



## Resource Kit

**Monitoring, Evaluation & Reporting  
for Sustainable Land Management in**

**LDC & SIDS Countries**





# Resource Kit

## Monitoring, Evaluation & Reporting for Sustainable Land Management in **LDC & SIDS Countries**

This document has been produced by the Global Support Unit and was written by consultants Dennis Fenton (Main Report and Attachment 1) and Greg Jacobs (Attachment 2: Questionnaires and guidelines for its completion).



This **Resource Kit** is designed to be used by Project Teams on national MSP projects supported by GEF and UNDP and implemented within the framework of the portfolio project 'LDC and SIDS Targeted Portfolio Approach for Capacity Development and Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management Project'. The portfolio project is hereafter referred to as the LDC-SIDS Portfolio Project.

## **I Introduction & Context**

- Purpose of this Resource Kit
- Outline of the Resource Kit
- Purpose of Monitoring and Evaluation
- Monitoring Tools and Indicators
- Principles of Monitoring and Evaluation
- Monitoring and Evaluating 'Capacity Development' and 'Mainstreaming' Attribution

## **II The Monitoring Framework and How to Use it**

- Introduction to the National MSP Annual Project Review Form
- How to prepare the Form during project development
- How to fill-out the Form during project implementation
- Linking the Form to regular planning, management and monitoring

## **III Communications and Reporting**

## **IV Evaluation**

## **V Adaptive Management**

## **VI Practical Aspects of Monitoring (including budget)**

### **Attachment I: Template for the National MSP Annual Project Review Form**

### **Attachment II: Awareness and Satisfaction Surveys**

Note to UNDP/GEF SLM Regional Technical Advisors (RTA): The Annual Project Review Form at the end of this Resource Kit includes a short survey, to be completed by MSP project teams, pertaining to the services and performance of the Global Support Unit (GSU) in Pretoria. Given that many such services are provided regionally, the RTA are also in a strong position to assess these services/performance. Hence, each SLM RTA is requested to complete the survey and submit to GSU by 15th July, annually.

## I

# Introduction & Context

## Purpose of this Resource Kit

### This Resource Kit aims to:

- Support monitoring of project impact and performance;
- help teams formulating MSPs as they prepare monitoring frameworks for their national level MSP projects;
- help MSP implementation teams and/or National Project Managers as they finalise their monitoring frameworks at the project start-up stage;
- help project decision-makers during project implementation, to learn lessons and revise project strategy if appropriate;
- complement existing material, made available by UNDP and UNDP/GEF and GEF, related to monitoring and evaluation.

### This Resource Kit does not aim to:

- support monitoring of the details of project management. I.e., it does not cover quarterly reports, Terms of Reference, Input Monitoring or the preparation and monitoring of quarterly workplans. These aspects are covered by existing UNDP guidelines and are assumed to be understood by project management teams<sup>1</sup>;

- support financial monitoring of project implementation;
- provide fully comprehensive guidance on reporting, monitoring, evaluation and project formulation. UNDP and UNDP/GEF have issued significant guidelines on these subjects. Although this Resource Kit is a self-contained document, it may be necessary to refer to these other guidelines on some occasions.

## Outline of the Resource Kit

### After this introductory section, this Resource Kit consists of the following sections:

- The Monitoring Framework and How to Use it. This section introduces the National MSP Annual Project Review Form, which is the principal tool for monitoring the national MSP projects. This section explains how to prepare and use the Form.
- Communications and Reporting. This section explains the communications and reporting requirements of the national MSP teams. This includes when to complete reporting forms, and where to send them.
- Evaluation. This short section explains requirements for evalua-

tions, and how this relates to monitoring and to the Annual Project Review Form.

- Adaptive Management. This short section explains the aims of adaptive management, how project monitoring contributes to adaptive management, and the roles of key players in adaptive management of national MSP projects.
- Practical Aspects of Monitoring. This section covers costs, deadlines and other practical matters.
- Attachment I: Template for the National MSP Annual Project Review Form. This attachment provides the template of the Form to be used by each national MSP. It notably provides the many indicators to be used to monitor progress. Most indicators are optional – each national MSP team should select and/or modify as appropriate. Some indicators are obligatory, and should be used without modification.
- Attachment II: Guidelines for the completion of the Awareness and Satisfaction Surveys. This attachment provides two questionnaires to assess 1) the increase of public awareness regarding SLM, 2) the increase in the percentage of land-

<sup>1</sup> In general the use of the term project management team includes the UNDP CO focal point.

## *‘LDC and SIDS Targeted Portfolio Approach for Capacity Development & Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management Project’*

users that are satisfied with the available technical support. Guidelines are provided for the implementation/completion of the surveys as well as templates for data processing.

- References.

### **Purpose of Monitoring and Evaluation:**

#### **Good monitoring and evaluation of the national MSPs makes the following contributions to projects:**

- It provides inputs to the national project management and decision-making, thereby improving management and decision-making;
- It provides inputs to the management and decision-making at the global level of the LDC-SIDS Portfolio Project;
- It provides a record and a reminder of the agreed objectives of the project;
- It helps ensure accountability;
- It helps understand and document why the project is succeeding and how the project could be more effective;
- It helps communicate project results, both nationally and internationally; and,
- It contributes to lesson-learning and knowledge management.

### **Monitoring Tools and Indicators**

#### **The tools and types of indicators used in the Resource Kit include:**

- Quantifiable targets. This states something to be achieved by a fixed date. If possible, the target should be broken down into milestones to be reached on the way to the targets. In some cases the targets may be quantifiable (e.g. a law being approved), but the milestone may not be easily quantified (e.g. the milestone may be to prepare a ‘draft’ of the law, in such a case there is some subjectivity as to whether an acceptable draft has been prepared);
- Scorecards questions. With scorecards, progress is measured along a scale of 1 (not good) to 5 (fully achieved). Therefore progress can be followed over time. In many cases, the indicators will not be quantifiable, and may to some extent be judgmental (e.g.: is a process participatory?);
- Survey results. In certain cases, the national project team should hire an

outside agency to undertake an annual survey, for example of the opinions of land-users, or of local attitudes.

### **Principles of Monitoring and Evaluation**

#### **Monitoring and Evaluation of the national MSP projects should, to the extent possible, respect the following principles:<sup>2</sup>**

- The monitoring and evaluation framework should be coherent and consistent with the overall national framework for monitoring implementation of the UNCCD. If possible, it should also contribute to this bigger picture. To ensure this principle is respected, where possible, in this Resource Kit, the indicators were selected from UNCCD documents and guidelines;
- The monitoring and evaluation framework should be coherent and consistent with the overall UNDP and GEF monitoring framework. To ensure this principle is respected, where possible, in this Resource Kit, indicators were selected from UNDP and GEF documents and guidelines. Also, the National MSP Annual Project Review Form is fully in line



- with GEF/UNDP annual reporting requirements;
  - Monitoring and evaluation should be cost-effective. To ensure this principle is respected, where possible, in this Resource Kit, the indicators selected are easy to measure and data is readily available;
  - Monitoring and evaluation should include indicators and targets, and where possible these should be measurable/quantifiable. A few good indicators is considered better than a lot of poor ones;
  - Monitoring and evaluation should, where possible, have direct additional benefits. These benefits can include:
    - confidence building, as the team sees that targets are being met;
    - awareness raising, as project stakeholders have a better understanding of the project and its relevance after being involved in monitoring;
    - 'learning-by-monitoring'. The project team should benefit from the process of building the monitoring framework and reporting;
    - Resource mobilisation.
- Monitoring can be used to demonstrate results, and this can be used to communicate with and

impress upon potential donors - national and international.

### Monitoring and Evaluating 'Capacity Development' and 'Mainstreaming'

It is generally recognised that 'capacity' and 'capacity development' are difficult to monitor. Typically, it may not be possible to define quantifiable indicators of impacts or impacts. Moreover, in many cases, impacts and results can often only be detected several years after the capacity was developed, which is too late to be of use in project management.

UNDP and GEF have done significant work on understanding how to monitor capacity development. Notably the 'Capacity Development Indicator Framework' (UNDP/GEF, 2003, draft) provides a conceptual analysis of capacity development, breaking it down into components, and identifying related indicators for two types of projects<sup>3</sup>. This Resource Kit draws from that work. It notably draws from the indicators provided, modifying and adapting them to the Sustainable Land Management Operational Programme. A related challenge is how to monitor the 'mainstreaming' of SLM into nation-

al policies, plans and programmes. An innovative aspect of OP 15, and the LDC-SIDS Portfolio Project in particular, is the objective of mainstreaming sustainable land management aspects into such policies, plans and programmes. Until present, very little work has been done on monitoring/evaluating mainstreaming. This Resource Kits, notably in the Attachment, provides some tools and indicators for monitoring mainstreaming.

### Attribution

Another challenge in monitoring capacity development is to determine attribution. That is, of all the existing factors, which contributed most to the improved performance or impact? Was it the GEF/UNDP sponsored activities, or was it the many activities sponsored by other development partners, or were there other factors that had a greater impact (e.g. the installation of a new government, the collapse of the economy, or a successful end to conflict)? This Resource Kit framework, in particular the Annual Project Review Form,

<sup>2</sup> Some of the following are general principles applicable to all monitoring processes. Others are specific to the national MSPs under the LDC-SIDS Portfolio.

<sup>3</sup> One each in the Biodiversity and Climate Change Portfolio.

## II

# The Monitoring Framework & How to Use it

The principal tool for Project Monitoring is the 'National MSP Annual Project Review Form'. This Section briefly introduces this Form, then describes how to prepare the Form during project preparation, and then describes how to fill-out the Form during project implementation. The template for the Form is provided as an attachment.

## 1. Introduction to the National MSP Annual Project Review Form

The Form consists of 3 Sections and an Annex.

### Section I - Project Identifiers.

This short Section covers the basic background data on the project. The questions in this Section have to be completed by all MSPs under the LDC-SIDS Portfolio Project.

### Section II - Monitoring Impact and Performance

This section covers, in detail, the impact and performance of the project. This Section answers the question: 'is there increased capacity for sustainable land management?'. Data is requested related to:

- Project Impact, with respect to the national MSP Project Objective.
- Project Performance. This is notably with respect to achieving the four Outcomes that are common to the national MSP <sup>4</sup>:
  - Outcome 1: Individual and institutional capacity for SLM developed;
  - Outcome 2: SLM mainstreamed into economic and sectoral development;
  - Outcome 3; National Action Programme completed;
  - Outcome 4; Medium Term investment Plan being financed and implemented;
- Meeting GEF Requirements. This covers how the project is meeting GEF principles and requirement. Data is requested related to:
  - The participatory nature of the project;
  - Whether the project is contributing to achieving the MDGs;
  - Whether the project has established linkages with UNCCD implementation mechanisms in-country;
  - Whether the project has established linkages with important SLM related capacity development processes in country

(including those supported by GEF and other international development partners);

- Whether the project contributes to improving the in-country gender situation, as it relates to SLM;
- Whether the project promotes the use and value of indigenous knowledge related to SLM;
- The sustainability (financial, institutional, social and environmental) of the project impacts;
- The replicability of the project approaches and findings.

In this Section, almost all sub-sections have 'compulsory' and 'optional' questions and indicators. In total there are 28 compulsory questions and 93 optional questions. All national MSP teams in all countries shall provide data related to the compulsory indicators. This should be submitted through the UNDP CO to the Global Support Unit (GSU) <sup>5</sup>. For the optional indicators, national MSP teams shall select the most appropriate indicators for their project. In some cases, the optional

<sup>4</sup> Formulation of the Outcome varies from country to country.

<sup>5</sup> The Global Support Unit (GSU) is based in Pretoria and provides technical support and coordination to the entire LDC-SIDS Portfolio Project, mostly through regional channels such as the UNDP/GEF RTAs and sub-contracts.

*For the compulsory indicators, the project formulation team should determine the baseline situation in the country. It should determine targets for the end of project situation.*

indicators may require modifying/adapting to the in-country situation. In other cases, national MSP teams may be inspired by the optional indicator, but may choose to design a superior, related indicator. Data related to optional indicators shall be submitted to the UNDP CO. There is a very long list of optional indicators, national MSP Teams should select a small number appropriate in their country.

