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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Based on its Results and Impact Assessment Methodology (RIAM), the Global Mechanism (GM) asked the Unisféra International Centre (UNISFERA) to conduct an assessment of nine Integrated Financing Strategy (IFS) processes selected among those developed, validated, and/or under implementation. This synthesis report integrates the findings and recommendations on that series of nine IFS processes. It is based on the IFS assessment reports for the following countries: Cambodia, Cameroun, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Mali, Peru, Tanzania, Vietnam and Zambia.

The IFS is a process undertaken by a country Party, with the assistance of the GM, to leverage national, bilateral and multilateral resources to increase the effectiveness and impact of interventions to further the implementation of the UNCCD in line with the Strategy. An IFS leads to the development of an Integrated Investment Frameworks (IIF), or when one exists, supports its implementation. IIFs are strategic planning documents for DLDD/SLM financing based on a common understanding of the importance of SLM for development, poverty reduction and environmental protection.

The objective of the IFS assessments was to assess the results and impact of IFS processes. More specifically, the assessments sought to document the role of IFS in mobilizing and improving the targeting and coordination of national, bilateral and multilateral financial and technological resources to support implementation of the UNCCD, and contribute to the improvement of the IFS process through a learning approach.

Hence, the assessments have been aimed at identifying facilitating factors and successes as well as hurdles and constraints encountered so far, and at making recommendations for the further development of IFS (Annex 1). Moreover, it should be stressed that the assessments were not designed to evaluate the performance of the GM per se but rather to assess its main modus operandi, i.e. Integrated Financing Strategies (IFS).

The assessments were structured around the OECD/DAC criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance\(^1\), namely: the relevance, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and efficiency of the IFS processes. Based on the evidence gathered and the objective judgement of the assessors, the IFS processes were graded on a ‘satisfactory’ scale, ranging from unsatisfactory (1) to satisfactory (4), with the following intermediate increments: moderately unsatisfactory (2) and moderately satisfactory (3).

\(^1\) [http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,2340,en_2649_34435_2086550_1_1_1_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,2340,en_2649_34435_2086550_1_1_1_1,00.html)
Although these grades convey a sense of ranking or evaluation, this is not their purpose as they purport rather to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the IFS process to guide the discussions on the continuous improvement of the process. The complete ranking is presented in Annex 2 (N.B. In the following graphs, the full horizontal line indicates the average). In the various tables of this report, country names were replaced by numbers (1 to 9) to avoid specific country comparisons; the names appear in the complete results table (Annex 2).

Early results and preliminary impact show that IFS processes are a positive contribution to the complex endeavour that is the mobilization of substantial financial resources for DLDD/SLM. In many instances, the IFS process has not yet reached a full cycle, in that the IFS is still being developed or an IIF has not yet been prepared. As a result, only preliminary data exist on the amounts mobilized as a result of the IFS processes. Monitoring of that information in coming years will be essential in that regard.

In the meantime, the IFS process can be assessed at several levels, with findings on strengths and weaknesses of the process in terms of relevance, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and efficiency.

**Relevance.** The relevance criterion considers the extent to which the objectives of the IFS process are consistent with the UNCCD 10-Year Strategy, the priorities of the recipient country, and the GM’s mandate as evidenced in its COP-approved RBM framework. Relevance is also a function of stakeholder and partner engagement in the process.
The assessment determined that the IFS process' relevance is satisfactory in its ability to take into account a) recipient country priorities; b) the UNCCD 10-Year Strategy and c) the GM's role as described in its RBM Framework.

The process' relevance is however often only moderately satisfactory when it comes to stakeholder and partner engagement. Additional and more in-depth involvement of country stakeholders (local and national) and development partners would reinforce the process' relevance. In that regard, it is recommended that at the outset of an IFS process, the GM and country formalize the identification and mapping of relevant stakeholders and partners and detail a strategic engagement plan (to be adjusted as needed as the process evolves).

**Effectiveness.** The effectiveness criterion is a measure of the extent to which the objectives of an IFS process were achieved, or will likely be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.
The assessment determined that the IFS process' effectiveness is satisfactory in meeting agreed-upon objectives laid out in cooperation agreements between recipient countries and the GM. The assessors have ranked the effectiveness of the IFS process as an approach to design and implement an IIF as moderately satisfactory. The caveat is based on the fact that in many instances it is too early to determine the actual effectiveness in achieving a sustained financed IIF, but evidence suggests that it will be effective in that regard.

One of the aspects of an IFS process is to mainstream DLDD/SLM finance into central government decision-making processes. From the assessors’ standpoint, the effectiveness and impact of the IFS process would be further improved if the GM and the Focal Point were to go beyond the mere identification and passive involvement of government officials from central ministries (such as economic development, agriculture, planning) in the IFS process, and actually co-opt them to the process. Champions from these ministries would constitute important vectors for mainstreaming DLDD/SLM finance. In addition, they will in most instances be familiar with and privy to the country’s planning and investments policies and practices and constitute therefore a formidable conduit to influence them. Identifying DLDD/SLM champions from these ministries would go a great length in forging the missing link necessary to fulfil the vision of substantial financial resources devoted to DLDD/SLM.

**Impact.** The term "impact" denotes the positive and negative changes produced by the IFS process, directly or indirectly, with regards to DLDD/SLM resource mobilization and governance, capacity and ownership.

Beyond its effectiveness in reaching the process objectives, the IFS process has had a positive impact that results in a moderately satisfactory rating in terms of resource mobilization. The same caveat as above applies, in that it is, in most instances, too early to
assess the concrete impact of IFS on resource mobilization, but enabling conditions have been set in place and the ‘trend’ goes in the right direction. The impact of IFS on DLDD/SLM governance, capacity and ownership has been very positive in some instances, with an overall scoring of moderately satisfactory.

In order to improve IFS impact on resource mobilization (and its monitoring), the assessors are of the opinion that each IFS process should start with a baseline analysis of current SLM financing and investments in the country (based on a set of agreed definitions of what SLM investments consist of, appropriate indicators, and data sources). This baseline should be updated on a yearly basis to assess trends in SLM financing. This would allow for an improved and agreed upon quantitative assessment of SLM financial flows and provide input into the on-going actualization and adjustments to be made to the IFS as a permanent country process. The yearly updates should also qualitatively assess whether any change in SLM finances is the result of the IFS process (in whole or in part). This assessment of actual SLM investments should also serve to refocus or intensify IFS efforts where necessary.

It also appears that the impact of an IFS on DLDD/LSM governance is strengthened when a multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder IFS coordination mechanism is set up at the outset of the process (versus waiting for the input of analytical reports) and built on existing structures when possible. The GM and/or development partners should support such a mechanism throughout the process, notably through the appointment of an in-country consultant to act as secretary to the process. This mechanism is complementary to the above recommendation on the co-opting of champions from key ministries and should not replace it.

**Sustainability.** The sustainability criterion aims to assess whether or not the benefits of the IFS process are likely to continue after GM support has been withdrawn. It includes an assessment of the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks beyond the initial phases of the IFS.
Sustainability of the IFS process scores as moderately satisfactory to satisfactory in most instances, with significant difference between countries. It appears to the assessors that the sustainability of the IFS process would benefit directly from two of the above-mentioned recommendations: co-opting key officials from central ministries and establishing a GM-supported coordination mechanism. The GM or development partners should also identify a way to continue the services of a country-based consultant to act as an advisor to the most relevant ministry driving the process and to provide input and follow-through into inter-ministerial consultations.

**Efficiency.** Efficiency measures the outputs in relation to inputs. In other words, it addresses how efficiently the various activities have transformed available resources into the intended results, in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness.
The IFS process' efficiency in converting inputs (resources) into outputs (results) ranges from moderately unsatisfactory to moderately satisfactory, with about half of the countries assessed in each category.

The efficiency of the process in terms of timeliness has been described as problematic in many instances. The length of time required to conduct the diagnostics and gap analyses was deemed too long before concrete steps were taken in terms of enabling governance conditions or resource mobilization. However, the impact of continued shared conversations around DLDD/SLM financing over time should not be completely discounted. Time is a necessary factor in shifting from a silo-based organizational culture to a cross-sectoral programmatic approach and for allowing a progression in absorption capacity.

However, the ‘time’ efficiency of the IFS process could be improved --without losing the added-value of a longer timeframe when a transformational change is required-- by adopting a multi-track approach where, after an initial snapshot is taken of SLM-related government processes, strategies and plans that need to be influenced to mainstream SLM, a multiple-track approach is initiated. One track should focus on building the longer-term outcomes of the process (diagnostics and gap analysis, involvement of stakeholders and partners, transformational change in DLDD/SLM governance) that will lead to sustained benefits for SLM finance. At the same time, another track should focus on targeted activities aimed at delivering short-term results based on promising sector strategies or targeted (innovative) investment opportunities and institutional reinforcement related to SLM-governance.

All the while, the period allotted for conducting diagnostic studies should be somewhat shortened (without excluding the possibility of further technical studies) to not last over six months. Such an approach would have the benefit of involving more stakeholders sooner in the process and capitalizing on changing opportunities, which in turn would reinforce the process’ momentum and strengthen UNCCD implementation.

