



UNITED
NATIONS



Convention to Combat Desertification

Distr.
GENERAL

ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.7
22 July 2009

Original: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE FOR THE REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

Eighth session

Buenos Aires, 23–30 September 2009

Item 4 (d) 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

Consideration of how best to measure progress on strategic objective 4 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

Consideration of how best to measure progress on strategic objective 4 of The Strategy

Summary

The 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008–2018) (The Strategy) defines four long-term strategic objectives and their impact indicators. Nevertheless, as stated in decision 3/COP.8, these impact indicators are indicative, and need to be further developed and refined. The secretariat and the Global Mechanism have shared responsibilities and tasks in further elaborating on the indicators related to strategic objective 4 (SO4).

* The document was delayed because of the need to conduct further consultations on the matter with specialized agencies and institutions.

This document presents a set of impact indicators for SO4, as developed by the two institutions, taking into account the advice provided by the Inter-Agency Task Force on reporting and the guidance received from the Bureaux of the Committee on Science and Technology (CST) and the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention (CRIC). The document also outlines the methodological approach adopted for the identification of the indicators and the relevant information for their use.

CRIC 8 is expected to review the proposed impact indicators for SO4, with the aim of submitting a draft decision to COP 9. Parties may also wish to consider developing targets for the indicators. Once adopted by COP, impact indicators will guide Parties in the implementation process and the institutions and subsidiary bodies of the Convention in the framing of the process. Impact indicators are one of the pillars of the new monitoring system put in place by CRIC and should be reviewed with reference to document ICCD/CRIC(8)/4 on the performance review and assessment of implementation system (PRAIS).

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
Abbreviations.....		3
I. INTRODUCTION	1-4	4
II. BACKGROUND	5-8	4
III. METHODOLOGY	9-11	5
IV. IDENTIFICATION OF IMPACT INDICATORS	12-34	5
A. General remarks	12-17	5
B. Impact indicators for expected impact 4.1.	18-25	6
C. Impact indicators for expected impact 4.2	26-34	8
D. Metadata for the proposed impact indicators		10
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	35-36	18

ABBREVIATIONS

BODA	bilateral official development assistance
CONS	Consolidated performance indicator
COP	Conference of the Parties
CRIC	Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention
CST	Committee on Science and Technology
DLDD	desertification/land degradation and drought
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GM	Global Mechanism
IATF	Inter-Agency Task Force
IGO	intergovernmental organization
JLG	Joint Liaison Group
JWP	joint work programme
ODA	official development assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PES	payment for ecosystem services
PRAIS	performance review and assessment of implementation system
RAP	regional action programme
RBM	results-based management
REDD	reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation
SO	strategic objective
SRAP	subregional action programme
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification

I. Introduction

1. The 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008-2018) (The Strategy) defines four long-term strategic objectives and their impact indicators.

2. Nevertheless, as stated in decision 3/COP.8, the impact indicators contained in the Strategy are indicative,¹ and need to be further developed and refined. While decision 3/COP.8 requested the Committee on Science and Technology (CST) to provide advice to the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention (CRIC) on how best to measure progress on strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 of The Strategy, there was no specific assignment of responsibilities for elaborating further on the indicators related to strategic objective 4 (SO4).

3. SO4 refers to the mobilization of resources to support the implementation of the Convention. Since its expected impacts relate to both financial and policy issues, some Parties at CRIC 7 requested the secretariat, together with the Global Mechanism (GM), to launch intergovernmental exchanges on how to approach the achievement of SO4.²

4. This document proposes a set of impact indicators to be used in assessing the implementation of The Strategy and the Convention against SO4, which was developed by the secretariat and GM on the basis of the indicators outlined in The Strategy. Essential to this process, was the advice provided by the Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF) on reporting, convened in Bonn on 14–15 May 2009, and the guidance received from the CST and CRIC Bureaux at their meetings held in Bonn on 25–26 and 27–28 May 2009, respectively.