Typically, it can be expected that an MSP Team answers 40 questions, the majority of which are 'scorecard' type questions.

### Section III - Monitoring Project Processes, Adaptive Management and Lessons Learning

#### **This Section has two aspects:**

- Determining the factors underlying and limiting project success. This will lead to lessons learning. This sub-section, although short, is very important, and project managers are encouraged to devote sufficient time and thought to completing this sub-section;
- Providing data on the process and data related to key decisions.

#### **Annex**

In addition, the Form contains an Annex: "Survey of Performance of the Global Support Unit". This survey should be completed by:

- all UNDP/GEF SLM Regional Technical Advisors;
- all national MSP project management teams (e.g. the National Project Manager and responsible UNDP officer).

Results of the survey should be submitted to the GSU. This survey relates to the performance of the GSU. It does not relate to monitoring of the in-country, MSP-funded activities. This feedback is essential to the GSU, in order to complete their global monitoring and to help the GSU adapt its support mechanisms. The survey aims to determine if the GSU activities are optimally relevant and effective.

#### **2. How to prepare the Form during project formulation**

At the MSP formulation stage (typically supported by a PDF A), the project formulation team should do the following:

#### Section I – Project Identifiers

Nothing is required at this stage.

#### Section II – Monitoring Impact and Performance

For the compulsory indicators, the project formulation team should determine the baseline situation in the country. It should determine targets for the end of project situation.

From amongst the optional indicators, the project formulation team should:

- select the most appropriate indicator for the country;
- modify or adapt the indicator if appropriate;
- determine the baseline situation in the country; and,
- determine targets for the end of project situation.

#### Section III – Monitoring Project Processes and Adaptive Management

The project formulation team should provide basic required information related to questions 5.1, 6.1 and 10.

Survey of Performance of the Global Support Unit



Nothing is required at this stage.

### 3. How to Fill-out the Form during project implementation

The Form has to be filled-out by the national Project Teams annually. In most cases, the required information is readily available to the Project Team. In some cases it may be necessary to purchase information, or to hire consultants to collect information.

Since many parts of the Form have been designed to provide essential information to UNDP/GEF and the Global Support Unit, the Form has to be completed strictly in line with deadlines established by the GSU, and be submitted to the GSU through the UNDP CO (see below).

In general, the 'Compulsory Indicators' are designed to assist the GSU. It is recognised that monitoring these indicators may not directly help the national MSP project teams.

In general, the 'Optional Indicators' are designed to help the national MSP project teams to monitor progress, to record achievements and challenges, and to identify where mitigations or

changes are needed. The information on these indicators should feed directly into the national decision-making and TPR process.

Two of the compulsory indicators require annual surveys of broad groups in each country. These are:

- a compulsory indicator at the level of the Objective requires a survey of public awareness regarding sustainable land management;
- a compulsory indicator for Outcome 1 requires a survey of a group of land-users to determine the percentage that is satisfied with available technical support.

These surveys have been included as Attachment II. The costs of undertaking these surveys are to be met by the MSP project budget.

### 4. Linking the Form to regular planning, management and monitoring

As discussed above, this Resource Kit addresses the monitoring of impact and results. Its time-scale is therefore annual – as changes to impacts and results are unlikely to be detectable over shorter time-scales. The Form (and

this Resource Kit) does not address the monitoring of processes, inputs and activities.

It is, however, necessary to link the Form to the MSP's regular mechanisms for planning, management and monitoring of processes, inputs and activities. The key tools for this planning and monitoring are:

- Terms of Reference for project inputs and activities;
- Reports from consultancies, of workshops and other activities;
- Quarterly workplans;
- Quarterly progress reports.

All the above should be prepared in a conscientious and participatory manner as set out by UNDP and UNDP/GEF guidelines and manuals.

For each of these regular planning and monitoring tools, in order to establish linkages with this Resource Kit and the Form, it is important to clarify:

- How each input and activity contributes to the project Objectives and Outcomes;
- How each input and activity relates to the GEF principles and requirements;

## III

## Communications & Reporting

All monitoring, communications and reporting shall be in line with UNDP and GEF procedures for Medium Sized Projects.

The National MSP Annual Project Review Form shall be updated regularly by the Project Team. It shall be submitted annually to the UNDP CO and the national Project Steering Committee (PSC) or equivalent steering mechanism in each country.

The MSP Project Team shall use the Form to:

- Closely follow progress;
- Identify bottlenecks and problems – as a precursor to taking action;

The UNDP CO and PSC shall use the Form:

- As a basis for the annual review of project progress, achievements and weaknesses;
- As a basis for planning future activities;
- To feed into the Country Office-wide reporting and planning.

The UNDP/GEF regional office and the UNDP/GEF Headquarters shall use the report in their standard procedures to monitor MSP projects.

GSU shall use information in the Form to:

- Compile aggregate monitoring and progress reports covering all MSP under the LDC-SIDS Portfolio Project;
- Present synthesized information to the GEF Council;
- Identify frequently occurring bottlenecks and problems and propose response actions;
- Feed into lessons sharing; and
- Feed into the design of technical support tools and mechanisms;

The completed Form must be submitted to the UNDP CO by 1st July annually. The first completed report is expected for all projects (including those at PDF A phase) by 1st July 2006. However, as many projects will still be in the early stages of implementation in July 2006, many sub-sections in the report may not be relevant for the 2006 Form, and those sub-sections should be left blank for those projects. The UNDP CO must check and complete and submit to the GSU by 15th July annually. This is essential in order for the GSU to meet its annual reporting requirements to the GEF Secretariat, the GEF Council and to the UNCCD.

Timing

*Ideas, lessons and criticisms freely move up, down and across the networks in the project management and stakeholder group. The project management takes account of all opinions, and uses these processes to identify and design improvements to the project structure and strategy.*

Details of how to perform evaluations, including sample ToR for the evaluation team, are found in the UNDP/GEF publication *'Measuring and Demonstrating Impact: UNDP/GEF Resource Kit No. 2.'*

## IV Evaluation

Each MSP project is to be evaluated at least once by an independent, external evaluation team. In most cases there will be one 'end-of-project' evaluation. This should take place in the three-month period before the project is operationally closed.

In some cases, it may be necessary to have an additional (mid-term) evaluation. This may be necessary:

- If the project duration exceeds four years;
- If the project encounters difficulties;
- If it is necessary to significantly redesign the project;
- If either the Project Team or the UNDP CO deem necessary.

UNDP CO and PSC shall determine if such mid-term evaluations should be conducted by external advisors or by the project team.

The National MSP Annual Project Review Forms shall be key background documents for the project evaluations.

## V Adaptive Management

Adaptive management is the ability of the project management to respond to unexpected challenges and opportunities in a flexible, positive, optimising manner.

The project stakeholders regularly review progress, identify lessons learnt, discuss project progress and constraints with other stakeholders. The project stakeholders do this in a consultative atmosphere, where each stakeholder freely shares opinions and findings. Ideas, lessons and criticisms freely move

up, down and across the networks in the project management and stakeholder group. The project management takes account of all opinions, and uses these processes to identify and design improvements to the project structure and strategy. This is Adaptive Management. The Resource Kit and the National MSP Annual Project Review Form are critical tools to support this Adaptive Management.

The Form, and the processing of monitoring products, creates linkages

between the Project Team, the UNDP CO, the PSC and the GSU of the LDC-SIDS Portfolio Project. If communications are strong and effective amongst this network, this network becomes the adaptive management network for the project.

# VI Practical Aspects of Monitoring

## Stakeholder participation in monitoring

Much of the monitoring is undertaken by the project team. However, stakeholders will be regularly consulted. Notably, the PSC and the inter-ministerial committee will be involved in monitoring.

For each MSP, at least two indicators require feedback from broader groups of stakeholders (The public for Objective 1, and representatives of land-users for Outcome 1). This feedback will be obtained through the surveys introduced above.

## Web-based monitoring

At a later stage, it may be possible to create a web-based monitoring system for all MSPs under the LDC-SIDS Portfolio Project. In this case, all MSP project teams should complete the National MSP Annual Project Review Form on-line. This would have the following two advantages:

- ↳ Up to date information on all projects will be available, globally;
- ↳ Basic analysis of data will be undertaken automatically;

This web-based approach will be developed by the GSU.

## Monitoring costs and responsibilities

The table below provides indicative costs for monitoring and evaluation and allocates responsibilities for monitoring and evaluation.

TYPE OF M&E ACTIVITY	LEAD RESPONSIBLE PARTY IN BOLD	BUDGET	TIME FRAME
Preparing M&E Framework and baseline during PDF A phase	PDF A Team	\$2-3,000	During PDF A stage
Inception Report	Project Team	\$0*	At the beginning of project implementation
Finalising M&E framework and overseeing implementation	Project Team, M&E specialist (4 m/m over lifetime of project)	\$6,000	

Data collection	Project Team	0	Ongoing
	Consultants (public awareness survey for third compulsory question)	\$4,500	Annual
	Consultants (survey of land-users for compulsory Outcome 1 question)	\$4,500	Annual
	Other surveys	\$0 – 5,000	
National MSP Annual Project Review Form	The Government, UNDP Country Office, Executing Agency, Project Team, GSU	\$0*	Every year, at latest by 1st July of that year
National MSP Annual Project Review Form – attached survey	Project Team and RTAs	\$0*	Every year, at latest by 1st July of that year
Tripartite meeting and report (TPR)	The Government, UNDP Country Office, Executing Agency, Project Team, GSU	\$3,000 (travel and meeting costs)	Every year, upon receipt of Form
External Evaluation	Project team, UNDP/GEF headquarters, GSU, UNDP Country Office, Executing Agency	\$15-30,000	Typically in final three months of project operations.
Terminal Report	UNDP Country Office, UNDP/GEF Task Manager, Project Team	\$0*	At least one month before the end of the project
Audit	Executing Agency, UNDP Country Office, Project Team	\$4,500	Yearly (3 times)
Visits to field sites	UNDP Country Office, Executing Agency	\$2,000	Yearly
Lessons learnt	UNDP-GEF, GEF SEC, Project Team, Executing Agency, GSU	\$1,000 for reports	Yearly
<b>TOTAL COST</b>		<b>\$42,500-63,500<sup>6</sup></b>	

\* Indicates that this activity is covered by project management unit, at no additional cost to project

<sup>6</sup> Includes \$2-3,000 of PDF A fun

# National MSP Annual Project Review Form for all UNDP/GEF Projects approved under the Global SLM SIDS and LDC Portfolio Project

This Form is to be completed annually by each MSP Project Team by 1st July (starting 2006), and submitted through the UNDP CO to the Global Support Unit in Pretoria.

Endnotes, indicated by small Roman numerals (i, ii, iii, etc), provide guidance on how to fill the Form

## SECTION I – PROJECT IDENTIFIERS

### Basic Project Identifiers

Country	
Project Title	
GEF Number	
UNDP Number	
Date of Prodoc signature	
Project duration	
Estimated closing date	
Principal Sector (s)	Agriculture, forestry or rangelands <sup>i</sup>

### Project Stakeholders

List of representatives of key stakeholders groups involved in the project (e.g. could be members of the National Coordinating Body)

Stakeholder Group	Representative (title)
e.g. Ministry of Agriculture	e.g. Deputy-Minister
e.g. NGO	e.g. President of a named, national NGO
e.g. local communities	e.g. Chair of a named, locally based CBO
Etc.	

### UNDP Identifiers <sup>ii</sup>

SRF Goal	
SRF Sub-Goal	
Strategic Area of Support	

**SECTION II – MONITORING IMPACT AND PERFORMANCE <sup>iii</sup>**

The following sub-sections include both scorecard questions and quantifiable indicators.

For scorecard questions, five possible answers are given in a table, and the responder should choose the most appropriate to his/her in-country situation. These are rated 1(poor) to 5 (high).

For quantifiable indicators, the project team should determine the baseline situation before the project starts, and measure the status of the indicator each year.

**1. Measuring Impact**

These questions relate to measuring how successful the project is in achieving the project objective.

