



United Nations

ICCD/CRIC(9)/INF.13



## Convention to Combat Desertification

Distr.: General  
17 February 2011

English only

---

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

Ninth session

Bonn, 21–25 February 2011

Item 3 (a-d) of the provisional agenda

**Assessment of implementation of the Convention against performance indicators**

**Preliminary analysis of information contained in reports from affected and developed country Parties, United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations and the Global Environment Facility on operational objective 1 of The Strategy**

**Preliminary analysis of information contained in reports from affected and developed country Parties, United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations and the Global Environment Facility on operational objective 2 of The Strategy**

**Preliminary analysis of information contained in reports from affected and developed country Parties, United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations and the Global Environment Facility on operational objective 3 of The Strategy**

**Preliminary analysis of information contained in reports from affected and developed country Parties, United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations and the Global Environment Facility on operational objective 4 of The Strategy**

Item 4 (a) of the provisional agenda

**Review of financial flows for the implementation of the Convention**

**Preliminary analysis of information contained in reports from affected and developed country Parties, United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations and the Global Environment Facility on operational objective 5 of The Strategy**

Item 5 of the provisional agenda

**Consideration of best practices in the implementation of the Convention**

**Review and compilation of best practices in sustainable land management technologies, including adaptation**

Item 7 (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**

**The iterative process relating to the assessment of implementation, including performance indicators, methodology and the reporting procedures**

**Analytical frameworks for the analysis of information contained in the reports from affected and developed country Parties, United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations, the Global Environment Facility, the Global Mechanism and accredited civil society organizations**

**Note by the secretariat**

*Summary*

By its decision 11/COP.9, the Conference of the Parties decided that, in accordance with the terms of reference of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention, the secretariat shall prepare a synthesis and preliminary analysis of the reports submitted by Parties and observers. Decision 13/COP.9 also requests the Global Mechanism (GM) to provide an analysis of financial flows and submit this to the secretariat for inclusion in its report to the CRIC.

In order to produce the compilation and the preliminary analysis of the information provided by the reporting entities within the 2010–2011 reporting and review process, specific analytical frameworks have been established for each section of the reports. The present document provides information on the methodological approach and the analysis performed by the secretariat in this regard; information on the analytical framework followed by the GM is included in document ICCD/CRIC(9)/8.

---

## Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
List of tables .....		4
List of abbreviations.....		5
I. Introduction .....	1–4	6
II. Analysis of the progress in reporting .....	5	6
III. Analysis of information relating to the operational objectives of The Strategy and related performance indicators .....	6–7	9
IV. Analysis of the additional information.....	8	76
V. Classification of best practices on sustainable land management technologies, including adaptation .....	9	95

**List of tables**

Table 1	Analysis on progress in reporting .....	7
Table 2	Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-1 .....	9
Table 3	Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-3 .....	13
Table 4	Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-4 .....	16
Table 5	Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-5 .....	18
Table 6	Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-6 .....	21
Table 7	Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-7 .....	26
Table 8	Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-8 .....	35
Table 9	Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-9 .....	43
Table 10	Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-10 .....	44
Table 11	Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-11 .....	46
Table 12	Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-13 .....	47
Table 13	Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-14 .....	55
Table 14	Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-15 .....	64
Table 15	Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-16 .....	66
Table 16	Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-17 .....	68
Table 17	Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-18 .....	73
Table 18	Reporting process-related issues, GEF .....	76
Table 19	Accommodation of specific requests within COP decisions.....	85
Table 20	Reporting on the implementation of the national action programme .....	88
Table 21	Any other country-specific issues .....	89
Table 22	Support to NAP/SRAP/RAP implementation and/or review .....	91
Table 23	Support to capacity-building initiatives in eligible affected country Parties.....	94
Table 24	Mandate-specific reporting .....	94
Table 25	Classification of best practices on sustainable land management technologies, including adaptation.....	95

## List of abbreviations

COP	Conference of the Parties to the UNCCD
CSO	civil society organization
CST	Committee on Science and Technology
DLDD	desertification/land degradation and drought
e-SMART	economic, specific , measurable, achievable, relevant and time bound
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GM	Global Mechanism
ICT	information and communication technology
IFS	Integrated Financial Strategy
IGO	intergovernmental organization
NAP	national action programme
NCSA	national capacity self-assessment
PPS	Programme and Project Sheet
PRAIS	performance review and assessment of implementation system
RAP	regional action programme
SLM	sustainable land management
SRAP	subregional action programme
STI	science and technology institutions

## **I. Introduction**

1. By its decision 12/COP.9, the Conference of the Parties (COP) established the system for performance review and assessment of the implementation of the Convention and of the 10-year strategic plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention (2008–2018) (The Strategy).

2. By its decision 11/COP.9, the Conference of the Parties (COP) decided that, in accordance with the terms of reference of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention (CRIC),<sup>1</sup> the secretariat shall prepare a synthesis and preliminary analysis of the reports submitted by Parties and observers (...). Decision 13/COP.9 also requests the Global Mechanism (GM) to provide an analysis of financial flows and submit this to the secretariat for inclusion in its report to the CRIC.

3. The synthesis and preliminary analysis prepared by the secretariat based on reports of Parties, United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the GM and accredited civil society organizations are contained in documents ICCD/CRIC(9)/3, ICCD/CRIC(9)/4, ICCD/CRIC(9)/5, ICCD/CRIC(9)/6, ICCD/CRIC(9)/7, ICCD/CRIC(9)/9 and ICCD/CRIC(9)/10; the analysis of financial flows prepared by the GM is contained in document ICCD/CRIC(9)/8.

4. In order to produce the compilation and the preliminary analysis of the information provided by the reporting entities within the 2010–2011 reporting and review process, specific analytical frameworks have been established for each section of the reports. The present document provides information on the methodological approach and the analysis performed by the secretariat and the GM in this regard.

## **II. Analysis of the progress in reporting**

5. This section provides information on analysis made on the 2010–2011 reporting and review process, with regard to the number of reports received per reporting entity, their geographical distribution, and their completeness.

---

<sup>1</sup> As contained in decision 11/COP.9.

Table 1  
**Analysis on progress in reporting**

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
PR1.1		<b>Coverage:</b> Number of reports received per reporting cycle in total, by region/subregion, by reporting entity	Global; regional/subregional	Affected, <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i> , developed, United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Show regions where reporting could be improved. When time series are available, trends will show progress in reporting  Indicate significance of indicator-based analyses	Tables with number of reports received by country Party/organization per reporting cycle. Total and aggregations: regional/subregional (only for affected country Parties), affected/developed/organizations		Progress could be compared with information on funding finalized to improving reporting (if information is available)
PR1.2		<b>Coverage:</b> Number of reports submitted online per reporting cycle in total, by region/subregion, by reporting entity	Global; regional/subregional	Affected, <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i> , developed, United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Show use of PRAIS portal for reporting	Tables with number of reports submitted online by country Party/organization per reporting cycle. Total and aggregations: regional/subregional (only for affected country Parties), affected/developed/organizations  Table with percentage of reports submitted online per reporting cycle. Total and aggregations: regional/subregional (only for affected country Parties), affected/developed/organizations		Input to AA1.8, AD1.8

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
PR2.1		<b>Completeness:</b> classification of reports received based on <b>a</b> ) percentage of compiled fields (3 classes: incomplete, 50% completed, almost complete) <b>and/or</b> on <b>b</b> ) the number of indicators for which information is provided (3 classes)	Global	Country Parties (affected, developed)		Shaded map showing coverage and degree of completeness (only for country Parties; global level; 4 classes: report not received; incomplete; 50% completed; almost complete).	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Complement with information on indicator CONS-O-9 from 2012 onwards
							Calculation of percentage of filled fields/indicators to be implemented	
PR2.2		<b>Completeness:</b> Number of reports with information relating to specific indicators	Global	Affected, <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i> , developed, United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF		Table with number of reports with information relating to specific indicators by indicator: total, by region/subregion (affected country Parties only)	Calculation of percentage of filled fields/indicators to be implemented	
PR3.1		<b>Progress/trends:</b> <i>Trends in the number of reports received per reporting cycle</i>	Global, regional/ subregional	Affected, <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i> , developed, United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF		<i>Graphs showing trends in number of reports received (global, by region, by reporting entity)</i>		

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available



### III. Analysis of information relating to the operational objectives of The Strategy and related performance indicators

6. This section provides information on the analysis conducted on information contained in the operational objectives section of the reports from affected and developed country Parties, United Nations organizations, IGOs, the GEF and the GM.

7. The analysis has been conducted on data and information as provided by reporting entities. When required, information provided for some performance indicators has been complemented with data from the following sources:

- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), Statistics Division: 2008 Population and Vital Statistics Report (Statistical Papers, Series A Vol. LXII, No. 2) Latest available census and estimates (2008–2009). July 2010
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), Statistics Division: 2008 Economic and Social Development Social Indicators: Indicators on income and economic activity. June 2010
- United Nations Treasury: United Nations Operational Rates of Exchange (2008–2009)

Table 2  
Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-1

*CONS-O-1: Number and size of information events organized on the subject of desertification/land degradation and drought (DLDD) and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity, and audience reached by media addressing DLDD and DLDD synergies. (countries, both 'affected' and 'developed', only report on indicator as 'affected')*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis/ notes</i>	
IA1.1 ID1.1	Proportion of population per country informed about DLDD per year	Progress in the proportion of population being informed about DLDD and DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity, in term of percentage of population being informed per year	Global, regional/ subregional	Country Parties (affected, developed), SRAPs/RAPs [include secretariat and GM in analyses on CSOs and STIs]	Show whether on track to reaching global target of 30% of population informed about DLDD and DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity by 2018	Table with percentage of population informed about DLDD per reporting cycle (total, by country, by region/ subregion)	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Shaded map with percentage of national population informed about	Population statistics (country level) to be made

<i>CONS-O-1: Number and size of information events organized on the subject of desertification/land degradation and drought (DLDD) and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity, and audience reached by media addressing DLDD and DLDD synergies. (countries, both 'affected' and 'developed', only report on indicator as 'affected')</i>								
<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis/ notes</i>
						DLDD for a specific year (only for country Parties; global level)	available	
						<i>Graphs with trends showing distance to target (global, by region/subregion)</i>		
IA1.2 ID1.2	Number of information events held each year and number of participants per year	Regions/subregions where the most/largest events are held each year	Global, regional/subregional	Country Parties (affected, developed), SRAPs/RAPs	Show where information events are more predominant, and hence regions where gaps exist in informing population about DLDD	Table and bar chart showing number of events and participants per year, globally and by region/subregion		Comparison of trends in percentage of population reached and trends in audience at country, global and regional level (to show whether more events and/or media products have contributed to a larger proportion of population being reached)
IO1.2 IG1.2	Number of information events held each year and number of participants per year globally and by regional	Regions where the most/largest events are held each year	Global, regional	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Show where more events are needed	Bar chart showing number of events and participants in each region/global per reporting cycle		Comparison of trends in percentage of population reached and trends in audience at global and regional level (to show whether more events and/or

*CONS-O-1: Number and size of information events organized on the subject of desertification/land degradation and drought (DLDD) and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity, and audience reached by media addressing DLDD and DLDD synergies. (countries, both 'affected' and 'developed', only report on indicator as 'affected')*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis/ notes</i>
	annex							media products have contributed to a larger proportion of population being reached)
					Show where more events are needed	<i>Graphs with trends showing progress (global, by region)</i>		
IA1.3 ID1.3	Estimated number of persons reached by media products (print, radio and TV, other ICT) and stakeholders (public, CSOs, STIs) per year	Audience reached by each type of media product per reporting cycle	Global, regional/ subregional	Country Parties (affected, developed), SRAPs/RAPs	Show which stakeholders are most informed by events, and which types of media products are most effective globally and in each region	Stacked bar charts showing stakeholders reached by each media type globally and in each region/ subregion		
		Type of media products being used most in each region/subregion			Show where more media products are needed	<i>Graphs with trends showing progress (global, by region/ subregion)</i>		
IO1.3 IG1.3	Estimated number of persons reached by media products (print, radio and TV, other ICT) and stakeholders (public, CSOs,	Audience reached by each type of media product per reporting cycle	Global, regional	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Show which stakeholders are most informed by events, and which types of media products are most effective globally and in each region	Stacked bar charts showing stakeholders reached by each media type globally and in each region		

