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General information section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE REPORTING ENTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and surname of the person submitting the report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation and contact details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subregional Action Programmes

Introduction
What action programmes need to be reported on

1. Affected country Parties of the region, in accordance with articles 11 and 12 of the Convention, may prepare and implement regional and/or subregional and/or joint action programmes in order to harmonize, complement and increase the efficiency of national programmes.

2. Decision 3/COP.10 decided that the subregional and regional institutions listed in the annex to that decision shall act as reporting entities with regard to the preparation and submission of reports on the implementation of the subregional and regional action programmes referred to in decision 8/COP.8.¹ In this context, and apart from reporting on subregional action programmes, subregional reporting entities may also report on the implementation of agreed joint action programmes (JAPs) that are implemented in more than one country within a given subregion.

3. For example, the transboundary action programme in Hispaniola includes only two countries of the Caribbean subregion², therefore this joint action programme would be reported by the subregional reporting entity for the Caribbean.

4. Within the templates, shaded areas contain information that subregional reporting entities are not requested to provide but are kept in the template for the sake of information; white areas are for reporting purposes and need to be filled in by subregional reporting entities with relevant data.

¹ On “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”.
² Dominican Republic and Haiti

General questions

Has your subregion prepared a Subregional Action Programme (SRAP) aimed at implementing the Convention at subregional level?
Yes

If yes, what is the name of the SRAP?
Draft Sub-Regional Action Programme to Combat Land Degradation in the Caribbean

Please provide the date of its adoption:
02/09/2011

Are you aware of any joint action programme (JAP) implemented at the subregional level?
Yes

If yes, list the joint action programmes at the subregional level, the countries where these joint action programmes are implemented, and the date of their adoption.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAP</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>List of countries involved</th>
<th>Date of adoption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAP1</td>
<td>Caribbean Biological Corridor</td>
<td>Haiti, Cuba and Dominican Republic with Jamaica and Ruperto Rico as observers.</td>
<td>07/08/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact indicators

Strategic Objective 4

Indicator SO-4-3

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

Impact indicator SO-4-3 for expected impact 4.1 Increased financial, technical and technological resources are made available to affected developing country Parties, and where appropriate Central and Eastern European countries, to implement the Convention

Percentage change in the domestic financial commitment to the implementation of the Convention

Understanding of the indicator
The indicator provides an indication of the trend in the supply of public finance for DLDD-related investments and other Convention-related activities to affected developing country Parties in the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs.

Data needed
- DLDD-related programmes and projects aiming at implementation of The Strategy in the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs (co-)financed through domestic public budgets
- Contribution by domestic public sources to investments and other initiatives in the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs to advance SLM
- Convention-related financial commitments in the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs to affected developing country Parties

Data sources (indicative only)
- PRAIS (financial annexes)
- CRIC performance reviews of OO5 and analyses of financial flows
- Relevant subregional-level studies to inform the IFS process (to be used when data is not available in the PRAIS system, and/or for cross referencing and validity checks)
- Inventories of SLM funding opportunities and/or investments in the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs
- Relevant databases and publications of authoritative entities (to be used when data is not available in the PRAIS system, and/or for cross referencing and validity checks)

Check the glossary for Integrated financing strategy; integrated investment framework, ‘JAPs’

Nominal amount (USD) of financial commitments for Convention-related objectives made from domestic public budgets, private contributions, and/or subregional/regional/international funds for the implementation of The Strategy

¹ In the context of the subregional action programme (SRAP).
² In the context of joint action programmes (JAPs), i.e. activities or initiatives implemented by two or more countries within the subregion but that do not encompass the entire subregion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>In the context of the SRAP¹</th>
<th>In the context of JAPs²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>60000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- Budget documents from the CNIRD/PISLM Support Office

Attachments:
None.
**Indicator SO-4-6**  
Strategic Objective 4  
To mobilize resources to support implementation of the Convention through building effective partnerships between national and international actors  

**Impact indicator SO-4-6 for expected impact 4.2**  
Enabling policy environments are improved for UNCCD implementation at all levels  
Number and type of legal and regulatory frameworks, economic incentives or other mechanisms securing or facilitating the transfer of funds for the implementation of the Convention at all levels.  

Understanding of the indicator  
The indicator provides a measure of the efforts made by Convention stakeholders to facilitate the implementation of the Convention at the subregional level.  

Data needed  
- Laws and regulations at the subregional level  
- Subregional economic and financial measures (e.g. fiscal rules, tax benefits, credit lines and borrowing rules, etc.)  
- Subregional cooperation frameworks (e.g. agreements, memoranda of understanding, contracts, etc.)  
- Subregional sectoral policies (e.g. trade, marketing, property rights, business development, etc.)  
- Subregional convention-specific mechanisms  

Data sources (indicative only)  
- Public records of Convention stakeholders  
- Relevant databases and publications and other authoritative entities (to be used when data is not available in the PRAIS system, and/or for cross referencing and validity checks)  
- PRAIS (CONS-O-6, CONS-O-14, CONS-O-18)  

Check the glossary for Incentive, ‘JAPs’

**Number of mechanisms in place in the subregion to facilitate the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Convention in the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs, by type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Laws and regulations</th>
<th>Economic and financial incentives</th>
<th>Cooperation frameworks</th>
<th>Sectoral policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the SRAP context</td>
<td>In the context of JAPs</td>
<td>In the SRAP context</td>
<td>In the context of JAPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative assessment**

**Description of mechanisms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>In the SRAP context</th>
<th>In the context of JAPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laws and regulations</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and financial incentives</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mechanism In the SRAP context In the context of JAPs

Cooperation frameworks
1. Partnership Initiative on sustainable Land Management is a functional cooperation mechanism established in the Caribbean to coordinate land management issues in Caribbean SIDS.
2. Oversight of PISLM is provided for by CARICOM through the Council of Ministers of COTED.

Sectoral policies --- ---

Sources of information
Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- PISLM internal documents, website: www.cnirdregional.org and PISLM information booklets

Attachments:
None.

Indicator SO-4-7
Strategic Objective 4
To mobilize resources to support implementation of the Convention through building effective partnerships between national and international actors

Impact indicator SO-4-7 for expected impact 4.2 Enabling policy environments are improved for UNCCD implementation at all levels
Clear entrusting of institutional responsibilities for UNCCD implementation, at all levels

Understanding of the indicator
The indicator provides an indication of the effectiveness of institutional arrangements for the implementation of the Convention with regard to the resource mobilization process in the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs.

Data needed
- Evidence of institutional arrangements, instruments and mechanisms that facilitate resource mobilization, or the lack thereof, in the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs
- Best practices in resource mobilization in the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs

Data sources (indicative only)
- Public records of Convention stakeholders
- Relevant databases and publications of authoritative entities
- PRAIS (Best Practices on finance and resource mobilization)

Check the glossary for ‘JAPs’

Institutional set up, responsibilities, and arrangements to facilitate the implementation of the Convention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>In the SRAP context</th>
<th>In the context of JAPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>very good</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative assessment

**Description of institutional arrangements at the subregional level**

1. CARICOM Council of Ministers on Trade and the Environment (COTED) provides sub-regional oversight
2. Sub-regional network of UNCCD Focal Points which provides general policy guidance
3. Sub-regional network of NGOs which provide civil society input
4. Sub-regional Task Force which provides policy guidance on the work of the Initiative as well as identify opportunities for synergies
5. A Support Office provided for by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago through the Caribbean Network for Integrated Rural Development
6. A PISLM Expert Group

**Sources of information**

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- PISLM documentation

**Attachments:**

- [Institutional Modalities of PISLM.pdf](http://www.unccd-prais.com/Uploads/GetFile/34e4f241-b726-42d0-891c-a0e600b19bf5), 2.23 MB
Performance Indicators

Operational Objective 1: Advocacy, awareness raising and education

Performance indicator CONS-O-1 for Outcome 1.1
Number and size of information events organized on the subject of DLDD and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity, and audience reached by media addressing DLDD and DLDD synergies.

