



**IFAD**  
**INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT**  
**Executive Board – Seventy-Seventh Session**  
Rome, 10-11 December 2002

**PROGRESS REPORT ON THE GLOBAL MECHANISM OF THE UNITED NATIONS  
CONVENTION TO COMBAT DESERTIFICATION IN THOSE COUNTRIES  
EXPERIENCING SERIOUS DROUGHT AND/OR DESERTIFICATION,  
PARTICULARLY IN AFRICA**





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. CONTEXT, RATIONALE AND THRUSTS OF GM INTERVENTIONS</b>	<b>1</b>
A. The CCD as a Sustainable Development Framework	1
B. CCD Financing: Original Context and New Developments	1
C. Lessons learned from CCD Implementation	2
D. The GM Operational Strategy	2
E. Strategic partners of the GM	2
F. Information and Communication	3
G. Contributions to GM Resources	3
<b>III. MOBILIZING RESOURCES FOR CCD IMPLEMENTATION</b>	<b>4</b>
A. Learning by Doing	4
B. Building Partnership Frameworks as a Proactive Approach to Resource Mobilization	5
C. Supporting Civil Society	6
Box: The GM Multiplier Effect	7
<b>IV. THE WAY FORWARD</b>	<b>7</b>
A. Broadening the Funding Base from Parties to the Convention	7
B. Mobilizing New and Additional Resources	8
C. Communications Strategy	9
<b>ANNEX I: GENERIC ROAD MAP FOR PARTNERSHIP BUILDING AND RESOURCE MOBILIZATION</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>ANNEX II: DONOR INFORMATION</b>	<b>12</b>





## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CBO	Community-Based Organization
CCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
CHC	Congressional Hunger Centre
COP	Conference of the Parties
ECOWAS/CILSS	Economic Community of West African States/Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GM	Global Mechanism
GTZ	German Agency for Technical Cooperation
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
NAP	National Action Programme
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee
PRSP	Poverty-Reduction Strategy Paper
RIOD	International NGO Network on Desertification
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SRAP	Subregional Action Programme
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development





## I. INTRODUCTION

1. In October 1997, on the occasion of the First Session of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD), IFAD was selected as the housing institution of the Global Mechanism (GM) of the Convention. Under the authority of the COP, the GM is mandated “to promote actions leading to the mobilization of substantial financial resources, including for the transfer of technology, on grant basis, and/or on concessional or other terms, to affected developing countries...”. The GM began its operations in 1998, and has submitted reports to the Executive Board of IFAD in December 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001, and to the Governing Council in February 1999, 2000 and 2001. This fifth report to the Executive Board provides a short recapitulation of the CCD background and GM’s operational strategy and alliances. It also gives an overview of lessons learned and GM activities in 2002, and outlines achievements to date in building partnerships and mobilizing resources.

## II. CONTEXT, RATIONALE AND THRUSTS OF GM INTERVENTIONS

### A. The CCD as a Sustainable Development Framework

2. The CCD addresses desertification as one of the major environmental threats. Under the CCD, the term desertification is defined as “land degradation in arid, semi-arid and dry sub-humid areas resulting from various factors, including climatic variations and human activities”. Poverty and unsustainable development are both the causes and effects of desertification. States Parties are encouraged to develop and implement national, subregional and regional action programmes (respectively NAPs, SRAPs and RAPs) as operational instruments for implementing the CCD.

3. Besides climatic variations, it is generally admitted that inappropriate policy, legislative and institutional frameworks and the lack of alternative livelihoods are the root causes of various forms of land abuse, such as overgrazing, overcultivation and deforestation. Symptoms of desertification include soil erosion, declining soil fertility, loss of vegetative cover, salinization and sand dunes. Desertification has substantial impacts on rural livelihoods, the natural resource base and economic infrastructure. It also has social implications in terms of rural exodus and, in many countries, negative consequences on the national economy.

### B. CCD Financing: Original Context and New Developments

4. The CCD’s broad approach to land degradation issues requires a multi-source, multi-channel approach to financing. While the GM mandate is to take all actions leading to mobilization and channelling of resources, including for technology transfer, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) was referred to as one source of financing for the CCD through the interface of land degradation with its relevant focal areas (i.e. mainly preservation of biodiversity, protection of international waters and climate-change mitigation). At the same time, the GM is also expected to explore new and innovative financing mechanisms.