*CONS-O-1: Number and size of information events organized on the subject of desertification/land degradation and drought (DLDD) and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity, and audience reached by media addressing DLDD and DLDD synergies. (countries, both 'affected' and 'developed', only report on indicator as 'affected')*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis/ notes</i>
	STIs) per year globally and by regional annex							
		Type of media products being used most in each region			Show where more media products are needed	<i>Graphs with trends showing progress (global, by region)</i>		
IA1.4	Yes/no on whether part of national or organizational communication strategy that addresses environmental issues	Number of reporting entities where information provided is part of a strategy	Global, regional/ subregional	Country Parties (affected, developed), SRAPs/RAPs, United Nations agencies and IGOs	Show whether communication strategy is included in institutional environmental strategy	Tables with number of reporting entities where information provided is part of a total strategy, by region/subregion (only for country Parties)		

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available

Table 3  
**Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-3**

*CONS-O-3: Number of CSOs and science and technology institutions participating in the Convention processes (countries both 'affected' and 'developed' only report on indicator as 'affected')*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
IA3.1 ID3.1	Numbers of CSOs and STIs involved in programmes/projects per year	Progress in the participation of CSOs and STIs in the Convention processes per year globally and by region/subregion	Global, regional/subregional	Country Parties (affected, developed), SRAPs/RAPs	Show progress towards the target of recording a steady growth in the participation of CSOs and STIs in the Convention processes along the time frame of The Strategy. In particular:  Where more CSOs/STIs are participating each year  Regions where participation by CSOs/STIs has highest growth  Where more funding and capacity-building is needed to increase participation	Table with numbers of CSOs and STIs involved per year (total, by region/subregion)		
IO3.1 IG3.1	Numbers of CSOs and STIs involved in programmes/projects financially supported by organization per	Progress in the participation of CSOs and STIs in the Convention processes per year globally and by region/subregion	Global, regional/subregional	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Show progress towards the target of recording a steady growth in the participation of CSOs and STIs in the Convention processes along the time frame of The Strategy. In	Table with numbers of CSOs and STIs involved per year (total, by region/subregion)		

CONS-O-3: Number of CSOs and science and technology institutions participating in the Convention processes (countries both 'affected' and 'developed' only report on indicator as 'affected')

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
	year and by region				particular:			
					Where more CSOs/STIs are participating each year	Graphs with trends, with separate lines for CSOs and STIs showing progress (global, by region)		
					Regions where participation by CSOs/STIs has highest growth			
					Where more funding and capacity-building is needed to increase participation			
IA3.2 ID3.2	Yes/no on whether Government is taking concrete steps to increase participation	National contribution to the target	Global; regional/ subregional	Country Parties (affected, developed), SRAPs/RAPs	Countries where Governments are/are not getting fully involved with UNCCD participation	Table of countries where Governments are taking steps to increase participation (only for country Parties) with percentages at the global, regional and subregional level.	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	

*CONS-O-3: Number of CSOs and science and technology institutions participating in the Convention processes (countries both 'affected' and 'developed' only report on indicator as 'affected')*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
						Map of where Governments are taking steps to increase participation (only for country Parties; global level)		
IA3.3 ID3.3	Importance of reasons for decreasing/increasing participation by CSOs/STIs	Most important reasons for increasing/decreasing trends per region	Global; regional/subregional	Country Parties (affected, developed), SRAPs/RAPs		Table and bar charts of most important reasons for increasing/decreasing trends in regions		
IO3.3 IG3.3	Importance of reasons for increasing participation by CSOs/STIs	Most important reasons for increasing trends	Global	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF		Table and bar charts of most important reasons for increasing trends; global level		

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available

Table 4  
Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-4

*CONS-O-4: Number and type of DLDD-related initiatives of CSOs and science and technology institutions in the field of education (countries both 'affected' and 'developed' only report on indicator as 'affected')*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
IA4.1, ID4.1	Number of DLDD-related initiatives in formal/non-formal education being undertaken by CSOs and STIs per year	Education initiatives by CSOs/STIs per year globally and by region/subregion  Types of events most predominant in each region/subregion	Global, regional/subregional	Country Parties (affected, developed), SRAPs/RAPs	Where civil society and scientific involvement in education is stronger  Where governments need to be encouraged to give more support to education initiatives	Table with numbers of education initiatives (formal/non-formal) undertaken by CSOs and STIs per year (total, by region/subregion)  <i>Graphs with trends, with separate lines for CSOs and STIs showing progress (global, by region/subregion)</i>  Shaded map showing classification of countries based on the average size of education initiatives (only for country Parties; global level; 4 classes)  Bar chart with the type of initiatives more common (global, per region/subregion)	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	
IO4.1, IG4.1	Number of DLDD-related initiatives in formal/non-formal education being undertaken by CSOs and STIs supported by organization per year and per region	Education initiatives by CSOs/STIs per year globally and by region	Global, regional	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Donors supporting more initiatives of a certain type, or different initiatives in different regions	Table with numbers of education initiatives (formal/non-formal) undertaken by CSOs and STIs per year (total, by region)	Maps on administrative limits (country/regional level) to be made available	



CONS-O-4: Number and type of DLDD-related initiatives of CSOs and science and technology institutions in the field of education (countries both 'affected' and 'developed' only report on indicator as 'affected')

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
		Types of events most predominant in each region				<p>Graphs with trends, with separate lines for CSOs and STIs showing progress (global, by region)</p> <p>Map showing classification of regions based on the average size of education initiatives (global level; 4 classes).</p> <p>Bar chart with the type of initiatives more common (global, per region)</p>		
IA4.2, ID4.2	Yes/no on whether Government is taking concrete steps to increase education initiatives	National contribution to the target	Global, regional/ subregional	Country Parties (affected, developed), SRAPs/RAPs	Countries where Governments are making efforts to increase education initiatives	<p>Table of countries where Governments are taking steps to increase education initiatives (only for country Parties) with percentages at the global, regional and subregional level</p> <p>Map with countries where Governments are taking steps to increase education initiatives (only for country Parties; global level)</p>	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	
IA4.3, ID4.3	Reasons, by importance, for decreasing/increasing education initiatives by CSOs/STIs	Most important reasons for increasing/decreasing trends in	Global, regional/ subregional	Country Parties (affected, developed), SRAPs/RAPs	The predominant reasons why education-initiatives are decreasing or increasing in regions, and hence where more funding, capacity-	Bar charts of most important reasons for increasing/decreasing trends in regions		

*CONS-O-4: Number and type of DLDD-related initiatives of CSOs and science and technology institutions in the field of education (countries both 'affected' and 'developed' only report on indicator as 'affected')*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
			regions		building and encouragement of CSOs/STIs are needed			
IO4.3, IG4.3	Reasons, by importance, for increasing education initiatives by CSOs/STIs	Most important reasons for increasing trends in regions	Global	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	The predominant reasons why education-initiatives are increasing in regions, and hence where more funding, capacity-building and encouragement of CSOs/STIs are needed	Bar charts of most important reasons for increasing trends		

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available

**Table 5**  
**Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-5**

*CONS-O-5: Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities that 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.*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
IA5.1	Yes/no to whether formulated/ revised NAP and dates of approval	Progress in formulation of NAPs aligned with The Strategy	Global, regional/ subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs	Progress towards reaching target of 80% of affected countries having NAP aligned to The Strategy by 2014	Table with number of countries with NAP approved (4 classes: NAP not revised; NAP revised and aligned; new NAP aligned; no NAP); or 3 classes: NAP not aligned; NAP aligned; no NAP). Totals and regional/subregional aggregations	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	

*CONS-O-5: Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities that 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.*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
	Planned time frame for the development/alignment of NAP with The Strategy				Where more investment and resources are needed to help revise/formulate NAP	Shaded map showing progress in formulation of NAPs (4 classes: NAP not revised; NAP revised and aligned; new NAP aligned; no NAP; or 3 classes: NAP not aligned; NAP aligned; no NAP). Global level  Pie charts showing progress in terms of percentage of countries (4 classes: NAP not revised; NAP revised and aligned; new NAP aligned; no NAP; or 3 classes: NAP not aligned; NAP aligned; no NAP). Totals and regional/subregional aggregations  Graph showing distance to 2014 target using information on date of approval of aligned NAPs and forecasts (separate lines for total and regional/subregional)		
IA5.2	If NAP not revised/ formulated, importance of reasons for this	Most common reasons for NAP process not initiated/ aligned in some countries and their relevance	Global, regional/ subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs	Where more investment and resources are needed to help revise/formulate NAP  Where external assistance is now needed, and what type would be most beneficial in a region	Bar chart of number of countries which experienced difficulties categorized by type of problem (7 classes) and its importance (3 classes: not important, important, very important). Globally and by region/subregion		

*CONS-O-5: Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities that 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.*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
					Where there is a need to provide assistance to overcome the most important difficulties			
IA5.3	Yes/no on whether NAP takes into account biophysical and socio-economic information, national planning and policies, and integration into investment frameworks	Alignment of NAPs to The Strategy: what components NAPs contain and which regions have integrated them into investment frameworks	Global, regional/subregional	Affected country Parties with NAP aligned with The Strategy, SRAPs/RAPs	Whether more encouragement is needed to read guidelines on NAP in order to ensure all components are included and integrated into frameworks	Bar charts showing number of countries where NAP includes specific components (DLDD drivers, SLM barriers, SLM-related measures) and if integrated into other frameworks (integrated investment framework, national development planning, poverty reduction strategy, use of alignment guidelines); globally and by region/subregion		
IA5.4	Yes/no to whether assistance for NAP has been received and by whom (secretariat, GM, GEF, bilateral, multilateral) and type of assistance (technical, financial, capacity-building)	Which countries/ regions have received external assistance and type of assistance	Global, regional/subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs	Where more investment and resources are needed to help revise/formulate NAP	Table with number of countries that received assistance categorized by type of assistance and donor), total and regional/subregional summaries	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Analysis combined with IA5.1

*CONS-O-5: Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities that 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.*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
					Where external assistance is needed, and what type would be most beneficial in a region	Shaded map showing whether a country has NAP aligned (colours) and if it received assistance (pattern)		
IA5.5	Difficulties by importance on NAP formulation/alignment	Identification of major difficulties in formulation/alignment of NAPs	Global, regional/subregional	Affected country Parties, <i>SRAPs/RAPs</i>	Where there is a need to provide assistance to overcome the most important difficulties	Table and bar chart of number of countries which experienced difficulties categorized by type of problem (5 classes) and its importance (3 classes: not important, important, very important); globally and by region/subregion		

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available

**Table 6**  
**Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-6**

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
ID6.1	Number of partnership agreements under implementation with affected countries by type and per year	Progress and distribution of partnership agreements, in terms of:	Global, regional/subregional	Developed country Parties	Show progress towards 2014 target of 2 partnership agreements per affected country Party	Table with number and percentage of agreements in place and planned in each developed country per year and type (3 types). With totals: per country and global	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Complements IO6.1, IG6.1:
	List of affected countries in	a) Number of partnership agreements			Measure most abundant types of	Stacked bar charts of the number of agreements in		

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
	partnerships	concluded and under implementation or planned by type (3 types: relating to integrated investment framework established within IFS, within other integrated financing strategies or not related to integrated investment frameworks) and per year			agreement in each region and whether agreements relate to investment frameworks	place and planned per year and type; global		
	Yes/no on whether planning to concluding partnership agreements, time frame for and list of which affected countries	b) Geographical distribution of bilateral partnership agreements				Table with number of bilateral partnership agreements in place and planned per affected country categorized by type (3 types); total and by region/subregion		
		c) Distance to 2014 target				Map showing the distribution and number of bilateral partnership agreements in affected countries		
		d) National contribution to progress towards 2014 target				Table with number of affected countries where 2014 target is already achieved or will be achieved according to current plans; total and by region/subregion.  National contribution to target:		

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
						Table of developed country contribution (countries classified by number of bilateral partnership agreements supported/planned, 4 classes)		
						Map of developed country contribution (countries classified by number of bilateral partnership agreements established/planned, 4 classes)		
IO6.1 IG6.1	Number of partnership agreements under implementation with affected countries by type and per year  List of affected countries in partnerships	Progress and distribution of partnership agreements, in terms of:  a) Number of partnership agreements concluded and under implementation by type (3 types: relating to integrated investment framework established within IFS, within other integrated financing strategies or not related to integrated investment frameworks) and per year	Global, regional/ subregional	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Measure most abundant types of agreement in each region and whether agreements relate to investment frameworks	Table with number and percentage of partnership agreements in place per year, type (3 types) and per organization. With totals: per organization and global  Stacked bar charts of the number of agreements in place per year and type; global	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Complements ID6.1