Understanding of the indicator
In the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs, the indicator measures the performance of Convention-related communication strategies, in particular whether DLDD issues and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity are being communicated and if so, whether the communication is considered to be effective. Effectiveness is assessed through the appraisal of the media campaigns carried out; the assumption is that the stronger the media campaigns on DLDD issues and synergies, the higher the probability of passing the messages on to the target audiences. The focus of the indicator is on information activities specifically dedicated to DLDD issues and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity. Other reporting entities will complement the information provided by subregional reporting entities by reporting on Convention-related communication strategies at the national, regional and global levels.

Data needed
- Information on events/media specifically addressing DLDD and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity.
- Only events organized by major subregional DLDD stakeholders about which subregional reporting entities have been informed should be considered.
- Only the media products from the five most important TV/radio channels and the five most relevant newspapers with subregional coverage should be considered.

Data sources (indicative only)
Attendance list of events (meetings, workshops, seminars), programme/project documents, major media (TV/radio channels, newspapers) with subregional coverage, the Internet, organizers of events.

Check the glossary for

Check the reporting manual for
‘How can the number of information events and estimated number of participants in information events be determined?’, ‘How can the number of media products be determined?’, ‘How can the proportion of the population which is informed about DLDD and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity be estimated?’

Overall target
By 2018, 30 per cent of the global population is informed about DLDD and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity.

Number of information events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of information events</th>
<th>Estimated number of participants in the information events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the SRAP context¹</td>
<td>In the context of JAPs²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Information events implemented in the context of the subregional action programme (SRAP).
² Information events implemented in the context of joint action programmes (JAPs), i.e. activities implemented by two or more countries within the subregion that do not encompass the entire subregion.
Number of media products made public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Newspapers</th>
<th>Radio and TV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the SRAP context</td>
<td>In the context of JAPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- PISLM data

Attachments:

None.

Qualitative assessment

Is there a subregional communication strategy addressing DLDD and/or DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity?

No

If yes, does the implementation of the subregional communication strategy complement the implementation of the UNCCD Comprehensive Communication Strategy?

No answer required.

If no, is the UNCCD Comprehensive Communication Strategy being implemented instead in your subregion?

No

Are activities relating to the United Nations Decade for Deserts and the Fight Against Desertification (UNDDD) being implemented in your subregion?

Yes

List the activities implemented in your subregion which are related to the UNDDD

- 1. A Agro-Forestry Tourism Initiative in Belize
- 2. A Women in SLM and Agriculture project in St. Vincent

Performance indicator CONS-O-3 for Outcome 1.3

Number of civil society organizations (CSOs) and science and technology institutions (STIs) participating in the Convention processes.

Understanding of the indicator

In the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs, the indicator measures the level of participation of CSOs and STIs in DLDD-related programmes and projects. The indicator will outline whether the active involvement of these stakeholders in initiatives implemented in the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs increases over time and whether programmes/projects are valid tools for the engagement of, and receiving contributions from, CSOs and STIs at the field level. Other reporting entities will complement the information provided by subregional reporting entities by reporting on the involvement of CSOs and STIs at the national, regional and global levels; additionally, the secretariat and the GM will report on the involvement of CSOs and STIs at the institutional level.

Data needed

A list of the organizations involved in the subregional programmes/projects as reported in the PPSs.
Data sources (indicative only)
PPSs submitted to the UNCCD as part of the reporting exercise.

Check the glossary for
‘STIs’, ‘CSOs’, ‘PPS’, ‘Convention processes’, ‘JAPs’

Check the reporting manual for
‘Which CSOs involved in DLDD-related programmes/projects should be counted?’

Overall target
A steady growth in the participation of CSOs and STIs in the Convention processes is recorded along the implementation period of The Strategy.

Number of CSOs/STIs involved in DLDD-related programmes/projects
In the PPSs you have specified the number of CSOs and the number of STIs involved in each programme/project in your subregion. Add these numbers and give the totals by year in the table below.

¹ CSOs involvement measured in the context of the subregional action programme (SRAP).
² CSOs involvement measured in the context of joint action programmes (JAPs), i.e. activities implemented by two or more countries within the subregion but that do not encompass the entire subregion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of CSOs involved in DLDD-related programmes/projects</th>
<th>Number of STIs involved in DLDD-related programmes/projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the SRAP context¹</td>
<td>In the context of JAPs²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide the names of these organizations.
- Caribbean Youth Environment Network (CYEN)
- Ya axche (Belize)
- Women in Agriculture Network (St. Vincent)
- Morvant/Laventille Youth Agriculture Network (Trinidad)
- CNIRD
- UWI
- IICA

Performance indicator CONS-O-4 for Outcome 1.3
Number and type of DLDD-related initiatives of civil society organizations (CSOs) and science and technology institutions (STIs) in the field of education.

Understanding of the indicator
In the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs, the indicator measures the number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by CSOs and STIs in the education sector. The assumption is that the higher the number of DLDD-related education initiatives undertaken by these stakeholders, the stronger their interest in addressing DLDD problems. This indicator focuses on “education” because “awareness” and “advocacy” are already measured through indicators CONS-O-1 and CONS-O-2, respectively. Other reporting entities will complement the information provided by subregional reporting entities by reporting on the involvement of CSOs and STIs at the national, regional and global levels.

Data needed
- Information on initiatives undertaken in the field of education that may be found in: information on CSOs and STIs DLDD-related education initiatives obtained by the subregional reporting entity by liaising with the institutions or focal points that implemented the SRAP or joint action programmes; contractual and/or programme/project-related documents; records of academic bodies and their curricula; and Internet resources made available by CSOs and STIs.
Only initiatives in the field of education taken in the subregion and directly relating to DLDD issues are to be considered.

Data sources (indicative only)
CSOs and STIs operating in the subregion.

Check the glossary for
‘CSOs’, ‘STIs’, ‘NFP’, Education initiatives’, ‘JAPs’

Check the reporting manual for
‘Which CSOs involved in DLDD-related education initiatives should be counted?’