From the assessors’ point of view, it appears that the efficiency could also be improved by conducting a formal analysis and duly considering IFS process risks and assumptions at the outset and revisiting them throughout the process in order to ensure that the process responds and adapts to the evolving environment.

In conclusion, the IFS processes have had a generally positive impact on the country environment for SLM financing. As detailed in Section 3, the overall results of this Assessment are consistent with the survey findings of the Intersessional Working Group on the mid-term evaluation of the 10-Year Strategy with regards to feedback from countries having experienced an IFS process.
1. INTRODUCTION

The 10-year Strategic Plan and Framework (2008–2018) to enhance the implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) (the Strategy), adopted by Decision 3/COP8, is the context in which the Global Mechanism (GM) operates as one of the institutions of the Convention. Paragraphs 17 to 19 and paragraphs 24 to 32 of said decision define the central responsibility of the GM in contributing to the achievement of Strategic Objective 4 (SO4) and Operational Objective 5 (OOS), and the alignment of the GM’s programme of work and the enhancement of coordination with the Secretariat. As per its paragraph 42, a mid-term evaluation of the Strategy shall be completed for consideration at the eleventh session of the Conference of Parties of the Convention (COP).

The Strategy also called for a results-based management (RBM) system that would facilitate the reporting of the Convention’s bodies to the COP. The institutions and subsidiary bodies of the Convention, including the GM, developed an RBM for their operations. By means of the RBM system, the GM biennial programmes of work and budgets are aligned with those of the Secretariat, the Committee on Science and Technology (CST) and the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention (CRIC).

By Decision 1/COP9 (Annex III), the GM was also requested to report on its impact. In particular, there was a request to develop a “methodology to assess the quantitative impact of the GM on resource mobilization available and implemented (first application for COP 10 reporting)”, as well as a request to conduct a “client” survey to mainly measure the qualitative impact (Decision 1/COP.9 – Annex III). The GM therefore developed and presented to COP a Results and Impact Assessment Methodology (RIAM) in October 2011 (ICCD/COP(10)/3) to evaluate the work of the GM based on a methodological consensus of all country Parties. The GM had also conducted a client satisfaction survey in July 2011.

The RIAM is set within the parameters of the 10-Year Strategy, and in particular on OOS on financing of sustainable land management (SLM). Framed by the RBM approach, it addresses the institutional performance of the GM in support of country Parties in

---

2 SO4: To mobilize resources to support implementation of the Convention through building effective partnerships between national and international actors.

3 OOS: Financing and technology transfer. To mobilize and improve the targeting and coordination of national, bilateral and multilateral financial and technological resources in order to increase their impact and effectiveness.

accordance with article 21 of the Convention. The RIAM is the foundation of the quality assurance policy of the GM. Its implementation is expected to lead to the following results:

- Enhancement of the GM’s capacity to develop and manage evidence of Integrated Financing Strategy (IFS) results in the context of the Strategy and National Action Programmes (NAPs) or other programmes of countries and regions (as requested by Decision 1/COP9; Decision 6/COP9 paragraph 6; Decision 1/COP10 Annex III and V);
- Development of better management and monitoring and evaluation systems, building on existing processes, and improvement in the accountability to the COP (as requested by Decision 3/COP8, Annex 1; Decision 1 and 6/COP9);
- Improvement in the quality of support to country Parties for building capacity to gain results in financial resource mobilization for SLM, linked to IFS processes (as requested by Decision 1/COP9, C; Decision 3/COP9 paragraph 4); and
- Creation of a baseline for GM outcomes.

Based on the RIAM, the GM conducted in 2012-2013 an assessment of nine IFS processes selected among those developed, validated, and/or under implementation.

This synthesis report integrates the findings and recommendations on that series of nine IFS processes in the following countries: Cambodia, Cameroun, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Mali, Peru, Tanzania, Vietnam and Zambia.

The nine countries selected for the assessment reflect the large diversity of the regions in which the GM is supporting IFS development, the varying levels of institutional SLM governance capacity and a range of IFS partners and solutions.

Since the mobilization of resources relies upon a number of factors, the focus of the assessments has not been the mere mobilization of resources through and by the GM itself, but the effectiveness of the IFS instrument as a tool for resource mobilization by all partners and, more specifically, the concerned country Parties.

The Assessors had the opportunity to discuss and validate the preliminary findings of this synthesis report with country representatives at a workshop organized by the Global Mechanism in March 2013.
INTEGRATED FINANCING STRATEGIES AND INTEGRATED INVESTMENT FRAMEWORKS

The UNCCD Strategy calls upon country Parties to develop Integrated Investment Frameworks (IIF).\(^5\) IIFs consist of strategic planning documents based on a common understanding of the importance of SLM for development, poverty reduction and environmental protection.

An IIF integrates, with a mid-term perspective (3 to 7 years), the country's NAP, costed SLM programmes and initiatives and the confirmed sources and level of financing from national, bilateral and multilateral sources with a view to increasing the effectiveness and impact of interventions.

To assist countries in accessing finance for SLM, through IIFs, the GM supports country Parties through the elaboration of Integrated Financing Strategies (IFS) for Sustainable Land Management (SLM).\(^6\) The IFS is a process undertaken by a country Party, with the assistance of the GM, to leverage national, bilateral and multilateral resources to increase the effectiveness and impact of interventions to further the implementation of the UNCCD in line with the Strategy. An IFS leads to the development of an IIF, or when one exists, supports its implementation.

IFS processes are anchored in national governance processes and take into consideration existing SLM-relevant programmes and finances. IFS processes are designed to contribute to enhance the implementation of the NAPs and contribute to their alignment with the Strategy. The starting point for IFS processes is an in-depth analysis of current investment climate, resource allocation, SLM governance and capacity (diagnosis). Gaps and constraints that may have hampered financial flows into SLM are identified (gap analysis) and actions recommended for improving this environment (road map).

Once this picture is clear, the IFS process strives to lead to an integration of SLM as a national development and investment priority into key development policies and processes, such as Poverty Reduction Strategies and national budgetary frameworks. This is a key step in promoting investment into SLM, with the potential to increase domestic budgetary

---

\(^5\) Outcome 2.2: "Affected country Parties revise their national action programmes (NAPs) into strategic documents supported by biophysical and socio-economic baseline information and include them in integrated investment frameworks" and Outcome 5.1: "Affected country Parties develop integrated investment frameworks for leveraging national, bilateral and multilateral resources with a view to increasing the effectiveness and impact of interventions."

allocation and attract greater international public and private investments. Throughout the IFS process, the GM facilitates the country Party engagement with donors, the private sector and financial institutions, in exploring new sources of finance and financing mechanisms. IFS and IIF are living documents, to be continually updated as national SLM priorities and programmes evolve and new financial sources are identified and secured.

PARAMETERS OF THE IFS RESULTS AND IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

The objective of the IFS assessments was to assess the results and impact of the GM-supported processes of IFS development and implementation, with regards to finance for sustainable land management (SLM) and the management of sectors of relevance to SLM. More specifically, the assessments sought to document, explain, and improve the role of IFS in mobilizing and improving the targeting and coordination of national, bilateral and multilateral financial and technological resources to support implementation of the Convention as contemplated by strategic objective 4 (SO4)\(^7\) and operational objective 5 (OO5) of the UNCCD Strategy.\(^8\)

It is important to underline that the approach followed was one of ‘assessment’ and not of ‘evaluation’. On the one hand, an assessment is designed to inquire about, demonstrate and improve a process. It involves using the evidence to document, explain, and improve a process (such as the IFS) and to learn from it. On the other hand, an evaluation determines the quality of a performance or outcome in order to make decisions based on the quality. It is designed to measure the results of a process in comparison to the intended objectives and results.

Hence, the assessments have been aimed at identifying barriers and constraints that have been encountered as well as lessons learnt and successes, and at making recommendations for the further development of IFS (The list of recommendations is presented in Annex 1). Moreover, it should be stressed that the assessments were not designed to evaluate the performance of the GM per se but rather to contribute to its overall appraisal through the assessment of its main modus operandi, i.e. Integrated Financing Strategies.

\(^7\) SO4: To mobilize resources to support implementation of the Convention through building effective partnerships between national and international actors.

\(^8\) OO5: Financing and technology transfer. To mobilize and improve the targeting and coordination of national, bilateral and multilateral financial and technological resources in order to increase their impact and effectiveness.
The individual assessments were structured around the OECD/DAC criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance, namely: the relevance, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and efficiency of the IFS processes.

For the purpose of the Synthesis Report, the assessment indicators developed for the country reports were further refined and streamlined into an assessment scale, ranging from unsatisfactory (1) to satisfactory (4), with the following intermediate increments: moderately unsatisfactory (2) and moderately satisfactory (3).

The assessors then placed each of the IFS processes on the ‘satisfactory’ scale based on the evidence gathered and the objective judgement of the assessors. Country focal points and GM programme managers were invited to comment on the scaled assessment results specific to the country.

The specific elements that the assessments sought to analyse and the scaled results are listed in Annex 2. (Country names were replaced by numbers in report’s tables to avoid specific country comparisons, but they are presented in Annex 2.)

