | | |
| Geographical level of application | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> International | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Local |
| Entities reporting on the indicators | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Affected country Parties | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Developed country Parties | <input type="checkbox"/> UN and IGOSs | <input type="checkbox"/> GEF |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities | | <input type="checkbox"/> Secretariat | <input type="checkbox"/> GM |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Indicator name | Degree of adequacy, timeliness and predictability of financial resources made available by developed country Parties to combat DLDD | | |
| Indicator no. | CONS-O-16 | Type | <input type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qualitative |
| Rationale | The indicator measures the performance of the bilateral contribution process. Performance is measured through the qualitative assessment of the financial resources from developed country Parties to affected country Parties for the implementation of the Convention. The level of performance will indicate whether contributed financial resources are adequate, timely and predictable enough for the implementation of the action programmes at national, subregional and regional level. | | |
| Compliance with e-SMART criteria | | | |
| economic | + | Reporting against this indicator involves no cost for Parties. It is based on the qualitative description of reporting entities' experience. | |
| Specific | + | The indicator relates to the 'adequacy', 'timeliness' and 'predictability' of the financial resources referred to in outcome 5.2. | |
| Measurable | - | The indicator is not measurable. It is a qualitative indicator. | |
| Achievable | + | No major difficulties are foreseen for the narrative reporting on the indicator. | |
| Relevant | + | The indicator provides a qualitative assessment of the financial resources made available to affected country Parties through bilateral contributions, in terms of adequacy for a country's needs, timeliness and predictability of resources to allow for proper planning and implementation. "Adequate", "timely" and "predictable" resources are frequently referred to in The Strategy as being necessary to ensure effective implementation. Besides measuring the performance of those providing the financial resources, the indicator, indirectly, also measures the performance of those facilitating the financial flows. | |
| Time-bound | + | The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time as necessary. | |
| Data required and method of computation | | Unit of measurement | Scores |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The three qualitative characters will be assessed against a ranking scale. The scale range could, for example, include five assessment levels, from 1 to 5, where 1 is "very poor", 2 is "poor", 3 is "fair", 4 is "good" and 5 is "very good". Each score will be briefly justified by narrative text. Ranking will be provided for each contributing developed country Party, and overall for the total of the financial resources received on a bilateral basis. ▪ | | | |
| Data sources (means of verification) | | | |
| National documents and budgets. | | | |
| Geographical level of application | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> International <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Local | | | |
| Entities reporting on the indicators | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affected country Parties <input type="checkbox"/> Developed country Parties <input type="checkbox"/> UN and IGOSs <input type="checkbox"/> GEF | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities <input type="checkbox"/> Secretariat <input type="checkbox"/> GM | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Indicator name | Number of DLDD-related project proposals successfully submitted for financing to international financial institutions, facilities and funds, including the GEF. | | |
| Indicator no. | CONS-O-17 | Type | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative |
| Rationale | The indicator measures the performance of fund-raising processes. Performance is measured through the number of project proposals successfully submitted to the various financing organizations for funding. The level of performance will indicate whether affected country Parties and subregional and regional reporting entities make increasing efforts to mobilize resources and whether they have enough capacity to do so. | | |
| Compliance with e-SMART criteria | | | |
| economic | +/- | Information needs to be collected from several stakeholders and compilation work by the focal points is thus required; this may involve some costs. | |
| Specific | - | The indicator is a proxy to outcome 5.3, the "promotion" of UNCCD/SLM agenda being measured by means of fund-raising efforts. | |
| Measurable | + | The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable documents (project proposals). | |
| Achievable | +/- | The compilation of this indicator is feasible if information flows exist between major CSOs, science and technology institutions, line ministries and other stakeholders on the one hand, and the Convention focal points on the other. As they are focal points for the UNCCD, it would be logical that all DLDD-related proposals, although not directly involving the focal points, are at least brought to their attention before submission. Developed country Parties, the United Nations and other IGOs are expected to keep a record of proposals received. | |
| Relevant | + | The indicator provides a measure of the efforts made by affected country Parties concretely to mobilize financial resources for the implementation of the Convention. | |
| Time-bound | + | The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any necessary time. | |