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

### Number of DLDD-related initiatives undertaken by CSOs/STIs

1 Education initiatives implemented in the context of the subregional action programme (SRAP).

2 Education initiatives implemented in the context of joint action programmes (JAPs), i.e. activities implemented by two or more countries within the subregion but that do not encompass the entire subregion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of DLDD-related education initiatives undertaken by CSOs</th>
<th>Number of DLDD-related education initiatives undertaken by STIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the SRAP context¹</td>
<td>In the context of JAPs²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- PISLM Support Office data

**Attachments:**

*None.*

### Operational Objective 2: Policy framework

**Performance indicator CONS-O-5 for Outcomes 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3**

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

**Understanding of the indicator**

The indicator measures the performance of the subregions of the UNCCD Regional Implementation Annexes (RIAs) in formulating or revising their SRAPs in alignment with The Strategy. While providing information on this process, the indicator also outlines whether: (a) the analysis of DLDD drivers, barriers to possible solutions, and measures that may eventually overcome these barriers has been carried out; (b) the alignment process has been supported by biophysical and socio-economic baseline information; (c) the action programmes have been included in integrated investment frameworks; and (d) the action programmes have been integrated with other existing subregional plans and policies. The indicator will inform on the extent to which Parties have responded to decision 3/COP.8, paragraph 45, and on the feasibility of assessing the progress of The Strategy over its implementation period (2008–2018). Affected country Parties and regional reporting entities will complement the information provided by subregional reporting entities by reporting on formulation or revision of NAPs RAPs in alignment with The Strategy.
Data needed
- UNCCD SRAP. Only a SRAP formally adopted by the subregion is to be considered as ‘finalized’
- Other relevant planning documents

Data sources (indicative only)
UNCCD Regional coordination mechanism (RCM).


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

SRAP Adoption and Revision

_Had your subregion already adopted a SRAP prior to The Strategy, i.e. before 31.12.2007?_  
No

_If yes, specify the date of its approval._  
No answer required.

_Had your subregion already adopted a SRAP prior to The Strategy, has it revised the SRAP in alignment with The Strategy by the end of the reporting period?_  
No answer required.

_If yes, specify the date of its approval._  
No answer required.

_Had your subregion not revised the SRAP in alignment with The Strategy, specify why the process was not initiated._  
Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.  
No answer required.

_Other (specify)_  
No answer required.

_Had your subregion not had a SRAP prior to The Strategy, has it formulated an aligned SRAP after The Strategy’s adoption, i.e. after 1.1 2008?_  
No

_If yes, specify the date of its approval._  
No answer required.

_Had your subregion not had a SRAP prior to The Strategy, specify why the process was not initiated._  
Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Level of importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A Draft SRAP has been prepared and adopted by all Country Parties and CARICOM. The PISLM Task Force is in the process of working with Country Parties to align SRAP to Strategy and, this should by completed by the first quarter of 2013.|
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Level of importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not a priority for the subregion</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity constraints at subregional level (countries)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity constraints at subregional level (institutions)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial resources at subregional, bilateral and multilateral level</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of accountability in the institutional framework</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support, participation and coordination on the part of the affected country Parties of the subregion</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of coordination with relevant subregional organizations and existing subregional programmes</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of institutional clarity of how the alignment process at subregional level should be undertaken</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other (specify)**

*No answer provided.*

---

**For subregions having a SRAP aligned to The Strategy**

*Is your aligned SRAP supported by biophysical and socio-economic baseline information?*

Yes

*Does your aligned SRAP assess DLDD drivers?*

Yes

*Does your aligned SRAP assess the barriers to sustainable land management?*

Yes

*If yes, does the aligned SRAP include recommendations to remove these barriers?*

Yes

*Has your aligned SRAP been included in an integrated investment framework?*

No

*Has your aligned SRAP been integrated into subregional sustainable development strategies or programmes and relevant sectoral and investment plans and policies?*

Yes

*Did your subregion refer to the guidelines on the alignment of action programmes with The Strategy as proposed in ICCD/COP(9)/2/Add.1 while revising the SRAP to be in alignment with The Strategy or while formulating an aligned SRAP?*

Yes

---

**Sources of information**

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- PISLM support Office
Subregional contribution to the target

If your subregion did not have a SRAP aligned to The Strategy by the end of the reporting period, when do you plan to have it completed?

2012–2013

Qualitative assessment

Has the revision of the SRAP to be in alignment with The Strategy or the formulation of an aligned SRAP been supported by external assistance?

Yes

If yes, did you receive assistance from one or more of the following institutions?

- Secretariat
- GM

If yes, which type of assistance did you receive?

- Technical Support

Identify the major difficulties experienced in the process of revising the SRAP to be in alignment with The Strategy or in formulating an aligned SRAP.

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Level of importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor availability of biophysical and socio-economic baseline information at subregional level</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing investment frameworks are not fully compatible with the SRAP</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamlining the SRAP into existing plans and policies is too time-consuming</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

Performance indicator CONS-O-7 for Outcome 2.5

Number of initiatives for synergistic planning/programming of the three Rio Conventions or mechanisms for joint implementation, at all levels.

Understanding of the indicator

The indicator measures the existence of synergistic processes through the number of instruments (i.e. joint planning/programming and/or operational mechanisms) in place which foster the introduction of, or strengthen the mutually reinforcing measures among, the three Rio Conventions in the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs. The assumption is that the higher the number of enabling instruments in place, the higher the possibility of achieving synergies in implementation. This information will be complemented by the reporting of other reporting entities on synergistic processes at the national, regional and global levels.

Data needed

- Planning/programming documents and legislative/regulatory documents.
- Information on operational mechanisms explicitly aimed at achieving joint implementation, synergies and convergence, as well as at introducing or strengthening reinforcing measures among the Rio Conventions.

Data sources (indicative only)
UNCCD Regional coordination mechanism (RCM)

Check the glossary for
‘Joint planning/programming initiatives’, ‘Operational mechanisms for joint implementation or mutual reinforcement’, ‘JAPs’

Check the reporting manual for
‘Which synergistic instruments should be included?’, ‘Indicative list of activities by Parties to promote synergies among the Rio Conventions’

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

SRAP

Were joint planning/programming initiatives for the three Rio Conventions implemented in the context of the SRAP in the reporting period?  
No

If yes, specify the type of joint initiative(s)
No answer required.

Other (specify)
No answer required.

Did operational mechanisms for joint implementation or mutual reinforcement exist in your subregion during the reporting period?  
No

If yes, specify the type of subregional mechanism(s)
No answer required.

Other (specify)
No answer required.

JAP1

Were joint planning/programming initiatives for the three Rio Conventions implemented in the context of the JAP in the reporting period?  
No answer provided.

If yes, specify the type of joint initiative(s)
No answer required.

Other (specify)
No answer required.

Did operational mechanisms for joint implementation or mutual reinforcement exist in your subregion during the reporting period?  
No answer provided.

If yes, specify the type of subregional mechanism(s)
No answer required.

Other (specify)
No answer required.

JAP2

Print — Caribbean Network for Integrated Rural Development
Were joint planning/programming initiatives for the three Rio Conventions implemented in the context of the JAP in the reporting period?

No answer provided.

If yes, specify the type of joint initiative(s)

No answer required.

Other (specify)

No answer required.

Did operational mechanisms for joint implementation or mutual reinforcement exist in your subregion during the reporting period?

No answer provided.

If yes, specify the type of subregional mechanism(s)

No answer required.

Other (specify)

No answer required.

Sources of information

List the synergistic instruments referred to above.

No answer provided.

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- PISLM Support Office

Attachments:
None.

Qualitative assessment

Has the establishment of subregional synergistic processes for joint implementation of the Rio Conventions
been supported by the institutions of the Rio Conventions?

No

If yes, by the institutions of which Convention?

No answer required.

Identify the major difficulties experienced in establishing synergistic planning/programming or mechanisms for joint implementation.

