

The UNCCD Impact Indicators Pilot Tracking Exercise: Results and Conclusions

Prepared by the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre for the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
Cambridge, UK
January 2012

Comments by Spain and Portugal

February 24, 2012

Introduction

First we would like to warmly congratulate the team that wrote the report. We are sure it must have been an arduous task to take out and synthesize a, sometimes, very heterogeneous information. In particular, we consider very well reflected the concerns of the affected countries and developed countries, so we thank you specially for that.

The participation of Spain and Portugal in the Pilot Tracking has been somewhat peculiar, since it has not been involved at all stages of the exercise. As stated in the Final Report, the contribution that Spain and Portugal have made to the Tracking Pilot did not accommodate to the templates provided for it was focused on a "Report on the results of national data collection phase," including reflections and comments over some of the indicators and metrics that we are working on. On the other hand, the data produced on the various indicators and metrics were not actually included in the report and power point presentation sent to Basecamp, since it was only intended to reflect examples of availability.

It is obvious that these peculiarities might have hindered the interpretation of our input (we apologize for this added difficulty to the task). Accordingly, and in order to qualify some of the references related to the contribution of Spain and Portugal to the Tracking Pilot included in the Report, allow us to send you some comments or suggestions.

Comments

p.18	Furthermore, Spain and Portugal chose to report on only three indicators, since the remaining were deemed less relevant for a developed affected country and/or the data were not readily available. Their joint report did not follow the suggested template, making it difficult to assess their report. However, for the indicators on which Spain reported, the information provided is both spatially explicit and based on long-term data. While the metrics definitions may vary from the officially proposed metrics, they are nevertheless closely aligned, suggesting that Spain/Portugal are in a position to report satisfactorily on the three	Furthermore, Spain and Portugal chose to report on only three indicators, since the remaining were deemed less relevant for a developed affected country and/or the data were not readily available. It is also important to note that the contribution of Spain and Portugal wasn't itself a report on indicators, but on the availability and applicability of the full set of indicators, highlighting which they considered less relevant for a developed affected country and the data were not readily available, proposing, where appropriate, operational metrics in the country. Therefore, their joint report did not follow the suggested template, making it difficult to assess their report. However, for the indicators on
------	---	---

	indicators	which Spain reported, the information provided is both spatially explicit and based on long-term data. While the metrics definitions may vary from the officially proposed metrics, they are nevertheless closely aligned, suggesting that Spain/Portugal are in a position to report satisfactorily on the three a relevant set of indicators.
P 19	Table 4	<i>According to the clarification of the preceding paragraph, in the sense that Spain and Portugal wasn't itself a report on indicators, but on the availability and applicability of the full set of indicators, we propose change in Table 4 the score of 1 to 3 indicators: VIII Drought index, IX Land cover status and X Carbon stocks Above and below ground, because we also have data available for reporting.</i>
p.23	Table 6.	<i>We propose the following changes, more in line with what was said in the contribution of Spain</i>

Very relevant	Less relevant
<p>Indicator I 'water'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> water resources management indicators <p>Indicator II. Change in land use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of land use changes with CORINE Land Cover (CLC) and other sectoral sources and databases (farming and forestry) <p>Indicator VI 'land degradation'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area at risk of desertification, Soil losses by sheet erosion and rill <p>Indicator IX. Land cover status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land condition assessment based on DeSurvey project methodology (Assessment and monitoring of land condition. 2d RUE) <p>Indicator XI 'SLM'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area of afforestation Forest area managed (with plans or forest management projects) Size of Protected Natural Areas Organic farming Number of organic livestock farm Use of fertilisers and pesticides Evolution of the efficiency of irrigation systems Area under agri-environmental measures Number of farms qualifying for environmental compliance requirements of the European Common Agricultural Policy Surface applied in conservation agriculture techniques 	<p>Indicator III 'poverty'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> poverty risk rate rate of persistent poverty <p>Indicator IV 'food' (Proportion of children (< 5 years) suffering from chronic malnutrition in rural areas)</p> <p>Indicator VIII 'drought' (Standardized Precipitation Index)</p> <p>Indicator V 'soil' (ability of soils to maintain agricultural and pastoral)</p> <p>Indicator VII 'biodiversity' (abundance and conservation status of terrestrial flora and fauna)</p>