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
		b) Geographical distribution of multilateral partnership agreements				Table with number of multilateral partnership agreements in place per affected country categorized by type (3 types); total and by region/subregion.  Map showing the distribution and number of multilateral partnership agreements in affected countries		
ID6.2 IO6.2 IG6.2	Number of partnership agreements (bilateral and multilateral) under implementation with affected countries by type and per year  List of affected countries in partnerships  Yes/no on whether developed countries planning to conclude partnership agreements, time frame for and list of	Distance to 2014 target and distribution of partnership agreements	Global, regional/subregional	Developed country Parties, United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Show progress towards 2014 target of 2 partnership agreements per affected country Party	Table with number and percentage of affected countries where 2014 target is already achieved or will be achieved according to current plans; total and by region/subregion.  Table with number of total partnership agreements in place and planned per affected country categorized by type (3 types); total and by region/subregion.  Map showing the distribution and number of partnership agreements in affected countries	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Builds on ID6.1, IO6.1, IG6.1



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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
	which affected countries							
ID6.3 IO6.3 IG6.3	Yes/no on whether UNCCD-related institutions/bodies facilitated (4 classes: secretariat, GM, GEF, other)[1]	Contribution of UNCCD-related institutions and bodies	Global	Developed country Parties, United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Show contribution of UNCCD institutions/bodies to the establishment of partnership agreements	Table and pie chart on contributions of UNCCD-related institutions/bodies in terms of number of developed country Parties/organizations that reported that agreements were facilitated by UNCCD institutions/bodies (4 classes); global		[1] [GEF reports only on other UNCCD bodies]
ID6.4 IO6.4	Difficulties, by importance, in concluding partnership agreements	Identification of major difficulties in establishing partnership agreements	Global	Developed country Parties, UN agencies & IGOs	Show where need to provide assistance to overcome the most important difficulties	Table and bar chart of number of countries/United Nations agencies and IGOs experiencing difficulties, categorized by type of problem (5 classes) and its importance (3 classes: not important, important, very important); global		

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available

Table 7  
**Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-7**

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
IA7.1	Yes/no on whether implementing joint initiatives and type	Progress in the establishment of synergies among the three Rio Conventions, in terms of:	Global, regional/ subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/ RAPs	Show progress towards the 2014 target of each affected country Party having established either one joint national plan or functional mechanism(s) to ensure synergies (where we are now with respect to the target and whether the target will be achieved by 2014 based on current plans) and where	Table with number of affected country Parties where an initiative has been established in full, partially established (only two Rio conventions), planned (with breakdowns for the four time periods) or not established, categorized by type of initiative (8 types). Globally and by region/subregion	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	
	Yes/no on whether operational mechanisms exist for joint implementation, and type	a) Number of affected country Parties with joint national plans/functional mechanisms in place or planned to ensure synergies among three Rio Conventions and time frame by which countries should have joint initiatives in place				Bar chart of number of initiatives in place, being planned (by time period) and not established, categorized by type of initiative (8 types). Globally and by region/subregion		
	Planned time frame by which mechanism for ensuring synergies will be in place	b) Coverage of joint initiatives and operational mechanisms				Map of country Parties with full/ partial/planned/ without initiatives		

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

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
		c) Distance to 2014 target				Distance to target: progress bar of percentage of countries per region with initiative in place, planned, and with no plans with respect to 2014 target		
IA7.2	Yes/no on whether joint implementation is supported by Rio Conventions and which ones	Support from the institutions of the Rio Conventions on the establishment of synergistic processes	Global, regional/ subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/ RAPs	Show where Rio Conventions are supporting synergies	Table and bar chart of number of affected country Parties that received support from the Rio Conventions by institution providing support (3 classes). Globally and by region/subregion		
IA7.3	Difficulties, by importance, in establishing synergistic planning/ programming or mechanisms for joint implementation	Identification of major difficulties in establishing synergies among the three Rio Conventions	Global, regional/ subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/ RAPs	Show where there is a need to provide assistance to overcome the most important difficulties	Table and stacked bar charts of number of affected country Parties experiencing difficulties, categorized by type of problem (7 classes) and its importance (3 or 2 classes: not important, important/very important). Globally and by region/subregion		
ID7.1	Number of enabling instruments established per year in affected country Parties with technical/ financial support by developed country Party	Contribution of developed country Parties to the establishment of synergies among the three Rio Conventions, in terms of:	Global, regional/ subregional [1]	Developed country Parties	Show contribution of developed country Parties to the establishment of synergies among the three Rio Conventions,	Table with the number of enabling instruments supported per year by type (2 types) and supporting country Party. With grand totals: per developed country and global	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Complements IO7.1/ and IG7.1 (United Nations agencies and IGOs and GEF report on breakdowns of number of enabling instruments

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

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
								supported by regional annex)[1] [Regional/subregional analysis limited to geographical distribution of support]
	List of beneficiary affected countries	a) Number of enabling instruments established in affected country Parties with the support of developed country Parties per year by type of instrument (joint initiatives/operational mechanisms)	-		Which countries are being supported or planned to be supported	Graphs showing trends in the number of enabling instruments globally		Analysis on plans to support affected country Parties complements IA7.1 (distance to target)
	Yes/no on whether there are plans to provide support to country/region, when by, and list of affected countries planning to support	b) Geographical distribution of support	-		Countries and regions where donors need to be targeting their support more	Table with distribution/coverage of the support provided, in terms of the number of times a specific affected country Party was reported to receive support by year or where plans to support exist. With totals: global and by region/subregion		

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
		c) National contribution to progress towards 2014 target				<p>Map showing the distribution and number of initiatives/mechanisms supported in affected countries (using data above)</p> <p>National contribution to target:</p> <p>Table of developed country contributions (countries classified by number of enabling instruments supported/planned, 4 classes)</p> <p>Map of developed country contributions (countries classified by number of enabling instruments supported/planned, 4 classes)</p>		
ID7.2	Type of joint initiatives/mechanisms supported	Type of support provided, in terms of:	Global	Developed country Parties	Show the most common initiatives, types of support and frameworks within which support was provided	<p>Table with the number of most common type of initiatives (8 types). Totals: global</p> <p>Pie charts on the type of initiatives globally (using data above)</p>		Complements IO7.2, IG7.2
	Frameworks support provided through, and type of support	a) Number of countries providing support by type of initiatives/mechanisms supported (5+3 = 8 types)						

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
		b) Number of countries providing support through specific frameworks by type of framework (4 types: UNCCD, CBD, UNFCCC, other)				Table and pie charts of frameworks (4 classes: UNCCD, CBD, UNFCCC, others)		
		c) Number of countries providing support by type of support (3 types: technical, financial, both)				Table with the number of developed countries that provided support by type of support (3 types: technical, financial, both) With totals: global  Pie charts on the most common types of support globally (using data above)		
ID7.3	Yes/no on whether instruments are in place to allow coordinated positioning	Progress in coordination with respect to the three Rio Conventions, in terms of number of countries where national instruments allowing coordinated positioning are in place at each reporting cycle	Global	Developed country Parties		Table of number of countries where national instruments allowing coordinated positioning are in place by reporting cycle  <i>Graphs with trends on number of countries where national instruments allowing coordinated positioning are in place</i>		Complements IO7.3, IG7.3

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

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
ID7.4	Difficulties, by importance, for those countries that have supported affected countries	Identification of major difficulties in establishing enabling instruments	Global	Developed country Parties	Show how recipient countries are to be supported more in order to ease the difficulties and supporting countries encouraged	Table of difficulties in terms of number of developed country Parties that did not provide support experiencing problems, categorized by type of problem (4 classes) and its importance (3 or 2 classes: not important, important/very important). Total		Complements IO7.4, IG7.4 and IA7.3
	Reasons, by importance, that prevented delivery of support by countries that have not provided support					Stacked bar charts/pie charts showing the most relevant problems (using data above). Global		
						The same for developed country Parties that provided support (by a different set of problems, 4 types		
IO7.1, IG7.1	Number of enabling instruments established globally and by regional annex per year in affected country Parties with technical/ financial	Contribution of United Nations agencies, IGOs and the GEF to the establishment of synergies among the three Rio Conventions, in terms of:	Global, regional/ subregional [1]	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Contribution of United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF to the establishment of synergies among the three Rio Conventions,	Table with the number of enabling instruments supported per year by type (2 types), supporting organization, regional annex and globally. With grand totals: per organization, global and by regional annex	Maps showing UNCCD regions and subregions to be made available	Complements ID7.1 [2] [1] [Regional/ subregional analysis limited to geographical distribution of support] [2] [Developed

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

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
	support by organization							country Parties do not report breakdowns of number of enabling instruments supported by regional annex but total numbers and list of affected country Parties supported]
	List of region(s)/subregion(s) supported	a) Number of enabling instruments established in affected country Parties with the support of IGOs by type of instrument (joint initiatives/operational mechanisms)  b) Geographical distribution of support			The most common initiatives in regions  Regions where donor organizations need to be targeting their support more	<i>Graphs showing trends in the number of enabling instruments globally and by regional annex</i>  Table with distribution/coverage of the support provided, in terms of the number of times a specific region/subregion was reported to receive support by year or where plans to support exist. With totals: global  Map showing the distribution and number of initiatives/mechanisms supported in		



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

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
IO7.2, IG7.2	Type of joint initiatives/mechanisms supported	Type of support provided, in terms of:	Global	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Show the most common initiatives, type of support and frameworks within which support was provided	regions/subregions (using data above)  Table with the number of most common type of initiatives (8 types). Totals: global  Pie charts on the type of initiatives globally (using data above)		Complements ID7.2
	Frameworks support provided through	a) number of organizations providing support by type of initiatives/mechanisms supported (5+3 = 8 types)						
	Type of support provided	b) Number of organizations providing support through specific frameworks by type of framework (4 types: UNCCD, CBD, UNFCCC, other)  c) Number of organizations providing support by type of support (3 types: technical, financial, both)				Table and pie charts of frameworks (4 classes: UNCCD, CBD, UNFCCC, others)  Table with the number of organizations which provided support by type of support (3 types: technical, financial, both) With totals: global  Pie charts of the type of support globally (using data above)		

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
IO7.3, IG7.3	Yes/no on whether instruments to foster synergies are in place	Progress in coordination with respect to the three Rio Conventions, in terms of number of organizations where instruments fostering synergies are in place at each reporting cycle	Global	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF		Table of number of organizations where instruments fostering synergies are in place by reporting cycle		Complements ID7.3
						<i>Graphs with trends on number of organizations where instruments fostering synergies are in place</i>		
IO7.4, IG7.4	Difficulties, by importance, for those organizations that have supported affected countries	Identification of major difficulties in establishing enabling instruments	Global	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Show how recipient countries are to be supported more in order to ease the difficulties and supporting countries can be encouraged	Table of difficulties in terms of number of organizations that did not provide support experiencing problems, categorized by type of problem (4 classes) and its importance (3 or 2 classes: not important, important/very important)		Complements ID7.4 and IA7.3
	Reasons, by importance, that prevented delivery of support by organizations who have not provided support					Stacked bar charts/pie charts showing the most relevant problems (using data above)		

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
						The same for organizations that provided support (by a different set of problems, 4 types)		

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available

Table 8  
**Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-8**

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
IA8.1	Yes/no on whether DLDD monitoring system, if functional and regularly updated	Progress in the establishment of national monitoring systems for DLDD, in terms of:	Global, regional/ subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs	Show progress towards target of 60% of affected country Parties having national monitoring systems for DLDD established by 2018 (where we are now with respect to the target and whether the target will be achieved by 2018 based on current plans) and where	Table with number of affected country Parties where national systems are in place (with breakdowns for functional and regularly updated systems), planned (with breakdowns for the four time periods), not established, or with national environmental monitoring systems partially covering DLDD in place. Global and by region/subregion	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	
	<i>List of monitoring systems at sub-national level [not to be considered at this stage]</i>	a) Number of affected country Parties where an operational national monitoring system for DLDD is in place or planned and time frame by which				Bar chart of number of systems in place (2 classes), being planned (by time period), not established, or with environmental monitoring systems in place. Globally and by region/subregion		

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
		countries should have monitoring systems in place						
	Yes/no on whether there is a plan to have monitoring system and by when	b) Coverage of monitoring systems				Map of affected country Parties with monitoring systems in place, planned, without or with environmental monitoring systems		
		c) Distance to 2018 target				Distance to target: progress bars of percentage of affected country Parties with systems already in place, that are planning to establish systems, and that have no system/plan in relation to 60% target. Globally and per region		
IA8.2	Difficulties by importance in establishing national monitoring systems for DLDD	Identification of major problems in establishing national monitoring systems	Global, regional/ subregional	Affected country Parties with no monitoring system in place, SRAPs/RAPs	Show where there is a need to provide assistance to establish national monitoring systems for DLDD	Table with number of affected country Parties experiencing problems, categorized by type of problem (8 classes) and its importance (3 or 2 classes: not important, important/very important). Total and by region/subregion		
						Stacked bar charts/pie charts showing what are the most relevant problems (using data above). Global and by region/subregion		