5. In the last two years, a number of positive developments have occurred, including: (i) renewed global commitments (cf. the Monterrey Consensus) to reverse a ten-year declining trend in official development assistance (ODA) and to increase the level of investments in agriculture; (ii) a recognition by the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) of the importance of the CCD as a potential contributor to achieving poverty-reduction targets in the context of the Millennium Development Goals; (iii) the imminent opening of a GEF window on land degradation and deforestation, as recommended at the WSSD and at the second GEF Assembly (Beijing, October 2002), while recognizing the “complementary roles of GM and GEF”; and (iv) the WSSD recommendations in respect of various sectors (including agriculture, energy, water, health and biodiversity), which highlight the need for an integrated and cross-sector approach to sustainable development, based on multi-stakeholder partnerships.

### C. Lessons Learned from CCD Implementation

6. The formulation of NAPs is a long and exacting participatory process in many countries, which has, however, fallen short of the originally anticipated financial support. The main reason has been the failure, on both the demand and the supply sides, to anchor the NAPs onto the relevant national strategic frameworks (e.g. poverty-reduction strategy papers [PRSPs]) and to reflect NAP priorities explicitly in the respective programming cycles of development partners.

### D. The GM Operational Strategy

7. The main thrusts of GM's operational strategy are the following:

- mainstreaming CCD into government planning and budgeting processes, such as national development plans and PRSPs;
- partnership building through NAP interface with partners' cooperation frameworks and related programming cycles;
- using GM catalytic resources to generate a multiplier effect on investments;
- capitalizing on GM's Facilitation Committee and other strategic alliances, as described later, for the purpose of coordination and synergies.

**Mainstreaming** means that the issue of desertification/land degradation must become a political priority both for the affected States Parties and for the development cooperation agencies of the developed States Parties. Funds are allocated to issues that are given high political priority, and the CCD depends largely on existing financial resources being allocated more effectively and efficiently to addressing land degradation. This applies both to allocations within national budgets and to allocations of bilateral and multilateral development cooperation funds, and will only happen if the appropriate political commitment exists.

**Partnership building** means that governments and development cooperation partners come together on the basis of a common understanding to invest in addressing land degradation. Investment needs are identified and compared with donors' priorities and programming processes with the objective of partnership agreements being signed between the government and donors or private-sector partners for investment programmes and projects.

The **multiplier effect** refers to the catalytic nature of GM's investments in terms of resource mobilization. In particular, the GM invests its own resources in bringing mainstreaming and partnership-building processes forward. The funds so invested result in funding agreements between donor and recipient governments and organizations, hence leading to a considerable multiplier effect from ODA and other forms of financing. The multiplier effect refers not only to the infusion of GM's catalytic resources to bring about larger-scale, quantifiable investments. It is also about a qualitative snowball effect, which is not measurable but equally as important as the quantitative effect. GM support has contributed in some countries to:

- enhanced awareness, mobilization and multi-stakeholder coordination;
- a more coherent approach to CCD issues and related substantive follow-up;
- improved NAP visibility, linkage with relevant frameworks and related funding opportunities; and
- recognition of GM as a key player for partnership building and resource mobilization.

### E. Strategic Partners of the GM

8. The GM cooperates with, and promotes coordination between, a number of partners to pursue its mandate. Such cooperation and coordination involves policy dialogue as well as operational





collaboration on the basis of each partner's corporate strategies and activities at country and/or subregional level. The main constituencies with which the GM is forging strategic partnerships are:

- the GM Facilitation Committee comprising IFAD, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank as the three founding members; subsequently joined by the CCD Secretariat, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the GEF Secretariat, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the African, Asian and Inter-American Development Banks;
- subregional organizations with specific mandates and/or interest in the CCD;
- research and academic institutions, particularly the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research institutions;
- bilateral agencies and their relevant coordinating bodies such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistant Committee (OECD/DAC);
- the non-governmental organization (NGO) community and their networks, including the International NGO Network on Desertification (RIOD).

## **F. Information and Communication**

9. In 2002, the GM engaged in a detailed technical analysis of the online version of the GM Financial Information Engine on Land Degradation (FIELD) in preparation for a major upgrade of the system to allow the GM to respond more effectively to the requirements of the Parties to the Convention. Upgrading will include enhancing the search functionality, improving the graphical interface, adding cross references between relevant documents and topics, further streamlining data entry and promoting the use of FIELD among target audiences worldwide.