10.3. Appendix: Assessment of national indicator reporting (1)

10.3.6 Spain/Portugal

According to the above proposed changes, we suggest:

- to include the footnote (1)
 (1) The contribution of Spain and Portugal wasn't itself a report on indicators, but on the availability and applicability of the full set of indicators, highlighting which they considered less relevant for a developed affected country and the data were not readily available, proposing, where appropriate, operational metrics in the country.
- to add a yes on the indicators VIII, IX and X,
- to delete references in the columns "Link to indicator purpose, Link to national priorities, Time series available, Data for affected areas", since that information was not actually included in the contribution
- to add additional metrics and comments and qualify some of the already included in the following table. Please take notice that this is not new info as it was more or less explicit in the aforementioned contribution.

Name of the indicator	Metric	Reported on indicator	Metric reported	Proposed metric	Link to indicator purpose	Link to national priorities	Time series available	Data for affected areas	Comment
I Water availability per capita	Water availability and use	No	Set of "water resources management" indicators	% of available water used by humans					Useful in Spain framed within Strategic Objectives 2) & 3)
	Percentage of rural population with access to (safe) drinking water	No	--	--					Scarce relevance in developed affected countries
II Change in land use	Land use	Yes	Total area and % area of farmland and forest replaced by different land use forms Analysis of land use changes with	% change in land uses over time	Yes	No	Yes/no (2000 & 2006)	Yes— data are spatially explicit (at regional level)	Did not use reporting template and did not provide all requested information

Name of the indicator	Metric	Reported on indicator	Metric reported	Proposed metric	Link to indicator purpose	Link to national priorities	Time series available	Data for affected areas	Comment
			CORINE Land Cover (CLC) and other sectoral sources and databases (farming and forestry)						
III Proportion of the population living above the relative poverty line		No	--	Proportion of population in affected areas living above the poverty line					Scarce relevance in developed affected countries
IV Food consumption per capita	Proportion of chronically undernourished children under the age of 5 in rural areas	No	--	% of underweight children					Scarce relevance in developed affected countries
V Capacity of soils to sustain agro-pastoral use	GLADIS "Soil Health Status"	No		GLADIS soil health indicator					Data could be derived from existing surveys not in the short/medium term but in the long term
VI Degree of land degradation	Level of land degradation	Yes	Level of desertification risk	--	Yes	No	Not reported (uncertain)	Yes— data are spatially explicit	Did not use reporting template and did not provide all requested information
VII Plant and animal biodiversity	Number and share of crop and animal varieties that are endangered per area	No	--	Endangered species per area					Biodiversity data are available but not reported here since relationships between the state of biodiversity of flora and fauna with desertification processes has not been established
	Number of crop	No	--	--					

Name of the indicator	Metric	Reported on indicator	Metric reported	Proposed metric	Link to indicator purpose	Link to national priorities	Time series available	Data for affected areas	Comment
	and animal species in agricultural use								
	Living Planet Index (LPI)	No	--	--					
	Wild Bird Index (WBI)	No	--	--					
	Soil biodiversity	No	--	Soil mesofauna					
VIII Drought index	Trends in seasonal precipitation	No Yes	--	--					
	Standardised Precipitation Index (SPI)	No Yes	--	Standardised Precipitation Index					SPI information exists at the national level. Not useful for assessing impact of Convention, since it is an indicator of meteorological drought.
IX Land cover status	Land cover	No Yes	--	Area per land cover type					
	Land productivity	No Yes	Land condition assessment based on DeSurvey project methodology (Assessment and monitoring of land condition. 2d RUE)	NDVI					
X Carbon stocks above and below ground	Above ground organic carbon stocks	No Yes		Carbon stocks in tonnes/hectare					Information is now available for the calculation of the carbon stored in living tree biomass, both

Name of the indicator	Metric	Reported on indicator	Metric reported	Proposed metric	Link to indicator purpose	Link to national priorities	Time series available	Data for affected areas	Comment
									above and below ground
	Below ground organic carbon stocks	No Yes	--	--					
XI Land under Sustainable Land Management (SLM)	Land under Sustainable Land Management (SLM)	Yes	Protected areas (ha, % of total), forest (ha), sustainably managed forest (ha) Set of Indicators on forest and agricultural land management	Land under SLM in ha	Yes/no (only one aspect of land use considered)	No	No	No	Did not use reporting template and did not provide all requested information