In fact, although these grades convey a sense of ranking or evaluation, this is not their purpose. They purport rather to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the IFS process to guide the discussions on the continuous improvement of the process. The complete list of successes, examples, challenges and recommendations is presented in Annex 3.

9 http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,2340,en_2649_34435_2086550_1_1_1_1,00.html.
2. SYNTHESES OF THE IFS RESULTS AND IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

Early results and preliminary impact show that IFS processes are a positive contribution to the complex endeavour that is the mobilization of substantial financial resources for DLDD/SLM. In many instances, the IFS process has not yet reached a full cycle, in that the IFS is still being developed or an IIF has not yet been prepared. As a result, only preliminary data exist on the amounts mobilized as a result of the IFS processes. Monitoring of that information in coming years will be essential in that regard.

In the meantime, the IFS process can be assessed at several levels, with findings on strengths and weaknesses of the process in terms of relevance, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and efficiency.

The overall assessment of IFS indicates that the process is moderately satisfactory on average (see previous graph). (N.B. In the above and following graphs, the full horizontal line indicates the average).

2.1 RELEVANCE OF IFS PROCESS

The relevance criterion considers the extent to which the objectives of the IFS process are consistent with the UNCCD 10-Year Strategy, the priorities of the recipient country, and the GM’s mandate as evidenced in its COP-approved RBM framework. Relevance is also a function of stakeholder and partner engagement in the process.
Overall, the relevance of the IFS process was found to be moderately satisfactory to satisfactory.

The assessment also determined that the IFS process' relevance is satisfactory in its ability to take into account a) recipient country priorities; b) the UNCCD 10-Year Strategy and c) the GM's role as described in its RBM Framework.

In all instances, the alignment of the IFS process with the UNCCD 10-Year Strategy, most notably SO4 and OO5, was found to be satisfactory. The level of alignment with country needs as stated through national priorities, NAP, Country Programme was found to have been moderately satisfactory to satisfactory. The clarity and consistency of the IFS process with the GM's role as described in the RBM was found moderately satisfactory. This is the result of the discrepancy in the formulation of the IFS process objectives and those
contained in the RBM, which affects clarity. It does not however affect the consistency of IFS and RBM objectives.

The process' relevance is however often only moderately satisfactory when it comes to stakeholder and partner engagement, with a wide range of results.

All countries that were assessed have provided for at least some form of stakeholder consultation and participation in SLM decision-making processes stemming from the IFS, albeit at different levels, ranging from moderately satisfactory to satisfactory.

Many IFS were developed and validated by a number of relevant country stakeholders in the context of existing structures and taking into account the impact of SLM on various complementary sectors (agriculture, climate change, poverty reduction, etc.).

However, it has appeared that certain groups could have been more meaningfully targeted such as the private sector, women and youth. In particular, the private sector can be called upon to play a partnership role in projects at the local level but even more importantly, it can play an influential role as a land owner and steward. As such, the private sector can offer valuable perspectives on barriers to SLM efforts in the country and can provide leadership as an early adopter of SLM best practices.

Another important component of the relevance of the process is the extent to which partnerships with relevant development organizations were consistently and sufficiently explored and the extent to which the IFS process led to the development or consolidation of relevant partnerships with bilateral or international donors, development agencies or South-to-South Cooperation initiatives. The relevance of those efforts ranged from moderately unsatisfactory to several instances of satisfactory.
RECOMMENDATIONS

In a number of instances, IFS process could have been improved by formalizing and further refining the assessment of stakeholder groups to involve and establishing what messages should be communicated to them during the different phases of the process and what contribution was expected from them. This assessment may also have improved the selection of stakeholders invited to participate in IFS training. Such an assessment may also uncover what skills, tools and information would have been most needed in approaching and garnering buy-in from certain groups of stakeholders such as the planning/finance ministries and the private sector, for example.

Additional and more in-depth involvement of country stakeholders (local and national) and development partners would have reinforced the relevance of some processes.

1. **Stakeholder and partner engagement is key to the relevance of the IFS process.** In that regard, it is recommended that at the outset of an IFS process, the GM and the recipient country formalize the identification and mapping of relevant stakeholders and partners and detail a strategic engagement plan (to be adjusted as needed as the process evolves).

2. **The identification and mapping of relevant stakeholders should be sufficiently broad to include women, youth and the private sector (as land owner/steward and project partner).**

2.2 EFFECTIVENESS OF THE IFS PROCESS

The effectiveness criterion is a measure of the extent to which the objectives of an IFS process were achieved, or are likely to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

The IFS process ranks fairly high with regard to its overall effectiveness, oscillating between moderately satisfactory and satisfactory in all but one instance (see next graph).
Although the effectiveness of the IFS process with regards to resource mobilization specifically will need to be revisited as more IFS reach implementation stage, a majority of respondents consider that the processes have been useful at their current stage of development.

The IFS process’ effectiveness ranks as satisfactory in meeting agreed-upon recipient country - GM objectives laid out in cooperation agreements. The process is moderately satisfactory as an effective approach to design and implement an IIF. This latter caveat is based on the fact that in many instances it is too early to determine actual effectiveness in achieving a sustained financed IIF. The current trend suggests that the process will be effective in that regard. Indeed, the most advanced IFS in terms of implementation led to IIFs that offer a set of costed investment priorities and a detailed action and resource mobilization strategy. There is also evidence that the structured process of developing an IFS has improved the targeting and coordination of resources.

The effectiveness of the IFS approach in identifying and implementing innovative sources of financing to date has been moderately satisfactory in the countries where it has taken place. The GM worked with the Tropical Agricultural Research and Higher Education Center (CATIE) to develop and test a methodology and scorecard system to guide decision makers in selecting incentive and market-based mechanisms (IMBM) most suitable to their country, environment and site\textsuperscript{10}. Innovative financing mechanisms and sources have been identified

and others are being examined to combat DLDD, notably from the private sector, market-based mechanisms, collaborations with industry associations, foundations and civil society organizations as well as other financing mechanisms on related issues such as climate change adaptation and mitigation, biodiversity preservation, natural resource conservation and the reduction of hunger and poverty.

The actual involvement of key government officials from central ministries such as finance, planning, economic development/commerce and agriculture as well as the Focal Point responsible for the UNFCCC has proven to be a key factor in mainstreaming DLDD/SLM finance into central government decision-making processes. Champions from these ministries constitute important vectors for mainstreaming DLDD/SLM finance. In addition, they will in most instances be familiar with and privy to the country’s planning and investments policies and practices and constitute therefore a formidable conduit to influence them. These champions could also tap into a more varied network of stakeholders with expertise and interest in innovative financing. Identifying these champions would go a great length in forging the missing link necessary to fulfil the vision of substantial financial resources devoted to DLDD/SLM.

However, the buy-in of central ministry representatives has sometimes proven challenging to elicit from the perspective of the UNCCD Focal Point, given the often low level of awareness of the impact of SLM on country development.

Other factors having positively contributed both to the effectiveness and the efficiency of the IFS process in various countries include:

- High-level political commitment to the process;
- Commitment and availability of the National Focal Point;
- Strong planning of activities based on local capacity and available resources;
- Participation of national, local and regional actors and involved in SLM;
- Involvement of existing financial and technical partners working in the country;
- Establishment of a functional cross-sectoral working group to exchange knowledge and drive the process;
- Officially structuring the IFS as a permanent process;
- Synergies with other initiatives.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on evidence and analysis, the Assessors would make the following recommendations with a view to improving the effectiveness of IFS processes:

3. The identification of innovative sources of financing most suitable to the country, environment and site should be pursued, notably from the private sector, market-based mechanisms, collaborations with industry associations, foundations and civil society organizations as well as other financing mechanisms on related issues such as climate change adaptation and mitigation, biodiversity preservation, natural resource conservation and the reduction of hunger and poverty.

4. The effectiveness and impact of the IFS process would be further improved if the GM and the Focal Point were to go beyond the mere identification and passive involvement of government officials from central ministries (such as economic development, agriculture, planning) in the IFS process, to actually co-opt them to the process. Champions from these ministries constitute important vectors for mainstreaming DLDD/SLM finance. In addition, they will in most instances be familiar with and privy to the country’s planning and investments policies and practices and constitute therefore a formidable conduit to influence them. Identifying DLDD/SLM champions from these ministries would go a great length in forging the missing link necessary to fulfil the vision of substantial financial resources devoted to DLDD/SLM.

5. A compendium of best practices in successful innovative financing mechanisms and non-traditional partnerships for SLM should be made available to country Parties as part of a series of advocacy tools to approach central ministry representatives and raise awareness on the positive impact of SLM on country development.

2.3 IMPACT OF THE IFS PROCESS

The term “impact” denotes the positive and negative changes produced by the IFS process, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended, with regards to DLDD/SLM resource mobilization and governance, capacity and ownership.