10. Through FIELD, the GM aims at producing financial and socio-economic analyses that will generate knowledge of specific value for the CCD process, thereby promoting more effective and efficient use of resources for CCD implementation. To this effect, the GM collaborated with the DAC Secretariat to prepare a study on "Aid Targeting the Objectives of the Rio Conventions 1998-2000".

11. This study, published in August 2002, examines data on financial resources extended by DAC members to developing countries between 1998 and 2000 in order to assist them in implementing the three Rio Conventions.<sup>1</sup> Besides presenting a number of important findings, the study suggests various possibilities for future research and monitoring work, which will be followed up within the competent DAC working groups, in consultation with the GM and with the secretariats of the three Rio Conventions.

## **G. Contributions to GM Resources**

12. The GM's core budget in 2002 amounted to USD 1 737 300, based on assessed contributions approved by COP5. Proceeds of the core budget are deposited into GM's first account to finance administrative and operating expenditures associated with the normal tasks of GM's core staff. The GM also received voluntary contributions from multilateral agencies (IFAD and the World Bank) and from bilateral sources. These voluntary contributions are split between GM's second and third accounts, based on which the GM can provide the catalytic funding referred to earlier, in the context of a business plan approach in collaboration with members of the GM Facilitation Committee.

13. Between December 2001 and April 2002, the IFAD Executive Board approved, in two tranches, a grant in the amount of USD 2.5 million, as part of the pledge that it made in support of the GM when applying as a GM housing institution. It is anticipated that, in response to requests received from countries for GM assistance in the CCD process, most of the IFAD 2001/2002 grant contribution

---

<sup>1</sup> The CCD; Framework Convention on Climate Change; and Convention on Biological Diversity.



to GM resources will be allocated at the meeting of the Technical Advisory Group in early December 2002.

14. The World Bank has also made voluntary contributions to GM resources in the amount of USD 1.27 million in 2002, in support to activities it has agreed to undertake in the context of CCD implementation.

15. In 2002, voluntary contributions have also been received from the Governments of Canada (USD 91 393), Italy (USD 150 758), The Netherlands (USD 112 454), Norway (USD 250 810), Sweden (USD 319 289) and Switzerland (USD 75 758); and from the Congressional Hunger Centre (CHC) (USD 103 500) and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) (USD 11 523).

### **III. MOBILIZING RESOURCES FOR CCD IMPLEMENTATION**

#### **A. Learning by Doing**

16. In response to requests from a growing number of countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America and the Caribbean, the GM has adopted a pragmatic approach in its support to NAP and SRAP processes. In this connection, it has successfully linked NAPs with relevant strategic frameworks at national levels and worked with Facilitation Committee members and other partners to:

- develop partnership frameworks that result in financing packages in support of CCD implementation (e.g. China's western region development strategy and the China/GEF partnership framework);
- integrate NAP priorities into economic and social development plans and reflect CCD concerns in the legislative processes related to conducive policy frameworks and budget allocation (e.g. Tunisia);
- promote the formulation of a GEF-supported component as an add-on to donor-supported programmes, including those of IFAD (e.g. sustainable development programme of Fouta Djallon Highlands, Niger/Nigeria shared ecosystems, and, prospectively, north-east region of Brazil and Ningxia/Shanxi provinces in China);
- help African subregional organizations (e.g. the Southern African Development Community [SADC], the Intergovernmental Authority on Development [IGAD], and the Economic Community of West African States/Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel [ECOWAS/CILSS]) to establish subregional support facilities with GM seed money combined with donors' technical assistance, which will enable their member states to mainstream NAPs and to develop pipelines of transboundary resource management.

17. Countries benefiting from GM technical and/or financial assistance to formulate or implement their NAPs in 2001/2002 are: Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mali, Mauritania, Nepal, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Uzbekistan and Viet Nam. GM has also provided support to SRAPs in East, West, North and Southern Africa, and in Central and Western Asia, and to subregional ecosystems in Latin America and the Caribbean such as the Puna and the Gran Chaco Americano.