| Data required and method of computation | | Unit of measurement | Number |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only project proposals directly related to DLDD issues shall be considered. ▪ Computation, on a yearly basis, from 2008: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Count and sum the project proposals submitted to international financial institutions, facilities and funds, and the GEF. - Count and sum the number of submitted proposals that have been approved for funding. - Provide the total of the amounts approved for funding within the approved projects. | | | |
| Data sources (means of verification) | | | |
| Documents (project proposals) at national, subregional and regional level; project proposals within the funding institutions. | | | |
| Geographical level of application | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> International <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Local | | | |
| Entities reporting on the indicators | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affected country Parties <input type="checkbox"/> Developed country Parties <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UN and IGOSs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GEF | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities <input type="checkbox"/> Secretariat <input type="checkbox"/> GM | | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Indicator name | Amount of financial resources and type of incentives which have enabled access to technology by affected country Parties | | |
| Indicator no. | CONS-O-18 | Type | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative |
| Rationale | The indicator measures the performance of facilitation processes for access to technology. Performance is measured through the quantification of financial resources allocated to access technology in general and to technical support in particular, and through the screening of applying economic and policy incentives. The level of performance will indicate whether enabling environments for technology transfer have been created at national level and whether sufficient resources are dedicated to technology transfer. | | |
| Compliance with e-SMART criteria | | | |
| economic | +/- | The thorough screening by the focal points of the budgets and reports of programmes/projects may involve some costs. | |
| Specific | - | The indicator refers to financing, incentives and technical support referred to in outcome 5.5 but it does not measure whether financing is adequate or incentives are effective. | |
| Measurable | + | The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable amounts. It also includes a qualitative component implying no measurement. | |
| Achievable | +/- | Difficulties are foreseen in: (a) screening a substantial quantity of documents, and (b) agreeing on a common interpretation of "access to technology". | |
| Relevant | + | The indicator provides a measure of the financial allocations and initiatives which have facilitated technology transfer within the framework of international cooperation. The narrative description of incentives allows the sharing of the information among affected country Parties, thus increasing their opportunities to learn about measures facilitating access to technology. The indicator measures the performance of affected country Parties according to articles 5 and 12 of the Convention. It also measures the performance of developed country Parties against the obligation foreseen by article 6 of the Convention, paragraph (e), if low levels of financial resources dedicated to technology transfer occur. | |
| Time-bound | + | The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time as necessary. | |
| Data required and method of computation | | Unit of measurement | US \$ |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only financial resources provided within the framework of DLDD-related projects/programmes are to be considered. ▪ Economic and policy incentives facilitating access to technology shall be those established and implemented at national, subregional or regional level, not necessarily within the framework of DLDD-related cooperation. ▪ Computation, on a yearly basis, from 2008: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extract from annual project/programme budgets the amounts allocated to enabling access to technology. Keep separated the amounts allocated to technical support (distinguishing between physical aid and knowledge aid). - Add the amounts allocated yearly to access technology, specifying those allocated to technical support. | | | |
| Data sources (means of verification) | | | |
| Programme/project budgets and interim/final reports of programmes and projects. | | | |
| Geographical level of application | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> International <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Local | | | |
| Entities reporting on the indicators | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affected country Parties <input type="checkbox"/> Developed country Parties <input type="checkbox"/> UN and IGOSs <input type="checkbox"/> GEF | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities <input type="checkbox"/> Secretariat <input type="checkbox"/> GM | | | |

III. Conclusions and recommendations

5. This document is an addendum to the main document on performance indicators (ICCD/CRIC(8)/5); conclusions and recommendations relating to the consolidated set of performance indicators to measure progress against the operational objectives of The Strategy are contained in document ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.1.

6. Parties at CRIC 8 may wish to use the information contained in the present document to deliberate on the pertinence and applicability of the proposed performance indicators.

7. Upon review and adoption of the proposed consolidated performance indicators, guidance received on metadata will be taken into account in preparation of the reporting tools to be finalized by the secretariat for each reporting entity, with the assistance of the Global Mechanism as required and according to its mandate.