II. Background

5. Parties at CRIC 7 made a number of specific recommendations on impact indicators. The identification process for establishing a minimum set of impact indicators should focus on existing relevant indicators and data at the country level; the process should further consider aspects such as the measurability, reliability, simplicity and cost-effectiveness of the proposed indicators; indicators should have specific units of measurement; and both qualitative and quantitative indicators should be identified and differentiation made between the two types.³

6. With regard to SO4, this identification process was based on: (a) the expected impacts and indicators identified in The Strategy; (b) the general recommendations made by CRIC 7 on impact indicators; (c) the advice received by the CRIC and CST Bureaux and by the IATF on reporting; and (d) the available literature on impact indicators.

7. In line with the call by CRIC 7 to harmonize the various sets of indicators used by The Strategy aimed at achieving a coherent indicator system within the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), the work undertaken for the selection of indicators for strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 was also taken into account. Consistency was further

¹ ICCD/COP(8)/16/Add.1, para. 25 (a) of the annex to decision 3/COP.8.

² ICCD/CRIC(7)/5, paragraph 22.

³ ICCD/CRIC(7)/5, paragraphs 114 and 115.

pursued with regard to the set of performance indicators for measuring progress against the operational objectives of The Strategy, and in particular operational objective 5.

8. Finally, a methodology to assess impact indicators on SO4, a set of information on the use of each indicator (metadata) and a glossary clarifying the terminology and definitions used, were also considered and are proposed in this document.

III. Methodology

9. The identification and selection of impact indicators on SO4 went through five main steps: (a) consideration of the use of the same methodology used to assess performance indicators;⁴ (b) analysis of expected impacts and indicators contained in The Strategy; (c) harmonization with the other sets of indicators being identified for use within the Convention; (d) conclusions drawn from a series of consultation processes; and (e) specification of the metadata of the indicators.

10. With regard to methodological step (a) above, the e-SMART criteria are considered appropriate also for the selection of impact indicators on SO4, although some flexibility is proposed in assessing the cost-effectiveness of such indicators since the measurement of some of them may require costly ad hoc studies and/or investigations.

11. Methodological steps (b), (c) and (d) above are detailed in sections B and C of chapter IV below and methodological step (e) is developed in section D of the same chapter.

IV. Identification of impact indicators

A. General remarks

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

12. The underlying rationale of SO4 is to assess whether institutional, policy and financial weaknesses represent a constraint to the mobilization of resources for UNCCD implementation. SO4 is meant to provide information on whether removal of any structural impediments has taken place within the reference period of the implementation of The Strategy.

13. There are two major components within SO4: “mobilization of resources” and “effective partnerships”. These components are reflected in two expected impacts.

14. Expected impact 4.1 focuses on the quantification of investment flows in terms of the availability of financial, technical and technological resources to affected country Parties for the implementation of the Convention. Impact indicators for expected impact 4.1 are self-evidently quantitative.

⁴ Reference is made to the e-SMART criteria used for the identification of the performance indicators (see ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.1, para. 9).

15. Expected impact 4.2 focuses on the existence of enabling policy environments facilitating the mobilization of resources. These enabling frameworks may refer to specific mechanisms or to broader regulatory, institutional and policy settings facilitating financial flows and investments. Impact indicators for expected impact 4.2 do not necessarily need to be quantitative and may include qualitative features.

16. The baseline year against which progress of impact indicators will be measured is 2008.

17. According to recommendations received from CRIC 7, impact indicators for assessing progress against the strategic objectives of The Strategy will be measured every four years; the reporting against these indicators is included in the desertification/land degradation and drought (DLDD) profiles. However, some of the proposed impact indicators for SO4 (namely SO4-1, SO4-2 and SO4-3, see paragraph 22 below) derive from the information contained in the financial annex that will be submitted by reporting entities every two years. Since SO4-1, SO4-2 and SO4-3 will measure the investment flow through quantitative information, complementing information collected through operational objective 5, it is proposed that they also be reviewed by CRIC every two years.

B. Impact indicators for expected impact 4.1

Expected impact 4.1. Increased financial, technical and technological resources are made available to affected developing country Parties, and where appropriate Central and Eastern European countries, to implement the Convention.

Indicator proposed in The Strategy: Increase in the level and diversity of available funding for combating desertification/land degradation and mitigating the effects of drought.

18. The indicator proposed in The Strategy correctly points to the quantification of available funding for the implementation of the Convention. The reference to “diversity” is intended as the diversity of the sources of funding. The reference to “increase” reflects the wording of expected impact 4.1 that refers to “increased resources”.