18. Some specific examples of GM support to action programming at national or subregional levels (in close collaboration with Facilitation Committee members and other partners, based on comparative advantages) are listed below:

- establishment of subregional facilitation funds combined with technical assistance – under the aegis of the relevant subregional organizations in East, Southern and West Africa; such funds are meant to assist countries in identifying and lifting barriers to NAP mainstreaming, and to develop a pipeline of transboundary resource management projects;
- support to the elaboration and promotion of an action plan for the Integrated Land and Water Initiative, a joint programme between the World Bank, UNEP, UNDP and GEF, which aims at addressing problems related to water and land resources in Africa;
- provision of financial resources for the development of a project channelling debt swap proceeds to revert the desertification and the natural resource degradation processes in the Cuenca de Rio Llave Region in Peru (in the context of Italy's Millennium Debt Initiative);
- support to harmonization of public policies relevant to combating desertification, currently involving Mexico, with input into the legislative process (e.g. federal law on sustainable rural development). Potential pilot countries include Barbados and Peru;
- support to desertification-related legislative processes and monitoring and evaluation in Tunisia, and earmarking of funds for NAP under the National Development Plan;
- support to the organization of a legislators' conference in Southern Africa with civil-society participation, with a view to developing guidelines for legislative processes relevant to the CCD, both in terms of conducive policies and financial resource allocation by governments;
- regional joint technical assistance to enhance the policy, legislative and institutional frameworks for NAP implementation in Central Asian countries;
- support to the inception of a transboundary action programme of assistance to local communities between the Dominican Republic and Haiti;
- support to grass-roots initiatives through local NGO consortiums (in Argentina) and to community capacity-building and traditional knowledge networking (Mexico);
- support to capacity-building and cross-fertilization of experiences among experts from various regions, e.g. in the context of the Northern Mediterranean Regional Action Programme to Combat Desertification.

### **B. Building Partnership Frameworks as a Proactive Approach to Resource Mobilization**

19. In response to COP recommendations, the GM has facilitated subregional and regional consultations, bringing together interdepartmental country teams under the aegis of relevant intergovernmental organizations (particularly in sub-Saharan Africa). These consultations have resulted in a common understanding of the required approach to mainstreaming and partnership building, by internalizing desertification/land degradation issues into governments' planning and budget processes, and into the country cooperation frameworks of the development partners. This process has also laid the groundwork for the ongoing elaboration, in many African countries, of a partnership framework to combat land degradation and poverty, as a strategic instrument for a systematic mobilization of financing packages in support of NAPs.

20. On the basis of the experience gained, the GM has encouraged countries, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, to establish *country partnership frameworks*, based on the systematic analysis of the symptoms and root causes of land degradation, and to formulate an agenda for addressing these issues sustainably, through broad-based partnership building.



21. To achieve these objectives, the GM has developed a generic road map for partnership building and resource mobilization. The road map approach is a sequenced, systematic approach to NAP and SRAP development and implementation, consisting of seven steps (see Annex D). The GM will apply this approach, in collaboration with each country and on the basis of its particular situation. The road map is not an additional criterion for NAP and SRAP development and implementation, but rather a guideline for the process.

22. In the Central Asian republics, a strategic partnership agreement for implementation of the CCD in the Central Asia subregion was entered into by the GM, the Asian Development Bank, the Canadian International Development Agency, and the CCD project of the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) in 2001. The primary objective of this partnership is to enhance the coordination of the donor partners working in the subregion in order to promote CCD implementation at local, national and subregional levels.

23. To strengthen partnership building at country and subregional levels, the GM is supporting the establishment of subregional support facilities, working with pertinent intergovernmental organizations: SADC in Southern Africa (with technical support from the World Bank-coordinated multi-donor hub); IGAD in East Africa; and ECOWAS/CILSS in West Africa. In the Central Asian region, the GM is also collaborating with the International Centre for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas in an initiative funded through a cost-sharing agreement with IFAD, and is planning a similar partnership in the Meso-American region with the Central American Integration System. In line with the mandates of these organizations, the support facilities are:

- coordinating the preparation and implementation of the SRAPs, which includes providing technical assistance and/or political oversight (as appropriate) in the preparation and implementation of transboundary projects and initiatives defined under the SRAPs;
- assisting member states in the development and implementation of their NAPs and providing a relay for development partners to support the NAP processes in these countries; and
- providing a subregional forum for policy dialogue and cross-fertilization of experiences.

24. An important advantage of collaboration with intergovernmental organizations duly strengthened to this effect is the opportunity they provide for working in an integrated manner across government departments and at various levels, ranging from technical staff to policy-makers and political authorities.