The Project Objective of each MSP is ‘capacity developed for sustainable land management in concerned government agencies, non-governmental and civil service organisations, user groups, etc. and sustainable land management principles mainstreamed into national policies, plans and processes’ <sup>iv</sup>

**Compulsory Indicators**

An SLM related national policy or law <sup>v</sup> :

1	Is not yet officially planned
2	Is officially planned
3	Has been drafted
4	Has been approved
5	Has been developed and approved in a fully participatory manner

National development plans (e.g. five year plans, PRSP, budget):

1	Contain only plans that will have a negative impact on sustainable land management
2	Pay no attention to sustainable land management
3	Pay some, but inadequate, attention to sustainable land management
4	Pay adequate attention to sustainable land management
5	Place sustainable land management at the heart of the development process

NGOs and CSOs are:

1	Not active in promoting sustainable land management
2	Active at some levels (local or national) in promoting sustainable land management

- 3 Active at all levels but not very effective in promoting sustainable land management
- 4 Active and effective in some levels in promoting sustainable land management
- 5 Active and effective at all levels.

The public has <sup>vi</sup> :

- 1 Low awareness and no understanding of sustainable land management
- 2 Low/medium awareness/understanding
- 3 Medium/medium awareness/understanding
- 4 Medium/high awareness/understanding
- 5 High awareness and high understanding

The knowledge of senior decision-makers in all sectors of importance to land degradation: \_\_

- 1 Less than 20% are aware of the importance of Land degradation
- 2 20 - 40% are aware of the importance of Land degradation
- 3 40 - 60% are aware of the importance of Land degradation
- 4 60 - 80% are aware of the importance of Land degradation
- 5 All are aware of the importance of Land degradation

The role of the UNDP/GEF MSP in strengthening sustainable land management capacity and mechanisms has been:

- 1 Negligible
- 2 Weak
- 3 Supportive of national and other efforts
- 4 Leading
- 5 Critical

Does the national budget make a specific allocation to sustainable land management? Yes/No.

For those countries answering yes, what is the percentage increase over Year 2004?

Attribution

What have been the major factors contributing to improvements in the above impact indicators over the past 5 years?

Place the following factors in declining order of level of contribution: Economic growth; increasing political stability; changes in overall governance framework; climatic conditions; international assistance; GEF/UNDP projects and programmes; Other

**Optional Indicators**

*Each national MSP will be very specific in nature, and hence the monitoring framework and indicators will vary enormously from country to country. The optional indicators presented cannot cover all possibilities nor all eventualities. This section gives examples, suggestions and possibilities. Each national project team must select and/or modify from amongst the indicators and monitoring tools listed. Further, UNDP and UNDP/GEF have developed substantial material to assist the development of monitoring frameworks and choosing indicators. This material should also be consulted.*

The no of voluntary actions taken by private sector to incorporate SLM into production (e.g. banana plantation owners adopt low tillage operations, adopt low chemical inputs, adopt IPM; E.g. road construction company adopts minimal disruption or rehabilitation practices). <sup>vii</sup>

The percentage of sales of (agricultural, forestry or livestock) products that are certified sustainable.

**2. Measuring Performance**

Outcome 1 Individual and institutional capacity for SLM developed:

**Compulsory Indicators**

An inter-ministerial or inter-sectoral institution or mechanism for SLM <sup>viii</sup> :

- 1 Does not exist
- 2 Exists on paper but meets irregularly
- 3 Meets regularly but is largely ineffective
- 4 Meets regularly, and is overall sustainable, but does not have full financial independence or full budget security
- 5 Meets regularly to discuss SLM related issues, has a clear workplan and financial independence, has a well-staffed secretariat and a secure budget and legislative status, follows-up on all decisions, and is able to enter into dialogue with all agencies represented

OR (GAC to decide)

The National Agency responsible for sustainable land management:

- 1 Has not been established
- 2 Has been established, but has no clear mandate, staff, equipment and authority.
- 3 Has reasonable mandate, staff, equipment and authority
- 4 Has strong mandate, staff, equipment and authority
- 5 Has strong mandate, staff, equipment and authority, and is actively promoting and mainstreaming SLM principles

Innovative tools for SLM, such as land functionality analysis, economic valuation techniques, integrated assessment, multi-criteria decision-making:

1	Are non-existent in the country
2	Exist, but have been borrowed from international experience, and have not been adapted to local and national needs
3	<sup>ix</sup>
4	Exist, have been adapted, but are not fully functional
5	Exist and are fully functional

Indicator The percentage of land-users satisfied with available technical support (from either extension services or government technical agency or other service suppliers) <sup>x</sup>

**Optional Indicators**

*Each national MSP will be very specific in nature, and hence the monitoring framework and indicators will vary enormously from country to country. The optional indicators presented cannot cover all possibilities nor all eventualities. This section gives examples, suggestions and possibilities. Each national project team must select and/or modify from amongst the indicators and monitoring tools listed. Further, UNDP and UNDP/GEF have developed substantial material to assist the development of monitoring frameworks and choosing indicators. This material should also be consulted.*

(The following starts with indicators of individual capacity, and then deals with institutional and organisational capacity.)

The organisations responsible for capacity building for sustainable land management: <sup>xi</sup>

1	Have little idea of the capacity needs
2	Have some idea of capacity needs at either individual, institutional and systemic level
3	Have a good idea of capacity needs at most levels
4	Have a full understanding of capacity needs
5	Have a full idea of the individual, institutional and systemic capacity needs, and of the measures that should be taken to develop capacity

Research into indigenous knowledge related to sustainable land management is:

1	Not undertaken
2	Undertaken, but by a very small number of experts
3	Undertaken by many experts, in a random and arbitrary manner
4	Undertaken systematically
5	Undertaken by a formal, sustainably financed network of capable researchers

Training programmes and awareness raising programmes for local communities:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | Are non-existent   |
| 2 | Exist, but are of poor quality and are not affordable by most local communities  |
| 3 | Exist but are of irregular quality   |
| 4 | Are being implemented in a financially sustainable manner  |
| 5 | Are being implemented in a financially sustainable manner and cover all technical requirements and alternative practices (e.g. reseeding, water point networks; IPM, drip irrigation, sustainable logging) |

Training programmes and awareness raising programmes for marginalized communities:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | Are non-existent   |
| 2 | Exist, but are of poor quality and are not affordable by most local communities  |
| 3 | Exist but are of irregular quality   |
| 4 | Are being implemented in a financially sustainable manner  |
| 5 | Are being implemented in a financially sustainable manner and cover all technical requirements and alternative practices (e.g. reseeding, water point networks; IPM, drip irrigation, sustainable logging) |

The school curriculum:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | Does not address land degradation or sustainable land management                            |
| 2 |   |
| 3 | Addresses land degradation and sustainable land management for some age groups              |
| 4 |   |
| 5 | Addresses land degradation and sustainable land management appropriately for all age groups |

Understanding of links between economy and land degradation:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | The extent and economic costs of land degradation are poorly understood and unknown  |
| 2 | The extent of land degradation is partly understood and known by a small number of scientists and a limited number of activists              |
| 3 | The extent of land degradation is understood and known by a limited number of people in the environment and land sectors                     |
| 4 | The extent and economic costs of land degradation are understood and known by a limited number of people in the environment and land sectors |
| 5 | The extent and economic costs of land degradation are understood and known by decision-makers and the general public                         |

The principal national agencies responsible for environment and land : xii

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | Do not have staff with required skills                                     |
| 2 | Have some staff with required skills, but face regular shortages           |
| 3 |  |
| 4 | Do have staff with skills, but they are stretched and not always available |
| 5 | Have available staff with adequate skills                                  |

(Staff may be replaced with 'equipment' or 'resources')

**NOTE: AS MANY PROJECTS WILL TARGETS NGOS, CBOS OR LAND-USER GROUPS, IN EACH CASE "PRINCIPAL NATIONAL AGENCY" CAN BE REPLACED BY "TARGETED NGO" OR "TARGETED CBO" OR "TARGETED LAND-USER GROUP".**

The principal national agencies, local agencies and extension services:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | Are unaware of integrated land-use planning approaches                 |
| 2 | Are aware of integrated land-use planning but lack technical knowledge |
| 3 | Are committed to integrated land-use planning but lack tools           |
| 4 | Are using integrated land-use planning to a limited extent             |
| 5 | Are fully using integrated land-use planning                           |

The principal national agencies, local agencies and extension services: \_\_

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | Have not heard of the landscape approach to sustainable land management   |
| 2 | Are committed to the landscape approach but are not technically competent |
| 3 |   |
| 4 | Are starting to use the landscape approach                                |
| 5 | Are successfully using the landscape approach                             |

Human resources of the principal national agencies, local agencies and extension services:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | Are poorly qualified and unmotivated   |
| 2 | Are of mixed quality, with some qualified staff but generally lacking motivation     |
| 3 |  |
| 4 | Are in general well qualified, but many lack motivation and some lack qualifications |
| 5 | Are generally well qualified and well motivated                                      |

Individuals:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | Do not have the skills matching their job description                         |
| 2 | Have some, poor skills related to their job description                       |
| 3 |   |
| 4 | Are reasonably skilled but skills could be better matched to job requirements |
| 5 | Are appropriately skilled, in line with job description                       |

Staff development:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | There are no mechanisms in place for training, mentoring, and learning.   |
| 2 | Some mechanisms exist, but they are insufficient to develop enough people and unable to provide the full range of skills needed                   |
| 3 |   |
| 4 | Mechanisms generally exist to develop professional skills, but there is either a shortage, or they do not cover the full range of required skills |
| 5 | There are adequate mechanisms in place for training, mentoring, and learning in order to maintain a continuous flow of new staff                  |

Knowledge and capacity to develop payment schemes and markets for ecosystem functions and services related to sustainable land management is:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | Non-existent   |
| 2 | available, but only through regional or international bodies |
| 3 | Exists with a small number of people in the country          |
| 4 | Exists and is starting to be applied                         |
| 5 | Exists and is applied regularly                              |

The Staff of a named department/organisation have/have not the ability to .... **state a specific task of the organisation, e.g. obtain and use satellite data; organise fully participatory consultations; etc..)**

(Note that some countries will have very specific individual capacity requirements: eg developing individual capacity related to trade, debt,))

Percentage of targeted land-users having access to appropriate credit schemes.

Percentage of targeted land-users having access to insurance schemes.

(Following indicators focus on 'institutional' level capacity)

Membership of the national coordinating body or inter-sectoral committee:

- 1 Is limited to environment and land agencies
- 2 Involves all concerned national government agencies
- 3
- 4 Involves governmental (national and local) agencies and non-governmental agencies
- 5 Involves governmental (national and local) agencies and non-governmental agencies, in an appropriately equitable manner, with each representative having a clear role and responsibilities

The principal national agencies responsible for environment and land: \_\_

- 1 Have no plans or strategies
- 2 Have plans/strategies, but they are out of date or were prepared in a top-down fashion
- 3 Have a mechanism to prepare plans and strategies, but it is irregular or top down
- 4 Regularly prepare plans and strategies
- 5 Regularly prepare plans and strategies in a fully participatory manner

Indigenous knowledge:

- 1 Is largely ignored in national policy, programmes and policy
- 2
- 3 Occasionally feeds into national policy, programmes and policy
- 4
- 5 Is mainstreamed into national policy, programmes and policy via a sustainable, effective formal mechanism

SLM policy:

- 1 There is no policy or it is old and not reviewed regularly
- 2 Exists, but is only reviewed at irregular intervals
- 3
- 4 Is reviewed regularly, but not annually
- 5 Is reviewed annually, and updated

The principal national agencies, local agencies and extension services: \_\_

- 1 Resist changes
- 2 Do accept change, but only very slowly
- 3
- 4 Tend to adapt in response to change, but not always very effectively or with some delays
- 5 Are highly adaptive, responding effectively and immediately to change

The principal national agencies, local agencies and extension services have <sup>xiii</sup>:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | No mechanisms for monitoring, evaluating or reporting on their own performance  |
| 2 | Some mechanisms for monitoring, evaluating, reporting, but they are limited and weak  |
| 3 |   |
| 4 | Have reasonable mechanisms for monitoring, evaluating and reporting, but they are not as strong or comprehensive as they could be |
| 5 | Have effective internal mechanisms for monitoring, evaluating and reporting   |