19. The proposed indicator is generally appropriate, but it needs to be improved to provide CRIC with comprehensive information for assessing investment flows. This improvement will be achieved by detailing the major sources of funding and by referring to change rather than increase, to reflect the actual trend of funding that may be increasing or decreasing. Although reporting will be on changes, information on absolute values will still need to be provided to allow further analysis and comparability of data.

20. The consultations held with the CST and CRIC Bureaux and IATF in this regard pointed to the following major sources of funding: multilateral assistance, bilateral assistance, country financial commitment, innovative sources, and private sector and others. The possibility of detailing the resources available for the development and implementation of investment frameworks within the financial flows was also discussed, but ultimately considered too complex to implement. Finally, it was acknowledged that availability should be considered in terms of investments actually committed and/or disbursed within the reference period.

21. In terms of harmonization with the other sets of indicators used within the Convention, bilateral assistance is already measured through performance indicator CONS-O-15.⁵ The percentage change of bilateral contributions over time can be easily derived from CONS-O-15. To add value to this information, it is proposed that bilateral assistance under SO4 refer to the UNCCD share of the total bilateral official development assistance (BODA).

22. Taking into account the above remarks, the following draft impact indicators are proposed for expected impact 4.1:

- SO4-1: percentage change of multilateral donor contributions for UNCCD-related activities.
- SO4-2: UNCCD share of BODA.
- SO4-3: percentage change of domestic financial commitment to UNCCD implementation.
- SO4-4: percentage change of contributions from innovative sources of finance for UNCCD-related activities.
- SO4-5: percentage change of private sector and other contributions for UNCCD-related activities.

23. The information needed for reporting against the proposed indicators is partially contained in the financial annex devised by GM. Rules for completing the financial annex complement the computation methods reported in the metadata of the indicators and are fundamental for the correct attribution of amounts to UNCCD and to avoid double counting of investments. As described in document ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.4, guidelines for completing the financial annex will be provided to reporting entities as a component of the methodological tools to be produced after consideration and adoption of all relevant reporting elements.

24. The financial annex will not include information related to BODA (SO4-2) or to investments carried out by stakeholders that have no obligation to report to the Convention (SO4-5 and, partially, SO4-4). Thus, dedicated reporting by developed country Parties and other bilateral donors (including, for instance, the European Commission) will be necessary for SO4-2, while a specific study will be needed to quantify financial flows related to SO4-5 and, partially, SO4-4. The costs for undertaking this study should be included in the joint work programme (JWP) of the secretariat and GM as part of their obligation to prepare synthesis reports under the new performance review and assessment of implementation system (PRAIS).⁶

25. The proposed indicators measure financial resources, while the expected impact refers to financial, technical and technological resources. Efforts by reporting entities will be needed to further distinguish technical and technological resources within the financial resources.

⁵ CONS-O-15: amount of financial resources made available by developed country Parties to combat desertification/land degradation and drought.

⁶ See document ICCD/CRIC(8)/4.

Distinction between financial, technical and technological resources will be pursued in any study carried out to compile the information related to indicators SO4-5 and, partially, SO4-4.

C. Impact indicators for expected impact 4.2

Expected impact 4.2. Enabling policy environments are improved for UNCCD implementation at all levels.

Indicator proposed in The Strategy: Development policies and measures address desertification/land degradation and mitigation of the effects of drought.

26. The indicator proposed in The Strategy refers to development policies and measures without linking them to the mobilization of resources. Further, it lacks the reference to the enabling character of these policies and measures, as requested by the wording of expected impact 4.2. Overall, it is not considered appropriate.

27. There is some overlap between the scope of expected impact 4.2 and the scope of some outcomes of the operational objectives of The Strategy. By purely considering the financing domain, such overlap is evident for outcomes 2.4, 5.1 and 5.5 of The Strategy.⁷ Proposed performance indicators for these outcomes measure the establishment of partnership agreements; the establishment of integrated investment frameworks; and the type of incentives to have enabled access to technology by affected country Parties.⁸ All these mechanisms create enabling environments for financial flows.

28. Impact indicators for expected impact 4.2 will thus complement the information provided through the above performance indicators without duplicating it. They will further be specific to those aspects that may potentially constrain and/or facilitate the mobilization of resources within UNCCD, according to the wording of expected impact 4.2 and of SO4.