### **C. Supporting Civil Society**

25. The CCD recognizes the important implementation role of civil society – NGOs and community-based organizations (CBOs). Combating desertification and land degradation depends, in the end, on how farmers, herders and other natural resource users manage their land. Therefore, traditional knowledge and appropriate technologies developed at the grass-roots level will always play a significant role in the fight against land degradation. The GM, guided by its mandate, supports civil society in capacity-building and resource mobilization through its Community Exchange and Training Programme (CETP). The CETP, developed as a joint partnership between the GM and the RIOD, aims at facilitating the contribution of civil society to NAPs and SRAPs. Working through small-scale community exchange and training projects, it aims to enhance:

- the ability of local communities to identify, articulate and respond to limiting factors and opportunities in natural resource management and production;
- dialogue and transfer of technical and indigenous knowledge among communities, for better natural resource management and alternative income-generation;
- the capacity of NGOs and CBOs to respond to local community needs; and
- the production and dissemination of knowledge.

**BOX: THE GM MULTIPLIER EFFECT**

It is difficult to isolate the respective impacts of the various factors affecting the often-complex environment in which country-level decision-makers consider policy and investment options. It is also known, from experience in rural development and natural resources management, that an initial decision to earmark resources for the NAP does not necessarily guarantee successful programme implementation. Nonetheless, the multiplier effect is becoming an increasingly useful concept in GM's decision-making process – alongside other considerations for catalytic resource allocation. Obviously, the impact of GM intervention will vary from one situation to another, depending also on the prospects for capitalizing on strategic partnerships. Against this background, a few cases are examined below as illustrations of the multiplier effect of GM interventions.

In **Tunisia**, a major achievement so far is the mainstreaming of the NAP into the tenth five-year socio-economic plan. In this plan, the Government has allocated USD 18.60 million, out of a total cost of USD 33.67 million, for priority projects it is developing with GM support. The GM's catalytic investment was USD 80 000, mostly from IFAD funding. The NAP has been integrated into the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). The Italian Government has allocated USD 3.58 million, initially destined for another project developed by the GM with the Ministry of Environment and Planning. The Japanese Government has expressed interest in supporting related NGO projects. The French Government has indicated its interest in supporting the research component of the priority projects. The GM is actively pursuing actions to mobilize additional resources to match the Government of Tunisia's budget allocation.

In **West Africa**, the multiplier effect of GM interventions can be seen under the SRAP. A GM facilitation grant of USD 100 000, combined with other technical and financial assistance from UNEP/GEF, FAO, IFAD and the World Bank, has resulted in the approved GEF planning grant of USD 350 000 for the Fouta Djallon Highlands Strategic Plan, which is expected to lead to a GEF grant of about USD 10 million. Likewise, a GEF planning grant of USD 350 000 for the Niger/Nigeria Initiative on Coordinated Management of Natural Resources in the Transboundary Areas has been followed by a prospective application for GEF project funding of USD 8 million-10 million. These planning activities, in which the GM was designated as facilitator for resource mobilization, will result in: (i) an overall strategic framework encompassing partnership agreements and investment programmes in the Fouta Djallon Highlands of over USD 75 million; and (ii) an investment portfolio of more than USD 400 million for the Niger/Nigeria initiative, including programmes and projects supported by bilateral/multilateral partners and the private sector.

In **Brazil**, the GM has supported the Brazilian Government with a financial contribution of USD 100 000 for the elaboration of a NAP and the implementation phase of its national policy to combat desertification. In addition, IFAD and the GM are supporting the Government in developing a GEF component linked to IFAD's Sustainable Development Project for Agrarian Reform Settlements in the Semi-Arid North-East. As a result, the Government has finalized and approved the GEF Project Development Facility B Concept Note, which has been submitted to IFAD as the GEF executing agency for it to enter GEF pipeline. This initiative amounts to USD 12.5 million. In addition, the European Commission, FAO, the French Fund for the World Environment, the Department for International Development and GTZ have committed a total of USD 10.1 million in support of the *Projecto Dom Helder Camara* - GEF initiative.

**IV. THE WAY FORWARD****A. Broadening the Funding Base from Parties to the Convention**

26. GM's operational strategy is based on the premise that the GM needs to interact with both the demand and supply side of the Parties to the Convention. As described previously, action programmes need to be developed and investment needs and opportunities defined as a basis for negotiations on funding. The GM has developed, and is now pursuing more systematically, an approach in this regard. It is also involving development partners in the process, as represented through their development cooperation agencies in affected countries, to ensure their financial support for action programme implementation.