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

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
IA8.3	How system is maintained, by importance	Factors that limit the maintenance of monitoring systems for DLDD	Global, regional/subregional	Affected country Parties with monitoring systems in place, SRAPs/RAPs	Show which support is needed to maintain systems based on countries where a system is already in place	Table with number of affected country Parties with a monitoring system in place by maintenance class (5 classes: system maintained with national resources, external resources, not maintained due to limited capacity, not maintained due to limited resources) and its importance (3 or 2 classes: not important, important/very important). Total and by region/subregion  Stacked bar charts/pie charts showing how systems are maintained (using data above). Global and by region/subregion		
ID8.1	Number of monitoring systems per year supported in affected countries, regions and subregions, and type (2 types)  List of beneficiary affected countries	Contribution of developed country Parties to the establishment of DLDD and environmental monitoring systems in affected country Parties/regions and subregions, in terms of:  a) Number of monitoring systems supported in affected country Parties, regions and subregions (both targeted to DLDD and not specific to	Global, regional/subregional [1]	Developed country Parties	Contribution of developed country Parties to the establishment of monitoring systems  Countries and regions where donors need to be targeting their support more	Table with number of monitoring systems supported by type (2 classes: targeted to DLDD, not specific) per year and supporting country Party. With totals: global  <i>Graphs showing trends in the number of monitoring systems supported globally</i>	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Complements IO8.1, IG8.1 [1] [Regional/subregional analysis limited to geographical distribution of support]

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
		DLDD)						
	Yes/no on whether monitoring system was supported before 2008, and list of beneficiary affected countries	b) Geographical distribution of support				Table with distribution/coverage of the support provided, in terms of the number of times a specific affected country Party was reported to receive support, by year, before 2008 or where plans to provide support exist		
	Yes/no on whether there are plans to provide support to country/region, when by, and list of affected countries planning to support	c) National contribution to progress towards 2018 target				Map showing the distribution of monitoring systems supported in affected countries (using data above)		
						National contribution to target:		
						Table of developed country contributions (countries classified by number of monitoring systems supported/planned, 4 classes)		
						Map of developed country contributions (countries classified by number of monitoring systems supported/planned, 4 classes)		
ID8.2	Frameworks support	Kind of support provided, in terms	Global	Developed country	Show the most common type of support and	Table and pie charts of frameworks (4 classes: UNCCD, CBD,		Complements IO8.2, IG8.2

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

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
	provided through	of:		Parties	frameworks within which support was provided	UNFCCC, others)		
	Type of support provided (3 types: technical, financial, both)	a) Number of countries providing support through specific frameworks, by type of framework (4 types: UNCCD, CBD, UNFCCC, other)				Table with the number of developed countries that provided support, by type of support (3 types: technical, financial, both) With totals: global		
		b) Number of countries providing support, by type of support (3 types: technical, financial, both)				Pie charts on the type of support globally (using data above)		
ID8.3	Number of monitoring systems supported that are still functional	How many systems are still in operation.	Global	Developed country Parties		Table with number of systems still in operation reported, by developed country and per reporting cycle. With totals: global		Complements IO8.3
ID8.4	Difficulties, by importance, for those countries that have supported affected countries	Identification of major difficulties in establishing a monitoring system	Global	Developed country Parties	Show how recipient countries are to be supported more in order to ease the difficulties and supporting countries can be encouraged	Table of difficulties in terms of number of developed country Parties that did not provide support experiencing problems, categorized by type of problem (4 classes) and its importance (3 or 2 classes: not important, important/very important). Total		Complements IO8.4, IG8.4 and IA8.2

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

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
	Reasons, by importance, that prevented delivery of support by countries that have not provided support					The same for developed country Parties that provided support (by a different set of problems, 4 types).		
						Stacked bar charts/pie charts showing the most relevant problems (using data above). Global		
IO8.1, IG8.1	Number of monitoring systems per year supported in affected countries, and type	Contribution of organizations to the establishment of DLDD and environmental monitoring systems in affected country Parties/ regions and globally, in terms of:	Global, regional/ subregional [1]	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Contribution of organizations to the establishment of monitoring systems	Table with number of monitoring systems supported (two classes: targeted to DLDD, not specific) per year and supporting organization. With totals: global	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Complements ID8.1 [1] [Regional/sub regional analysis limited to geographical distribution of support]
	List of the names of the beneficiary country, regions or global in scope	a) Number of monitoring systems supported (both targeted to DLDD and not specific to DLDD)			Countries and regions where donors need to be targeting their support more	Graphs showing trends in the number of monitoring systems supported globally		



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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
	Yes/no on whether monitoring system was supported before 2008, and list of beneficiary affected countries	b) Geographical coverage of countries/regions supported				Table with distribution/coverage of the support provided, in terms of the number of times a specific country or region was reported to receive support, by year, before 2008 or where plans to support exist		
	Yes/no on whether there were plans to provide support to country/region, when by, and list of affected countries planning to support							
IO8.2, IG8.2	Frameworks support provided through, and type of support	Kind of support provided, in terms of:  a) Number of organizations providing support through specific frameworks by type of framework (4 types: UNCCD, CBD, UNFCCC, other)	Global	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF		Table and pie charts of frameworks (4 classes: UNCCD, CBD, UNFCCC, others)  Table with the number of type of support (3 types).		Complements ID8.2

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
		b) Number of organizations providing support, by type of support (3 types: technical, financial, both)				Pie charts on the type of support (using data above)		
IO8.3	Number of monitoring systems supported that are still functional	How many systems are still in operation	Global	United Nations agencies and IGOs		Table with number of systems still in operation reported by developed country and per reporting cycle. With totals: global		Complements ID8.3
IO8.4, IG8.4	Difficulties, by importance, for those organizations that have supported monitoring systems	Identification of major difficulties in establishing a monitoring system.	Global	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Show how recipient countries are to be supported more in order to ease the difficulties and supporting organizations can be encouraged	Table of difficulties in terms of number of organizations not providing support experiencing problems, categorized by type of problem (4 classes) and its importance (3 or 2 classes: not important, important/very important)		Complements ID8.4 and IA8.2
	Reasons, by importance, that prevented delivery of support by organizations that have not provided support					The same for organizations that provided support (by a different set of problems, 4 types)		
						Stacked bar charts/pPie charts showing the most relevant problems (using data above)		

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available

Table 9  
**Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-9**

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
IA9.1	Yes/no on whether the country reported on two impact indicators	Progress in reporting on impact indicators along revised reporting guidelines in terms of:	Global, regional/ subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs	Showing progress towards target of 90% of countries reporting in line with new reporting guidelines by 2018	Table with the number of affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs reporting on the two indicators (3 classes), using guidelines (3 classes: using, not using, planning to use). With totals: global and by region/subregion.	TO BE IMPLEMENTED IN 2012	
	Number of impact indicators the country reported on (in 2012 and 2016)	a) Number of affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs reporting on the two indicators (3 classes: reporting on both indicators, not reporting, reporting on one indicator) for the two reporting cycles				Map showing countries that have reported on two impact indicators	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	
	Yes/no on whether the country referred to reporting guidelines	b) Number of affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs using or planning to use (by time period (2 time periods) reporting guidelines/CST methodology for the two reporting cycle				Bar chart showing average number of indicators reported on in 2012 and 2016 in regions/subregions		
	Time frame for when the country plans to report on impact indicators and comply with	c) Distance to 2018 target				Progress bars towards 90% target: separate bar for reporting and complying with guidelines. Globally and by region/subregion		

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
IA9.2	reporting guidelines (post-2012) Difficulties, by importance, on reporting on impact indicators	Most important difficulties experienced in reporting on impact indicators and their relevance	Global, regional/subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs	Show difficulties in reporting on the two impact indicators or complying with reported guidelines	Table with number of affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs experiencing difficulties, by type of difficulty (4 classes) and their relevance (3 classes: important, very important, not important). Totals and by region/subregion.  Stacked bar charts of major difficulties in reporting. Global and by region/subregion	TO BE IMPLEMENTED IN 2012	

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available

Table 10  
**Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-10**

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis/ notes</i>
IA10.1	Yes/no on whether identification of drivers (analysis of interactions of measures is knowledge based,	Progress in NAPs quality self-assessment, in terms of:	Global, regional/subregional	Affected country Parties with a NAP aligned to The Strategy,	Progress towards 70% of revised NAP/SRAP/RAPs successfully having gone through quality self-assessment by	Table with number of countries where driver identification/analysis of interactions in NAPs is already based on knowledge, by year or planned (by time period, 4 periods). With	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis/ notes</i>
	and type of knowledge			SRAPs/RAPs	2018			
	Yes/no on whether drought mitigation is analysed/reflected on in NAP	a) Number of affected country Parties where driver identification/analysis of interactions in NAPs is already based on knowledge or planned (by time period, 4 periods)			The regions where NAPs have been revised to reflect knowledge on DLDD drivers			
	Time frame for quality self-assessment	b) Which type of knowledge is used (scientific literature, expert or traditional knowledge)			Regions where self-assessments need to be encouraged to increase progress towards target		Progress bar showing percentage gone through self-assessment, planning to or no plans, in relation to 2018 target. Global and by region/subregion	
		c) Number of affected country Parties where drought mitigation is analysed and/or reflected in NAPs					Table with percentage of countries whose NAPs reflect knowledge by type of knowledge (3 types: scientific, expert, traditional knowledge). Global and by region/subregion	
		d) Distance to 2018 target					Pie charts based on the above data	
IA10.2	Reasons, by importance, for not taking into account scientific/traditional knowledge	Most common reasons for scientific/traditional knowledge not being taken into account in developing NAPs	Global, regional/subregional	Affected country Parties with a NAP aligned to The Strategy, SRAPs/RAPs	Show the most important reasons for not developing knowledge-based NAPs		Table and stacked bar charts of most important reasons for not developing knowledge-based NAPs (7 classes). Globally and by region/subregion	

Table 11  
**Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-11**

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

<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
Effectiveness, measured using numbers of users, of knowledge-sharing systems for each region/subregion	Global, regional/ subregional	Country Parties (affected, developed, SRAPs/RAPs, United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	The type of systems that are most effective at sharing scientific and traditional knowledge, and best practices  The contribution that these systems make to the UNCCD website	Map on average number of users per system in each region/country?  Bar chart of overall number of systems and number of users (range) per system in each region/country	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	[1] [based on list compiled by the secretariat after quality control of data provided by reporting entities]

Table 12  
**Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-13**

*CONS-O-13: Number of countries, subregional and regional reporting entities engaged in building capacity to combat DLDD on the basis of national capacity self assessments (NCSA) or other methodologies and instruments*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
IA13.1	Number of capacity-building initiatives per year	Progress in the establishment of capacity-building initiatives, in terms of:	Global, regional/ subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/ RAPs	Show progress towards target of 90% of affected country Parties, regions/subregions having DLDD-specific capacity-building plans/programmes/projects under implementation by 2014 (where we are now with respect to the target and whether the target will be achieved by 2014 based on current plans) and where	Table with number of capacity-building initiatives undertaken by affected country Party, region/subregion or planned by affected country Party, region and subregion and time period (5 classes; only for countries where no capacity-building initiatives currently being implemented). With totals (global and by region/subregion)		
	Time frame by which plan to implement capacity building	a) Number of capacity-building initiatives undertaken by affected country Parties, regions/subregions or planned, and time frame by which countries should have capacity-building initiatives in place				Bar chart of number of capacity-building initiatives by year, Totals and by region/subregion (using data above)		

*CONS-O-13: Number of countries, subregional and regional reporting entities engaged in building capacity to combat DLDD on the basis of national capacity self assessments (NCSA) or other methodologies and instruments*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
		b) Coverage of capacity-building initiatives				Map of countries with capacity-building initiatives in place (categorized by number of initiatives) or planned (categorized by time period)		
		c) distance to 2014 target				Distance to target: Progress bars of percentage of affected country Parties and regions/subregions that have implemented capacity-building initiatives, that are planning to implement capacity-building initiatives in relation to 90% target. Globally and per region/subregion		
IA13.2	Yes/no on whether capacity-building needs have been assessed, or process ongoing and within which framework (NCSA or other)	Progress in assessing capacity-building needs, in terms of:	Global	Affected country Parties	Show which framework has provided the best ability to assess DLDD capacity-building	Table with number of Parties, regions/subregions having assessed capacity-building needs (2 types: through NCSA or other frameworks), where assessment is still ongoing or not assessed		