The IFS process scores on average as moderately satisfactory with regard to its impact (see next graph).
**Resource mobilization.** Beyond its effectiveness in reaching the process objectives, the IFS process has had a positive impact that results in a moderately satisfactory rating in terms of resource mobilization. The same caveat as above applies, in that it is, in most instances, too early to assess the concrete impact of IFS on resource mobilization, but enabling conditions have been set in place and the 'trend' goes in the right direction. The impact of the IFS on resource mobilization per se will need to be revisited in the medium term for each of the countries assessed.
The diagnostics and stocktaking of the IFS process have indeed for the most part created a relevant body of knowledge necessary for identifying and mobilizing resources and measuring the impact of further resource mobilization:

- Analysis of national and international financial flows of current related activities for SLM allows for a baseline reference and for an improved coordination of activities related to SLM;
- Constraints and bottlenecks to SLM resource mobilization have been identified, leading in turn to reduced duplication of efforts and improved knowledge of efforts impacting SLM in other areas not under the purview of the Focal Point ministry;
- At minimum a sector-specific or region-specific economic valuation of land degradation was undertaken in almost all the countries, providing an instrumental tool for lobbying decision-makers in areas not traditionally related to SLM;
- Innovative funding sources and mechanisms have been identified, involving in many instances the private sector (private sector as influential land managers and owners and also through partnerships and corporate social responsibility at the project level), market-based mechanisms, climate change, biodiversity, payments for environmental services, food security and poverty and hunger alleviation;
- In some countries, the analysis of possible opportunities was based on a careful matching of existing donor projects whereas in others the approach seemed to stem from the identification of priorities combining economic development or local/social factors, which were then developed into projects;
- The more advanced IFS have led to an IIF which provides all actors with costed investment priorities and a detailed strategy for resource mobilization with lines of accountability for implementation;
- Some countries, such as Mali and Peru, have already identified and launched promising innovative projects even if the IIF is not finalized or adopted.

Tracking the evolution of SLM financing has proven to be a challenge in most, if not all, countries. Whereas the level of SLM financing and investments was often determined in the initial diagnostics, country respondents were unable to provide information on the evolution of SLM finance for subsequent years. The absence of information on financial flows hampers the ability for the country to determine whether any change is the result in
whole or in part of the IFS process, and whether adjustments are necessary to the IFS strategy.

The impact of IFS on DLDD/SLM governance, capacity and ownership has been very positive in some instances, with an overall score of moderately satisfactory.

**Governance.** The overall scoring is moderately satisfactory with regards to inter-sectoral coordination and the mainstreaming of DLDD/SLM in governmental decision-making processes and national development policies.

In a number of countries assessed, positive changes in governance structures have been significant and mutually reinforcing. Examples of such changes include:

- Identification, at the outset of the process, of sustainable land management (SLM) as a key tool to effectively meet broad development challenges, which include, inter alia food security, climate change and poverty reduction, leading to the immediate involvement of relevant ministries in the IFS approach;

- The sharing of a systemic view of the issues affecting SLM and of opportunities for incorporating SLM into existing and planned efforts through cross-sectoral dialogue; this helps move thinking from a silo-based planning perspective to a landscape view of SLM;

- The incorporation of the IFS approach with other institution-building efforts for SLM in general, such as the creation of the Inter-institutional Technical Group for SLM in Guatemala;
• The official adoption by the highest authorities (e.g. presidential decree) of the priorities for ongoing work to combat desertification, and/or of the mandate of the committee responsible for IFS implementation;

• The establishment of cabinet-level committee meetings once a month on a statutory basis;

• The creation of ad-hoc working groups to support the UNCCD focal unit;

• The creation of an independent committee, supported by external audit, to monitor the implementation progress of the IFS/IIF;

• The mainstreaming of SLM at the central government level with integration at the policy level, including into national development strategies;

• Transparent budget-making processes for DLDD/SLM;

• The referencing of DLDD in decision-maker briefing books;

• The participation of the focal point ministry in budget arbitration discussions.

In terms of SLM advocacy, it appears that it would be useful to go beyond mainstreaming efforts (which often focus on the inclusion of SLM in other policies by trying to raise the profile of SLM as a priority itself) to present SLM to decision-makers with evidence as to how SLM can be a positive contributing factor in supporting the achievement of stated country priorities such as economic development and poverty alleviation.

In terms of coordination, the assessors noted that in some instances, the linearity of the IFS process delayed the launch of inter-sectoral coordination mechanisms until after the diagnostics were conducted. It seems like this may have led to lost opportunities in knowledge exchange and in fostering momentum around the IFS and IIF.

**Capacity and knowledge.** In all the IFS processes assessed so far, DLDD/SLM knowledge and capacity has been reinforced, both generally and in terms of financing capacity specifically, leading to a scoring of moderately satisfactory. Overall, activities have notably led to an improved understanding of the extent of DLDD and the identification of priority areas and of the financial flows affected to SLM, from national and international sources.

Notable knowledge and capacity building outputs include:

• Information on the economic cost of land degradation, often leading to a refinement of sector-based methods;
• Sharing of available information on existing efforts and projects to combat DLDD and capturing of best practices through standing inter-sectoral working groups on SLM relying on country technical expertise;

• Creation of various technical groups supporting SLM finance, SLM technical knowledge and National Strategy implementation;

• The publication and dissemination of general awareness information on SLM;

• Organization of regional induction courses on climate change by the UNCCD focal point;

• Planned capture of traditional and scientific knowledge on indirect factors of drought, reinforcing the linkages with climate change and biological diversity;

• Civil society workshops to reinforce participation.

A strong majority of questionnaire respondents noted an increase of in-country capacity to design an IFS, even if additional GM support would in most cases still be required to carry out the process as such. In particular, assessment feedback showed that although the workshops on Designing Integrated Financing Strategies (DIFS) were very useful in providing understanding of the process, the team developing and implementing the IFS may have not received sufficient targeted and sustained capacity support to move forward.

In addition to the DIFS workshops at the outset of the processes, capacity to design an IFS in particular has been assured through the organization of several regional knowledge exchange activities by the GM to share IFS process experiences. Capacity to develop project proposals for financing has also increased. In one country, for example, capacity-building activities for 2012 included elaborating proposals to replicate a successful SLM Project in three other regions and to develop and disseminate training materials on best practices for SLM.

It has been suggested that the GM continue to provide capacity building support throughout the IFS/IIF process, not only at the outset. This is especially important from the assessors’ perspective given that IFS implementation involves cross-sectoral initiatives that are often challenging to administer in silo-based environments. Certain aspects of this support could also be provided by other development partners working in the country and who also have experience in rolling out cross-sectoral approaches.

**Stakeholders and Partners.** The overall rating for stakeholder coordination and ownership is moderately satisfactory. This seems to be due to the fact that although stakeholders may have been consulted at the outset and in the validation of the IFS, their involvement has not yet been mainstreamed into governance processes. Changes in governance will play a key
role in determining the level of country ownership. In one instance, albeit a continued commitment on behalf of government and key stakeholders, the lack of structuring governance measures to date have made the level of ownership of the process difficult to evaluate in particular.

The suggested formalizing of the identification and mapping of potential stakeholders at the outset and detailing of a sustained engagement plan as suggested in section 2.1, may contribute to improving ownership.

RECOMMENDATIONS

6. a) In order to improve IFS impact on resource mobilization (and its monitoring), the assessors are of the opinion that each IFS process should start with a baseline analysis of current SLM financing and investments in the country (based on a set of agreed definitions of what SLM investments consist of, appropriate indicators, and data sources). This baseline should be updated on a yearly basis to assess trends in SLM financing. This would allow for an improved and agreed upon quantitative assessment of SLM financial flows and provide input into the on-going actualization and adjustments to be made to the IFS as a permanent country process. The yearly updates should also qualitatively assess whether any change in SLM finances is the result of the IFS process (in whole or in part). This assessment of actual SLM investments should also serve to refocus or intensify IFS efforts where necessary. These analyses should therefore be budgeted and funded as an integral part of the IFS process. Such analyses would also prove useful for substantiating the countries’ financial reports to the UNCCD COP.

b) Furthermore, whereas the IFS/IIF implementation should be monitored on a continuous basis, these monitoring processes should be designed to support reporting tasks to PRAIS and with regards to the NAPs.

7. a) The analyses of financial flows, economic value of land and cost of land degradation and the identification of innovative funding sources (including private sector, CC, CBD) are core outputs necessary as decision-making tools and should therefore be part of each IFS process.

b) Advocacy for best practices to mainstream SLM into existing national/local climate and biodiversity-related projects should also be explored as a means of increasing the impact of existing funding in these areas on SLM.

8. It also appears that the impact of an IFS on DLDD/SLM governance is strengthened when a multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder IFS coordination mechanism is set up at the outset of the process (versus waiting for the input of analytical reports) and
built on existing structures when possible. The GM and/or development partners should support such a mechanism throughout the process, notably through the appointment of an in-country consultant to act as convenor/secretary to the process. This mechanism is complementary to the above recommendation on the co-opting of champions from key ministries and should not replace it.

9. In terms of SLM advocacy to decision-makers, although raising the profile of SLM as a priority has been a useful approach, a complementary perspective would be to present decision-makers with evidence as to how SLM can be a positive contributing factor in supporting the achievement of other stated country priorities such as poverty alleviation and economic development.