29. The mobilization of resources is influenced (either facilitated or constrained) by legal and regulatory frameworks, economic measures or other market-based mechanisms, from the global to the subnational levels. Favourable laws, fiscal incentives for investors, subsidies, or the smoothing of trade barriers, for example for technology transfer, are examples of interventions conducive to sustained investment flows. The memorandum of understanding between UNCCD and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) is another example of a global instrument allowing Parties to the Convention to rely on regular financial flows over a medium-term period.

⁷ Outcome 2.4: Developed country Parties mainstream UNCCD objectives and sustainable land management interventions into their development cooperation programmes/projects in line with their support to national sectoral and investment plans. 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. 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.

⁸ See CONS-O-6, CONS-O-14 and CONS-O-18, respectively, in ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.1 and ICCD/CRIC(8)/5/Add.2.

30. Institutional aspects may also influence the level of investments and financial flows. Weak or unclear institutional responsibilities, for example, are unlikely to attract private investments because of the higher risks implied.

31. Institutional weaknesses in reaching consensus among Parties are among the limiting factors highlighted in The Strategy.⁹ Within the Convention, institutional weaknesses are particularly evident at the subregional and regional level, where a clear entrusting of responsibility for the implementation of the Convention is often missing and where the role of some existing or envisaged mechanisms/structures (thematic programme networks, subregional/regional financing platforms, Regional Coordination Units) is unclear.¹⁰

32. Results-based management (RBM) frameworks have, among others, the aim of clarifying responsibilities against achievements, in line with the institutional mandates established in the Convention. The subsidiary bodies of the COP, the secretariat and GM will report against these frameworks. However, RBM does not apply to the other Convention stakeholders, thus their reporting on the UNCCD-related institutional arrangements would represent valuable information for highlighting strengths and weaknesses at the institutional level and facilitating or constraining implementation, in particular in terms of resource mobilization.

33. Taking into account the above remarks, the following impact indicators are proposed for expected impact 4.2:

- SO4-6: number and type of legal and regulatory frameworks, economic incentives or other mechanisms securing or facilitating transfer of funds for the implementation of UNCCD, at all levels.
- SO4-7: clear entrusting of institutional responsibilities for UNCCD implementation, at all levels.

34. An overview of proposed indicators and their attribution to the various reporting entities is provided in the table below.

⁹ ICCD/COP(8)/16/Add.1, para. 2 of the annex to decision 3/COP.8.

¹⁰ Weaknesses were also acknowledged in the reporting principles proposed for the implementation of subregional and regional action programmes in ICCD/CRIC(7)/3/Add.7.

Overview and attribution of impact indicators for SO4

Expected impact	Indicator no.	Indicator name	Affected country Parties	SRAPs and RAPs	Developed country Parties	United Nations and IGOs	GEF	Secretariat	GM
4.1	SO4-1	Percentage change of multilateral donor contributions for UNCCD-related activities.				X	X		
	SO4-2	UNCCD share of BODA			X				
	SO4-3	Percentage change of domestic financial commitment to UNCCD implementation.	X	X					
	SO4-4	Percentage change of contributions from innovative sources of finance for UNCCD-related activities.	X	X	X	X	X		
	SO4-5	Percentage change of private sector and other contributions for UNCCD-related activities.	Study to be commissioned						
4.2	SO4-6	Number and type of legal and regulatory frameworks, economic incentives or other mechanisms securing or facilitating transfer of funds for the implementation of UNCCD, at all levels.	X	X	X	X	X		
	SO4-7	Clear entrusting of institutional responsibilities for UNCCD implementation, at all levels.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

D. Metadata for the proposed impact indicators

Indicator name	Percentage change of multilateral donor contributions for UNCCD-related activities		
Indicator no.	SO4-1	Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative
Rationale	The indicator measures the financial flows from multilateral donors for the implementation of the Convention. It provides an assessment of international efforts to combat DLDD.		