*CONS-O-13: Number of countries, subregional and regional reporting entities engaged in building capacity to combat DLDD on the basis of national capacity self assessments (NCSA) or other methodologies and instruments*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
	Yes/no on whether necessary resources have been assessed and if included into investment framework	a) Number of affected country Parties, regions/subregions that have assessed capacity-building needs, and which framework was used (NCSA or other)	Regional/ Subregional	SRAPs/ RAPs	Which institutions have contributed most	Table with number of affected country Parties, regions/subregions having assessed or not assessed capacity-building resource needs. Total and by region/subregion		
	Type of assistance and institutions received from	b) Number of number of affected country Parties, regions/subregions that have assessed availability of resources for addressing capacity-building needs and whether resource requirements are included in an investment framework				Table with number of affected country Parties, regions/subregions having included resource requirements in an investment framework. Total and by region/subregion		
		c) Assistance received (secretariat, GM GEF, bilateral, multilateral) to build capacities				Table with number of countries supported by different institutions/organizations (5 classes)		
						Pie chart of percentage of countries who have received assistance by institution (using data		

CONS-O-13: Number of countries, subregional and regional reporting entities engaged in building capacity to combat DLDD on the basis of national capacity self assessments (NCSA) or other methodologies and instruments

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
						above)		
ID13.1	Number of capacity-building initiatives supported each year, both NCSA-generated and others  List of affected countries supported	Contribution of developed country Parties to the establishment of capacity-building initiatives in affected country Parties/ regions and subregions, in terms of:  a) Number of capacity-building initiatives supported or planned to be supported (per time period, 4 periods) in affected country Parties, regions and subregions (NCSA-generated or other) per year	Global, regional/sub regional [1]	Developed country Parties	Contribution of developed country Parties to capacity-building initiatives	Table and bar charts with the number of capacity-building initiatives supported each year by type (2 types: NCSA-based and others) or planned by time period (4 time periods) and supporting country Party. With grand totals: per supporting country and global  <i>Graphs showing trends in the number of capacity building initiatives supported globally</i>	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Complements IO13.1, IG13.1 [1] [Regional/subregional analysis limited to geographical distribution of support]

*CONS-O-13: Number of countries, subregional and regional reporting entities engaged in building capacity to combat DLDD on the basis of national capacity self assessments (NCSA) or other methodologies and instruments*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
	Yes/no on whether there are plans to support affected countries, by when, and list of affected countries planned to be supported	b) Geographical coverage of support				Table with distribution/coverage of the support provided, in terms of the number of times a specific affected country Party was reported to receive support, by year, or where plans to support exist		
		c) National contribution to progress towards 2018 target				Map showing the distribution of capacity-building initiatives supported in affected countries (using data above)		
						National contribution to target:		
						Table with developed country contribution (countries classified by number of capacity building initiatives supported/planned, 4 classes)		
						Map on developed country contribution (countries classified by number of capacity-building initiatives supported/planned, 4 classes)		

CONS-O-13: Number of countries, subregional and regional reporting entities engaged in building capacity to combat DLDD on the basis of national capacity self assessments (NCSA) or other methodologies and instruments

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
ID13.2	Difficulties, by importance, for those countries that have supported affected countries	Identification of main reasons for DLDD capacity-building plans/programmes not being implemented	Global	Developed country Parties	Show whether support given is limited by insufficient cooperation between recipients and donors	Table of difficulties in terms of number of developed country Parties that did not provide support experiencing problems, categorized by type of problem (4 classes) and its importance (3 or 2 classes: not important, important/very important). Total		Complements with IA13.2, IO13.2, IG13.2
	Reasons, by importance, that prevented delivery of support by countries who have not provided support					The same for developed country Parties that provided support (by a different set of problems, 4 types)		
						Stacked bar charts/pie charts showing the most relevant problems (using data above). Global		
IO13.1	Number of capacity-building initiatives supported each year, NCSA-generated and others	Contribution of United Nations agencies and IGOs to the establishment of capacity-building initiatives in affected country Parties/ regions and subregions, in terms of:	Global, regional/ subregional [1]	United Nations agencies and IGOs	Contribution of United Nations agencies and IGOs to capacity-building initiatives	Table and bar charts with the number of capacity-building initiatives supported each year by type (2 types: NCSA-based and others) and supporting organization. With grand totals: per supporting organization and global	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Complements ID13.1, IG13.1 [1] [Regional/subregional analysis limited to geographical distribution of support]

*CONS-O-13: Number of countries, subregional and regional reporting entities engaged in building capacity to combat DLDD on the basis of national capacity self assessments (NCSA) or other methodologies and instruments*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
	List of affected countries supported	<p>a) Number of capacity-building initiatives supported in affected country Parties, regions and subregions (both NCSA-generated and other) per year</p> <p>b) Geographical coverage of support</p>				<p><i>Graphs showing trends in the number of capacity building initiatives supported globally</i></p> <p>Table with distribution/coverage of the support provided, in terms of the number of times a specific affected country Party was reported to receive support, by year.</p> <p>Map showing the distribution of capacity-building initiatives supported in affected countries (using data above).</p>		
IO13.2 , IG13.2	Difficulties, by importance, for those organizations that have supported affected countries	Identification of main reasons for DLDD capacity-building plans/programmes not being implemented	Global	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Show whether support given is limited by insufficient cooperation between recipients and donors	Table of difficulties in terms of number of organizations that did not provide support experiencing problems, categorized by type of problem (4 classes) and its importance (3 or 2 classes: not important, important/very important). Total		Complements with IA13.2, ID13.2,

CONS-O-13: Number of countries, subregional and regional reporting entities engaged in building capacity to combat DLDD on the basis of national capacity self assessments (NCSA) or other methodologies and instruments

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
	Reasons, by importance, that prevented delivery of support by organizations who have not provided support					The same for organizations that provided support (by a different set of problems, 4 types)		
						Stacked bar charts/pie charts showing the most relevant problems (using data above). Global		
IG13.1	Number of capacity-building initiatives supported each year, both NCSA-generated and other	Contribution of GEF to the establishment of capacity-building initiatives in affected country Parties/ regions and subregions, in terms of:	Global, regional/sub regional [1]	GEF	Contribution of GEF to capacity-building initiatives	Table and bar charts with the number of capacity-building initiatives supported each year by type (2 types: NCSA-based and others) and supporting organization	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Complements ID13.1, IO13.1 [1] [Regional/subregional analysis limited to geographical distribution of support]
	List of affected countries supported	a) Number of capacity-building initiatives supported in affected country Parties, regions and subregions (both NCSA-generated and other) per year				Graphs showing trends in the number of capacity building initiatives supported globally		

*CONS-O-13: Number of countries, subregional and regional reporting entities engaged in building capacity to combat DLDD on the basis of national capacity self assessments (NCSA) or other methodologies and instruments*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
		b) Geographical coverage of support				Table with distribution/coverage of the support provided, in terms of the number of times a specific affected country Party was reported to receive support by year  Map showing the distribution of capacity building initiatives supported in affected countries (using data above)		

**Table 13**  
**Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-14**

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
IA14.1	Yes/no on whether integrated investment framework has been developed, and when	Progress in the development of integrated investment framework in affected country Parties, regions/subregions, in terms of:	Global, regional/subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs	Progress towards the target of 50% of affected country Parties, regions/subregions with established integrated investment frameworks by 2014 (where we are now and whether the 2014 target is likely to be achieved)	Table with the number of affected country Parties, regions/subregions with established investment frameworks (2 types: based on NAP, not based on NAP) or planned by time period (4 periods) Total and by region/subregion	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
	Yes/no on whether framework is based on NAP. If yes, who assisted, type of assistance and whether devised within IFS	a) Number of affected country Parties, regions/subregions with integrated investment framework, developed or planned and whether based on NAP			Regions that have yet to develop investment frameworks, or frameworks not based on NAP, and hence require assistance	Map of affected country Parties that have developed investment framework, and if based on NAP		
	Time frame by which plan to have integrated investment framework	b) Coverage of integrated investment frameworks				Distance to target: Progress bar of percentage of affected country Parties and regions/subregions that have established investment frameworks, that are planning to establish frameworks in relation to 90% target. Globally and per region/subregion		
		c) Distance to 2014 target						
IA14.2	Yes/no on whether framework is based on NAP. If yes, who assisted, type of assistance and whether devised within IFS	Assistance received from donors/institutions for the establishment of integrated investment frameworks in affected country Parties, in terms of:	Global, regional/subregional	Affected country Parties with integrated investment framework based on NAP, SRAPs/RAPs	Show donors groups/institutions contributing the most	Table with the number of frameworks supported by donors groups/institutions (5 groups: GM, GEF, bilateral, multilateral, others). Globally and by region/subregion		



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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
	Yes/no on whether framework concretely allows leveraging on resources to combat DLDD	a) Number of frameworks supported by different donor groups/institutions (5 groups: GM, GEF, bilateral, multilateral, others)			Whether all regions/subregions are covered	Pie charts with the percentage contributions to the establishment of integrated investment frameworks of donor groups/institutions. Global and by region/subregion		
		b) Type of support received (3 types: technical, financial, both)				Table with the number of countries that received a specific type of support (3 types: technical, financial, both). Global and by region/subregion		
		c) Number of frameworks devised within IFS and assisted by GM				Pie charts showing the type of support received (using data above). Global and by region/subregion.		
		d) Number of frameworks allowing leveraging				Table and pie charts with the number of frameworks assisted by GM that were devised within IFS. Globally and by region/subregion		
						Table with the number of countries with a NAP-based integrated investment framework allowing the leverage of national, bilateral and multilateral resources. Globally and by region/subregion		

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

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
IA14.3	Difficulties, by importance, in developing integrated investment framework	Identification of the main difficulties in each region in developing frameworks	Global, regional/ subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/ RAPs	Show where there is a need to provide assistance to establish integrated investment frameworks	Table with number of affected country Parties experiencing problems, categorized by type of problem (8 classes) and its importance (3 or 2 classes: not important, important/very important). Total and by region/subregion.  Stacked bar charts/pie charts showing what are the most relevant problems (using data above). Global and by region/subregion		Complements ID14.3, IO14.3, IG14.3
ID14.1	Number of integrated investment frameworks supported per year, within IFS and others	Contribution of developed country Parties to the development of integrated investment frameworks in affected country Parties, regions/subregions, in terms of:	Global, regional/ subregional[1]	Developed country Parties	Contribution of developed country Parties to the establishment of integrated investment frameworks	Table with number of framework supported (2 classes: within IFS and others) per year and by supporting country Party. With grand totals: per supporting country and global	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Complements IO14.1, IG14.1 [1] [Regional/subregional analysis limited to geographical distribution of support]
	List of beneficiary affected countries	a) Number of integrated investment frameworks supported (within both IFS and other strategies) and planned to be supported (by time period) per year	-		Countries and regions where donors need to be targeting their support more	Graphs showing trends in the number of investment framework supported globally		

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
	Yes/no on whether monitoring system was supported before 2008, and list of beneficiary affected countries	b) Geographical coverage of support				Table with distribution/ coverage of the support provided in terms of the number of times a specific affected country Party was reported to receive support, by year, before 2008 or where plans to support exist		
	Yes/no on whether there was a plan to support affected countries, by when and list of affected countries planned to be supported	c) National contribution to target				Map showing the distribution of investment frameworks supported in affected countries (using data above).  National contribution to target:  Table of developed country contributions (countries classified by number of integrated frameworks supported/planned, 4 classes)  Map of developed country contributions (countries classified by number of integrated frameworks supported/planned, 4 classes)		
ID14.2	Frameworks support provided through, and type of support	Kind of support provided, in terms of:	Global	Developed country Parties	Show the most common type of support and frameworks within which support was	Table with the number of types of support (3 types). With totals: global		Complements IO14.2, IG14.2,

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
					provided			
		a) Number of countries providing support through specific frameworks by type of framework (4 types: UNCCD, CBD, UNFCCC, other)				Pie charts on the type of support globally (using data above)		
		b) Number of countries providing support by type of support (3 types: technical, financial, both)				Table and pie charts of frameworks (4 classes: UNCCD, CBD, UNFCCC, others)		
ID14.3	Difficulties, by importance, for those countries that have supported affected countries	Identification of main reasons why integrated investment frameworks have not been supported/ had difficulty in being supported	Global	Developed country Parties	Better process is needed to support coordination of ministries and resources in affected countries, to ease difficulties in supporting integrated investment frameworks	Table and pie charts showing the most important reasons for difficulties/no support		Complements IA14.3, IO14.3, IG14.3
	Reasons, by importance, that prevented delivery of support by countries who have not provided support							