The principal national agencies, local agencies and extension services are well managed:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | Have totally inadequate internal management  |
| 2 | Have a management system that is largely ineffective and does not deploy resources effectively |
| 3 |  |
| 4 | Are reasonably well managed, but resources are not always deployed effectively                 |
| 5 | Are well managed with effective, efficient deployment of resources                             |

The principal national agencies, local agencies and extension services:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | Operate in isolation  |
| 2 | Have established some partnerships, but they are irregular and with many gaps   |
| 3 |   |
| 4 | Have many partnerships with a wide range of partners, but there are still some gaps and the partnerships are not always operational |
| 5 | Have effective and operational partnerships with all government, non-government and local stakeholders                              |

The principal national agencies, local agencies and extension services have <sup>xiv</sup>:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | Virtually no information for monitoring land quality  |
| 2 | Limited information for monitoring land quality and for monitoring strategies and action plans  |
| 3 |   |
| 4 | Easy access to most required information and it is mostly of good quality, but there remain some gaps in quality, coverage and availability |
| 5 | Access to all the information they need to develop and monitor strategies and action plans  |

Local governments have:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | None of the following: expertise, information, budgetary control and financial resources |
|---|--|

2	One of the following: expertise, information, budgetary control and financial resources
3	Two the following: expertise, information, budgetary control and financial resources
4	Three of the following: expertise, information, budgetary control and financial resources
5	Adequate expertise, information, budgetary control and financial resources

Society's role in monitoring the state of land <sup>xv</sup>:

1	There is no dialogue on the state of the land at all
2	There is some dialogue ongoing, but is restricted to specialized circles and not with the wider public
3	
4	There is a reasonably open public dialogue ongoing, but certain issues remain taboo
5	There is an open and transparent public dialogue about the state of the land

Self-organisations amongst farmers/herders/forest gatherers:

1	Are not allowed
2	Are allowed, but discouraged and do not exist
3	Exist, with low capacity and few resources
4	
5	Are active and involved in the national debates on sustainable land management

The no. of independent NGOs accredited to the National Coordinating Body <sup>xiv</sup>:

The percentage of violations of land-use regulations that are processed.

The percentage of a surveyed (or targeted) population that adopt at least one SLM practice by the project end.

The number of functioning land management networks or platforms developed at the village or community level

Outcome 2 SLM mainstreamed into economic and sectoral development:

**Compulsory Indicators**

The Ministry of Economic Development and/or Finance and/or Planning:

1	Is unaware of land degradation issues
2	
3	Has a stated aim of halting and where possible reversing land degradation.
4	
5	Uses environmental economic analyses of land-use options as a tool in development planning and in preparing economic/development policies and/or budgets.

Political commitment to SLM is present:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | There is no political will at all, or the existing political will is against sustainable land management |
| 2 | Some political will exists, but it is not strong enough to make a difference                             |
| 3 |  |
| 4 | Reasonable political will exists, but it is not always strong enough                                     |
| 5 | There are very high levels of political will   |

Attribution

What have been the major factors contributing to improvements in the above indicators over the past 5 years?

Place the following factors in declining order of level of contribution: changes in overall government programme; international assistance; UNDP/GEF projects and programmes; Other.

STATEMENT (ANSWER 'YES' OR 'NO')	SECTOR	AGRICULTURE	FORESTRY	RANGELANDS	ECONOMIC DEV.	ENERGY	OTHER
IMPACTS OF SECTOR POLICY/NATIONAL PLANS ON SLM ARE IMPORTANT BUT ARE NOT BEING ASSESSED							
IMPACTS OF SECTOR POLICY/NATIONAL PLANS ON SLM ARE BEING ASSESSED IN A PARTICIPATORY MANNER							
IMPACTS OF SECTOR POLICY/NATIONAL PLANS ON SLM HAVE BEEN ASSESSED							
IMPACTS OF SECTOR POLICY/NATIONAL PLANS ON SLM HAVE BEEN ADEQUATELY ASSESSED AND MITIGATION MEASURES PROPOSED							

**Optional Indicators**

Mainstreaming in General or integration into all Sectors <sup>xvii</sup>

The SLM agenda:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | There is no recognisable national SLM agenda   |
| 2 | The agenda exists, some persons or institutions or actively pursuing the agenda but they have little influence |
| 3 |  |
| 4 | A number of champions are promoting the agenda, but more is needed   |
| 5 | There is an adequate number of leaders and champions effectively promoting the agenda                          |

Public support for SLM:

- 1 The public has little knowledge or interest in SLM
- 2 There is limited support for promoting SLM amongst the public
- 3
- 4 There is general public support and some lobby groups (e.g. NGOs) pushing strongly for SLM
- 5 There is tremendous public awareness and support

A named law (e.g. Forestry Law, Agricultural Code, Law on Water..) is developed/approved and fully addresses SLM concerns, with specific sections on land degradation and/or sustainable land management.

National land-use planning guidelines and legislation provide clear instructions related to SLM.

X projects affecting land in named (e.g. forestry, agriculture, rangelands, watershed management, transport or energy) sector have integrated SLM aspects.

	SECTOR	AGRICULTURE	FORESTRY	RANGELANDS	ECONOMIC DEV.	ENERGY	OTHER
STATEMENT (ANSWER 'YES' OR 'NO')							
SLM CONSIDERATIONS ARE ADEQUATELY MENTIONED IN SECTOR POLICY/NATIONAL PLANS							
SLM CONSIDERATIONS ARE ADEQUATELY MENTIONED IN SECTOR POLICY THROUGH SPECIFIC LEGISLATION							
REGULATIONS ARE IN PLACE TO IMPLEMENT THE LEGISLATION							
THE REGULATIONS ARE BEING ADEQUATELY ENFORCED							
ENFORCEMENT OF REGULATIONS IS MONITORED							

The number of functioning tools/incentives established with SLM objectives (e.g. trust funds for land rehabilitation, payments for environmental services, certificates or labels for 'land friendly products' -includes organic labels).

Economic Development

The UNCCD Focal Point and the inter-sectoral committee:

- 1 Are not consulted on the preparation of NEAP and PRSP
- 2 Are consulted, but inadequately, on the preparation of NEAP and PRSP
- 3
- 4 Are consulted and play a small role in the preparation/supervision of development plans, PRSP, NEAP, and other sector plans and strategies
- 5 Play a full role in the preparation/supervision of development plans, PRSP, NEAP, and other sector plans and strategies

National Sectoral and Provincial Governments have a department mandated to ensure land is sustainably managed.

The Ministry of Economic Development/Finance/Planning use environmental economic analyses of land-use options as a tool in development planning and in preparing economic/development policies.

The Five Year Plans have a chapter on sustainable land management and/or implementation of the National Action Plan.

Agriculture

A label for organic and sustainable products:

- 1 Is not envisaged
- 2 Is being developed
- 3
- 4 Exists but is not fully functioning
- 5 Exists and is functioning nationally and internationally

The degraded agricultural areas:

- 1 Are of unknown extent
- 2 Are generally known
- 3
- 4 Have been clearly identified and mapped
- 5 Have been identified and response plans have been prepared

Expertise and inputs related to (Integrated Pest Management/conservation farming/environmentally sustainable irrigation/crop diversification according to land functionality analysis ): \_\_

- 1 Is unknown
- 2 Is not readily available
- 3
- 4 Is available, but availability and/or quality is irregular
- 5 Is readily available and of adequate quality

The incentives for inappropriate practices (such as crop intensification, overuse of chemicals, over-extraction of water):

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | Have not been identified                            |
| 2 | Have been identified                                |
| 3 | Have been identified and response measures proposed |
| 4 |   |
| 5 | Have been identified and removed                    |

**Named** agricultural enterprises have revised regulations/practices incorporating SLM

The percentage of land-users using or intending to use Integrated Pest Management/conservation farming/environmentally sustainable irrigation/crop diversification according to land functionality analysis <sup>xviii</sup>

Forestry

The degraded forestry areas:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | Are of unknown extent                                      |
| 2 | Are generally known  |
| 3 |  |
| 4 | Have been identified and mapped                            |
| 5 | Have been identified and response plans have been prepared |

The incentives for inappropriate practices (e.g land clearing, mono-plantations, burning):

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | Have not been identified                            |
| 2 | Have been identified                                |
| 3 | Have been identified and response measures proposed |
| 4 |   |
| 5 | Have been identified and removed                    |

Across the country, **Y** hectares of forestry land are managed with sustainable land management as the priority objective (and/or certified)

**Named** Forest enterprises have revised their regulations/practices incorporating SLM

Rangelands

The degraded rangeland areas:

- 1 Are of unknown extent
- 2 Are generally known
- 3
- 4 Have been identified and mapped
- 5 Have been identified and response plans have been prepared

The incentives for inappropriate practices (e.g. over-stocking of animals, conversion of rangelands to crops, blocking of transhumance corridors, mismanagement of fire, inappropriate supplemental feeds, unsustainable sylvo-pastoral systems):

- 1 Have not been identified
- 2 Have been identified
- 3 Have been identified and response measures proposed
- 4
- 5 Have been identified and removed

The root causes of over-grazing:

- 1 Are not known
- 2 Are known for a small number of pilot areas
- 3
- 4 Are generally known in many areas and largely understood
- 5 Are known and understood for all areas

Existence of new legislation targeting sustainable impact of rangeland management

Existence of new Guidelines to be implemented

Energy

Targets for the penetration of renewable energy in rural areas vulnerable to land degradation/desertification (do they exist? Are they being met?)

Rural energy agencies have full awareness of and commitment to SLM

Transport

Existence of new Guidelines

Local development

Local community decision-making processes and planning processes:

- 1 Do not acknowledge the issue of land degradation
- 2 Acknowledge land degradation
- 3
- 4 Acknowledge land degradation and set out measures for mitigation
- 5 Take full account of the need for sustainable land management

The need to promote traditional/indigenous practices: \_\_

- 1 Has not been acknowledged at the local level
- 2 Has been acknowledged at the local level
- 3
- 4 Has been acknowledged and measures tentatively identified
- 5 Has been acknowledged and is fully incorporated into local plans

Land tenure:

- 1 Does not account for land degradation
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 Is designed to fully account for and protect the value of land

Resource pricing (e.g. water):

- 1 Does not account for land degradation
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 Is designed to fully account for and protect the value of land

There is a national process underway to develop land management plans for each community, driven by the communities.

Outcome 3 National Action Programme completed

**Compulsory Indicators**

NAP monitoring and review:

- 1 There is no mechanism for monitoring NAP implementation or for NAP reviews
- 2 There is a stated aim of regular monitoring of NAP implementation, and reviews, but there is no formal mechanism for doing this
- 3
- 4 There is a stated formal monitoring mechanisms, but it has no fixed funding source
- 5 There is an annual review process, covering state (of land, locally and nationally), pressure (level of threats), response resources allocated (nationally and site specific); capacity (individual, institutional and systemic), with adaptive management.

The National Budget or Medium-Term Development Plan or PRSP allocate funding to the NAP.

**Optional Indicators**

This will depend very much on the contents of the NAP - which should have its own indicators. For example, is the NAP an orientation framework or a programming framework? Contents, approval process and monitoring will vary for these two extremes.

The National Action Programme:

- 1 Is under preparation
- 2 Has been drafted
- 3 Has been finalised and approved by the lead agency
- 4 Has been approved and funds committed by all concerned agencies
- 5 Has been approved, funds have been committed by all concerned agencies, institutional measures have been taken, projects have commenced and are being monitored

The National Action Programme:

- 1 Does not identify roles and responsibilities and does not include measures to strengthen the institutional framework and local institutions
- 2
- 3 Identifies measures to strengthen the institutional framework and local institutions, yet does not clearly set out roles and responsibilities.
- 4
- 5 Clearly sets out roles and responsibilities, and identifies measures to strengthen the institutional framework and local institutions.