Compliance with e-SMART criteria¹¹		
economic	+	The information needed to report against this indicator is available in the financial annex. Thus, there is no additional reporting burden for multilateral organizations and agencies regularly reporting to the Convention.
Specific	+	The indicator directly refers to strategic objective 4.
Measurable	+	The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable parameters (amounts).
Achievable	+	United Nations organizations, other IGOs and GEF are expected to keep precise records of financial flows.
Relevant	+	The indicator provides a measure of the efforts made by international stakeholders to provide concrete support to the implementation of the Convention.
Time-bound	+	The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time, as required.
Data needed and method of computation		Unit of measurement %
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Amounts attributed to programmes/projects marked with UNCCD Rio markers shall be considered. Reference is made to the financial annex and corresponding instructions provided by GM. ▪ Computation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sum the eligible amounts actually committed and/or disbursed yearly at the time of reporting, over the reporting period, (a) by country, (b) by regional implementation annex and (c) overall. Express these figures in US\$ millions. - Calculate the percentage change of (a), (b) and (c) against the baseline year (2008). - As far as feasible, provide a share of technical and technological resources in (a), (b) and (c). 		
Data sources (means of verification)		
Financial annex, completed with information obtained from databases and information systems of the concerned organizations and compiled on the basis of clear guidelines provided by GM.		
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> United Nations and IGOs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GEF <input type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities <input type="checkbox"/> Secretariat <input type="checkbox"/> GM		

¹¹ Compliance with e-SMART criteria: the three signs used here (+, +/- and -) reflect degrees of effectiveness of indicators where + is the most effective.

Indicator name	UNCCD share of bilateral official development assistance		
Indicator no.	SO4-2	Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative
Rationale	The indicator measures the overall financial flows from bilateral sources for their official development assistance and the share of these flows dedicated to the implementation of the Convention.		
Compliance with e-SMART criteria			
economic	+/-	The information contained in the financial annex refers to UNCCD-related contributions. BODA is the total ODA provided by bilateral donors to aid recipient countries. The calculation of BODA on a yearly basis requires some compilation work and this may imply some costs.	
Specific	+	The indicator directly refers to strategic objective 4.	
Measurable	+	The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable parameters (amounts).	
Achievable	+	Developed country Parties and other bilateral donors are expected to have readily available the information to derive the BODA figure.	
Relevant	+	The indicator provides an assessment of the importance given by developed country Parties to UNCCD implementation within their overall cooperation support.	
Time-bound	+	The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time, as required.	
Data needed and method of computation		Unit of measurement	%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bilateral aid, in order to be comparable among countries, should be calculated according to common and well-defined rules. Reference is made to the financial annex and corresponding instructions provided by GM. ▪ Computation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yearly, calculate the overall bilateral aid by (a) beneficiary country, (b) by regional implementation annex, and (c) overall. Express these figures in US\$ millions. - The amount of financial resources made available yearly to combat DLDD is readily available from the compilation of (d) performance indicator CONS-O-15. - Calculate the percentage share of (d) within (c). - As far as feasible, provide a share of technical and technological resources in (d) and (c). 			
Data sources (means of verification)			
Financial annex, databases and information systems of the reporting entities as primary sources.			
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"/> United Nations and IGOs			
<input type="checkbox"/> GEF <input type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities <input type="checkbox"/> Secretariat <input type="checkbox"/> GM			