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Level of importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not a priority for the subregion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity constraints at subregional level (countries)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity constraints at subregional level (institutions)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial resources at subregional, bilateral and multilateral level</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of accountability in the institutional framework</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support, participation and coordination on the part of the affected country Parties of the subregion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of coordination with relevant subregional organizations and existing subregional programmes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of institutional clarity of how the alignment process at subregional level should be undertaken</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

Operational Objective 3: Science, technology and knowledge

Performance indicator CONS-O-8 for Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2

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

Understanding of the indicator

The indicator measures whether there is a monitoring system for DLDD in place in the context of the SRAP or JAPs or, alternatively, if there is the potential to establish one in the subregion. If there is more than one subregional monitoring system, that may be specifically dedicated to DLDD or may partially cover it, the indicator also measures if they are interlinked and harmonized. Further, the indicator will inform on the extent to which it is realistic to expect more regular and coherent reporting by subregional reporting entities during the implementation of The Strategy and beyond. This information will be complemented by the reporting of affected country Parties and other reporting entities on UNCCD-relevant monitoring systems established and supported at the national, regional and global levels.

Data needed

- Information on monitoring systems established within the subregional bodies/institutions
- Programme/project documents and interim or final reports

Data sources (indicative only)

Regional coordination mechanism (RCM)
Check the glossary for ‘monitoring system’, ‘monitoring system specifically dedicated to DLDD’, ‘monitoring system partially covering DLDD’, ‘RCM’, ‘subregional monitoring system’

Check the reporting manual for ‘Can a monitoring system that is not an environmental monitoring system, but which accounts for the socio-economic aspects of DLDD, be considered a DLDD monitoring system?’, ‘Can a meteorological monitoring system be considered a DLDD monitoring system?’

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

SRAP

Is a subregional monitoring system specifically dedicated to DLDD established in your subregion?
   No

If yes, specify whether this system is functional
   No answer required.

If yes, specify whether this system is regularly updated
   No answer required.

If yes, does the subregional reporting entity have access to this monitoring system in order to collect information for reporting purposes?
   No answer required.

JAP1

Is a subregional monitoring system specifically dedicated to DLDD established in your subregion?
   No answer provided.

If yes, specify whether this system is functional
   No answer required.

If yes, specify whether this system is regularly updated
   No answer required.

If yes, does the subregional reporting entity have access to this monitoring system in order to collect information for reporting purposes?
   No answer required.

JAP2

Is a subregional monitoring system specifically dedicated to DLDD established in your subregion?
   No answer provided.

If yes, specify whether this system is functional
   No answer required.

If yes, specify whether this system is regularly updated
   No answer required.

If yes, does the subregional reporting entity have access to this monitoring system in order to collect information for reporting purposes?
   No answer required.

JAP3
Is a subregional monitoring system specifically dedicated to DLDD established in your subregion?
   No answer provided.

If yes, specify whether this system is functional
   No answer required.

If yes, specify whether this system is regularly updated
   No answer required.

If yes, does the subregional reporting entity have access to this monitoring system in order to collect information for reporting purposes?
   No answer required.

Monitoring systems

If there are more than one single monitoring system available in your subregion, list them and describe their main features, in particular those that can contribute to UNCCD reporting, and indicate if they are being used in the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Name of the monitoring system</th>
<th>Description of main features</th>
<th>Used in the SRAP context</th>
<th>Used in the context of the JAP1</th>
<th>Used in the context of the JAP2</th>
<th>Used in the context of the JAP3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please describe the potential for these monitoring systems to be interlinked and harmonized for DLDD monitoring purposes in your subregion.
   No answer provided.

Sources of information

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- PISLM Support Office

Attachments:
   None.

Subregional contribution to the target

Does your institution/organization or another institution/organization of the subregion have plans for providing support to one or more affected country Party(ies) for monitoring systems relating to DLDD?
   Yes

If yes, when?
   2014–2015

If yes and if known at the time of reporting, to which affected country(ies)?
Qualitative assessment

For those subregions not having a monitoring system specifically dedicated to DLDD or partially covering DLDD at subregional level, identify the major difficulties experienced in the establishment process.

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Level of importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial constraints at subregional, bilateral and multilateral level</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity constraints at subregional level (countries)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity constraints at subregional level (institutions)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of coordination among relevant affected country Parties of the subregion and unclear attribution of responsibilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of coordination among donor-led programme/project interventions at subregional level</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing initiatives are too fragmented; cannot be realistically coordinated under one umbrella at subregional level</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing national monitoring systems use different methodologies and cannot be realistically harmonized at subregional level</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (specify)

No answer provided.

For those subregions having a (or a network of) subregional monitoring system(s) specifically dedicated to DLDD or partially covering DLDD, how is/are the system(s) maintained?

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Level of importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By means of internal resources</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By means of external support</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No maintenance is possible due to the limited professional capacity of the subregional institution in charge of the monitoring system</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No maintenance is possible due the limited financial resources of the subregional institution in charge of the monitoring system</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (specify)
Performance indicator CONS-O-10 for Outcome 3.3 and 3.4
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

Understanding of the indicator
The indicator measures knowledge-transfer processes from the theoretical to the operational level. This is done through an assessment carried out by subregional reporting entities (self-assessment) of the levels of traditional and scientific knowledge reflected in their SRAPs. The assumption is that SRAPs based on sound scientific and traditional knowledge will propose more significant and effective strategies and activities for implementation at the subregional level, and will, ultimately, perform better than those SRAPs that do not take into account available knowledge on DLDD and DLDD synergies with climate change and biodiversity. The indicator will inform to what extent UNCCD implementation is likely to achieve meaningful results. Affected country Parties and regional reporting entities will complement the information provided subregional reporting entities by reporting on the assessment of their NAPs and RAPs.

Data needed
- SRAP aligned to The Strategy
- Scientific literature consulted for the formulation/revision of the SRAP

Data sources (indicative only)
UNCCD Regional coordination mechanism (RCM)

Check the glossary for

As this indicator is meant to contribute to the subregion’s self-assessment of its aligned SRAP, subregions not having an aligned SRAP or not having revised their SRAP in alignment with The Strategy do NOT report on this indicator.

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

Sources of information
UNCCD SRAP formulated taking account of, or revised in alignment with, The Strategy.

Assessment of the aligned NAP

In your SRAP, is the identification of biophysical and socio-economic drivers, and of their interaction, knowledge-based?
 No

If yes, specify upon which type of knowledge it is based
Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.
 No answer required.

If based on scientific literature, list the main reference literature consulted. You may also upload relevant documents.
 No answer required.

In your SRAP, is the analysis of the interaction between DLDD and climate change or biodiversity knowledge-based?
 No answer provided.

If yes, specify upon which type of knowledge it is based.
Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.
No answer required.

If based on scientific literature, list the main reference literature consulted. You may also upload relevant documents.
No answer required.

Is drought policy and drought preparedness, including mitigation, analyzed and/or reflected in some of the actions outlined in the SRAP?
No answer provided.

If drought policy and drought preparedness, including mitigation, are not analyzed and/or reflected in some of the actions outlined in the SRAP, when do you plan to do so?
No answer required.

Subregional contribution to the target

If in your SRAP, DLDD drivers, their interactions, and the interaction of DLDD with climate change and biodiversity are not analyzed on the basis of relevant scientific, expert and/or traditional knowledge, when do you plan to do so?
2012–2013

Qualitative assessment

If your SRAP has not been developed taking into account relevant scientific and/or traditional knowledge, identify the reasons.