Information regarding land and land management <sup>xix</sup>:

1	Is difficult to access
2	Is available to the institutions responsible for collecting the information
3	Is partly available to some stakeholders
4	Is readily accessible to all stakeholders
5	Is readily accessible in systemised format to all stakeholders and the general public

Grade the following stakeholder groups in terms of their involvement in the National Action Programme on a scale of 1 (low involvement) to 5 (very high involvement <sup>xx</sup>):

The number/volume of internationally funded projects in direct support of the National Action Programme.

Outcome 4 Medium Term investment Plan being financed and implemented:

**Compulsory Indicators**

**INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS:**

1	Show no interest in the Investment Plan
2	Some partners finance some projects through the Investment Plan, most prefer to finance projects separately
3	
4	Most partners finance most related projects through the Investment Plan
5	Partners finance all related programmes and projects through the Investment Plan

GROUP	STAGE	ROLE IN NAP PREPARATION	ENVISAGED ROLE IN NAP IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM
NATIONAL GOVERNMENT			
LOCAL GOVERNMENTS			
NGOS			
COMMUNITIES			
SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY			
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS			
SMALL SCALE PRIVATE SECTOR			
LARGE SCALE PRIVATE SECTOR			
HOLDERS OF INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE			
OTHER			

Financing for the Investment Plan has been secured (e.g. trust fund fully capitalized; fixed commitment from Ministry of Finance from annual budget; innovative one-off (e.g. debt swap, donor) and sustainable (e.g. service payments) financial mechanisms secured): \_

- 1 No financing secured
- 2 Initial financing secured
- 3
- 4 Considerable financing secured
- 5 Fully financed

**Optional Indicators**

The medium term investment plan: \_\_

- 1 Is under preparation with limited involvement of stakeholders
- 2 Is under preparation with full involvement of stakeholders
- 3 Has been prepared and submitted for approval
- 4 Has been prepared and approved by government agencies, and secured some government funding
- 5 Has been prepared in a fully participatory manner, has been approved, and initial funding from government and development partners has been committed

Implementation mechanism:

- 1 None of the following have been established: body responsible for Plan implementation with authority and budget; independent monitoring mechanism; chef de file from amongst development partners; permanent consultative mechanism involving most donors and national stakeholders
- 2 One of the above is established and functioning
- 3 Two of the above are established and functioning
- 4 Three of the above are established and functioning
- 5 All of the above are established and functioning

To what extent are donors coordinated and harmonised in their approach to financing SLM initiatives:

- 1 No coordination or harmonisation
- 2 Limited, but increasing, coordination and harmonisation
- 3
- 4 Donors are coordinated and harmonised.
- 5 All donors are fully coordinated within the framework of the Medium Term Investment Plan

Percentage of surveyed/targeted land-users, NGOs, private sector with information on and access to the financial mechanisms associated with the Plan <sup>xxi</sup>.

### 3. Monitoring the GEF requirements <sup>xxii</sup>

Participatory nature of the project.

#### Compulsory Indicator

How successful has the project been in forging the involvement of representatives of all concerned stakeholder groups?:

		NGOs	Land-users	Women	Marginalised communities	Indigenous people
1	Not at all					
2	Success with some stakeholders					
3	Success with many stakeholders, some of the time					
4	Success with most stakeholders					
5	Full					

For those respondents indicating '4' or '5', examples should be provided.

#### Optional Indicators

Does the project have specific mechanisms for involving the stakeholders in project decision-making or monitoring?:

1	No mechanisms
2	Mechanisms were envisaged in the project design documents, but were never established
3	
4	Mechanisms envisaged in project design documents were established, but do not function fully
5	Mechanisms established and functioning

The number and level of participation by sectoral agencies, provincial governments, local communities in the project has been:

- 
- 1 Almost inexistent
  - 2
  - 3 Acceptable
  - 4
  - 5 Very satisfactory

What is the project budget for activities that directly target participation (e.g. by developing co-management mechanisms, or by addressing decentralisation)?

Has the project directly led to the finalisation of one (or more) MoU between stakeholders?

Contribution to achieving the MDGs?

**Compulsory Indicator**

---

The project:

- 1 Makes no linkages with either MDG goals or bodies responsible for MDG in the country
- 2
- 3 Is clearly linked to MDG, but no operational linkages have been established
- 4
- 5 Clearly articulates the linkages with MDG and operationalises these linkages

**Optional Indicators**

---

The project management has established mechanisms for monitoring and reporting on the MDGs. **State the specific MDG and national target.**

The project promotes a land management policy that will have a direct impact on poverty alleviation or other MDGs **state the specific MDG**

Integration with other in-country UNCCD implementation mechanisms.

**Compulsory Indicator**

---

The UNCCD National Focal Point and Inter-Sectoral Committee:

- 1 Played no role in project design or implementation

- 2 Played an active role in project design, but are not involved in implementation;
- 3
- 4 Play a role in project design and implementation
- 5 Play a strong and active role in both project design and implementation

**Optional Indicator**

The Project has operational linkages to projects supported by the Global Mechanism and/or other GEF projects in the Sustainable Land Management portfolio.

Linkages with key SLM related capacity development processes in country (including GEF and internationally funded projects <sup>xiii</sup>)

**Optional Indicator**

Co-management arrangements (for example, joint project office or joint project steering committee) have been established with UNDP GEF projects in other focal areas, or with other UNDP natural resource management projects.

Does the project create or promote linkages with the implementation of UNFCCC and UNCBD?

**Compulsory Indicator**

Has the project implemented joint activities with projects implemented within the framework of UNFCCC and/or UNCBD?

**Optional Indicator**

Does the project have activities and/or budget to specifically promote coordination amongst Focal Points and/or national teams/committees of the global environmental conventions?

Contribution to the in-country gender situation, as it relates to SLM.

**Compulsory Indicator**

Do the project outputs (e.g. NAP, Investment Plan, Guides, Training programmes) make specific allowance for the gender dimension?

1	Almost inexistent
2	
3	Sometimes
4	
5	Always

**Optional Indicators**

Is the gender dimension a specific component of any project activity?

Is the gender dimension of the project budgeted separately?

Promote the use and value of indigenous knowledge related to SLM.

**Compulsory Indicator**

Are custodians of indigenous knowledge related to sustainable land management formally included in the project implementation or technical support mechanisms?

**Optional Indicators**

The project outputs (e.g. NAP, Investment Plan) target the use and valorisation of indigenous knowledge

1	Almost never
2	
3	Sometimes
4	
5	Always

Do any project activities focus on indigenous knowledge related to sustainable land management (e.g. creating a database, capacity building)?

Sustainability

This is covered under Section III, Question 3

Replicability

**Compulsory Indicators**

Does the project specify activities to replicate project successes and allocate budget to these activities?

---

**Optional Indicators**

---

What is the budget for replication?

Is there a clear replication strategy for promoting incentive measures and instruments (e.g. certificates, payments) within and beyond the project boundaries?

**SECTION III – MONITORING PROJECT PROCESSES, PROJECT ADAPTIVE  
MANAGEMENT LESSON LEARNING**

**1. Progress and Challenges <sup>xxiv</sup>**

*For each Project Outcome provide a brief narrative analysis of progress and challenges to success*

Outcome 1 Individual and institutional capacity for SLM developed

Outcome 2 SLM mainstreamed into economic and sectoral development

Outcome 3 National Action Programme completed

Outcome 4 Medium Term investment Plan being financed and implemented

**2. Factors Contributing to Progress <sup>xxv</sup>**

*Identify one underlying factor, in the project design or project structure, that is key to the project success. Identify one underlying factor, in the project design or project structure, that is a key obstacle to project success.*

Project design or structure factor underlying project success

Project design or structure factor that is an obstacle to project success

### 3. Lessons learnt <sup>xvi</sup>

*Are there lessons that could benefit the design or the implementation of other GEF-funded projects? Please list up to three.*

- a.
- b.
- c.

### 4. Adjustments To Original Project Strategy

*Indication of any major adjustments in strategies, targets and outcomes.*

- a. Have the project's expected outcomes changed in the course of implementation?
- b. Explain how and when changes were made.
- c. Was the logical framework matrix of the project updated to reflect changes in activities/outputs/objectives?
- d. Has this affected the project's objectives or overall goal?

### 5. Partnership Strategies

*This section refers to collaboration among institutions to achieve mutually shared or agreed upon objectives and goals that draws on individual strengths and maximizes synergies. For the purpose of this report partners are understood as those that either: i) cooperate with the project (through in kind, or financial collaboration); or ii) are subcontracted providers of project services.*

#### 5.1 Please provide the following information 5

Partner Full Name (Do not give acronym only!)	Type (*)	Role (*)	\$ Value	
			Contributed (leveraged)	Contracted

(\*) Please refer to Instruction sheet for guidelines on how to fill out this section.

#### 5.2 Additional information on Private Sector Involvement.

*This refers to companies that contribute to a project as opposed to receiving financing from it as subcontractors.*

1. What economic sector does the company work in (e.g. tourism, fisheries, forestry, agriculture)?
2. How is the company contributing to project objectives?
3. How is the company being involved in project implementation?
4. What benefit is the company deriving from contributing to the project?

### 6. Project Sustainability

#### 6.1

a) What are the key changes brought about (or that will be brought about) by the project which must be maintained into the future?

- 1) ....
- 2) ...
- etc

#### 6.2 What are the critical conditions that must be maintained in order for these changes to be sustained?

Condition Required	Indications that it will be maintained
1)	
2)	
etc	

7. Monitoring And Evaluation			Comments
CO Field Visit	LAST:	NEXT:	
UNDP GEF Field Visit	LAST:	NEXT:	
Tripartite Review	LAST:	NEXT:	
Final Evaluation	PLANNED:	NEXT:	DONE:

**8. Financial Information**

**8.1 Project Funding. Please present all financial values in US\$ millions (e.g. 3,502,000 = 3.502)**

	Grant	Loans	Credits	Equity invest.	In-kind	TOTAL
A. GEF Funding	P					
	A					
B. Co-Financing:						
UNDP (TRAC)	P					
	A					
UN AGENCY	P					
	A					
GOVERNMENT	P					
	A					
BILATERAL DONORS	P					
	A					
MULTILATERAL DONORS	P					
	A					
REGIONAL BANKS	P					
	A					
NON-GOVERN. ORG.	P					
	A					
PRIVATE SECTOR	P					
	A					
OTHER	P					
	A					
Total	P					
Co-Financing	A					
TOTAL FUNDING					Proposed ACTUAL	

**8.2 PROJECT DISBURSEMENTS. From project start up to date of this report**

CUMULATIVE ACTUAL DISBURSEMENT (\$MILLIONS)

CUMULATIVE PLANNED DISBURSEMENT (\$MILLIONS)(\*)

DISBURSEMENTS RATIO

(% OF ACTUAL VS. PLANNED EXPENDITURES)

P=PROPOSED ; A=ACTUAL

(\*) AS STATED IN ORIGINAL BUDGET IN PRODOC

9. WORK PLAN	
For outcomes rated MS or U (see Section II, Part 2), please describe priority Actions planned for the following reporting period to overcome constrains	
ISSUE/CONSTRAINT: PRIORITY ACTION: BY WHOM	Date Entered:  Expected Completion:
ISSUE/CONSTRAINT: PRIORITY ACTION: BY WHOM	Date Entered:  Expected Completion:

10 . RISKS				
	Risk Description	Describe Status of Risk at start of project (Year 0)	Describe Status Last Year	Rating*
A				
B				
C				
D				
Additional Risks or unexpected problems encountered during the last year of implementation				
E				
F				
Please describe actions taken or planned to manage High and Substantial risks				

(\*) H= High ; S= Substantial ;M=Modest ;L= Low. Please refer to Instruction sheet for definition of ratings for risks

## SURVEY OF PERFORMANCE OF THE GLOBAL SUPPORT UNIT

This survey is not related to the national MSP. It relates to the performance of the Global Support Unit (GSU). The aim of this survey is to provide feedback to the GSU on the relevance and effectiveness of the GSU and its support mechanisms.

In each country, at least two persons (one at the UNDP CO and one on the Project Team) should complete the survey. The completed surveys should be sent directly to the GSU.

All concerned UNDP/GEF SLM Regional Technical Advisors (all 6) should also complete this survey, annually.