Indicator name	Percentage change of domestic financial commitment to UNCCD implementation		
Indicator no.	SO4-3	Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative
Rationale	The indicator measures the country contribution to the implementation of the Convention. It provides an assessment of financial efforts to combat DLDD by affected country Parties.		
Compliance with e-SMART criteria			
economic	+	The information needed to report against this indicator is available in the financial annex. Thus, there is no additional reporting burden for affected country Parties regularly reporting to the Convention.	
Specific	+	The indicator directly refers to strategic objective 4.	
Measurable	+	The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable parameters (amounts).	
Achievable	+/-	Coherent and comprehensive reporting against this indicator needs a well-established and regularly maintained financial database at country level dedicated to UNCCD. The database shall encompass all the features that are required for completing the financial annex and should be part of the capacity-building approach provided by UNCCD to affected country Parties.	
Relevant	+	The indicator provides a measure of the efforts made by affected country Parties to implement the Convention.	
Time-bound	+	The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time, as required.	
Data needed and method of computation		Unit of measurement	%
Computation of this indicator will be done at the central level taking into account the information provided in the financial annex. Eventually, official and authoritative sources, such as the OECD Creditor Reporting System, as well as other official financial information systems, project databases and portfolio reviews will be considered to fill possible data gaps.			
Data sources (means of verification)			
Financial annex, compiled on the basis of databases and information systems of the concerned countries.			
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 type="checkbox"/> United Nations 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	Percentage change of contributions from innovative sources of finance for UNCCD-related activities		
Indicator no.	SO4-4	Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative
Rationale	The indicator measures the capacity of the Convention to attract and make use of innovative sources of finance for its implementation.		
Compliance with e-SMART criteria			
economic	+/-	The information needed to report against this indicator is part of the information collected for SO4-1, SO4-2, and SO4-3, for those entities reporting to the Convention. However, innovative sources of finance may also be channelled through entities that do not report to the Convention; in this case a specific study is needed to quantify this component. This study will also gather the necessary information for SO4-5.	
Specific	+	The indicator directly refers to strategic objective 4.	
Measurable	+	The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable parameters (amounts).	
Achievable	+/-	Reporting entities shall be able to disaggregate the information compiled for SO4-1, SO4-2, and SO4-3 identifying those contributions deriving from innovative sources. For this purpose, a clear and common understanding of what constitutes an innovative source is necessary.	
Relevant	+	The indicator provides a measure of the efforts made by Convention stakeholders to diversify the sources of financing. The rate of use of innovative sources also provides an assessment of the capacities of the institutional bodies of the Convention in keeping the pace with latest market and environment-related developments and opportunities.	
Time-bound	+	The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time, as required.	
Data needed and method of computation		Unit of measurement	%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Innovative sources of finance (e.g. payment for ecosystem services (PES), mechanisms for rewarding reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) and other carbon trading initiatives) may represent common financing instruments for the Rio conventions. A list of innovative sources could thus be defined and regularly kept updated by the Joint Liaison Group (JLG). ▪ For innovative sources of finance channelled through entities that do not report to the Convention: terms of reference for the study should be adopted by the COP and financial resources made available for the Joint Work Programme. ▪ Computation for innovative sources of finance channelled through entities that report to the Convention: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify the amounts related to innovative sources of finance against the JLG list. - Sum the amounts actually committed and/or disbursed at the time of reporting, over the reporting period and on a yearly basis. Express the total in US\$ millions. - Calculate the percentage change of the total against the baseline year (2008). 			
Data sources (means of verification)			
Financial annex, database and information systems of reporting entities, computation work for SO4-1, SO4-2, and SO4-3.			

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"/> United Nations 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	Percentage change of private sector and other contributions for UNCCD-related activities.			
Indicator no.	SO4-5	Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative	<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative
Rationale	The indicator measures the financial flows for the implementation of the Convention from entities other than those regularly reporting to the Convention.			

Compliance with e-SMART criteria		
economic	-	This indicator needs a study to be carried out for gathering the necessary information. It may thus imply costs that need to be included in the JWP of the secretariat and GM. This study will also gather the necessary information for SO4-4.
Specific	+	The indicator directly refers to strategic objective 4.
Measurable	+	The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable parameters (amounts).
Achievable	+	As a task to be outsourced and paid for against comprehensive terms of reference, a quality deliverable is feasible.
Relevant	+	The indicator provides an assessment of the attractiveness of the Convention to diverse investors on the basis of various reasons (economic gain, philanthropy, etc). The identification of these reasons may be useful to the institutions and subsidiary bodies of the Convention in framing the process of attracting investments.
Time-bound	+	The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time, as required.

Data needed and method of computation	Unit of measurement	%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clear and comprehensive terms of reference need to be prepared and adopted by the COP to guide the study and obtain good quantitative and qualitative information. Only one study is needed for SO4-5 and SO4-4. ▪ Computation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To be specified in the terms of reference. Computation methods shall be coherent with the rules established for completing the financial annex. ▪ Amounts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To be expressed in US\$ millions to allow comparison with the other indicators. 		