10. In the assessors’ opinion, the IFS process design could be improved from the following perspectives with regards to knowledge and capacity building:

   a) Pursuing DIFS capacity building throughout the process, not only at the beginning, and allowing for support to the IFS team during the different stages of the process and taking into account the usual shifts that occur in persons involved over time;

   b) Identifying development partners' strengths and availability to jointly support the IFS/IIF process in a complementary fashion through to implementation, based on identified country needs;

   c) Ensuring that the IFS process includes a thorough strategy to maximize communication and impact of findings and best practices.

2.4 SUSTAINABILITY OF THE IFS PROCESS

The sustainability criterion aims to assess whether or not the benefits of the IFS process are likely to continue after GM support has been withdrawn. It includes an assessment of the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks beyond the initial phases of the IFS.

Sustainability of the IFS process scores as moderately satisfactory to satisfactory in most instances.
The various IFS have at a minimum achieved their goal of laying down a road map for improved governance of SLM financing. There is some concern that the country teams responsible for IFS implementation have sufficient leadership and support to carry out the sustained cross-silo consultation and collaboration needed to implement the roadmap. At the country level, efforts should be maintained so that cross-sectoral consultation habits developed during the IFS’ development do not return to the old ways because of sectoral responsibilities at the time of operational implementation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

11. Particular support and capacity building on managing work across silos and with competing deadlines and resources need to be quickly provided for to support the implementation of new governance processes – possibly with the support of other development partners having this type of expertise.

12. To accomplish the broad scope of knowledge and capacity-building activities outlined in all the IFS documents, emphasis will need to be placed on clarifying the accountability and timelines for the IFS main activities.

(4. & 8.) The sustainability of the IFS process would benefit directly from two of the above-mentioned recommendations: co-opting key officials from central ministries and establishing a supported coordination mechanism.

13. The GM or development partners should also identify a way to continue the services of a country-based consultant to act as an advisor to the most relevant ministry driving the process and to provide input and follow-through into inter-ministerial consultations.
2.5 EFFICIENCY OF THE IFS PROCESS

Efficiency measures the outputs in relation to the inputs. In other words, efficiency addresses how the various activities have transformed available resources into the intended results, in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness.

The IFS process’ efficiency in converting inputs (resources) into outputs (results) ranges from moderately unsatisfactory to moderately satisfactory, with about half of the countries assessed in each category.

Absorption capacity, assumptions and risk assessment. Overall, the ability of the IFS process to take into account the institutional and managerial country absorption capacity is moderately satisfactory. Most respondents were of the opinion that project risks have been considered, but the results of that assessment are rarely put down on paper.

Timeliness of the process. The efficiency of the process in terms of timeliness has been described as problematic in many instances. The length of time required to conduct the diagnostics and gap analyses was deemed too long before concrete steps were taken in terms of enabling governance conditions or resource mobilization.

This being said, in a number of instances, some actors have noted that the delays in the process have had the benefit of giving actors time to become involved in conversations about SLM priorities and to exchange knowledge around a shared framework, thus beginning the transition in organizational culture needed to foster ownership of SLM finance.
If the process is organized in a multi-track fashion, allowing for concrete deliverables even as other more strategic actions are carried out, a longer process may also better coincide with local absorption capacity. For example, in some instances, SLM was integrated into development policies and harmonized into commercial activities even before the final adoption of the IFS/IIF.

**Government performance as a partner.** A significant contributing factor to the efficiency of the IFS process is the contribution of the Government to IFS design, execution, monitoring and reporting, supervision and implementation, and evaluation in its expected role and responsibilities within the IFS life cycle. It has been noted that if there is not a sustained and real interest and involvement of the country Party as a full partner in the IFS process, the efficiency and effectiveness of the process will be very limited. Recommendations #4 and #8 stem from such country ownership.

**GM performance as a partner.** The overall feedback received from respondents was satisfactory as to GM delivering on its partner engagements. However country Parties insisted on the importance of maintaining GM support through to IFS implementation (versus only design). In addition, in reviewing the documentation made available to the assessors, it was noted that efficiency might be further improved by reinforcing project management processes (risk analysis, quality assurance and consignment of project milestones allowing to recreate the process’ critical path).

**Monitoring and evaluation.** The IFS was designed as a permanent process - to be planned, executed, regularly assessed, and where necessary adapted - to ensure it is delivering the expected results. A feedback mechanism, using a documented paper trail, would ensure that the analysis remains up to date, and that adjustments are made periodically instead of starting the entire process over every few years. From the assessors’ perspective, assigning a dedicated resource person to monitoring and updating the IFS in such a manner would improve the efficiency of the limited resources available to the ongoing process’ maintenance.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

14. From the assessors’ point of view, it appears that the efficiency could be improved by conducting a formal analysis and duly considering IFS process risks and assumptions at the outset and revisiting them throughout the process in order to ensure that the process responds and adapts to the evolving environment.

15. The ‘time’ efficiency of the IFS process could be improved --without losing the added-value of a longer timeframe when a transformational change is required-- by adopting a multi-track approach where, after an initial snapshot is taken of
SLM-related government processes, strategies and plans that need to be influenced to mainstream SLM, a multiple-track approach is initiated:

a) One track should focus on building the longer-term outcomes of the process (diagnostics and gap analysis, involvement of stakeholders and partners, transformational change in DLDD/SLM governance) that will lead to sustained benefits for SLM finance.

b) At the same time, another track should focus on targeted activities aimed at delivering short-term results based on promising sector strategies or targeted (innovative) investment opportunities and institutional reinforcement related to SLM-governance, also with GM support as needed.

c) All the while, the period allotted for conducting diagnostic studies should be somewhat shortened (without excluding the possibility of further technical studies) to not last over six months.

16. A sustained real interest and involvement of the country Party is a key factor to be taken into account when considering the opportunity of conducting an IFS process in a given country.

17. From an operational perspective, the GM’s support should extend to key needs identified by the Country for IFS implementation (versus only design).

18. GM performance could also be further improved by reinforcing project management processes.

19. In order to improve the efficiency of resources available for the ongoing maintenance of the IFS, a dedicated person could be assigned to ensure that a feedback mechanism – supported by a documented paper trail – is in place to monitor and adjust the IFS periodically instead of repeating the entire IFS development process every few years.
3. COMPATIBILITY OF FINDINGS WITH THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE STRATEGY

By Decision 3/COP.8, the UNCCD COP decided that an independent mid-term evaluation of the 10-Year Strategy be undertaken and presented at COP 11. By Decision 12/COP.10, the COP adopted the terms of reference for the evaluation, and decided to establish an ad hoc Inter-sessional Working Group (IWG) to prepare related recommendations under the direction of the Bureau of the COP.

The IWG held its second meeting from 31 October to 3 November 2012. In this meeting, the group noted that conducting the evaluation according to the terms of reference requires a significant amount of background information; most of which is contained in the reports submitted through the PRAIS and the background documents that were defined in the terms of reference for the IWG. In addition, the IWG decided to conduct an online survey to complement the existing material through a questionnaire, which was sent to all UNCCD National Focal Points.

The Survey contained questions regarding the Integrated Financing Strategy/Integrated Investment Framework process. Ten countries having initiated an IFS process answered the Survey. These countries were: Bhutan, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ghana, Lebanon, Lesotho, Mexico, Mozambique, Niger and Panama.

When comparing the responses to the IWG Survey by the 10 countries having completed an IFS process with the nine having participated in the GM IFS assessment, there is no overlap between countries having responded, yet the results are very similar.
The IFS Assessment did not measure the support provided by the GM per se. With regards to the differing responses on the Sustainability criteria, the Assessors point to the difference in question wording as the reason behind the divergence. The IFS Assessment Questionnaire was framed more loosely than the IWG Survey, the former asking whether the process had initiated or was likely to initiate lasting changes in the country, whereas the latter only considered transformational change having taken place:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IWG Survey</th>
<th>IFS Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Highly relevant process</td>
<td>• Highly relevant process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alignment of IFS with Strategy</td>
<td>• Alignment of IFS with Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Useful to improve decision-making</td>
<td>• Useful to improve governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good support provided by GM</td>
<td>• Not assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor sustainability of the process</td>
<td>• Sustainability varies widely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase in SLM resources rated neutral to positive</td>
<td>• Mobilization of resources rated as moderately satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NAP alignment varies widely</td>
<td>• NAP alignment moderately satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

As a result of IFS processes, countries now have more harmonized sets of SLM policies and plans that are aligned with the UNCCD 10-Year Strategy and offer cohesive orientations, leading directly or indirectly to updated and aligned NAPs and in some instances, to national strategies to combat desertification. IFS processes also led to an increased political awareness of SLM issues and the development of a useful body of knowledge that was not previously available.

Given the current stages of IFS implementation, and limited national monitoring of SLM investments, only scarce and preliminary data exist on the amounts mobilized as a result of the IFS processes. However, a generally positive impact on the country environment for SLM financing can already be felt.