**For each of the following, rank the support of the GSU on a scale of 1 (not useful) to 5 (very useful).**

**Where appropriate, this should cover both direct support from the GSU, and services procured by GSU for the portfolio, such as sub-contracts to regional organisations.**

**NOTE: National level respondents should only respond to those questions they feel sure about. If unsure about the role of the GSU, the concerned question should be left blank.**

- The technical role of the GSU during the Project formulation period.
- The facilitative role played by the GSU during the Project formulation period.
- The timeliness of the workshops organised by the GSU.
- The relevance to your project of the workshops organised by the GSU.
- The timeliness of the guidelines and documentation prepared by the GSU.
- The timeliness of the response to queries/request by the GSU.
- The relevance to your project of the guidelines and documentation prepared by the GSU.
- The role of the GSU in promoting cross-regional exchanges and fertilisation.
- Respondents indicating 4 or 5 should give examples of how their country has benefited from cross-regional exchanges or fertilisation.
- The role of the GSU in helping the project to address the gender dimension.
- The role of the GSU in helping the project to address the use and value of indigenous knowledge related to SLM.
- Does the MSP Project Document identify specific needs, technical or otherwise, needed from the GSU. If so, to what extent are these being met?
- Overall level of satisfaction with GSU support mechanisms.

## SUPPORTING NOTES

- i Red font indicates suggested answers or alternatives.
- ii To be completed by the UNDP Country Office
- iii This Section consists of compulsory indicators (to be completed by all countries and data to be submitted through the UNDP CO to UNDP/GEF and SLM GSU by 30th June each year) and a large menu of optional indicators.
- iv Precise wording of the Objective varies from country to country, but the meaning is approximately the same.
- v For scorecard questions, choose from the table below and insert the response (i.e., number 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5) into the following space. The responder should choose the response that is most closely equivalent to the in-country situation. For example, if elements of SLM are found in several laws, a high number should be chosen (4 or 5), even if there is no Law focussing specifically on SLM.
- vi A survey will be designed by the GSU for implementation in all countries. Undertaking the survey will be financed by the national MSP budget.
- vii For quantifiable indicators such as this, the project should establish the baseline figure, and then establish targets to be achieved through the project.
- ix This refers to any committee that has been established to oversee UNCCD implementation or to address land degradation. Informal committees may be considered.
- x In some cases it is not possible to provide five alternative responses. Three or four are provided in such cases.
- x A survey will be developed by GSU, implementation to be financed through MSP budget.
- xi The organisations should be identified in the country. This scorecard question assesses 'understanding of needs', not ability to meet needs, nor level of skills.
- xii Principal agencies will vary from country to country. At a minimum this is the Ministry for Environment. It almost definitely includes the ministries responsible for land, agriculture, forests, water and food. It may include institutes, universities, even NGOs.
- xiii Note that this scorecard question relates to monitoring the performance of the organisations.
- xiv This scorecard question relates to access to accurate information/data.

- xv This scorecard question uses dialogue as a proxy indicator of the scale of society's involvement in monitoring the land.
- xvi NCB or other inter-sectoral formal committee.
- xvii The sector targeted for mainstreaming will vary from country to country. For example, some may aim for mainstreaming into development policy in general. Others may seek mainstreaming into a sector, say agriculture.
- xviii Select from amongst these
- xix For this scorecard question, access to information is used as a proxy indicator of ability to implement NAP.
- xx This question assesses the involvement of the different groups in the NAP, an indicator of its quality.
- xxi This would require a survey, with budgetary implications.
- xxii Note that in each case the following refer specifically to the MSP project, not to land degradation nor to sustainable land management in general. For example, the participatory question refers to participation in the project, not in land management in general.
- xxiii No compulsory question.
- xxiv 1-2 pages would be appropriate.
- xxv 1-2 pages would be appropriate.
- xxvi 1-2 pages would be appropriate.

# Guidelines for the completion of the Awareness & Satisfaction Surveys

## Introduction

There are two surveys in this M&E toolkit. Each survey is supported by spreadsheets which process the data from the national to regional and global levels.

Users are encouraged to use the information generated to draw conclusions about the level of satisfaction with the technical support provided and the level of awareness about SLM that there is. Users are especially encouraged to use the disaggregation by sex to analyse gender and to analyse the responses to specific questions.

Each survey and its spreadsheets contains an example for user reference (Annexures 1, 2 and 3 for the Awareness survey and 4, 5 and 6 for the Satisfaction survey).

A glossary of terms used in the surveys is attached as Annexure 8.

## Regional and country uniqueness

Each national MSP has its own unique conditions and requirements. The survey and spreadsheets have been designed for easy alteration in-country by the Project Teams.

MSPs are encouraged to ensure that there are at least twenty questions in the surveys. Some questions can be deleted to suit the specific country conditions. In some cases a new scorecard type question and scoring may be developed if desired.

## Conducting the survey

The surveys should be completed in each of the countries participating in the LDC and SIDS Targeted Portfolio Approach for Capacity Development and Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management Project.

### Survey staff

The surveys should be completed by an extensionist, project officer or anyone who is at the contact point in the Department that deals with SLM.

### Timing

Complete the survey annually at the same time every year for the duration of the support.

### Baseline

The first completion of the survey will become the baseline for all future assessments. Any improvement or decline in the impact of the support should be deduced by comparison of subsequent surveys against the baseline.

The first baseline survey questionnaire of each MSP will be technically verified by the GSU (hans.eschweiler@undp.org), while the following annual ones (which should be the same as the first but with some modifications if required), will be checked by the CO.

## Sampling

In order to get an accurate sample for the survey ensure the following are adhered to:

- 1) The size of the sample will vary from country to country but must reflect a representative sample of the interested and affected parties.
- 2) The population are the general public (for the awareness survey) and land-users (for the satisfaction survey)
- 3) The sampling units are individuals (for the awareness survey) and land-users (for the satisfaction survey).
- 4) The scope of the target population (or universe) is a country.
- 5) The sampling frame or the set of units from which the sample will be selected is a list of interested and affected parties involved in the MSP.

## Survey methodology

A structured interview is suggested. The interview may be conducted telephonically or face-to-face.

## Etiquette

The person conducting the survey is encouraged to adopt the following practices when engaging with a respondent.

- Thank her/him for their time
- Explain that the survey will take about 20 minutes
- Explain the purpose of the survey
- After the survey thank her/ him for their participation
- Ask if you can approach her/him for any follow-up questions

## Scoring the survey

The survey is in a scorecard format. The scoring system is a simple weighting on a scale of 1-5. The scale increases from low to high from a generally low level to a generally high level of awareness or satisfaction as described in the table below.

Score	Equivalent value (%)	Awareness survey	Satisfaction survey
1	0%	Generally low level of awareness	Generally low level of satisfaction
2	25%		
3	50%		
4	75%	Generally high level of awareness	Generally high level of satisfaction
5	100%		

The surveys have been designed to account for the sex of the respondent. These are quantified as the number of Female or Male respondents and are not scored according to the scoring system shown above. Instead the sex of the respondents is captured as a number.

## Instructions for the completion of the Satisfaction and Awareness Surveys and Spreadsheets

### Survey 1: Awareness

(Objective 1: To measure the increase of public awareness regarding SLM)

#### Aim of the survey

The aim of the survey is to measure if there has been an increase in public awareness of SLM.

#### Sample

Prepare a representative sample of public, private and civil society organizations from the universe of interested and affected parties in the support. The sample must include individuals, parastatals, government, NGOs, CSO/CBOs and research institutions which are part of the universe of the support's target group.

### Survey 2: Satisfaction

(Outcome 1: To measure the increase in the percentage of land-users that are satisfied with the available technical support.)

#### Aim of the survey

The aim of the survey is to identify an increase in the percentage of land-users that are satisfied with the available technical support offered by the support.

#### Sample

The National Coordinator must compile a representative sample of land-users from the universe of interested and affected parties in the support. The sample must include individuals, parastatals, government, NGOs, CSO/CBOs and research institutions which are part of the universe of the support's target group.

## Instructions

### The surveys

The surveys must be completed by in the following way:

1. Once the sample has been selected, the required number of surveys is printed and prenumbered.
2. Printed surveys are prenumbered with consecutive numbers prefixed by the country acronym (e.g. for the first survey in Mauritius the reference is MU1) in the top right hand corner of the survey. A table of standard country acronyms is attached as Annexure 7.
3. One survey is completed in hard copy for each respondent identified in the sample.
4. Complete the survey by checking (with an X) the appropriate score on the scorecard questions.
5. The interviewer must write her/his name, sign and date the survey on completion.
6. The surveys are returned to the National MSP and the raw data is entered onto the National Summary spreadsheet.

## The spreadsheets

The spreadsheet data must be captured in the following way:

1. Do not enter data into the greyed out cells.
2. The national data capturer collects the completed surveys from the interviewers. S/he collates them numerically.
3. On the spreadsheets the data capturer must amend the spreadsheet to match the sample number on the sheet:
  - a. Adjust the number of respondents in the National Summary by adding the number of rows required to match the sample size of the country.
  - b. Adjust the number of respondents in the Regional-Global Summary by adding the number of columns required to match the sample size of the country.
  - c. Adjust the number of questions to the final number decided on in both the National and Regional-Global Summaries by adding the required number of rows and columns respectively.
4. For gender data collection and disaggregation the following must be done:
  - a. The data capturer enters M (male) or F (female) into the Question 1 row of the National Summary.
  - b. The data capturer manually adds up the number of Males and Females.
  - c. The total numbers for Male and Female are entered into cells W7 and X7.
5. Make the following changes to formulae in the spreadsheets:
  - a. Copy the formula in cell Y29 in the National Summary spreadsheet to all the cells (Y9, Y10 and so on) for the appropriate country in the sheet Regional-Global Summary..
  - b. Copy cell B9 in sheet Regional-Global Summary sheet from cell W29 in sheet National Summary.
  - c. Copy cell C9 in sheet Regional-Global Summary from cell X29 in sheet National Summary.
  - d. Copy cell Y8 in the sheet National Summary to the cell D9 in the sheet Regional-Global Summary then copy the cell across all questions.
  - e. Change the formula in sheet National Summary in cell Y8 (=SUM(C8:V8)/19) so that "19" reflects your correct sample number. For example in the Satisfaction survey example the sample was 19 (=SUM(C8:V8)/19).
  - f. For gender disaggregation change the formula in sheet National Summary in cell W8 (=(6/20\*100/1)/1\*Y8/100) so that "6" and "2" for Male in Awareness and Satisfaction respectively reflect the correct number of Male respondents. The same should be done in cell X8 for Female respondents. The formula can be copied from the sheet Example National Summary.
6. The data capturer uses the country summary surveys to enter the information (percentages) into the national summary spreadsheet according to the scoring  
(1 = 0%; 2 = 25%; 3 = 50%; 4 = 75%; 5 = 100%).
7. The national summary will be e-mailed to the GSU (hans.eschweiler@undp.org).
8. The spreadsheets for the Regional- Global Summaries are relevant to the GSU and must not be completed by the country support.

## Annexure 1: Example of the Awareness survey

### National SLM SIDS and LDC Portfolio Project Survey

#### Objective 1 Indicator: Increase of public awareness regarding SLM

COUNTRY	ANGOLA	SURVEY NO.:	AO1
DATE	11.NOV.05	PERIOD OF SURVEY	OCT.04
		TO	OCT.05

1 What is the sex of the respondent?

Female  Male

2 Have you heard of "Sustainable Land Management"?

Yes  No

**Please respond to each of the following as accurately as possible:**

3 Of these four, how many have you heard of - UN Convention to Combat Desertification, UN Convention on Climate Change, UN Convention on Biodiversity, Millennium Development Goals?

- 1 Have not heard of any
- 2 Have heard of one
- 3 Have heard of two
- X** 4 Have heard of three
- 5 Have heard of all four

4 What best describes the way(s) you have come to know about SLM through the media?

- 1 Have not heard about SLM from any media
- 2 From the internet
- X** 3 From television and the internet
- 4 From the radio and printed matter
- 5 Printed matter, television, radio and the internet

5 What best describes the way(s) you have verbally heard about SLM?

- X** 1 Never heard about SLM verbally
- 2 From a non-verbal source, like the media, the press
- 3 From a conference, workshop or seminar
- 4 From a colleague or word-of-mouth
- 5 I work in SLM

6 SLM related National Policy is:

**X** Not known to me

- 2 I am not sure if there is any
- 3 Known to me but I do not know much about it
- 4 Known to me
- 5 Very well known to me.