Data sources (means of verification)				
Study – to be commissioned.				
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"/> United Nations and IGOs				
<input type="checkbox"/> GEF <input type="checkbox"/> Subregional and regional reporting entities <input type="checkbox"/> Secretariat <input type="checkbox"/> GM				

Indicator name	Number and type of legal and regulatory frameworks, economic incentives or other mechanisms securing or facilitating transfer of funds for the implementation of UNCCD, at all levels.		
Indicator no.	SO4-6	Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qualitative
Rationale	The indicator measures those mechanisms facilitating financial flows towards the Convention. It assesses whether environments are sufficiently supportive or if barriers to investment flows exist.		
Compliance with e-SMART criteria			
economic	+/-	The measurement of this indicator implies a significant workload in terms of screening cross-sectoral documents, laws and regulations, thus it may imply some costs for the reporting entities.	
Specific	+	The indicator directly refers to strategic objective 4.	
Measurable	+	The indicator is based on the counting of objectively verifiable parameters (mechanisms). However, there is a substantial narrative component related to the description of the mechanisms.	
Achievable	+/-	At all levels, tracking relevant information may require the establishment of cooperation or communication channels with line ministries, relevant departments or units, legal services, etc.	
Relevant	+	The indicator provides a measure of the efforts made by the Convention stakeholders to facilitate the implementation of the Convention.	
Time-bound	+	The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any time, as required.	
Data needed and method of computation		Unit of measurement	number
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only mechanisms that may be relevant for UNCCD will be considered. Such mechanisms are likely to have been devised within broader economic, regulatory and policy frameworks and thus are not UNCCD-specific but may nevertheless be applied to UNCCD initiatives. ▪ Mechanisms are grouped according to the following broad categories: (a) laws and regulations; (b) economic and financial measures (incentives, fiscal rules, tax benefits, credit lines and borrowing rules, etc.); (c) cooperation frameworks (agreements, memorandums of understanding, contracts, etc.); (d) sectoral policies (trade, marketing, property rights, business development, etc.). ▪ Emphasis shall be given to UNCCD-specific mechanisms, if any. ▪ Computation, on a yearly basis, since 2008: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Count the number of mechanisms identified for each broad category; give the total. ▪ Computation goes together with a comprehensive narrative description of each identified mechanism, following the reporting guidelines and specifying the geographical level of application (international, regional, subregional, national, local). 			
Data sources (means of verification)			
Documents, laws and regulations, at all levels.			
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"/> United Nations 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	Clear entrusting of institutional responsibilities for UNCCD implementation, at all levels.		
Indicator no.	SO4-7	Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Quantitative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qualitative
Rationale	The indicator assesses the occurrence of institutional weaknesses that may constrain the implementation of the Convention because they imply inability either in handling or in attracting resources.		
Compliance with e-SMART criteria			
economic	+	Reporting against this indicator implies no cost for Parties. It is based on the qualitative description of experience by reporting entities.	
Specific	+	The indicator directly refers to strategic objective 4.	
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 measure of the functioning of institutional arrangements within the Convention, of their strengths and weaknesses, in particular with regard to the facilitation or constraint of resources mobilization.	
Time-bound	+	The indicator varies over the years and can be measured at any necessary time.	
Data needed and method of computation		Unit of measurement	score
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each reporting entity will provide a narrative assessment of the institutional levels they are dealing with, including their own, in terms of resource mobilization. The narrative assessment will be guided by the reporting guidelines. ▪ Assessment of the various institutional levels will be done 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. 			
Data sources (means of verification)			
-			
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"/> United Nations 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			

V. Conclusions and recommendations

35. Impact indicators, once adopted, will become a mainstay of the new monitoring system applied by CRIC. They will guide affected country Parties in the implementation of action programmes as well as orient developed country Parties and other UNCCD stakeholders towards supportive actions to be taken. The concurrent assessment of impact and performance may also detect a relation between the level of the performance and the impact achieved.

36. CRIC may wish:

(a) To consider draft impact indicators for strategic objective 4 with a view to recommending their adoption by COP 9;

(b) To consider whether global and/or national targets are required for the impact indicators on strategic objective 4, with a view to recommending that the COP initiate consultations among Parties in this regard;

(c) To acknowledge the need to rely on external assistance for the computation of indicator SO4-5 and the partial computation of indicator SO4-4, every four years;

(d) To invite the JLG to provide technical assistance on indicator SO4-4, as required;

(e) To provide guidance to the secretariat in assessing capacity-building measures for the implementation of indicator SO4-3.