27. A select number of development cooperation agencies support the voluntary funds of the GM, which are used to generate the multiplier effect as previously described. This group of agencies needs to be widened; equally important, interaction with these agencies at headquarters level needs to be



broadened to include divisions and departments responsible for country strategies, policy-making and overall strategic planning. This is required not only to build a more solid base of support for action programme planning and implementation, but also to broaden and ensure long-term support for GM's voluntary resources. The GM is planning to enhance its capacity to develop and pursue a sustained interaction with both bilateral and multilateral development cooperation agencies. More specifically, in the coming year it will intensify its dialogue with relevant working groups within the European Union and the OECD/DAC.

28. The GM also supports the building of partnerships and strategic alliances among institutions whose mandates are relevant to action programmes at national, subregional and regional levels. Its role in this process is to facilitate the matching of resource needs for CCD implementation with available domestic and external resources. These resources come from different stakeholders (domestic, bilateral, multilateral, private sector, international foundations and NGOs), take different forms (parallel financing, cofinancing, grants, loans, etc.), and may be contributed either directly to the country or through the established mechanisms of financial institutions.

### **B. Mobilizing New and Additional Resources**

29. An important mandate of the GM is to mobilize new and additional resources for the development and implementation of action programmes. The CCD defines the GEF as such a resource (Article 20). Through Decision 9/COP3, paragraph 8, the COP recommends that the GM take account of relevant intergovernmental negotiations with a view to identifying potential opportunities for, and innovative sources of, financial assistance for CCD implementation.

30. In response to these decisions, the GM has, in cooperation with countries and subregional organizations, worked with GEF agencies to identify initiatives for potential GEF funding and approached development partners to raise cofinancing. Since the decision was taken to make IFAD the executing agency of the GEF, with a special mandate related to land degradation, the GM has worked with IFAD to develop GEF components as complements to IFAD projects. Following the decision made by the GEF Assembly to include land degradation as a new focal area under the GEF, the GM will intensify its efforts to mobilize both GEF resources – through the procedures of the implementing and executing agencies, as appropriate – and the required cofinancing for the CCD. The GEF fully recognizes GM's role in mobilizing cofinancing for GEF project components.

31. The GM has followed developments with regard to carbon sequestration and how carbon trade can become beneficial to the CCD. It is increasingly collaborating with various private companies and public institutions involved with these developments. It is also developing a special business plan to define how to 'tap' this source of new and additional funds to benefit the CCD. The recent admission of the GM as a member of the Technical Advisory Group of the World Bank-spearheaded Biocarbon Fund opens new prospects for mobilizing additional resources in support of local area development initiatives relevant to the CCD.

32. The CCD refers to national desertification funds as a means of supporting civil-society participation in the implementation of the Convention through, *inter alia*, local area development initiatives. The GM will promote, where appropriate, the development of such funds, and other options for financing local area development, including promotion of microfinance in collaboration with competent agencies and exploration of options for payment of environmental services.

33. The GM will continue to inventory private foundations, international NGOs and private-sector entities as potential partners in CCD implementation. The objective is to identify the interface between the strategies and focal areas of interest of such organizations and the CCD, thereby defining opportunities for them to support NAP-related activities and projects in selected countries and subregions.



### **C. Communications Strategy**

34. Resource mobilization is based on communications as to why resources are required and how they will be used. The GM has until now mainly depended on direct communications with a small number of partners. To reach a broader audience, a well-developed communications strategy needs to be put in place, with equal attention placed on the means of communication and its content.

35. An important premise for developing the strategy is that many advocates are experiencing great difficulty in convincing decision-makers in finance and planning ministries, as well as in donor agencies, that investments in dryland development make economic sense. Lack of information is widely considered to be a major constraint and an area where substantial progress can be made, both in terms of improving aid effectiveness and supporting policy-making at national and international levels. Yet, the broad findings from long-term studies of dryland development are that people in these areas are remarkably resilient and have succeeded in increasing their incomes sustainably, coping with all but the most severe natural calamities. Dryland development has entailed on-farm innovation in low-risk techniques and activities. It has also involved the development of off-farm income sources, which are then often invested in on-farm activities. A thriving agricultural economy is clearly a necessary, albeit not sufficient, condition for successful dryland development.