The process of developing an IFS has in itself improved the targeting and coordination of resources. Innovative financing mechanisms and sources have been identified and others are being examined to combat DLDD, notably from the private sector, market-based mechanisms, collaborations with industry associations, foundations and civil society organizations as well as other financing mechanisms on related issues such as climate change adaptation and mitigation, biodiversity preservation, natural resource conservation and the reduction of hunger and poverty.
**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATIE</td>
<td>Tropical Agricultural Research and Higher Education Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>United Nations Convention on Biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLP</td>
<td>Core Learning Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Conference of the Parties to the UNCCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIC</td>
<td>Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil society organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST</td>
<td>Committee on Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFS</td>
<td>Designing Integrated Financing Strategies (workshop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLDD</td>
<td>Desertification, Land Degradation and Drought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>Global Environment Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Development Cooperation Agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>Global Mechanism of the UNCCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDB</td>
<td>International Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFS</td>
<td>Integrated Financing Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIF</td>
<td>Integrated Investment Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMBM</td>
<td>Incentive and Market-Based Mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWG</td>
<td>Intersessional Working Group on the mid-term evaluation of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNCCD 10-Year Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAP</td>
<td>National Action Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFP</td>
<td>National Focal Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD/DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAIS</td>
<td>Performance Review and Assessment of Implementation System (of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the UNCCD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBM</td>
<td>Results-Based Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIAM</td>
<td>Results and Impact Assessment Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLM</td>
<td>Sustainable Land Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
<td><strong>10-year Strategic Plan and Framework (2008-2018) to enhance the implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNCCD</strong></td>
<td>United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNFCCC</strong></td>
<td>United Nations Framework to Combat Climate Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 1 – RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Stakeholder and partner engagement is key to the relevance of the IFS process. In that regard, it is recommended that at the outset of an IFS process, the GM and the recipient country formalize the identification and mapping of relevant stakeholders and partners and detail a strategic engagement plan (to be adjusted as needed as the process evolves).

2. The identification and mapping of relevant stakeholders should be sufficiently broad to include women, youth and the private sector (as land owner/steward and project partner).

3. The identification of innovative sources of financing most suitable to the country, environment and site should be pursued, notably from the private sector, market-based mechanisms, collaborations with industry associations, foundations and civil society organizations as well as other financing mechanisms on related issues such as climate change adaptation and mitigation, biodiversity preservation, natural resource conservation and the reduction of hunger and poverty.

4. From the assessors’ standpoint, the effectiveness and impact of the IFS process would be further improved if the GM and the Focal Point were to go beyond the mere identification and involvement of government officials from central ministries (such as economic development, agriculture, planning) in the IFS process, to actually co-opt them to the process. Champions from these ministries constitute important vectors for mainstreaming DLDD/SLM finance. In addition, they will in most instances be familiar with and privy to the country’s planning and investments policies and practices and constitute therefore a formidable conduit to influence them. Identifying DLDD/SLM champions from these ministries would go a great length in forging the missing link necessary to fulfil the vision of substantial financial resources devoted to DLDD/SLM.

5. A compendium of best practices in successful innovative financing mechanisms and non-traditional partnerships for SLM should be made available to country Parties as part of a series of advocacy tools to approach central ministry representatives and raise awareness on the positive impact of SLM on country development.

6. a) In order to improve IFS impact on resource mobilization (and its monitoring), the assessors are of the opinion that each IFS process should start with a baseline analysis of current SLM financing and investments in the country (based on a set of agreed definitions of what SLM investments consist of, appropriate indicators, and data sources). This baseline should be updated on a yearly basis to assess trends in SLM financing. This would allow for an improved and agreed upon quantitative assessment of SLM financial flows and provide input into the on-going actualization and adjustments to be made to the IFS as a permanent country process. The yearly updates should also qualitatively assess whether any change in SLM finances is the result of the IFS process (in whole or in part). This assessment of actual SLM investments should also serve to refocus or intensify IFS efforts where necessary.
These analyses should therefore be budgeted and funded as an integral part of the IFS process. Such analyses would also prove useful for substantiating the countries’ financial reports to the UNCCD COP.

b) Furthermore, whereas the IFS/IIF implementation should be monitored on a continuous basis, these monitoring processes should be designed to support reporting tasks to PRAIS and with regards to the NAPs.

7. a) The analyses of financial flows, economic value of land and cost of land degradation and the identification of innovative funding sources (including private sector, CC, CBD) are all core outputs necessary as decision-making tools and should therefore be part of each IFS process.

b) Advocacy for best practices to mainstream SLM into existing national/local climate and biodiversity-related projects should also be explored as a means of increasing the impact on SLM of existing funding in these areas.

8. It also appears that the impact of an IFS on DLDD/SLM governance is strengthened when a multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder IFS coordination mechanism is set up at the outset of the process (versus waiting for the input of analytical reports) and built on existing structures when possible. The GM and/or development partners should support such a mechanism throughout the process, notably through the appointment of an in-country consultant to act as secretary to the process. This mechanism is complementary to the above recommendation on the co-opting of champions from key ministries and should not replace it.

9. In terms of SLM advocacy to decision-makers, although raising the profile of SLM as a priority has been a useful approach, a complementary perspective would be to present decision-makers with evidence as to how SLM can be a positive contributing factor in supporting the achievement of other stated country priorities such as poverty alleviation and economic development.

10. The IFS process design could be improved from the following perspectives with regards to knowledge and capacity building:

a) Pursuing DIFS capacity building throughout the process, not only at the beginning, and allowing for support to the IFS team during the different stages of the process and taking into account the usual shifts that occur in persons involved over time;
b) Identifying development partners' strengths and availability to jointly support the IFS/IIF process in a complementary fashion through implementation, based on identified country needs;

c) Ensuring that the IFS process includes a thorough strategy to maximize communication and impact of findings and best practices.

11. Particular support and capacity building on managing work across silos and with competing deadlines and resources need to be quickly provided for to support the implementation of new governance processes – possibly with the support of other development partners having this type of expertise.

12. To accomplish the broad scope of knowledge and capacity-building activities outlined in all the IFS documents, emphasis will need to be placed on clarifying the accountability and timelines for the IFS main activities.

13. The GM or development partners should also identify a way to continue the services of a country-based consultant to act as an advisor to the most relevant ministry driving the process and to provide input and follow-through into inter-ministerial consultations.

14. From the assessors’ point of view, it appears that the efficiency could be improved by conducting a formal analysis and duly considering IFS process risks and assumptions at the outset and revisiting them throughout the process in order to ensure that the process responds and adapts to the evolving environment.

15. The ‘time’ efficiency of the IFS process could be improved --without losing the added-value of a longer timeframe when a transformational change is required-- by adopting a multi-track approach where, after an initial snapshot is taken of SLM-related government processes, strategies and plans that need to be influenced to mainstream SLM, a multiple-track approach is initiated:

a) One track should focus on building the longer-term outcomes of the process (diagnostics and gap analysis, involvement of stakeholders and partners, transformational change in DLDD/SLM governance) that will lead to sustained benefits for SLM finance.

b) At the same time, another track should focus on targeted activities aimed at delivering short-term results based on promising sector strategies or targeted (innovative) investment opportunities and institutional reinforcement related to SLM-governance, also with GM support as needed.

c) All the while, the period allotted for conducting diagnostic studies should be somewhat shortened (without excluding the possibility of further technical studies) to not last over six months.
16. A sustained real interest and involvement of the country Party is a key factor to be taken into account when considering the opportunity of conducting an IFS process in a given country.

17. From an operational perspective, the GM’s support should extend to key needs identified by the Country for IFS implementation (versus only design).

18. GM performance could also be further improved by reinforcing project management processes.

19. In order to improve the efficiency of resources available for the ongoing maintenance of the IFS, a dedicated person could be assigned to ensure that a feedback mechanism – supported by a documented paper trail – is in place to monitor and adjust the IFS periodically instead of repeating the entire IFS development process every few years.
ANNEX 2 – ASSESSMENT CHART

See next pages.
Ratings are based on available evidence and the objective judgement of the evaluators: 1-Unsatisfactory; 2-Moderately unsatisfactory; 3-Moderately satisfactory; 4-Satisfactory
* indicates a preliminary rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEVANCE of IFS process</th>
<th>Cambodia</th>
<th>Cameroun</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>Mali</th>
<th>Peru</th>
<th>Tanzania</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
<th>Zambia</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, institutional priorities, and partner and donor policies.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country needs, objectives and logical framework (RBM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which stated objectives in IFS-related documents are aligned with the UNCCD 10-year strategy, in particular Operational Objective 5?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which stated objectives in IFS-related documents, correctly address the identified problems and needs of the country (alignment with stated national priorities, NAP, Country Programme)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The clarity and consistency of the IFS process stated objectives and related results-based management (RBM) logical framework</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELEVANCE - Consistency with country needs / UNCCD 10-YS / GM RBM</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement of stakeholders and partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key stakeholders and contributors to the IFS process were adequately informed, consulted and involved throughout the IFS process. The results of the consultations were duly considered during the design and implementation of the IFS process</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engagement of stakeholders and partners

Key stakeholders and contributors to the IFS process were adequately informed, consulted and involved throughout the IFS process. The results of the consultations were duly considered during the design and implementation of the IFS process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>RELEVANCE</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The extent to which the IFS process led to the development or consolidation of relevant partnerships with bilateral or international donors, development agencies or South-to-South Cooperation initiatives.