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Level of importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant scientific literature is not available at subregional level</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant traditional or expert knowledge is not available at subregional level</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial resources to mobilize the necessary knowledge at subregional, bilateral and multilateral level</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor coordination among the affected country Parties of the subregion prevented a subregional pooling of knowledge/expertise</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant affected country Parties of the subregion could not contribute due to lack of time</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant affected country Parties of the subregion could not contribute due to lack of staff</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (specify)
No answer provided.

Performance indicator CONS-O-11 for Outcome 3.5
Type, number and users of DLDD-relevant knowledge-sharing systems at the global, regional, subregional and national levels described on the Convention website

Understanding of the indicator
In the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs, the indicator measures the presence of DLDD-related knowledge-sharing processes, through the quantification of the type and number of existing subregional knowledge-sharing systems. Effectiveness of these systems is measured through quantification of their user-base. The indicator will inform to what extent scientific and traditional knowledge, including best practices, are available to and sufficiently shared with end-users. This information will be complemented by the reporting of affected country Parties and other reporting
entities on existing UNCCD-relevant knowledge-sharing systems at the national, regional and global levels.

Data needed
- Information from websites.
- Only DLDD-relevant knowledge-sharing systems and networks shall be considered.

Data sources (indicative only)
Relevant subregional organizations hosting subregional knowledge-sharing systems and networks within their website

Check the glossary for
‘PRAIS’, ‘subregional knowledge-sharing system’, ‘JAPs’

Check the reporting manual for
‘How can you provide the number of users in a knowledge-sharing system?’

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

Knowledge-sharing systems

List any DLDD-relevant ‘subregional knowledge-sharing system’ in your subregion you are aware of, providing an Internet link and estimated number of users per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Name of the system</th>
<th>Internet link</th>
<th>Estimated number of users per year</th>
<th>Used in the context of the SRAP</th>
<th>Used in the context of the JAP1</th>
<th>Used in the context of the JAP2</th>
<th>Used in the context of the JAP3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Operational Objective 4: Capacity building

Performance indicator CONS-O-13 for Outcomes 4.1 and 4.2

Number of countries, subregional and regional reporting entities engaged in building capacity to combat DLDD on the basis of NCSA or other methodologies and instruments

Understanding of the indicator
The indicator measures the presence of capacity-building processes through the quantification of existing DLDD-related capacity-building initiatives. The indicator will inform to what extent subregional reporting entities may be expected to meet their obligations foreseen by the Convention, including forthcoming ones (i.e. new reporting requirements, establishment of monitoring systems, accessing new financing mechanisms). This information will be complemented by the reporting of affected country Parties and other reporting entities on capacity-building initiatives at the national, regional and global levels.

Data needed
- Information on DLDD-related capacity-building initiatives; only programmes/projects mentioned in the PPSs that
have DLDD-related capacity-building as a major objective are to be considered.

Data sources (indication only)
- PPSs submitted to UNCCD as part of the reporting exercise
- Programme/project documents and interim or final reports of those programmes and projects identified through the PPSs as having DLDD-related capacity-building at the subregional level as a major objective

Check the glossary for

Check the reporting manual for
‘What can be considered as a programme or project that has DLDD-related capacity-building as a major objective?’

Overall target
By 2014, at least 90 per cent of affected country Parties, subregional and regional reporting entities implement DLDD-specific capacity-building plans or programmes/projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>In the SRAP context</th>
<th>In the context of JAPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide relevant information on the size, scope, effectiveness and status of the initiatives reported.

No answer provided.

Have DLDD-related capacity-building needs been assessed in your subregion?

The process is still ongoing

If yes, within the framework of which initiative(s)?
No answer required.

Other (specify)
No answer required.

If yes, have the necessary resources for addressing capacity-building needs been assessed in your subregion?
No answer required.

If yes, are these resource requirements included in a subregional investment framework?
No answer required.

Sources of information
Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- PISLM Support Office

Attachments:
None.

Subregional contribution to the target
If at the time of reporting there are no DLDD-specific capacity-building plans, programmes or projects implemented in the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs, when does your institution/organization or another institution/organization of the subregion plan to have something in place?
Qualitative assessment

Has your subregion received assistance from one or more of the following institutions to build capacities to combat DLDD?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRAP</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, which type of assistance has the subregion received?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Which</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRAP</td>
<td>Technical support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operational Objective 5: Financing and technology transfer

Performance indicator CONS-O-14 for Outcome 5.1

Number of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities whose investment frameworks, established within the IFS devised by the GM or within other IFSs, reflect leveraging national, bilateral and multilateral resources for combating desertification and land degradation.

Understanding of the indicator

In the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs, the indicator measures the presence of integrated financing processes allowing the leverage of national, subregional, regional, bilateral and multilateral resources for combating desertification and land degradation, through the quantification of investment frameworks developed by the subregions within the Integrated Financial Strategies (IFSs) devised by the GM or other IFSs promoted by diverse international institutions. This information will be complemented by the reporting of affected country Parties and other reporting entities on the establishment of Integrated Investment Frameworks (IIFs) at national and regional levels.

Data needed
- Investment framework documents.
- Only investment frameworks prepared along the guidelines devised within IFSs shall be considered.

Data sources (indicative only)
UNCCD Regional coordination mechanism (RCM)

Check the glossary for

Overall target
By 2014, at least 50 per cent of affected country Parties, subregional and regional entities have developed IIFs.

| SRAP — has an IIF been developed in your subregion by the end of the reporting period? |
| Has an IIF been developed in your subregion by the end of the reporting period? |
| If yes, specify when it was developed. |
| No answer required. |
| Is (are) the IIF (s) in your subregion based on the SRAP? |
| No answer required. |
| If based on the SRAP, who assisted in its development? |
| No answer required. |
| Other (specify) |
| No answer required. |
| If assisted, which type of assistance did you receive? |
| No answer required. |
| If assisted by the GM, was it devised within the IFS? |
| No answer required. |
| If your subregion has an IIF based on the SRAP, does this framework allow for the leveraging of national, subregional, bilateral and multilateral resources for combating DLDD? |
| No answer required. |
| Did your subregion receive assistance from the GM in exploring non-traditional and innovative channels of financial resources? |
| No answer provided. |

| Short overview of the progress in implementing the IIF |
| Provide a short overview of the progress in implementing the IIF in your subregion, in particular as it relates to its functionality and efficiency in leveraging the funding necessary for implementing the Convention at subregional level. |
| No answer provided. |

| JAP1 — has an IIF been developed in your subregion by the end of the reporting period? |
| Has an IIF been developed in your subregion by the end of the reporting period? |
| No answer provided. |
| If yes, specify when it was developed. |
| No answer required. |
| Is (are) the IIF (s) in your subregion based on the JAP1? |
| No answer required. |
| If based on the JAP1, who assisted in its development? |
| No answer required. |
| Other (specify) |
| No answer required. |
| If assisted, which type of assistance did you receive? |
No answer required.

If assisted by the GM, was it devised within the IFS?
No answer required.

If your subregion has an IIF based on the JAP1, does this framework allow for the leveraging of national, subregional, bilateral and multilateral resources for combating DLDD?
No answer required.

Did your subregion receive assistance from the GM in exploring non-traditional and innovative channels of financial resources?
No answer provided.

Short overview of the progress in implementing the IIF
Provide a short overview of the progress in implementing the IIF in your subregion, in particular as it relates to its functionality and efficiency in leveraging the funding necessary for implementing the Convention at subregional level.
No answer provided.