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

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
IO14.1	Number of integrated investment frameworks supported per year, within IFS and others	Contribution of United Nations agencies and IGOs to the development of integrated investment frameworks in affected country Parties, regions/subregions, in terms of:	Global, regional/subregional[2]	United Nations agencies and IGOs	Contribution of United Nations agencies and IGOs to the establishment of integrated investment frameworks	Table with number of frameworks supported (2 classes: within IFS and others) per year and by supporting organization. With grand totals: per supporting organization and global	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Complements ID14.1, IG14.1 [2] [Regional/subregional analysis limited to geographical distribution of support]
	List of beneficiary affected countries	a) Number of integrated investment frameworks supported (within both IFS and other strategies) per year and before 2008			Countries and regions where donors need to be targeting their support more	Graphs showing trends in the number of integrated frameworks supported globally		
	Yes/no on whether monitoring system was supported before 2008, and list of beneficiary affected countries	b) Geographical coverage of support				Table with distribution/coverage of the support provided, in terms of the number of times a specific affected country Party was reported to receive support by year or before 2008		
						Map showing the distribution of investment frameworks supported in affected countries (using data above)		

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
IO14.2, IG14.2	Framework support provided through, and type of support	Kind of support provided, in terms of:  a) Number of countries providing support through specific frameworks by type of framework (4 types: UNCCD, CBD, UNFCCC, other)  b) Number of countries providing support by type of support (3 types: technical, financial, both)	Global	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Show the most common type of support and frameworks within which support was provided	Table and pie charts of frameworks (4 classes: UNCCD, CBD, UNFCCC, others)  Table with the number of type of support (3 types). Totals: global  Pie charts on the type of support globally and by region (using data above)		
IO14.3, IG14.3	Difficulties, by importance, for those organizations supporting affected countries  Reasons, by importance, that prevented delivery of support by organizations not	Identification of main reasons why integrated investment frameworks have not been supported/ had difficulty in being supported	Global	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Better process is needed to support coordination of ministries and resources in affected countries, to ease difficulties in supporting integrated investment frameworks	Table and pie charts showing the most important reasons for difficulties/no support		Complements IA14.3, ID14.3

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

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
	providing support							
IG14.1	Number of integrated investment frameworks supported per year, within IFS and others	Contribution of the GEF to the development of integrated investment frameworks in affected country Parties, regions/subregions, in terms of:	Global, regional/subregional [3]	GEF	Contribution of the GEF to the establishment of integrated investment frameworks	Table with number of framework supported (2 classes: within IFS and others) per year. With totals: global	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Complements ID14.1, IO14.1 [3] [Regional/subregional analysis limited to geographical distribution of support]
	List of beneficiary affected countries	a) Number of integrated investment frameworks supported (within both IFS and other strategies) and planned to support (by time period) per year			Countries and regions where donors need to be targeting their support more	Graphs showing trends in the number of integrated frameworks supported globally		
	Yes/no on whether monitoring system was supported before 2008, and list of beneficiary affected countries	b) Geographical coverage of support				Table with distribution/coverage of the support provided, in terms of the number of times a specific affected country Party was reported to receive support by year, before 2008 or where plans to support exist		

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
	Yes/no on whether there are plans to support affected countries, by when, and list of affected countries planned to be supported							

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available

Table 14  
**Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-15**

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
ID15.1	Amounts committed and disbursed to affected countries per biennium and currency	Trends in the amounts being made available to affected countries through DLDD-related programmes and projects  Difference in amounts committed and amounts disbursed	Global	Developed country Parties	Show trends in the amounts being made available in all regions  Percentage of amounts disbursed with respect to amounts committed	Table with the amounts made available to affected country Parties, by developed country Party and by biennium (committed, disbursed and differences between committed and disbursed) in United States dollars. With totals (global)  Frequency graph showing trends of the amounts being made available, with separate lines for committed and disbursed	Currency exchange rates to be made available	



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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
ID15.2	<i>Reasons, from 2012, for increasing/decreasing trend of financial resources made available</i>	<i>Main reasons for trends</i>	Global	Developed country Parties	Show why resources for DLDD are decreasing/increasing	<i>Table with reasons for decreasing/increasing trends and their relevance expressed by the number of developed country Parties by type of reason (3 types for decreasing trends; 4 types for increasing trends)</i>  <i>Stacked bar charts showing the reasons for the trends seen, by importance (using data above)</i>	To be implemented in 2012	

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available

Table 15  
**Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-16**

<i>CONS-O-16: Degree of adequacy, timeliness and predictability of financial resources made available by developed country Parties to combat DLDD</i>								
<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
IA16.1	Rating of bilateral assistance received, by adequacy, timeliness and predictability (per biennium)	Qualitative assessment of bilateral assistance received by affected country Parties, regions/subregions, in terms of:	Global, regional/subregional	Affected country Parties entitled to receive assistance under the UNCCD, SRAPs/RAPs entitled to receive assistance under the UNCCD	Show the quality and usefulness of resources made available (no target set)	Table with ratings of adequacy, timeliness, predictability of bilateral support (3 classes: adequate, fairly adequate, not adequate) by biennium, in terms of number of affected country Parties, regions/subregions that provided the rating and number of countries with constraints. Globally and by region/subregion.	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Cross check with CONS-O-15
	Yes/no on whether assistance has constrained country with respect to UNCCD	a) Rating of adequacy, timeliness and predictability of bilateral assistance received (3 classes: adequate, fairly adequate, not adequate) and whether assistance constrained performance in planning and implementation with respect to UNCCD			Whether more financial resources need to be made available to affected countries	Stacked bar charts of ratings of adequacy, timeliness and predictability (3 classes as above) and constraints. Globally and in each region (by proportion of countries)		
		<i>b) Analysis of trends of the above</i>			Where adequacy, timeliness and predictability needs to be improved so as not to further constrain countries	<i>Graphs showing trends of the above</i>		
		c) Where assistance constrained performance			Donors more predictable or timely or give more adequately	List of countries where assistance constrained performance in planning and implementation with respect to UNCCD		

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

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
					in certain regions			
						Map of countries where assistance constrained performance in planning and implementation with respect to UNCCD		
IA16.2	Yes/no on whether assistance in raising resources was received from bilateral donors, and from whom	Distribution/coverage of support to affected country Parties, regions/subregions in raising resources by bilateral donor groups (6 groups)	Global, regional/subregional	Affected country Parties entitled to receive assistance under the UNCCD	Institutions that have contributed the most assistance in raising resources	Table with distribution of support from donors, in terms of number of donor groups providing total support, per country or region/subregion and whether constraints	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Map on constraints could be combined with map on distribution of support
				SRAPs/RAPs entitled to receive assistance under the UNCCD	Show where assistance was most provided and where not	Maps of distribution of support from donors with classification of countries based on number of donor groups providing support (3 classes: none, less than 2, 4 or more)		
						Table with contributions of donors, in terms of number of countries supported by each donor group per biennium (6 groups: secretariat, GM, GEF, bilateral, multilateral, others). Globally and by region/subregion		

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
						Pie charts showing contribution to assistance by secretariat, GM, GEF, bilateral, multilateral, other sources or none (using data above). Globally and by region/subregion		

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available

**Table 16**  
**Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-17**

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
IA 17.1	Number of DLDD-related project proposals successfully submitted and projects ongoing by biennium	Progress in mobilizing resources, in terms of:	Global, regional/subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs	Show whether the target of a steady growth in the number of DLDD-related project proposals successfully submitted during the implementation period of The Strategy is being achieved	Table with the number of project proposals and ongoing projects, amount raised by biennium, with flags on whether enough resources are being mobilized and whether there are plans to increase efforts in presenting project proposals by affected country Parties, regions/subregions. With totals including: number of project proposals, number of ongoing projects, total amounts, number of countries that mobilized enough resources and number of countries that are planning to increase efforts. Global and by region/subregion	Currency exchange rates to be made available	Cross-check number of projects/amounts with IO17.1, IG17.1

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

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
	Amount of funds raised for the ongoing projects by biennium	a) Number of project proposals successfully submitted (in the pipeline) or number of projects being implemented (ongoing) per biennium			Show where resources are being mobilized (proposals successfully submitted and projects ongoing) and where not enough resources for DLDD-related projects are being mobilized	Bar charts using above data (totals) Globally and by region/subregion (useful when trends cannot be shown)	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	
	Yes/no on whether enough resources are being mobilized from international financial institutions, facilities and funds through project proposals	b) Amounts of funds raised for the ongoing projects per biennium			Show where assistance would be needed in developing successful proposals	<i>Graphs showing trends in the number of successfully submitted proposals, ongoing projects and amounts along the period of the implementation of the Strategy. Global and by region/subregion</i>		
	Yes/no on whether there are plans to increase efforts to present project proposals	c) Distribution of project proposals				Maps showing classes reflecting number of proposals and ongoing projects (4–5 classes)		
		d) <i>Trends in the number of successfully submitted project proposals and amounts</i>						

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

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
IA 17.2	Reasons for increasing/decreasing trends, by importance	Major reasons behind increasing/decreasing trends	Global, regional/subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs	Show major reasons for increasing trends that could be shared	Table with reasons for decreasing/increasing trends expressed by the number of affected country Parties or regions/subregions by type of reason (4 types for decreasing trends; 6 types for increasing trends) importance (2–3 classes: important/very important, not important). Globally and by region/subregion  Stacked bar charts showing the reasons for the trends, by importance (using data above)		
IO 17.1, IG 17.1	Number of DLDD-related project proposals submitted for funding (pipeline) and approved (ongoing) to the organization by regional annex and biennium	Progress in mobilizing resources and contributions of United Nations agencies and IGOs, in terms of:	Global, regional/subregional	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Show contribution of United Nations agencies and IGOs to the target of a steady growth in the number of DLDD-related project proposals successfully submitted along the implementation period of The Strategy	Table with the number of project proposals and ongoing projects, amount raised per organization and biennium, both submitted to/supported by the organization and submitted/developed by the organization. With totals including: number of project proposals (both submitted to and by IGOS), number of ongoing projects (both supported and developed by IGOs), total amounts (relating to ongoing projects supported and developed by IGOs), Global and by regional annex	Maps on administrative limits (aggregated at the regional level) to be made available	Cross-check number of projects/amounts raised with IA17.1
	Number of project proposals submitted to other organizations for funding (pipeline)	a) Number of project proposals successfully submitted (in the pipeline) or number			Show coverage of DLDD-specific allocations from donors, by region	Bar charts using above data (totals) Globally and by regional annex (useful when trends cannot be shown)		

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

Ref.	Data reported	Analysis	Type of analysis	Reporting entities	Relevance	Presentation	Additional requirements	Cross-cutting analysis / notes
	and ongoing by regional annex and biennium (excluding the GEF)	of projects being implemented (ongoing) per biennium (4 classes: submitted to the organization, developed with aid from the organization, submitted by the organization, developed by the organization)						
	Amount of funds raised by biennium (for both proposals submitted for funding to and by the organization)	b) Amounts of funds raised for the ongoing projects supported and developed by the organization per biennium				<i>Graphs showing trends in the number of successfully submitted proposals, ongoing projects and amounts along the period of the implementation of the Strategy. Global and by regional annex</i>		
		c) Distribution of project proposals (both supported and developed by the organization)				Maps at regional level showing classes reflecting number of proposals and ongoing projects (4–5 classes)		
		<i>d) Trends in the number of successfully submitted project proposals and amounts</i>						
IO 17.2, IG 17.2	Reasons for increasing/decreasing trends, by importance	Major reasons behind increasing/decreasing trends	Global, regional/ subregional	United Nations agencies and IGOs,	Show major reasons for increasing trends	Table with reasons for decreasing/increasing trends expressed by the number of organizations by type of reason (4		Combined with IA17.2

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
				GEF		types for decreasing trends; 6 types for increasing trends) importance (2–3 classes: important/very important, not important). Globally and by region/subregion		
						Stacked bar charts showing the reasons for the trends, by importance (using data above)		

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available



Table 17  
**Indicator-based analysis – CONS-O-18**

*CONS-O-18: Amount of financial resources and type of incentives that have enabled access to technology by affected country Parties*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
IA 18.1	Amounts allocated, by type, to facilitate technology transfer (material aid, knowledge aid)	Progress in the allocation of resources to facilitate access to technology, in terms of:	Global, regional/ subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/ RAPs	Show whether target of a steady growth in the financial resources allocated to facilitate access to technology and in the number of economic and policy incentives reported by affected country Parties along the implementation period of The Strategy is being achieved	Table with amounts of resources allocated by type (2 types: material, knowledge), country and year, with flags on whether incentives (policy, financial, fiscal) are in place or measures are planned for the four time periods and whether enough resources have been allocated. With totals (global, by region/subregions), including: amount of resources allocated (total and by type), number of countries with incentives (total and by type), number of countries planning measures, number of countries where enough resources have been allocated/not allocated	Currency exchange rates to be made available	
	Yes/no on whether incentives to facilitate access to technology, have been established and which types (policy, financial, fiscal)	a) Amounts allocated to facilitate technology transfer (for material aid and knowledge aid), by year and where			Show regions where access to technology is likely to have improved due to the allocation of resources and regions where more resources/support are needed	<i>Graphs showing trends in the amount of resources allocated by type, and number of countries with incentives/planning measures. Globally and by region/subregion</i>	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	
	Yes/no on whether enough resources have been allocated by country to	b) Measures put in place at the national level: incentives already in place (policy, financial,				Pie chart of types of incentives, globally and by region/subregion		