The extent to which the IFS’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

The extent to which the IFS process-related objectives and results agreed upon between the GM and the country were achieved / are likely to be achieved.

The extent to which the IFS process has led to the identification and/or implementation of innovative financing mechanisms for DLDD/SLM.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT of IFS process</th>
<th>Cambodia</th>
<th>Cameroun</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>Mali</th>
<th>Peru</th>
<th>Tanzania</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
<th>Zambia</th>
<th>All Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The term “impact” means the positive and negative changes produced by the IFS process, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLDD/SLM resource mobilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the IFS process led / is likely to lead to the mobilization/channeling of financial and/or technological resources for DLDD/SLM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT - DLDD/SLM resource mobilization</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLDD/SLM governance, capacity, ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the IFS process led to improved DLDD/SLM governance, intersectoral coordination, mainstreaming of DLDD/SLM in governmental decision-making processes and national development policies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the IFS process has led to improved coordination with and among local stakeholders and groups (e.g. local government, civil society, private sector)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the IFS process led to increased knowledge and capacity on DLDD/SLM and DLDD/SLM finance of relevant state and non-state actors and extent to which economic studies (e.g. economic valuation of land, financial flow analysis) are available for improved decisionmaking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the IFS process led to an increased level of ownership of the IFS process by key state and non-state actors and intended beneficiaries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact - DLDD/SLM governance, capacity, ownership</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY of IFS process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sustainability criterion is concerned with measuring whether or not the benefits of the IFS process are likely to continue after GM support has been withdrawn. It includes an assessment of the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks beyond the initial IFS phases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which appropriate DLDD/SLM governance (including political support, basic institutional arrangements, clearly defined responsibilities, mainstreaming of DLDD/SLM in decisional processes, relevant coordination mechanisms with and among local authorities or groups) is likely to continue after GM support has been withdrawn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which stakeholders, partners and target groups' ownership and involvement in DLDD/SLM processes and financing is likely to continue after GM support has been withdrawn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EFFICIENCY** of IFS process

- Efficiency measures the outputs — qualitative and quantitative — in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term that signifies that the process uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results.

- Assumptions and risks were duly identified and taken into account.

- The extent to which the objectives of the IFS process were achieved in an appropriate timeframe.

- The extent to which the cost of the IFS to date is justified by the results achieved.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT**
### ANNEX 3 – KEY SUCCESS FACTORS, EXAMPLES, CHALLENGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**IFS Process - Key Success Factors and Selected Examples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Success Factors</th>
<th>Selected Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Government leadership and ownership                           | **Cameroon**: Prime Minister created the *Comité national de Coordination* and adopted the IFS  
**Guatemala**: Technical Inter-Institutional Group (GTI) includes Secretariat of the Presidency and mandate adopted by decree; IFS adopted by decree; Ministerial support for creation of UNIDESEQ and GTI. Also, SLM has been mainstreamed into several plans and programs (climate, science, food, etc.)  
**Mali**: Political leadership is the main factor having positively influenced the success of the process to date  
**Vietnam**: SLM priorities mainstreamed into the Ninh Thuan Master Plan, and into both the Ninh Thuan and Binh Thuan Five-Year Socio-Economic Development Plans (SEDPs) |
| Co-opting senior officials from central ministries            | **Cameroon**: Sectoral ministries and development partners concerted on process before IFS process launch  
**Cameroon**: Involvement of central ministries in *Comité National de Coordination*  
**Guatemala**: EFN further created the *Comisión Delegada de Gobierno para la Desertificación y la Sequía*, presided by MARN and composed of the Ministers of Public Finance, MAGA and the Secretary of SEGEPLAN; meets once a month on a statutory basis |
| National multi-sectoral/stakeholder coordination mechanism chaired by senior official | **Cameroon**: *Comité National de Coordination* by decree of the PM  
**Ethiopia**: National committee for SLM chaired by minister of MoARD  
**Guatemala**: Technical InterInstitutional Group for IFS implementation (relevant central ministries, focal points, research institutions, CSOs, development agencies, local level...) mandate adopted by government decree  
**Mali**: Interministerial Committee for SLM comprised of 11 ministries and consultative committee on SLM comprised of 40 different groups/entities, |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Success Factors</th>
<th>Selected Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>these two are supported by a Secretariat</td>
<td><strong>Vietnam</strong>: national level: establishment of the National Coordination Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Technical review teams supporting Focal Point/SLM institution/coordination mechanism** | **Cambodia**: Recent creation of a Technical Review Team (TRT) by MAFF to steer the elaboration of the NAP  
**Ethiopia**: Technical Committee feeds the National SLM Platform chaired by Minister of MoARD  
**Guatemala**: EFN provides for creation of Technical Committee to support the GTI  
**Mali**: Technical Team of 9 structures mandated to develop the IIF  
**Peru**: Comité Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología para la Lucha contra la Desertificación y Sequía, a network of professional specialists on DDLD established to advise on the activities of the National Focal Point and CONALDES; plus a Technical Group for the elaboration of the National Strategy and the actualization of the NAP and a Financing Technical Group  
**Vietnam**: Establishment at the national level of the Science and Technology Advisory Group |
| **Support in the form of an in-country consultant**     | **Cameroun**: 2 local consultants hired to support process and IFS  
**Guatemala**: Hiring of a national consultant to develop IFS  
**Mali**: Hiring of national consultant to finalize the CSI-GDT  
**Vietnam**: Hiring of a national consultant to support the IFS process and act as a bridge between central government and provinces |
| **Synergies with CBD/UNFCCC – Engaging other Focal Points, notably in multi-sectoral coordination mechanism** | **Guatemala**: Focal Points for CC and Biodiversity on inter-institutional technical committee (GTI)  
**Cameroun**: The IFS plans for the addition of the CC focal point to the Coordinating National Committee |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Success Factors</th>
<th>Selected Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Donor and development partners alignment | **Cambodia**: Collaboration with UNDP with support from IFAD  
**Guatemala**: Close collaboration with FAO and UNDP  
**Mali**: A group on SLM has been constituted among technical and financial partners to support the process  
**Peru**: FAO/GM partnership, with financial backing from the Government of Spain, and the endorsement of the Focal Point and CONALDES; GM member of the Green Table where agencies interact to harmonize  
**Ethiopia**: Organization of a Donors’ Conference to discuss the Strategic Investment Framework and to commit and align technical and financial resources for its implementation |
| GM’s involvement in existing platform (e.g. TerrAfrica) | **Ethiopia**: contribution within the framework of TerrAfrica  
**Mali**: each partner contributing according to Code of Conduct and cross-collaborations on initiatives with each development partner (GIZ on climate proofing, WB, etc.) |
| Identification of innovative financing mechanisms/identification of financing opportunities specific to local and regional level | **Cambodia**: PES and REDD implementation in draft IFS  
**Cameroun**: Planned in IFS: PES, CC, ecolabels, etc.  
**Guatemala**: Successful experience in Chorti region in attracting funding from local cooperation agencies and climate financing as well as through PINFOR and PINPEP which expand informal financing modalities  
**Mali**: Identification of Commerce and CSOs as main entry points for CC/SLM finance, starting by the gum arabic sector strategy, and a diagnostic study on integration of commerce; identification of local funds through the *Agence Nationale d’Investissements des Collectivités Territoriales*; climate change also via SREP and FASTART programs; climate proofing pilots with GIZ  
**Peru**: Identification of the private sector and of public-private partnerships as innovative funding sources; development of sources proper/adapted to regional/local level in Piura, Apurímac and Moquegua and being replicated  
**Tanzania**: Identification of current & future projects complementing the NAP and NAPA with financing from traditional and non-traditional sources |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Success Factors</th>
<th>Selected Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Establishing a multi-track approach for IFS activities | **Guatemala:** Study on land degradation conducted while EFN implementation in progress; allowed for short-term and long-term deliverables in parallel  
**Mali:** Integration of SLM in various national policies even if IFS has not begun implementation: the CSCRP (growth & poverty reduction), National Environment Protection Policy, PAPAM (support to agricultural productivity), PNISA (agriculture investment), *Matrice d'action du Cadre intégré renforcé*  
**Peru:** Regional projects and initiatives moved forward concurrently to institution building of Ministry of Environment and IFS development |
| Stocktaking/diagnostic studies | **Cambodia:** Aide for Trade for agriculture  
**Cameroun:** 6 studies (cost of inaction, innovative financing, governance, financial flows, etc)  
**Mali:** More than 10 diagnostic studies undertaken  
**Peru:** Study of the potential for biotrade; Financial flows; National Strategy provides for transfer of traditional and scientific knowledge on indirect factors of DLDD & their linkages with climate & biodiversity; national inventory of climate adaptation & risk; surveillance system for DLDD  
**Tanzania:** Studies on the linkages between CC&SLM; Aid for Trade for Agriculture and SLM; IMBMs for SLM; land valuation; financial diagnostics  
**Zambia:** Five stocktaking studies including on economic valuation of land; CC & SLM; IMBMs; Trade & SLM |
| Economic valuation of land | **Cambodia:** Valuation of land in the Cardamom mountains  
**Cameroun:** Cost of inaction in SLM  
**Peru:** Economic valuation of land conducted and now being updated in the Piura region with input from 3 ministries  
**Tanzania:** Economic valuation of land and ecosystem services in collaboration with SEI [but will need be refined]  
**Zambia:** Study on the economic valuation of land by the University of Zambia |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Success Factors</th>
<th>Selected Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Engagement of non-state actors / beneficiaries, formal mapping of actors and engagement strategy | **Cameroun**: Strong involvement of local communities through regional workshops in the 3 NAP priority areas  
**Zambia**: Meeting organized with private sector representatives as part of the IFS design process in order to discuss barriers and incentives to SLM from their perspective as land owners and stewards  
**Ethiopia**: Establishment of regional and local SLM platforms; Champions at the Woreda level were designated by the Federal level representatives and provided with strong technical support  
**Guatemala**: EFN process actively involved non-state actors such as National Forest Institute, National Council of Climate Change (integrated by NGOs), Universities, Development Councils and the private sector, kept them informed by 2-way communication channel throughout process  
**Mali**: Several capacity-building workshops for CSOs were organized in the context of the process; participation of civil society and private sector in the process, in particular, presence on the *Equipe Technique* of several ONG by the SECO-ONG and the private sector and the *Haut conseil des collectivités*  
**Peru**: Involvement included 15 entities of CONALDES, 6 regional governments, environmental commissions of 3 zones, and RIOD which represents 40 NGOs; 25 workshops held throughout process; IFS calls for a Communications Strategy to accompany implementation |
| South-South Cooperation / Capturing and replicating best practices in IFS development | **Cameroun**: Involvement in COMIFAC, sharing of knowledge at COP10 & at 2012 workshop for African journalists  
**Mali**: Participation in 6 regional knowledge & capacity sharing workshops; case study; participation at COP9 and COP10  
**Peru**: Coordinator of the UNCCD Regional Thematic Network on Traditional Knowledge (TPN5); a party to the Sub-Regional Action Programme on the Puna Americana (high plateau) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Success Factors</th>
<th>Selected Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity-building on SLM finance useful to focal point</td>
<td><strong>Cameroun</strong>: 3 capacity building workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Guatemala</strong>: Participation of 5 country representatives in a 5-day GM sponsored workshop in Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mali</strong>: <em>Équipe Technique</em> now has IFS design capacities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Peru</strong>: Focal Point organized Climate Change induction courses at regional level, introducing the IFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tanzania</strong>: IMBM workshop organized with CATIE in January 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IFS Process Key Challenges and Synthesis Report Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Challenges</th>
<th>Key Recommendations of the Synthesis Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DLDD/SLM not a country priority / not on the policy agenda / weak national capacity</td>
<td>#4. Co-opt government officials from central ministries as DLDD/SLM champions (vs. simple identification or passive involvement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity-building on SLM finance less useful to finance-oriented ministries</td>
<td>#5. Make a compendium of best practices in successful innovative financing mechanisms and non-traditional partnerships for SLM available to country Parties as part of a series of advocacy tools to approach central ministry representatives and raise awareness on the positive impact of SLM on country development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited influence of UNCCD focal point in centralized budget processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making in silos / mainstreaming DLDD/SLM</td>
<td>#8. Set up a multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder IFS coordination mechanism at the outset of the process; That this mechanism be supported by the GM and/or development partners throughout IFS development/ implementation, notably through the appointment of an in-country consultant to act as secretary to the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited resources of UNCCD focal point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing process from GM Headquarters</td>
<td>#11. Quickly provide for particular support and capacity building on managing work across silos and with competing deadlines and resources to support the implementation of new governance processes – possibly with the support of other development partners having this type of expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging other Conventions / GEF</td>
<td>#12. Clarify the accountability and timelines for the IFS main activities where these have been left vague.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak engagement from development partners in IFS process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapidly identifying concrete opportunities for SLM financing</td>
<td>#1. At the outset of an IFS process, formalize the identification and mapping of relevant stakeholders and partners and detail a strategic engagement plan (to be adjusted as needed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#10b. Identify development partners' strengths and availability to jointly support the IFS/IIF process in a complementary fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#6. Start IFS process with a baseline analysis of current SLM financing and investments in the country, to be updated on a yearly basis to assess trends in SLM financing and to adjust the IFS as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#7. The analyses of financial flows, economic value of land and cost of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Challenges</td>
<td>Key Recommendations of the Synthesis Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Working in a linear approach through the stock-taking and IFS development    | #15. Begin process with an initial snapshot of SLM-related government processes, strategies and plans that need to be influenced to mainstream SLM; Then adopt a multi-track approach where:  
  