JAP2 — has an IIF been developed in your subregion by the end of the reporting period?
Has an IIF been developed in your subregion by the end of the reporting period?
No answer provided.

If yes, specify when it was developed.
No answer required.

Is (are) the IIF (s) in your subregion based on the JAP2?
No answer required.

If based on the JAP2, who assisted in its development?
No answer required.

Other (specify)
No answer required.

If assisted, which type of assistance did you receive?
No answer required.

If assisted by the GM, was it devised within the IFS?
No answer required.

If your subregion has an IIF based on the JAP2, does this framework allow for the leveraging of national, subregional, bilateral and multilateral resources for combating DLDD?
No answer required.

Did your subregion receive assistance from the GM in exploring non-traditional and innovative channels of financial resources?
No answer provided.

Short overview of the progress in implementing the IIF
Provide a short overview of the progress in implementing the IIF in your subregion, in particular as it relates to its functionality and efficiency in leveraging the funding necessary for implementing the Convention at subregional level.
No answer provided.

JAP3 — has an IIF been developed in your subregion by the end of the reporting period?
Has an IIF been developed in your subregion by the end of the reporting period?
No answer provided.
If yes, specify when it was developed.
No answer required.

Is (are) the IIF (s) in your subregion based on the JAP3?
No answer required.

If based on the JAP3, who assisted in its development?
No answer required.

Other (specify)
No answer required.

If assisted, which type of assistance did you receive?
No answer required.

If assisted by the GM, was it devised within the IFS?
No answer required.

If your subregion has an IIF based on the JAP3, does this framework allow for the leveraging of national, subregional, bilateral and multilateral resources for combating DLDD?
No answer required.

Did your subregion receive assistance from the GM in exploring non-traditional and innovative channels of financial resources?
No answer provided.

Short overview of the progress in implementing the IIF
Provide a short overview of the progress in implementing the IIF in your subregion, in particular as it relates to its functionality and efficiency in leveraging the funding necessary for implementing the Convention at subregional level.
No answer provided.

Sources of information
Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- PISLM Support Office

Attachments:
None.

Subregional contribution to the target
If an IIF has not been developed in your subregion by the end of the reporting period, do you plan to do it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRAP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2012–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative assessment
Identify the major difficulties experienced in developing an IIF for the subregion.
Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Level of importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial constraints at national, subregional, bilateral and multilateral level</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity constraints at the subregional level (countries)</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity constraints at the subregional level (institutions)</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of coordination among relevant affected country Parties of the subregion and unclear attribution of responsibilities</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of coordination among those providing support</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National, subregional, bilateral and multilateral resources are too diverse; cannot be realistically coordinated under one umbrella.</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>No answer provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance indicator CONS-O-16 for Outcome 5.2**

Degree of adequacy, timeliness and predictability of financial resources made available by developed country Parties to combat DLDD

Understanding of the indicator

This is a qualitative indicator requiring the perception-based assessment by subregional reporting entities of the adequacy, timeliness and predictability of bilateral contributions received from developed country Parties for the implementation of the Convention. “Adequate”, “timely” and “predictable” resources are frequently referred to in The Strategy as being necessary to ensure proper planning and effective implementation. Affected country Parties and regional reporting entities will complement the information provided by subregional reporting entities by reporting on their perception-based assessments at national and regional level.

Data needed

- Data sources (indicative only)
  - Check the glossary for

Refer your assessment to the following biennium only:
  - In 2012, biennium 2010–2011

Overall target

No target has been set for this indicator.

**Bilateral assistance received**

How would you rate the bilateral assistance received within the framework of UNCCD for the implementation of The
Strategy and of the Convention at the subregional level?

**Adequacy of bilateral assistance at the subregional level**
- Not adequate

**Timeliness of bilateral assistance at the subregional level**
- Not timely

**Predictability of bilateral assistance at the subregional level**
- Not predictable

Provide narrative justification on your above rating and feel free to highlight differences, where appropriate, in the financial resources received for SRAP and JAP implementation in your subregion.

So far we've received funding from GM for the hosting of two (2) meetings, the production of two (2) reports on innovative financing and some support for a website.

As we begin to roll out the SRAP it is envisioned that substantially more support will be necessary. A plan is being develop to identify sources of funding.|

**Additional information on any other impacting aspects**
If relevant, provide additional information on whether there are any other aspects beyond adequacy, timeliness and predictability of financial support made available by developed country Parties to combat DLDD which impact proper planning and effective implementation of the Convention in your subregion.

- Capacity Building remains a key issue in this process and must be taken into consideration throughout all aspects of the process.

**Qualitative assessment**

Did your subregion receive technical assistance in raising external resources?
- No

If yes, from whom?
- No answer required.

Other (specify)
- No answer required.

Has the level of adequacy, timeliness and predictability of bilateral assistance constrained your subregion's performance in planning and implementation with respect to UNCCD?
- Yes

**Performance indicator CONS-O-17 for Outcome 5.3**

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

Understanding of the indicator
In the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs, the indicator measures the capacity of fund-raising through the quantification of project proposals successfully submitted for funding to the various financing organizations. The indicator will inform to what extent the subregions make increasing efforts to mobilize resources. This information will be complemented by the reporting of affected country Parties and other reporting entities on the fund-raising efforts at national and regional levels.

Data needed
- Information contained in the PPSs and SFAs submitted to UNCCD.

Data sources (indicative only)
- PPSs and SFAs submitted to UNCCD as part of the reporting exercise.
- The PPS requires specification of the project 'status' thus it allows the identification of relevant projects to be considered by this indicator and the monitoring of their approval status.
- The SFA requires the specification of amounts committed to approved projects.

Check the glossary for ‘PPS’, ‘SFA’, ‘project proposals’, ‘currency’, ‘successfully submitted proposals’, ‘JAPs’

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

Sources of information
PPSs and SFAs

Number of subregional project proposals submitted (pipeline) and ongoing, by biennium

In the context of the subregional action programme (SRAP).

² In the context of joint action programmes (JAPs), i.e. project proposals made by two or more countries within the subregion but that do not encompass the entire subregion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biennium</th>
<th>Submitted (pipeline)</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the SRAP context¹</td>
<td>In the context of JAPs²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of funds raised for subregional activities, by biennium

You can find the amount of funds raised for the ongoing projects at the subregional level in the corresponding SFAs. Sum these amounts and give the total in the below table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biennium</th>
<th>Currency</th>
<th>Total amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the SRAP context</td>
<td>In the context of JAPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2011</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subregional contribution to the target

According to the information provided above, do you think that your subregion is mobilizing enough resources from international financial institutions, facilities and funds through successfully submitted project proposals?

No

If no, does your organization/institution or other organization/institution plan to increase its efforts in presenting subregional project proposals to international financial institutions, facilities and funds?

Yes

What percentage of financing used for the implementation of subregional DLDD-related programmes and projects comes from national sources, and what percentage from international sources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National sources</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International sources</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance indicator CONS-O-18 for Outcome 5.5

Amount of financial resources and type of incentives which have enabled access to technology by affected country Parties
Understanding of the indicator
The indicator measures whether access to technology is facilitated by means of financial resources or economic and policy incentives. In the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs, the indicator will inform to what extent an enabling environment for technology transfer has been created and whether sufficient resources are dedicated to technology transfer. Affected country Parties and regional reporting entities will complement the information provided by subregional reporting entities by reporting on financial resources and type of incentives which have enabled access to technology at the national and regional levels.