7 National Legislation is:

- 1 Not known to me
- X I am not sure if there is any
- 3 Known to me but I do not know much about it
- 4 Known to me
- 5 Very well known to me.

8 National Regulations on SLM is:

- 1 Not known to me
- 2 I am not sure if there are any
- 3 Known to me but I do not know much about them
- X Known to me
- 5 Very well known to me.

9 National/Regional/Provincial/Local SLM related National Development Plans are:

- 1 Not known to me
- X I am not sure if there are any
- 3 Known to me but I do not know much about them
- 4 Known to me
- 5 Very well known to me.

10 Publications that deal with SLM are:

- 1 Not known to me
- X I am not sure if there are any
- 3 Known to me but I do not know much about them
- 4 Known to me
- 5 Very well known to me.

11 Can you estimate how many statements or speeches you have heard that relate to SLM?

- 1 None
- X 1 to 3
- 3 3 to 6
- 4 6 to 9
- 5 More than 10

- 12 Can you estimate how many TV programmes or documentaries you have seen that relate to SLM?
- 1 None
  - 2 1 or 2
  - 3 2 or 3
  - 3 or 4
  - 5 More than 5
- 13 In the last year how many radio programmes relating to SLM have you heard?
- 1 None
  - 2 1 or 2
  - 3 2 or 3
  - 4 3 or 4
  - More than 5
- 14 In the last year can you estimate how many articles in a newspaper or publication on SLM have you read?
- 1 None
  - 2 1 or 2
  - 3 2 or 3
  - 4 3 or 4
  - More than 5
- 15 Organisations that promote SLM are:
- 1 Not known to me
  - 2 I am not sure if there are any
  - Known to me but I do not know much about them
  - 4 Known to me
  - 5 Very well known to me.
- 16 New organisations or institutions that deal with SLM that were established in the last year are:
- 1 Not known to me
  - 2 I am not sure if there are any
  - 3 Known to me but I do not know much about them
  - 4 Known to me
  - Very well known to me.
- 17 Senior decision-makers in my sector have:
- 1 No awareness and no understanding of SLM
  - 2 Low awareness and low understanding of SLM

- 3 Awareness and understanding of SLM
  - X Awareness and sound understanding of SLM
  - 5 Very high awareness and understanding of SLM
- 18 NGOs and CSOs have:
- 1 No awareness and no understanding of SLM
  - 2 Low awareness and low understanding of SLM
  - 3 Awareness and understanding of SLM
  - X Awareness and sound understanding of SLM
  - 5 Very high awareness and understanding of SLM
- 19 The public sector have
- 1 No awareness and no understanding of SLM
  - X Low awareness and low understanding of SLM
  - 3 Awareness and understanding of SLM
  - 4 Awareness and sound understanding of SLM
  - 5 Very high awareness and understanding of SLM
- 20 The private sector have
- 1 No awareness and no understanding of SLM
  - 2 Low awareness and low understanding of SLM
  - X Awareness and understanding of SLM
  - 4 Awareness and sound understanding of SLM
  - 5 Very high awareness and understanding of SLM
- 21 In general, public awareness of SLM is:
- 1 low
  - 2 low-medium
  - 3 medium
  - X medium-high
  - 5 high
- 22 In general, knowledge and understanding of SLM is:
- 1 low
  - 2 low-medium
  - X medium
  - 4 medium-high
  - 5 high

23 Do you personally think that SLM is an important issue?

- No important at all
- Unimportant
- Indifferent
- Important
- Very important

Do you have any comments or suggestions regarding raising awareness in SLM?

The respondent suggested that more extension staff be deployed in the field at community level.

**Thank you for your time and assistance**

name	sign	date
captured by (interviewer):		
processed by (data entry):		
verified by PM:		

## Annexure 2: : Example of the National Summary for Awareness

**National Summary: Awareness survey**      date: 11/11/05

Period of summary: octu-04 to octu-05

Country: Angola

Question No.	Survey No.										sex		country (question) TOTAL										
	A01	A02	A03	A04	A05	A06	A07	A08	A09	A10	A11	A12		A13	A14	A15	A16	A17	A18	A19	A20	M	F
1	F	M	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	6	14	20
2	0	0	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	22	52	74
3	50	50	25	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	22	52	74
4	50	25	25	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	18	42	60
5	0	0	50	50	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	7	16	23
6	0	0	0	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	13	30	43
7	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	18	43	61
8	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	26	60	86
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	22
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	22
11	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	13	30	42
12	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	13	30	42
13	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	26	60	86
14	100	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	19	43	62
15	50	75	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	20	45	65
16	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	13	30	43
17	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	24	56	80
18	75	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	18	43	61
19	25	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	13	30	42
20	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	12	28	40
21	75	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	12	29	41
22	50	50	25	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	17	24	41
23	0	50	50	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	22	29	51
Survey/ respondent TOTAL	48	52	51	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	30	70	54

Total number of respondents disaggregated by sex.

% response to a specific question by sex. Indicates proportion of M and F expressing the general level of awareness for each specific question

Gives a general level of awareness for each specific question at country level.

Total country average of all surveys responded to. Indicates a national general level of awareness.

Total country average of respondents disaggregated by sex.

Average percentage for all questions in a particular survey. Indicates a general level of awareness in the target group per respondent.

### Annexure 3: Example of the Regional- Global Summary for Awareness

**Regional-Global Summary: Awareness survey**

Period of summary: octu-04 to octu-05

NOTE: Countries must not complete this spreadsheet. To be completed by the GSI.

Region	Question																							TOTAL
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	
<b>AFRICA</b>	M	F																						
Angola	45	55	100	92	74	29	55	76	105	26	53	53	105	74	79	53	97	74	50	26	50	0	26	95
Burundi	45	55	100	92	74	29	55	76	105	26	53	53	105	74	79	53	97	74	50	26	50	0	26	95
Central African Republic																								
Comoros																								
Democratic Republic of Congo																								
Equatorial Guinea																								
Guinea Bissau																								
Liberia																								
Mauritius																								
Rwanda																								
Sao Tome and Principe																								
Seychelles																								
Sierra Leone																								
<b>ASIA</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Afghanistan																								
Bangladesh																								
Bhutan																								
Cambodia																								
Maldives																								
Papua New Guinea																								
Timor-Leste																								
<b>PACIFIC</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cook Islands																								
Fiji																								
Kiribati																								
Marshall Islands																								
Micronesia																								
Nauru																								
Niue																								
Palau																								
Samoa																								
Solomon Islands																								
Tonga																								
Turkmenistan																								
Vanuatu																								
<b>CARIBBEAN</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Barbados																								
Belize																								
Dominica																								
Dominican republic																								
Grenada																								
Guyana																								
Haiti																								
Jamaica																								
St. Kitts/ Nevis																								
St. Lucia																								
St. Vincent and the Grenadines																								
Suriname																								
Trinidad and Tobago																								
<b>GLOBAL AVERAGE</b>	45	55	100	92	74	29	55	76	105	26	53	53	105	74	79	53	97	74	50	26	50	0	26	95

Percentage of national respondents disaggregated by sex.

Percentage of regional respondents disaggregated by sex.

Total regional average of all surveys responded to. Indicates a regional general level of satisfaction with the support.

Total country average of all surveys responded to. Indicates a national general level of satisfaction with the support.

Total global average of all surveys responded to. Indicates a global general level of satisfaction with the support.

## Annexure 4: Example of the Satisfaction survey

### National SLM SIDS and LDC Portfolio Project Survey

#### Outcome 1 Indicator: Increase in the percentage of land-users that are satisfied with available technical support

COUNTRY	ANGOLA	PERIOD OF SURVEY	OCT.04	SURVEY NO.:	AO1
DATE	11.NOV.05	TO	OCT.05		

1 What is the sex of the respondent?

Female  Male

**Please respond as accurately as possible:**

2 Have you ever received any assistance up to now?

Yes  No

**If "No" answer questions 3, 4, 5 and 6 ONLY.**

3 Do you need technical assistance?

- 1 No, not at all!
- 2 No
- 3 Not sure
- 4 Yes
- 5 Yes, urgently!

4 Do you have an idea of what type of assistance you need?

- 1 No idea at all
- 2 Not really
- 3 I have some sense of what assistance I need
- 4 Yes, some idea
- 5 Yes, a very clear idea

5 How do you think the best way to go about getting assistance is?

- 1 I have no idea how to do this
- 2 Someone tells me how to get assistance
- 3 I approach someone for assistance
- 4 People who give assistance advise me how to get assistance
- 5 The assistance is offered to me

6 Have you ever formally requested assistance?

- 1 No
- 2 Yes, once
- X Yes, 2-3 times
- 4 Yes, 3-5 times
- 5 Yes, more than 5 times

**STOP here if you answered "No" to question 2**

7 How was the technical assistance supplied?

- 1 I came across it by coincidence
- 2 I approached someone for assistance
- 3 A colleague told me about it
- X A colleague told the assistance about my problem
- 5 The assistance approached me

8 How long have you used the assistance for?

- 1 About 1-3 months
- 2 About 4-6 months
- 3 About 6-9 months
- 4 About 9-12 months
- X More than 1 year

9 In the last 12 months how many times have you used the assistance?

- 1 Never
- X Monthly
- 3 2-3 times/ yr
- 4 4-5 times / yr
- 5 More than 5 times /yr

10 The kind of technical assistance that you received was:

- 1 None; no support was given.
- 2 Very poor; the support was not technically sound.
- X Average; the support was only just technically adequate.
- 4 Very satisfactory; the support was technically sound and professional.
- 5 Superior; the assistance was excellent and exactly what was needed

11 After first getting assistance, the contact that you had with the person giving assistance was:

- 1 Very poor; there was no contact
- 2 Poor; there was limited contact
- 3 Average; there was the required contact
- 4 Satisfactory; the contact was professional and technically sound.
- 5 Excellent; s/he took the responsibility for follow-up contact

12 How long did it take to resolve the problem?

- 1 The problem has still not been resolved
- 2 6 months
- 3 1 month
- 4 1 week
- 5 The problem was resolved immediately

**Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following:**

13 Rate your general satisfaction with the assistance.

- 1 Extremely unsatisfied
- 2 Unsatisfied
- 3 Indifferent
- 4 Satisfied
- 5 Extremely satisfied

14 In thinking about your most recent experience, was the quality of the service you received:

- 1 Very poor
- 2 Somewhat unsatisfactory
- 3 About average
- 4 Very satisfactory
- 5 Superior

15 How satisfied with the user-friendliness of the assistance are you?

- 1 Extremely unsatisfied
- 2 Unsatisfied
- 3 Indifferent
- 4 Satisfied
- 5 Extremely satisfied

- 16 The person who gave support:
- 1 Was not courteous and unwilling to support
  - 2 Did not display the kind of behaviour I expect
  - 3 Was courteous and willing to help
  - 4 Acted very professionally and was polite
  - X Very courteous and willing to assist; s/he went out of her/his way
- 17 The support person's knowledge of my situation and problem was:
- 1 S/he had no idea of my situation or problem
  - 2 S/he had a minimal sense of the situation and problem
  - 3 S/he had an idea of the situation and problem
  - X S/he understood the situation and problem well
  - 5 S/he was fully aware of the context and well prepared for the problem
- 18 How would you rate the quality of the assistance NOW compared to when you first used it?
- 1 Significantly worse
  - 2 Worse
  - X Neutral
  - 4 Better
  - 5 Significantly better
- 19 The assistance given was:
- 1 Far too complicated; I did not understand it
  - X Complicated; it was difficult to understand
  - 3 It was neither too complex nor too simple
  - 4 Simple; I understood most of it
  - 5 Simple; I understood it completely
- 20 Would you approach the person for advice or a referral on other problems that you may have?
- 1 No
  - 2 Reluctantly
  - X Perhaps
  - 4 Certainly
  - 5 Without a doubt!
- 21 I will use the assistance again in the future:
- 1 Never
  - X Less than likely
  - 3 Possibly

- 4 Likely
- 5 Definitely

22 How likely are you to refer the assistance to a colleague?

- 1 Not at all
- 2 Less than likely
- 3 Possibly
- 4 Likely
- X Definitely

**Please provide any comments or suggestions regarding the assistance**

The respondent suggested that the support be advertised on the notice boards of the local municipality.