  #15c) The period for diagnostic studies is shortened to not more than six months (without excluding the possibility of further studies).  
  
  #15a) One track focuses on building the longer-term outcomes of the process (diagnostics and gap analysis, involvement of stakeholders and partners, transformational change in DLDD/SLM governance) leading to sustained benefits for SLM finance.  
  
  #15b) Another track focuses on targeted activities delivering short-term results based on promising sector strategies or targeted (innovative) investment opportunities and institutional reinforcement related to SLM-governance.  
  
  #14. Formally analyze IFS process risks and assumptions at the outset and revisit them throughout the process to improve resiliency                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| IFS development process too long (too much investment in stocktaking - more investment to be put in implementation) | #6. Start IFS process with a baseline analysis of current SLM financing and investments in the country, to be updated on a yearly basis to assess trends in SLM financing and to adjust the IFS as necessary.  
  
  #7a. The analyses of financial flows, economic value of land and cost of land degradation and the identification of innovative funding sources are all core outputs necessary as decision-making tools and should therefore be part of each IFS process.  
  
  #7b) Advocacy for best practices to mainstream SLM into existing national/local climate and biodiversity-related projects should also be explored as a means of increasing the impact on SLM of existing funding in these areas.  
  
  #3. Pursue the identification of innovative sources of financing most suitable to the country, environment and site.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Selecting sector-specific methodologies and appropriate involvement of stakeholders in land valuation exercise |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Building awareness among decision-makers not traditionally related to SLM      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

---

#5. The analyses of financial flows, economic value of land and cost of land degradation and the identification of innovative funding sources are all core outputs necessary as decision-making tools and should therefore be part of each IFS process.  

---

#11. Begin process with an initial snapshot of SLM-related government processes, strategies and plans that need to be influenced to mainstream SLM; Then adopt a multi-track approach where:  

#11c) The period for diagnostic studies is shortened to not more than six months (without excluding the possibility of further studies).  

#11a) One track focuses on building the longer-term outcomes of the process (diagnostics and gap analysis, involvement of stakeholders and partners, transformational change in DLDD/SLM governance) leading to sustained benefits for SLM finance.  

#11b) Another track focuses on targeted activities delivering short-term results based on promising sector strategies or targeted (innovative) investment opportunities and institutional reinforcement related to SLM-governance.  

#10. Formally analyze IFS process risks and assumptions at the outset and revisit them throughout the process to improve resiliency  

---

#2. Start IFS process with a baseline analysis of current SLM financing and investments in the country, to be updated on a yearly basis to assess trends in SLM financing and to adjust the IFS as necessary.  

#8a. The analyses of financial flows, economic value of land and cost of land degradation and the identification of innovative funding sources are all core outputs necessary as decision-making tools and should therefore be part of each IFS process.  

#8b) Advocacy for best practices to mainstream SLM into existing national/local climate and biodiversity-related projects should also be explored as a means of increasing the impact on SLM of existing funding in these areas.  

#1. Pursue the identification of innovative sources of financing most suitable to the country, environment and site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Challenges</th>
<th>Key Recommendations of the Synthesis Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#9. Present decision-makers with evidence as to how SLM can be a positive contributing means to support other stated country priorities such as poverty alleviation and economic development (instead of presenting as a competing priority).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Engagement of non-state actors / beneficiaries | #1. At the outset of an IFS process, formalize the identification and mapping of relevant stakeholders and partners and detail a strategic engagement plan (to be adjusted as needed).  
#2. The identification and mapping of relevant stakeholders should be sufficiently broad to include women, youth and the private sector (as land owner/steward and project partner). |
| Sustainability of the process | #8. That the GM or development partners identify a way to continue the services of a country-based consultant to act as an advisor to the most relevant ministry driving the IFS process and to provide input and follow-through into inter-ministerial consultations.  
#19. In order to improve the efficiency of resources available for the ongoing maintenance of the IFS, a dedicated person could be assigned to ensure that a feedback mechanism – supported by a documented paper trail – is in place to monitor and adjust the IFS periodically instead of repeating the entire IFS development process every few years. |
| Capturing and replicating best practices in IFS development | #10a. Pursue DIFS capacity building throughout the process, not only at the beginning, and allow for support to the IFS team during the different stages of the process taking into account the usual shifts that occur in persons involved over time;  
#10b. Identify development partners' strengths and availability to jointly support the IFS/IIF process in a complementary fashion;  
#10c. Ensure that the IFS process includes a thorough strategy to maximize communication and impact of findings and best practices. |
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