Data needed
- Budgets of relevant programmes and projects articulated in the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs
- Information on subregional policy/regulatory, financial and fiscal incentives. Subregional incentives facilitating access to technology are those established and implemented in the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs, and not necessarily only within the framework of DLDD-related cooperation.

Data sources (indicative only)
- Financial documents of programmes and projects articulated in the context of the SRAP and/or JAPs and submitted as PPSs to the UNCCD as part of the reporting exercise
- Subregional policy/regulatory and economic/financial documents

Check the glossary for ‘technology transfer’, ‘technical support’, ‘incentive’, ‘PPS’, ‘JAPs’

Check the reporting manual for ‘How to disaggregate the amounts by year?’, ‘How to measure the effectiveness of technology transfer initiatives?’

Overall targets
- A steady growth in the financial resources allocated to facilitate access to technology by affected country Parties is recorded along the implementation period of The Strategy.
- A steady growth in the number of economic and policy incentives reported upon is recorded along the implementation period of The Strategy.

Estimate of amounts allocated to facilitate access to material and to knowledge aid (technology transfer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Currency</th>
<th>In the SRAP context</th>
<th>In the context of JAPs</th>
<th>In the SRAP context</th>
<th>In the context of JAPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have subregional incentives intended to facilitate access to technology been established in your subregion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Were incentives established?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRAP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, specify which types of incentives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>SRAP</th>
<th>JAP1</th>
<th>JAP2</th>
<th>JAP3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy or regulatory incentives (for example, related to market requirements and regulations, import/export, foreign investment, research &amp; development support,</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>SRAP</td>
<td>JAP1</td>
<td>JAP2</td>
<td>JAP3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentives (for example, preferential rates, State aid, subsidies, cash grants, loan guarantees, etc.)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal incentives (for example, exemption from or reduction of taxes, duties, fees, etc.)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Provide a short overview of specific aspects and the nature of technology transfer in your subregion, in particular in relation to those aspects where there is a need to increase the level of technology transfer.*

*No answer provided.*

**Sources of information**

Specify the sources used to extract the information provided above. You may also upload relevant documents.

- **PISLM Support Office**

**Attachments:**

None.
Standard Financial Annex

The CRIC has recommended that financial reporting be based on a standard financial reporting format to be used by affected country Parties, other reporting entities and their development partners. It also indicated that emphasis in reports should be put on financial matters and also on an analysis of the impact of the activities undertaken (ICCD/CRIC(8)/5).

The purpose of the SFA is to consolidate information on resources mobilized by affected country Parties, other reporting entities and their development partners under the framework of relevant strategies and action programmes. It facilitates the aggregation of data on financial commitments, financial flows and resources available by all relevant funding sources for activities related to the implementation of the Convention. It also helps minimize double counting in financial statistics (ICCD/CRIC(10)/14).

The SFA is to be used by each country Party and other reporting entities to list all financial commitments they have made during the reporting period in support of institutions, programmes, projects, as well as other relevant initiatives undertaken at national, subregional, regional or international level for the implementation of the Convention. While doing so, subregional reporting entities are urged to coordinate the submission of this information with the involved affected country Parties in order to avoid possible duplication of information. Please note that in case recipient countries within a programme and/or project encompass an entire subregion or, alternatively include two or more countries under the same subregion but not the entire subregion, the programme/project is supposed to be reported under the SRAP. If recipient countries within a programme and/or project encompass an entire region or two or more countries under different subregions, the programme/project is supposed to be reported under the RAP.

More specifically, for each relevant financial commitment or allocation made in the reporting period, the SFA requires a minimum set of data grouped as follows:

a. Identification, i.e. data required to identify the reporting entity, the funding source and the activity financed;

b. Basic data, i.e. data specifying the amount and type of financial commitment made, as well as the recipient country, subregion, region, and/or organization, and the funding period, if applicable;

c. Classification, i.e. categorization of the funded activity according to the Rio Markers for desertification, and the UNCCD Relevant Activity Codes (RACs).¹

The compilation of the SFA is guided by means of a template, which responds to the recommendations of CRIC 7 and CRIC 9, and builds on the GM methodological guide for financial reporting² presented to CRIC 6 as part of the report of the intergovernmental Ad Hoc Working Group to improve the procedures for communication of information. In addition, and as part of the iterative process³ requested by the Conference of the Parties in decision 13/COP.9, the SFA was adjusted based on the feedback that reporting entities provided on performance indicators and other elements of the reporting process to CRIC 10.

Within the template, shaded areas contain information and explanatory texts, while white areas are for reporting purposes and need to be filled in by the reporting entities with relevant data or narrative information.

Decision 13/COP.9, paragraph 8, invites country Parties and other reporting entities to refer to common terminology and definitions. Therefore, these guidelines should be read in conjunction with the comprehensive glossary of performance indicators for the review of implementation of The Strategy and best practices, common to all reporting entities and contained in a separate document (ICCD/CRIC(9)/13).

¹ Guidelines on the use of the Rio Markers and the RACs are provided in the quick reference guide. Additional references can be found in the following documents:
  - Relevant Activity Codes: http://www.global-mechanism.org/RACs.pdf

None delivered.
Programme and Project Sheets

Programme and Project Sheets (PPS) are used to provide more detailed information on programmes or projects undertaken or completed in the reporting period. This includes programmes and projects in the pipeline, as well as final proposals submitted for funding to internal or external funding sources. All country Parties and other reporting entities involved in the financing, coordination or implementation of relevant programmes and projects are requested to prepare a PPS for each of them, and to attach them to their official report to the UNCCD. While doing so, subregional reporting entities are urged to coordinate the submission of this information with the involved affected country Parties in order to avoid possible duplication of information. Please note that in case beneficiary countries within a programme and/or project encompass an entire subregion or, alternatively include two or more countries under the same subregion but not the entire subregion, the programme/project is supposed to be reported under the SRAP. If beneficiary countries within a programme and/or project encompass an entire region or two or more countries under different subregions, the programme/project is supposed to be reported under the RAP.

The compilation of the PPS is guided by means of a template. These templates are intended to collect a minimum set of qualitative and quantitative data to facilitate the analysis of funding and investment flows, and the production of better financial statistics related to UNCCD implementation (ICC/CRIC(10)/14), with a view to enabling the CRIC to undertake an objective review of progress in the implementation of the Convention and The Strategy. The PPS also facilitate the computation of certain performance and impact indicators.

A distinctive feature of the PPS is that it allows country Parties and other reporting entities to specify which strategic and operational objectives of The Strategy are targeted by each programme or project. In addition, it allows for individual programme or project components to be categorized using the Rio Markers for desertification and Relevant Activity Codes (RACs).

Furthermore, the PPS can be used to indicate whether the objectives of other Rio Conventions (i.e. the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity, UNCBD – and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, UNFCCC) are also addressed by the programme or project. This is done through the use of the biodiversity and climate change Rio Markers, respectively.

The PPS offers an opportunity to increase the visibility of relevant programmes and projects, thereby creating the conditions for a better sharing of experiences and lessons, as well as the transfer of knowledge in general. It also favours collaboration and networking by facilitating the identification of potential synergies.

Lastly, the PPS also allows country Parties and other reporting entities to provide a narrative description of the expected or achieved results. This information will facilitate the qualitative assessment of progress in the implementation of The Strategy, including on returns on investment. The CRIC will use the analysis of financial information originating from the PPS to assess results, performance and impacts.