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

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
	facilitate access to technology	fiscal) or measures planned and where						
	Yes/no on whether there are plans to have new/more incentives to facilitate technology access, and time frame	<i>c) Trends in the amounts allocated and number of countries already with incentives or planning measures to facilitate technology transfer</i>				Map showing allocations of resources for a specific year (classifying amounts in 4 classes)		
						List of countries where incentives are in place or planned		
						Map showing where incentives are in place or planned		
IA18.2	Yes/no on whether enough resources have been allocated by country to facilitate access to technology	Assessment of the effectiveness of incentives and adequacy of resources allocated (based on yes/no answers) and reasons for that, in terms of:	Global, regional/ subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/ RAPs		Table with country evaluation of major reasons why incentives not effective (4 types of reasons) by importance (3 classes: important, not important, very important) expressed in terms of number of countries. Global and by region/subregion		
	Reasons why incentives are not effective, by importance	a) Number of countries where resources allocated are not adequate  b) Major reasons why incentives have proved not to be effective( 4 types of				Stacked bar graphs with ratings. Global and by region/subregion		

*CONS-O-18: Amount of financial resources and type of incentives that have enabled access to technology by affected country Parties*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
		reasons)						
IA18.3	Reasons for increasing/decreasing trends, by importance	Major reasons behind increasing/decreasing trends	Global, regional/subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs	Show major reasons for increasing trends that could be shared	Table with reasons for decreasing/increasing trends and their relevance expressed by the number of affected country Parties or regions/subregions, by type of reason (5 types for decreasing trends; 4 types for increasing trends). Globally and by region/subregion  Stacked bar charts showing the reasons for the trends seen, by importance (using data above)		

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available

## IV. Analysis of the additional information

8. This section provides information on the analysis conducted on information contained in the additional information sections of templates and reporting guidelines of the reports from affected and developed country Parties, United Nations Organizations, IGOs, the GEF and the GM.

Table 18  
Reporting process-related issues, GEF

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
AA1.1, AD1.1	Yes/no on whether reporting country could count on sufficient financial resources to meet UNCCD reporting obligations	Availability of financial resources for UNCCD reporting, in terms of percentage of countries that could count on sufficient financial resources to meet UNCCD reporting obligations	Global; regional/subregional [1]	Country Parties (affected, developed), SRAPs/RAPs	Show whether countries need additional resources to meet UNCCD reporting obligations.	Table with number and percentage of affected and developed countries that could count/could not count on sufficient financial resources per reporting cycle (globally, by region/subregion, affected/developed)  Pie charts with percentage of affected/developed countries that could count/could not count of sufficient financial resources (global, by region/subregion, affected/developed)  Table with flags on availability of financial resources by country and reporting cycle	Map on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Cross-check with analysis on progress in reporting.  [1] [Only for affected country Parties, regions/subregions]

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
						Map showing countries that could count/not count on sufficient financial resources (only for country Parties; global level)		
AO1.1, AG1.1	Yes/no on whether the organization provided financial support to affected country Parties to meet UNCCD reporting obligations	Financial support to affected country Parties for UNCCD reporting, in terms of number of organizations providing support	Global	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Show whether affected country Parties received financial support to meet UNCCD reporting obligations	Table with a list of organizations that provided support to meet UNCCD reporting obligations		Cross-check with analysis on progress in reporting
AA1.2, AD1.2	Estimated amount invested (national budget) into UNCCD reporting	Amount of financial resources invested in meeting UNCCD reporting obligations in each reporting cycle	Global; regional/subregional	Country Parties (affected, developed), SRAPs/RAPs	Show total financial resources invested in UNCCD reporting-related activities.	Table with amounts invested in UNCCD reporting per country and reporting cycle. With totals (affected/ developed, global and by region/subregion)  Bar chart with amounts invested (by country, affected/developed, global, by region/subregion)  <i>Graphs with trends of financial resources made available for UNCCD reporting activities (global, by region/subregion)</i>	Currency exchange rates to be made available	Cross-check with analysis on progress in reporting

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
AO1.2, AG1.2	Estimated amount invested into UNCCD reporting	Amount of financial resources invested in meeting UNCCD reporting obligations in each reporting cycle	Global	United Nations agencies and IGOs, GEF	Show total financial resources invested in UNCCD reporting-related activities	Table with amounts invested in UNCCD reporting per organization and reporting cycle. With total  Bar chart with amounts invested (by organization and globally)  <i>Graph with trends of financial resources made available for UNCCD reporting activities (global)</i>	Currency exchange rates to be made available	Cross-check with analysis on progress in reporting
AA1.3, AD1.3	Number of people involved in the UNCCD process  Estimated total number of person/days dedicated to the UNCCD reporting progress	Human resources invested in meeting UNCCD reporting obligations at each reporting cycle, in terms of:  a) Number of people involved  b) Number of person/days dedicated	Global; regional/ subregional	Country Parties (affected, developed), SRAPs/ RAPs	Show whether countries need additional resources to meet UNCCD reporting obligations	Table with number of people and person/days dedicated to UNCCD reporting per country and reporting cycle. With totals (affected/ developed, global and by region/subregion)  Bar charts with number of people and person/days invested (by country, affected/developed, global, by region/subregion)  <i>Graphs with trends of human resources made available for UNCCD reporting activities (global, by region/subregion)</i>		Cross-check with analysis on progress in reporting

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
AA1.4, AD1.4	Yes/no on whether reporting country could count on sufficient technical and scientific knowledge to meet UNCCD reporting obligations	Availability of technical/scientific knowledge for UNCCD reporting, in terms of percentage of countries that could count on sufficient knowledge to meet UNCCD reporting obligations	Global; regional/ subregional	Country Parties (affected, developed), SRAPs/RAPs	Show whether countries need knowledge to meet UNCCD reporting obligations	Table with number and percentage of affected and developed countries that could count/could not count on sufficient knowledge per reporting cycle (globally, by region/subregion, affected/developed)  Pie charts with percentage of affected/developed countries that could count/could not count of sufficient knowledge (global, by region/subregion)  Table with flags on availability of technical scientific knowledge by country and reporting cycle.  Map showing countries that could count/not count on sufficient knowledge (only for country Parties; global level)	Map on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Cross-check with analysis on progress in reporting  Could be combined with AA1.1, AD1.1: e.g. map could show countries that could count on sufficient financial resources and/or knowledge (4 classes: both financial resources and knowledge, only financial resources, only knowledge, neither financial resources nor knowledge)

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
AA1.5	Yes/no on whether coordination with relevant agencies was satisfactory	Level of coordination for UNCCD reporting, in terms of percentage of countries where coordination with relevant line ministries was satisfactory	Global; regional/subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/RAPs	Show whether countries need to put more efforts for coordination with relevant agencies and line ministries	Table with number and percentage of affected countries where coordination with relevant line ministries was/was not satisfactory per reporting cycle (globally, by region/subregion)	Maps on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Cross-check with analysis on progress in reporting
	Yes/no on whether coordination at national level with relevant line ministries was satisfactory					Pie charts with percentage of affected countries where coordination with relevant line ministries was/was not satisfactory (global, by region/subregion)		
						Table with flags on coordination with relevant line ministries by country and reporting cycle		
						Map showing countries where coordination with relevant line ministries was/was not satisfactory (only for country Parties; global level)		



<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
AA1.6, AD1.6	Yes/no on whether a participatory or consultative approach was applied to involve all relevant stakeholders in the reporting process	Level of participation and consultation for UNCCD reporting, in terms of:	Global; regional/ subregional [2]	Country Parties (affected, developed), SRAPs/RAPs	Show whether countries need to make more efforts to increase participation and involve stakeholders in the reporting process	Table with number and percentage of affected/developed countries where a participatory or consultative approach was/was not applied, and where a validation meeting was/was not held per reporting cycle (globally, by region/subregion, affected/developed)	Map on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Cross-check with analysis on progress in reporting.  [2] [Only for affected country Parties, regions/subregions]
	Yes/no on whether a validation meeting was held as a tool to integrate stakeholders in the reporting process	a) Percentage of countries where a participatory or consultative approach was applied				Pie charts with percentage of affected/developed countries where a participatory or consultative approach was/was not applied, and where a validation meeting was/was not held (global, by region/subregion, affected/developed)		
		b) Percentage of countries where a validation meeting was held				Table with flags showing whether: a participatory or consultative approach was/was not applied, and where a validation meeting was/was not held by country and reporting cycle		
						Map showing countries where a participatory or consultative approach was/was not applied, and where a validation meeting was/was not held (only for country Parties; global level)		

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
AA1.7	Yes/no on whether country actively contributed to the subregional and regional reporting processes	Contribution to the subregional/regional reporting processes in terms of percentage of countries that actively participated in reporting processes	Global; regional/ subregional	Affected country Parties	Show extent of participation in subregional/ regional reporting processes	Table with number and percentage of affected countries that participated/not participated actively in the subregional and regional reporting processes (by region/subregion)  Pie charts with percentage of affected countries that participated/did not participate actively in the subregional and regional reporting processes (by region/subregion)  Table with flags showing whether country participated in the subregional and regional reporting processes, by country and reporting cycle		Cross-check with analysis on progress in reporting
AA1.8, AD1.8	If reporting on line yes/no on whether reporting country received sufficient PRAIS training  Number of countries reporting online (data source:	Exploitation of the PRAIS portal in terms of percentage of countries reporting online that could count on sufficient training	Global; regional/ subregional [3]	Country Parties (affected, developed) reporting on line, SRAPs/ RAPs reporting on line	Show whether countries need more assistance to meet use the PRAIS portal	Table with number and percentage of affected and developed countries that received/did not receive sufficient assistance or did not report online per reporting cycle (globally, by region/subregion, affected/developed)  Pie charts with percentage of affected/developed countries that received/did not receive sufficient assistance (global, by region/subregion,	Map on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Cross-check with analysis on progress in reporting. [3] [Only for affected country Parties, regions/subregions]  Combine with AA1.9 AD1.9

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
	PR1.2, counts of countries reporting through the PRAIS portal)					affected/developed)		
						Table with flags on availability of assistance and whether reporting/not reporting online by country and reporting cycle		
						Map showing countries that reported/did not report online and received/did not received sufficient assistance: 3 classes (not reporting online, reporting on line and receiving sufficient assistance, reporting on line and not receiving sufficient assistance) (only for country Parties; global level)		
AA1.9	If not reporting online, importance of reasons why the PRAIS system was not used	Identification of major difficulties in using the PRAIS system and their relevance	Global, regional/ subregional	Affected country Parties not reporting online, SRAPs/ RAPs not reporting online	Where there is a need to provide assistance to overcome the most important difficulties	Table and bar chart of number of countries that experienced difficulties, categorized by type of problem (5 classes: lack of Internet access, slow Internet access, complexity of the system, difficulties in getting access credentials, other) and its importance (3 classes: not important, important, very important). Globally and by region/subregion	Reports compiling descriptive text should be generated	Complements AD9.1
	If specific reasons ("Other" checked)					Report/table listing specific problems in reporting online by country [low priority]		Combine with AA1.8, AD1.8

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
	short explanatory text							
AD1.9	If not reporting online, importance of reasons why the PRAIS system was not used	Identification of major difficulties in using the PRAIS system and their relevance	Global	Developed country Parties not reporting online, SRAPs/RAPs not reporting online	Where there is a need to provide assistance to overcome the most important difficulties	Table and bar chart of number of countries that experienced difficulties categorized by type of problem (5 classes: lack of Internet access, slow Internet access, complexity of the system, difficulties in getting access credentials, other) and its importance (3 classes: not important, important, very important). Global	Reports compiling descriptive text should be generated	Complements AD9.1
	If specific reasons ("Other" checked) short explanatory text					Report/table listing specific problems in reporting online by country [low priority]		Combine with AA1.8, AD1.8

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available

Table 19  
Accommodation of specific requests within COP decisions

Section 2 of template and reporting guidelines for affected country Parties, developed country Parties, United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations, GEF