**Thank you for your time and assistance**

name	sign	date
captured by (interviewer):		
processed by (data entry):		
verified by PM:		

# Annexure 5: Example of the National Summary for Satisfaction

**National Summary: Satisfaction survey** 2/12/05

Period of summary: nov-04 to nov-05

Country: Angola

Question No.	Survey No.												country (question) TOTAL						
	A01	A02	A03	A04	A05	A06	A07	A08	A09	A010	A011	A012		A013	A014				
1	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	M	F	F	2	18	20	
2	100	0	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	0	100	9	85	95
3	100	50	25	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	50	50	100	9	83	92
4	75	25	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	25	25	75	7	66	74
5	25	50	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	50	50	25	3	26	29
6	50	100	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	6	50	55
7	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	8	69	76
8	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	11	95	105
9	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	3	24	26
10	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	5	47	53
11	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	5	47	53
12	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	11	95	105
13	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	7	66	74
14	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	8	71	79
15	50	75	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	75	75	5	47	53	
16	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	10	88	97
17	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	7	66	74
18	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	25	25	5	45	50	
19	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	3	24	26
20	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	3	24	26
21	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	3	24	26
22	100	50	50	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	9	83	95
Survey/respondent TOTAL	63	51	48	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	10	90	63

Total number of respondents disaggregated by sex.

% response to a specific question by sex. Indicates proportion of M and F expressing the general level of satisfaction for each specific question.

Gives a general level of satisfaction for each specific question at country level.

Average percentage for all questions in a particular survey. Indicates a general level of satisfaction with the support per respondent.

Total country average of all surveys responded to. Indicates a national general level of satisfaction with the support.

Total country average of respondents disaggregated by sex.

# Annexure 6: Example of the Regional- Global Summary for Satisfaction

**Regional-Global Summary: Satisfaction survey**      nov-04      to      nov-05      2/12/05

Period of summary

NOTE: Countries must not complete this spreadsheet. To be completed by the GSU.

Region	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	TOTAL	
<b>AFRICA</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>F</b>																						
Angola	10	90	95	92	74	29	55	76	105	26	53	53	105	74	79	53	97	74	50	26	50	26	95	58
Burundi	10	90	95	92	74	29	55	76	105	26	53	53	105	74	79	53	97	74	50	26	50	26	95	50
Central African Republic																								100
Democratic Republic of Congo																								75
Equatorial Guinea																								25
Guinea																								50
Guinea Bissau																								100
Liberia																								75
Mauritius																								50
Rwanda																								50
Sao Tome and Principe																								100
Seychelles																								100
Sierra Leone																								25
<b>ASIA</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Afghanistan																								25
Bangladesh																								25
Bhutan																								25
Cambodia																								50
Maldives																								25
Papua New Guinea																								25
Timor-Leste																								100
<b>PACIFIC</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Cook Islands																								25
Fiji																								50
Kiribati																								50
Marshall Islands																								50
Micronesia																								75
Nauru																								50
Niue																								50
Pelau																								75
Samoa																								75
Solomon Islands																								100
Tonga																								25
Tuvalu																								50
Vanuatu																								100
<b>CARIBBEAN</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Barbados																								100
Belize																								100
Dominica																								50
Dominican republic																								50
Grenada																								75
Guyana																								25
Haiti																								25
Jamaica																								100
St. Kitts/ Nevis																								50
St. Lucia																								50
St. Vincent and the Grenadines																								50
Suriname																								50
Trinidad and Tobago																								50
<b>GLOBAL AVERAGE</b>	10	90	95	92	74	29	55	76	105	26	53	53	105	74	79	53	97	74	50	26	50	26	95	58

Percentage of regional respondents disaggregated by sex.

Percentage of national respondents disaggregated by sex.

Percentage of global respondents disaggregated by sex.

Total regional average of all surveys responded to. Indicates a regional general level of satisfaction with the support.

Total country average of all surveys responded to. Indicates a national general level of satisfaction with the support.

Total global average of all surveys responded to. Indicates a global general level of satisfaction with the support.

## Annexure 7: Standardized country acronyms for use in the surveys and spreadsheets

AFRICA		PACIFIC	
AO	ANGOLA	CK	COOK ISLANDS
BI	BURUNDI	FJ	FUJI
CF	CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	KI	KIRIBATI
CD	DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO	MH	MARSHALL ISLANDS
GQ	EQUATORIAL GUINEA	FM	MICRONESIA
GN	GUINEA	NR	NAURU
GW	GUINEA BISSAU	NU	NIUE
LR	LIBERIA	PW	PALAU
RW	RWANDA	WS	SAMOA
SL	SIERRA LEONE	SB	SOLOMON ISLANDS
KM	COMOROS	TO	TONGA
MU	MAURITIUS	TV	TUVALU
ST	SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE	VU	VANUATU
SC	SEYCHELLES		

ASIA		CARIBBEAN	
AF	AFGHANISTAN	BB	BARBADOS
BD	BANGLADESH	BZ	BELIZE
BT	BHUTAN	DM	DOMINICA
KH	CAMBODIA	DO	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
MV	MALDIVES	GD	GRENADA
PG	PAPUA NEW GUINEA	GY	GUYANA
TL	TIMOR-LESTE	HT	HAITI
		JM	JAMAICA
		KN	ST. KITTS/ NEVIS
		LC	ST. LUCIA
		VC	ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES
		SR	SURINAME
		TT	TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

## Annexure 8: Glossary of terms used in the surveys

AVAILABLE TECHNICAL SUPPORT	TECHNICAL SUPPORT THAT IS OFFERED BY THE AGENCY THAT IS IMPLEMENTING THE SUPPORT. IT COMES FROM A GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT, THE PRIVATE SECTOR OR AN NGO BUT MAY COME FROM ORGANISATIONS LIKE COMMODITY PRODUCERS ASSOCIATIONS.
INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES	ALL ORGANISATIONS, INSTITUTIONS AND INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE IN DIRECT CONTACT WITH THE SUPPORT.
PUBLIC AWARENESS	THE LEVEL OF AWARENESS THAT THE PUBLIC HAVE AROUND SLM.
SERVICE SUPPLIER	ANY AGENCY THAT PROVIDES TECHNICAL SUPPORT TO THE TARGET GROUP; IT INCLUDES MULTILATERAL AGENCIES, BILATERAL AGENCIES, GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS, RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS, INDIVIDUALS AND CONSULTANTS.
THE PUBLIC	A PROFILE OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC, INCLUDING ALL INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES, FROM GOVERNMENT, CIVIL SOCIETY AND THE PUBLIC SECTOR. THE PROFILE INCLUDES THOSE NOT DIRECTLY INVOLVED.

## REFERENCES

### Background information on land degradation and OP 15

GEF, *'Operational Programme on Sustainable Land Management (OP 15)'*, 2003.

GEF, *'Pilot Country Programmatic Partnerships on Sustainable Land Management'*, Draft.

GEF/IUCN, *'Land Degradation and the GEF: A Guide to Developing Project Proposals and Accessing Project Funding from the Global Environment Facility for Sustainable Land Management'*, 2007.

GEF SEC Review Sheet for Project *'Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in Mauritius'*.

UNCCD/Global Mechanism, Brochure, *'The Global Mechanism of the UNCCD: Mobilising Resources to Combat Land Degradation and Poverty'*.

UNDP/GEF *'Guidelines for Developing OP 15 Projects Under Strategic Priority 1: Capacity Building'*, Draft.

UNDP/GEF, *'Scope and Coherence of the Land Degradation Activities in the GEF'*, 2005.

UNDP/UNCCD, *'Memorandum of Cooperation Between UNCCD Secretariat and UNDP'*.

United Nations, Text of the Convention to Combat Desertification in Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa, 1994.

### Background information on monitoring and evaluation

GEF, *'Monitoring and Evaluation, Policies and Procedures'*, 2002.

GEF, *'Report of GEF M&E Office on Annual Performance Review'*, 2005.

UN Evaluation Group, *'Norms for Evaluation in the UN System'*, 2005.

UN Evaluation Group, *'Standards for Evaluation in the UN System'*, 2005.

UNDP, *'Managing for Results: Monitoring and Evaluation in UNDP'*, 2001.

UNDP, *'Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators'*, 2002

UNDP/GEF, *'Measuring and Demonstrating Impact: UNDP/GEF Resource Kit (No. 2)'*, 2005.

UNDP/GEF, Formats for Annual Project Reports for UNDP/GEF Projects (Climate Change, Biodiversity and International Waters).

UNDP/GEF/SGP, *'Small Grants Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Framework'*.

## Sources of Indicators

GEF, *'Strategic Business Planning: Directions and Targets'*, 2003.

GEF, *'Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority Two: Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes and Sectors'*, 2004.

OSS/CILSS, *'UNCCD's Implementation Indicators –GRID a NAP Consolidation Tool'*. 1998

UNEP/GEF Case Studies on Sustainable Land Management.

UNCCD, *'Summary Grid for Monitoring Implementation of GEF-Related Projects'*, Draft, 2005.

UNCCD/COP, *'Benchmarks and Indicators: Report of the Ad Hoc Panel'*, 1998.

UNCCD/CRIC, *'National Reporting Process of Affected Country Parties: Explanatory Note and Help Guide'*, 2003.

UNCCD/INC, *'Report on Ongoing Work Being Done on benchmarks and Indicators'*, 1996.

UNDP/GEF, *'Biodiversity Indicators Advisory Note'*, Draft, 2003.

UNDP/GEF, *'Capacity Development Indicators, UNDP Resource Kit'*, Draft, 2003.

UNDP/GEF/Government of Argentina, Full-Sized Project Proposal, *'Sustainable Management of Arid and Semi-arid Ecosystems to Combat Desertification in Patagonia'*, 2005.

UNDP/GEF/Government of the Central African Republic, *'Request for PDF A Funds, Sustainable Land Management under the Global Portfolio Project'*, 2005.

UNDP/GEF/Government of the Dominican Republic, Project Brief for the SLM Full Project, 2005.

UNDP/Government of Mauritius, *'Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in Mauritius (under LDC and SIDS Targeted Umbrella Project for Capacity Building and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management)'*, Project Brief.

UNDP/GEF/Government of Niger, Project Brief for the SLM Full Project, 2005.

UNDP/GEF/Government of the Solomon Islands, *'Request for PDF A Funds, Sustainable Land Management under the Global Portfolio Project'*, 2005.

## Other

FAO et al, *'Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA)'*, Project information sheet.

UNDP/GEF Targeted Portfolio Approach/LDC-SIDS Portfolio Project, First Annual Workplan, June 2005.

UNDP/GEF Targeted Portfolio Approach/LDC-SIDS Portfolio Project, TPA Project, Inception Report, June 2005.

UNDP/GEF Targeted Portfolio Approach/LDC-SIDS Portfolio Project, Minutes of the First Global Advisory Committee Meeting, May 2005.

UNDP/GEF Targeted Portfolio Approach/LDC-SIDS Portfolio Project, Revised Format for Expedited MSP Projects within TPA umbrella, June 2005.

UNDP/GEF, *'LDC and SIDS Targeted Portfolio Approach for Capacity Development and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management'*, Project Document, 2005.



Additional information can be obtained  
from the following contacts:

**UNDP-GEF HQ**

Dr. Maryam Niamir-Fuller  
Principal Technical Advisor (Land Degradation)  
Email: [maryam.niamir-fuller@undp.org](mailto:maryam.niamir-fuller@undp.org)

**Global Support Unit**

Hans Eschweiler  
Global Coordinator  
SLM Portfolio Project for LDC/SIDS  
UNDP, Pretoria, South Africa  
Email: [hans.eschweiler@undp.org](mailto:hans.eschweiler@undp.org)



[www.undp.org/gef](http://www.undp.org/gef)