To minimize the reporting burden and avoid discrepancies in the information annexed to the reports of different entities, it is recommended that project partners identify the most suitable ways to coordinate among themselves the preparation of PPS to ensure that consistent data are reported for the same projects. It would also be advisable to compile just one PPS for large “umbrella” programmes, instead of separate PPS for each small project stemming from them.

In the PPS template, shaded areas contain information and explanatory texts, while white areas are for reporting purposes and need to be filled in by country Parties and other reporting entities with relevant data or narrative information.

¹ Such as performance indicators CONS-O-3, CONS-O-17, and CONS-O-18
² Guidelines on the use of the Rio Markers are provided in the quick reference guide. Additional references can be found in the following documents:
³ In conformity with Decision 13/COP 9 paragraph 21 and 22: http://global-mechanism.org/dynamic/File/Simone/Decision%2013.pdf

None delivered.
**Additional Information**

The section on additional information is meant to provide an instrument of flexibility in the reporting exercise as well as to enrich the knowledge base of the CRIC on concrete issues faced by subregional reporting entities and consequently to make more targeted and specific recommendations to the COP. It allows subregional reporting entities to comment or report upon issues that are not covered elsewhere but that are nevertheless of importance at the subregional level or within the framework of the implementation of The Strategy and the Convention.

The additional information section allows feedback to be received on the reporting process and on the implementation of SRAPs and/or joint action programmes at subregional level as well as lessons learnt, problems, constraints and bottlenecks faced in terms of human and financial resources. It is also meant to allow for feedback on the difficulties the subregional reporting entities may have encountered in using the performance indicators.

The proposed template for reporting is adjusted to the mandate of subregional reporting entities within the framework of the Convention, as requested by decision 13/COP.9, paragraph 17.

**Reporting process-related issues**

**Financial resources**

*Could your institution/organization count on sufficient internal or external financial resources to meet UNCCD reporting obligations?*

Yes

*If no, describe the difficulties experienced.*

No answer required.

*Which kind of financial resources did your institution/organization utilize, to comply with UNCCD reporting obligation?*

Both internal and external financial resources

*In case your institution/organization utilized both external and internal financial resources, please specify in what proportion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal financial resources</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External financial resources</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Provide an estimate of the amount invested into the UNCCD reporting process.*

15000 US Dollar

**Human resources and knowledge**

*How many people were involved in your institution/organization in the UNCCD reporting process?*

3 people

*Estimate the total number of person/day dedicated by these persons to the UNCCD reporting process:*

25 person/day

*Could your institution/organization count on sufficient technical and scientific knowledge to meet UNCCD reporting obligations?*

No

*If no, describe the main reasons and the difficulties encountered.*

i. Timeliness in data/info transfer

ii. Lack of info

**Coordination**
Was coordination at the subregional level with the relevant affected country Parties satisfactory in order to report comprehensively and coherently?  
No

How many affected country Parties collaborated in the subregional reporting process?  
6

Was coordination with the institutional focal points of the subregional action programme and/or joint action programmes at the subregional level satisfactory?  
No

In case there is a regional committee established in your region, was the collaboration with the regional committee fully developed in order to comply with the reporting obligations?  
No

If no, please describe the main reasons and the difficulties encountered.  
i. Many of the Focal Points were per-occupied with their own reporting  
ii. Communication was challenging

Has your institution/organization liaised and coordinated with the UNCCD regional coordination unit (RCU) of your region during the reporting process?  
Yes

If no, please describe the main reasons and the difficulties encountered.  
No answer required.

Validation of the report

Was the report validated by the affected country Parties of the subregion?  
Yes

Regional and national processes

Did your institution/organization actively cooperate with the institution entrusted with preparing the regional action programme report (RAP report)?  
No

Did your institution/organization provide any support to the country Parties of your subregion in the preparation of their national reports?  
Yes

PRAIS portal

Did you experience difficulties with accessing and using the PRAIS portal?  
Yes

If you experienced difficulties, identify the reasons.

Rate the level of importance by using a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 is not important at all and 5 is very important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Level of importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slow internet access</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of the system</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in getting access credentials</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accommodation of specific requests within COP decisions

Report on specific COP requests – iterative process on indicators
Decision 13/COP.9, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, envisages an iterative process to refine the set of performance and impact indicators. As a tool to implement this iterative process, subregional reporting entities can provide their suggestions and recommendations for improvement here.

Performance indicators
Tick the cells only if you have experienced difficulties in reporting on one, or more, performance indicator(s). Indicate against which of the e-SMART criteria the indicator(s) need(s) to be improved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>economic</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Measurable</th>
<th>Achievable</th>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>Time-bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONS-O-1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS-O-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS-O-4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS-O-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS-O-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS-O-8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS-O-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS-O-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS-O-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS-O-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS-O-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS-O-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS-O-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact indicators
Tick the cells only if you have experienced difficulties in reporting on one, or more, impact indicator(s). Indicate against which of the e-SMART criteria the indicator(s) need(s) to be improved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>economic</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Measurable</th>
<th>Achievable</th>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>Time-bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO4-3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO4-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO4-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reporting on the implementation of the subregional action programmes

Percentage of activities implemented

*In case your subregion has a subregional action programme (SRAP) and/or joint action programmes at the*
subregional level (JAPs) under implementation, what percentage of activities included in the SRAP and/or JAPs are currently implemented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRAP</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the SRAP and/or JAPs at subregional level have experienced difficulties in their implementation (i.e. below 30 %)

If the SRAP and/or JAPs at subregional level have experienced difficulties in their implementation (i.e. below 30 %), describe concrete measures being taken or provide suggestions for measures to be taken to foster SRAP and/or JAPs at the subregional level implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRAP</td>
<td>The PISLM Task force will be convening a meeting in October 2012 and within the 1st Quarter of 2013 to develop mechanisms to strengthen implementation.200w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP1</td>
<td>---200w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP2</td>
<td>---200w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP3</td>
<td>---200w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Human resources

Lessons learnt (report on the 2 most important only)

1. There has to be greater capacity support for the implementation of the SRAP.

2. There needed to be greater coordination among the focal points so as to expedite information gathering.

Problems, constraints and bottlenecks currently faced by your subregion (report on the two most important only)

1. Financial mobilization is the greatest constraint to attracting suitable human resource to participate in this process.

2. No answer provided.

Financial resources

Lessons learnt (report on the 2 most important only)

1. Creating a synergy with other programmes in the region may be a strategy for financing programmes outlined in the SRAP.
2. No answer provided.

Problems, constraints and bottlenecks currently faced by your subregion (report on the two most important only)

1. There is a need for greater technical support in resource mobilization.

2. No answer provided.

Any other subregional-specific issues

Are there any specific issue in your subregion that should be brought to the attention of the Conference of the Parties?

Yes

If yes, please specify.

Item 1
Category Funding/resource mobilization
Other (specify) ---
Narrative description Due to acute capacity constraints there is a need for technical support in the development of mechanism for funding and resource mobilization.

Item 2
Category Desertification/land degradation and drought (DLDD) and sustainable land management (SLM) monitoring and assessment/research
Other (specify) ---
Narrative description One of the capacity constraints is the diverse methodologies used in slm monitoring. There is need for a central clearing house in the sub-region that will track progress.
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