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
AA2.1	If difficulties in reporting on indicators, specification of needs for improvement with respect to e-SMART criteria	Need for improvement in reporting on indicators in terms of percentage of countries indicating need for improvement on specific e-SMART criteria (6 criteria) and indicators (13 indicators, 14 indicators from 2012 onwards)	Global; Regional/ Subregional	Affected country Parties experiencing difficulties in reporting on one or more indicator(s), SRAPs/RAPs experiencing difficulties in reporting on one or more indicator(s)	Contribution to iterative process on indicators	Table with number and percentage of affected countries indicating need/no need for improvement for the e-SMART criteria (6 criteria) and the 13 indicators (14 from 2012 onwards). Total, by region/subregion		Cross-check with analysis on progress in reporting
					Show where indicators need to be improved	Pie charts with percentage of affected/developed countries that indicated need/no need for improvement for the e-SMART criteria (6 criteria) and the 13 indicators (14 from 2012 onwards). Total, by region/subregion		Combined with AD2.1 to show difficulties at country Party level in reporting on specific indicators
								AA2.1, AD2.1, AO2.1, AG2.1 could be combined to show general difficulties in reporting on specific indicators

Section 2 of template and reporting guidelines for affected country Parties, developed country Parties, United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations, GEF

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
AD2.1	If difficulties in reporting on indicators, specification of needs for improvement with respect to e-SMART criteria	Need for improvement in reporting on indicators, in terms of percentage of countries indicating need for improvement on specific e-SMART criteria (6 criteria) and indicators (10 indicators)	Global	Developed country Parties experiencing difficulties in reporting on one or more indicator(s)	Contribution to iterative process on indicators	Table with number and percentage of developed countries indicating need/no need for improvement for the e-SMART criteria (6 criteria) and the 10 indicators. Total		Cross-check with analysis on progress in reporting
					Show where indicators need to be improved.	Pie charts with percentage of developed countries indicating need/no need for improvement for the e-SMART criteria (6 criteria) and the 10 indicators. Total.		Combined with AA2.1 to show difficulties at country Party level in reporting on specific indicators  AA2.1, AD2.1, AO2.1, AG2.1 could be combined to show general difficulties in reporting on specific indicators
AO2.1, AG2.1	If difficulties in reporting on indicators, specification of needs for improvement with respect to e-SMART criteria	Need for improvement in reporting on indicators in terms of percentage of countries indicating need for improvement on specific e-SMART criteria (6 criteria) and indicators (10 indicators)	Global	United Nations agencies and IGOs experiencing difficulties in reporting on one or more indicator(s), GEF	Contribution to iterative process on indicators	Table with number and percentage of organizations indicating need/no need for improvement for the e-SMART criteria (6 criteria) and the 10 indicators. Total		Cross-check with analysis on progress in reporting
					Show where indicators need	Pie charts with percentage of organizations		AA2.1, AD2.1, AO2.1, AG2.1 could

*Section 2 of template and reporting guidelines for affected country Parties, developed country Parties, United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations, GEF*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
					to be improved	indicating need/no need for improvement for the e-SMART criteria (6 criteria) and the 10 indicators. Total.		be combined to show general difficulties in reporting on specific indicators

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available

Table 20  
**Reporting on the implementation of the national action programme**

*Section 3 of template and reporting guidelines for affected country Parties*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
AA3.1	Implementation stage identified by percentage of activities included in the NAP currently implemented (5 stages)	Progress in the implementation of the NAP in terms of number of countries in each implementation stage (5 stages identified by percentage of activities included in NAP currently implemented: no activity implemented, 1–30%, 31–60%, 61–90%, 91–100%)	Global; regional/ subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/ RAPs	Show progress in the implementation of the NAP and whether more efforts should be made to implement the NAP	Table with number of affected countries in each NAP implementation stage (5 stages). Total, by region/subregion  Pie charts with distribution of countries in the 5 NAP implementation stages. Global, by region/subregion  Table with classification of countries with respect to the percentage of NAP activities currently implemented (5 classes: no activity implemented, 1-30%, 31-60%, 61-90%, 91-100%). (Only for country Parties; global  Map showing distribution of countries in the 5 NAP implementation stages.	Map on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	
AA3.2	Description of the two most important lessons learned and problems faced in relation to human	Lessons learned in relation to implementation of NAP	Global; regional/ subregional	Affected country Parties, SRAPs/		Report/table listing the two most important lessons learned and problem faced with respect to human resources by country.	Reports compiling descriptive text should be	



*Section 3 of template and reporting guidelines for affected country Parties*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
	resources			RAPs		Countries grouped by region/subregion	generated	
	Description of the two most important lessons learned and problems faces in relation to financial resources					Report/table listing the two most important lessons learned and problem faced with respect to financial resources by country. Countries grouped by region/subregion		

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available

**Table 21**  
**Any other country-specific issues**

*Section 4 of template and reporting guidelines for affected country Parties and sSection 3 of template and reporting guidelines for developed country Parties*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
AA4.1	Yes/no on whether reporting country has specific issues to bring to the attention of the COP	Specific issues not covered in the reporting guidelines, in terms of:	Global; regional/ subregional	Affected country Parties that have specific issues for the COP, SRAPs/RAPs	Provide information on specific issues not covered in the guidelines	Table with number of countries reporting issues by category (6 categories). With totals: global and by region/subregion	Reports compiling descriptive text should be generated	Complements AD4.1
	Category(s) of issues (7 categories)	a) Number of countries reporting specific issues by category (7 categories)				Bar charts showing number of countries reporting issues by category (6 category). With totals: global and by region/subregion [consider whether another type of diagramme more effective		

*Section 4 of template and reporting guidelines for affected country Parties and sSection 3 of template and reporting guidelines for developed country Parties*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
						eg. radar]		
	If category “Other” checked short explanatory text	b) Description of issues				Report/table listing category of issues described as “Other” by country		
	Narrative description of issues					Report/table listing the issues reported by country. Countries grouped by region/subregion		
AD4.1	Yes/no on whether reporting country has specific issues to bring to the attention of the COP	Specific issues not covered in the reporting guidelines, in terms of:	Global	Developed country Parties which have specific issues for the COP, SRAPs/RAPs	Provide information on specific issues not covered in the guidelines	Table with number of countries reporting issues by category (6 categories). With totals: global	Reports compiling descriptive text should be generated	Complements AA4.1
	Category(s) of issues (7 categories)	a) Number of countries reporting specific issues by category (7 categories)				Bar charts showing number of countries reporting issues by category (6 categories). With totals: global [consider whether another type of diagram more effective eg. radar]		
	If category “Other” checked, short explanatory text	b) Description of issues				Report/table listing category of issues described as “Other” by country		
	Narrative description of issues					Report/table listing the issues reported by country		

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available

Table 22  
**Support to NAP/SRAP/RAP implementation and/or review**

*Section 3 of template and reporting guidelines for United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
AO5.1	Yes/no on whether reporting organization is supporting the implementation of one or more NAP(s)/SRAP(s)/RAP(s)  List of affected countries, UNCCD regions and/or subregions supported by the organization	Contribution of United Nations agencies and IGOs to the implementation of NAPs/SRAPs and RAPs, in terms of:  a) Number of NAPs/SRAPs and RAPs supported by type (3 types)  b) Coverage of support (countries/regions/sub regions supported)	Global	United Nations agencies and IGOs	Show whether more support is needed for the implementation of NAPs, SRAPs and RAPs and where (which countries and/or regions/subregions are supported most)	Table with the number of programmes supported per reporting cycle by type (3 types) and supporting organization. With totals: global  <i>Graphs showing global trends in the number of programmes supported by type</i>  Table with distribution of support provided in terms of the number of times a specific affected country Party was reported to receive support  Map with distribution of support (only for country Parties) showing supported countries (classification based on number of organizations supporting a specific country, 3 classes)	Map on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Combine with AO5.2, to get a more complete view of support provided by UN agencies and IGOs

## Section 3 of template and reporting guidelines for United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
AO5.2	Yes/no on whether reporting organization is supporting the development or the alignment to The Strategy of NAP(s)/SRAP(s)/RAP(s)	Contribution of United Nations agencies and IGOs to the review of NAPs/SRAPs and RAPs, in terms of:	Global	United Nations agencies and IGOs	Show whether more support is needed for the development/alignment of NAPs, SRAPs and RAPs and where (which countries and/or regions/subregions are supported most)	Table with the number of programmes supported per reporting cycle by type (3 types) and supporting organization. With totals: global	Map on administrative limits (country level) to be made available	Combine with AO5.1, to get a more complete view of support provided by United Nations agencies and IGOs.
	List of affected countries, UNCCD regions and/or subregions supported by the organization	a) Number of NAPs/SRAPs and RAPs supported by type (3 types)				<i>Graphs showing global trends in the number of programmes supported by type</i>		Cross-check with IA5.1, IA52 to show which countries having no NAP or with NAP not aligned receive/do not receive support
		b) Coverage of support (countries/regions/sub regions supported)				Table with distribution of support provided in terms of the number of times a specific affected country Party was reported to receive support		
						Map with distribution of support (only for country Parties) showing supported countries (classification based on number of organizations supporting a specific country, 3 classes)		

Section 3 of template and reporting guidelines for United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
AO5.3	Rating of reporting organization's contribution to the implementation of the Convention, and the tackling of The Strategy's strategic and operational objectives (increasing rate from 1 to 3)	Contribution of United Nations agencies and IGOs to UNCCD scope, strategies and objectives, in terms of number of organizations contributing to implementation and objectives in each rating class (3 classes)	Global	United Nations agencies and IGOs	Show extent to which the UNCCD is included in agendas of United Nations agencies and IGOs and whether there is a need for more efforts in this area	Table with ratings for each aspect (implementation, strategic objectives, operational objectives), by supporting organization		
								Table with the total number of organizations that rated their contribution in each rating class (3 classes) and for each aspect (3 aspects). Global
								Bar charts/pie charts showing number/or percentage of organizations in each rating class (3 classes) and for each aspect (3 aspects) using data from table above. Global

Note: italics indicates analyses to be implemented when time series are available

Table 23  
**Support to capacity-building initiatives in eligible affected country Parties**

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
AG6.1	UNCCD-tailored reporting of progress achieved by the NCSA in the reporting period	Progress achieved by the NCSA	Global	GEF		Report	Reports compiling descriptive text should be generated	

Table 24  
**Mandate-specific reporting**

*Section 4 of template and reporting guidelines for GEF*

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
AG7.1	Information on discussions within the GEF Council on GEF strategies, programmes and projects for financing the agreed incremental costs of activities concerning desertification	GEF reporting	Global	GEF		Report	Reports compiling descriptive text should be generated	
AG7.2	Information on GEF replenishment agreements and the funding programmed for land degradation	GEF reporting	Global	GEF		Report	Reports compiling descriptive text should be generated	
AG7.3	Information on GEF monitoring and evaluation activities relating to projects concerning desertification	GEF reporting	Global	GEF		Report	Reports compiling descriptive text should be generated	

Section 4 of template and reporting guidelines for GEF

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Data reported</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Type of analysis</i>	<i>Reporting entities</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Additional requirements</i>	<i>Cross-cutting analysis / notes</i>
AG7.4	A synthesis of projects approved by the GEF Council during the reporting period concerning desertification with an indication of GEF and other resources allocated to such projects	GEF reporting	Global	GEF		Report	Reports compiling descriptive text should be generated	[If PPSs not submitted as part of UNCCD reporting]
AG7.5	A listing of projects approved by the GEF Council concerning desertification, with an indication of the cumulative financial resources allocated by the GEF to such projects	GEF reporting	Global	GEF		Report	Reports compiling descriptive text should be generated	[If PPSs not submitted as part of UNCCD reporting]

## V. Classification of best practices on sustainable land management technologies, including adaptation

9. This section provides information on the classification of best practices on sustainable land management technologies, including adaptation, contained in the reports from affected and developed country Parties, United Nations Organizations, IGOs, the GEF, the GM and accredited civil society organizations, as applicable.

Table 25

### Classification of best practices on sustainable land management technologies, including adaptation

<i>Contribution to strategic objectives</i>	<i>Synergistic impact on the objectives of other conventions*</i>	<i>Thematic areas*</i>	<i>Links with the other themes of best practices*</i>
To improve the living conditions of affected populations	Impact on biodiversity conservation	Cropland management and agriculture	Capacity-building and awareness-raising
		Rangeland management	
		Woodland management	DLDD and SLM monitoring and assessment/research
		Unproductive land restoration	Knowledge management and decision support
		Human settlements	
		Others	

<i>Contribution to strategic objectives</i>	<i>Synergistic impact on the objectives of other conventions*</i>	<i>Thematic areas*</i>	<i>Links with the other themes of best practices*</i>
	Impact on climate change mitigation		The policy, legislative and institutional framework
			Funding and resource mobilization
			Participation, collaboration and networking
	Impact on climate change adaptation		
To improve the conditions of affected ecosystems	Impact on biodiversity conservation		
	Impact on climate change mitigation		
	Impact on climate change adaptation		
To generate global benefits through UNCCD implementation			

\* Repetitive text in the boxes has been omitted for the sake of brevity.