36. To develop a powerful message as a basis for its communications strategy, the GM is working with partners in generating information showing that it makes economic and especially socio-economic sense to invest in dryland development. Such a message will, of course, be combined with information on the role of the GM and its partners in supporting CCD implementation and achievements to date. Not only will the GM convey the message, but it will also capitalize on the respective communication strategies of various CCD stakeholders (including governments, intergovernmental organizations, specialized agencies, NGOs and farmers' organizations), by ensuring that these strategies integrate messages aimed at promoting CCD objectives.

37. On these grounds, the GM will collaborate with its partners to elaborate specific messages aimed at carefully identified target audiences, through separate or joint communication tools as appropriate (websites, CD-ROMs, documentaries, publications, etc.), with the ultimate objective of facilitating partnerships and mobilizing resources.





## **GENERIC ROAD MAP FOR PARTNERSHIP BUILDING AND RESOURCE MOBILIZATION**

The generic model of the road map consists of the following:

- Step one – identify main actors/stakeholders for a sustained partnership to operationalize the following six steps;
- Step two – build consensus on symptoms and underlying causes for land degradation and identify concerned stakeholders (government, development partners and natural resource users);
- Step three – identify NAP priority areas and status of their implementation;
- Step four – identify the government’s and development partners’ strategic development frameworks at national and sector levels including, *inter alia*, national development plans, PRSPs and country cooperation frameworks of the development partners (country assistance strategy, country strategic operations paper, comprehensive development framework, UNDAF, etc.);
- Step five – in tune with the respective programming cycles, mainstream the priority areas identified in the NAP into the national and sectoral development frameworks of the government and into the country cooperation frameworks of the development partners identified in step three, and identify residual priorities, i.e. priorities that cannot be mainstreamed because they are not overlapping with the strategies of the government and development partners;
- Step six – define appropriate financial mechanisms for the execution of priority interventions and design a strategy for the implementation of the residual areas. This will require sustained support of the GM, and bilateral negotiations between government and the identified potential source of financing; and
- Step seven – design a monitoring and evaluation system to monitor process and impact (financial, social and environmental) so as to secure a sustained integration of land degradation issues into development strategies and frameworks.

### DONOR INFORMATION

(in USD)

#### GLOBAL MECHANISM 2<sup>ND</sup> AND 3<sup>RD</sup> ACCOUNT DONOR INFORMATION

		<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>SUBTOTALS</u>
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> ACCOUNT</b>	<b>COUNTRY or INSTITUTION</b>							
	CANADA				31 950 4/	62 092 5/		290 121
						22 876 5/		
						39 216 5/		
						133 987 3/		
	DENMARK				100 000 4/			100 000
	FINLAND				150 739 4/	343 474 1/		494 213
	GERMANY	100 000 4/						100 000
	ITALY					150 758 4/		150 758
	NETHERLANDS					112 454 4/	104 000	216 454
	NORWAY			95 655 4/	236 529 4/	250 810 4/		582 994
	PORTUGAL		100 000 5/					100 000
	SWEDEN	121 171 4/		527 535 4/		319 289 4/		967 995
	SWITZERLAND	72 834 4/	64 329 4/	71 461 4/	74 905 4/	75 758 4/	75 000	434 287
	AFSED				52 085 4/			52 085
	IFAD				50 000 4/	250 000 4/	250 000 4/	550 000
	IsDB		12 000 4/		20 000 4/			32 000
	OPEC				40 000 4/	350 000 5/		390 000
	US (CHC)				79 600 4/	103 500 4/		183 100
	WORLD BANK			250 000 4/	50 000 4/	265 678 4/		590 678
				25 000 4/				
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		294 005	176 329	944 651	1 510 808	2 129 892	179 000	5 234 685
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> ACCOUNT</b>	DENMARK				250 000 4/			250 000
	IDRC					11 523 4/		11 523
	IFAD		2 500 000 4/		1 000 000 4/	1 000 000 4/		4 500 000
	WORLD BANK			1 000 000 4/		1 000 000 4/		2 000 000
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		0	2 500 000	1 000 000	1 250 000	2 011 523	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>294 005</b>	<b>2 676 329</b>	<b>1 944 651</b>	<b>2 760 808</b>	<b>4 141 415</b>	<b>179 000</b>	<b>11 996 208</b>
	1/ Pending receipt of agreement							
	2/ Pending receipt of agreement after clearance from IFAD's legal and financial divisions							
	3/ Pending receipt of funds after countersignature							
	4/ Disbursed full amount							
	5/ Disbursed first tranche only							

