United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
Performance review and assessment of implementation system
Seventh reporting process

Report from United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

prais4

13 March 2023

Contents

1. SO: Strategic objectives

   A. SO-1: To improve the condition of affected ecosystems, combat desertification/land degradation, promote sustainable land management and contribute to land degradation neutrality.
      - SO1-1 Trends in land cover
      - SO1-2 Trends in land productivity or functioning of the land
      - SO1-3 Trends in carbon stocks above and below ground
      - SO1-4 Proportion of degraded land over the total land area
      - SO1 Voluntary Targets

   B. SO-2: To improve the living conditions of affected populations.
      - SO2-1 Trends in population living below the relative poverty line and/or income inequality in affected areas
      - SO2-2 Trends in access to safe drinking water in affected areas
      - SO2-3 Trends in the proportion of population exposed to land degradation disaggregated by sex
      - SO2 Voluntary Targets

   C. SO-3: To mitigate, adapt to, and manage the effects of drought in order to enhance resilience of vulnerable populations and ecosystems.
      - SO3-1 Trends in the proportion of land under drought over the total land area
      - SO3-2 Trends in the proportion of the population exposed to drought
      - SO3-3 Trends in the degree of drought vulnerability
      - SO3 Voluntary Targets

   D. SO-4: To generate global environmental benefits through effective implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification.
      - SO4-1 Trends in carbon stocks above and below ground
      - SO4-2 Trends in abundance and distribution of selected species
      - SO4-3 Proportion of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity that are covered by protected areas, by ecosystem type
      - SO4 Voluntary Targets

   E. SO-5: To mobilize substantial and additional financial and non-financial resources to support the implementation of the Convention by building effective partnerships at global and national level
      - SO5-1 Bilateral and multilateral public resources
      - SO5-2 Domestic public resources
      - SO5-3 International and domestic private resources
      - SO5-4 Technology transfer
      - SO5-5 Future support for activities related to the implementation of the Convention

2. IF: Implementation Framework

   A. Financial and Non-Financial Sources

   B. Policy and Planning

   C. Action on the Ground

3. Other files for Reporting

4. Templated Maps

SO1-1 Trends in land cover

Land area

SO1-1.T1: National estimates of the total land area, the area covered by water bodies and total country area

Year	Total land area (km²)	Water bodies (km²)	Total country area (km²)	Comments
2 001			0	
2 005			0	
2 010			0	
2 015			0	
2 019			0	

Land cover legend and transition matrix

SO1-1.T2: Key Degradation Processes

Degradation Process	Starting Land Cover	Ending Land Cover

Are the seven UNCCD land cover classes sufficient to monitor the key degradation processes in your country?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

SO1-1.T4: UNCCD land cover legend transition matrix

Original/ Final	Tree-covered areas	Grasslands	Croplands	Wetlands	Artificial surfaces	Other Lands	Water bodies
Tree-covered areas	0	-	-	-	-	-	0
Grasslands	+	0	+	-	-	-	0
Croplands	+	-	0	-	-	-	0
Wetlands	-	-	-	0	-	-	0
Artificial surfaces	+	+	+	+	0	+	0
Other Lands	+	+	+	+	-	0	0
Water bodies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Land cover

SO1-1.T5: National estimates of land cover (km²) for the baseline and reporting period

	Tree-covered areas (km²)	Grasslands (km²)	Croplands (km²)	Wetlands (km²)	Artificial surfaces (km²)	Other Lands (km²)	Water bodies (km²)	No data (km²)
2000								
2001								
2002								
2003								
2004								
2005								
2006								
2007								
2008								
2009								

	Tree-covered areas (km²)	Grasslands (km²)	Croplands (km²)	Wetlands (km²)	Artificial surfaces (km²)	Other Lands (km²)	Water bodies (km²)	No data (km²)
2010								
2011								
2012								
2013								
2014								
2015								
2016								
2017								
2018								
2019								
2020								

Land cover change

SO1-1.T6: National estimates of land cover change (km²) for the baseline period

	Tree-covered areas (km²)	Grasslands (km²)	Croplands (km²)	Wetlands (km²)	Artificial surfaces (km²)	Other Lands (km²)	Water bodies (km²)	Total (km²)
Tree-covered areas (km²)								0
Grasslands (km²)								0
Croplands (km²)								0
Wetlands (km²)								0
Artificial surfaces (km²)								0
Other Lands (km²)								0
Water bodies (km²)								0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

SO1-1.T7: National estimates of land cover change (km²) for the reporting period

	Tree-covered areas (km²)	Grasslands (km²)	Croplands (km²)	Wetlands (km²)	Artificial surfaces (km²)	Other Lands (km²)	Water bodies (km²)	Total land area (km²)
Tree-covered areas (km²)								0
Grasslands (km²)								0
Croplands (km²)								0
Wetlands (km²)								0
Artificial surfaces (km²)								0
Other Lands (km²)								0
Water bodies (km²)								0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Land cover degradation

SO1-1.T8: National estimates of land cover degradation (km²) in the baseline period

	Area (km²)	Percent of total land area (%)
Land area with degraded land cover		-
Land area with non-degraded land cover		-
Land area with no land cover data		-

SO1-1.T9: National estimates of land cover degradation (km²) in the reporting period

	Area (km²)	Percent of total land area (%)
Land area with improved land cover		-
Land area with stable land cover		-
Land area with degraded land cover		-
Land area with no land cover data		-

General comments

SO1-2 Trends in land productivity or functioning of the land

Land productivity dynamics

SO1-2.T1: National estimates of land productivity dynamics (in km²) within each land cover class for the baseline period

Land cover class	Net land productivity dynamics (km²) for the baseline period					
	Declining (km²)	Moderate Decline (km²)	Stressed (km²)	Stable (km²)	Increasing (km²)	No Data (km²)
Tree-covered areas						
Grasslands						
Croplands						
Wetlands						
Artificial surfaces						
Other Lands						
Water bodies						

SO1-2.T2: National estimates of land productivity dynamics (in km²) within each land cover class for the reporting period.

Land cover class	Net land productivity dynamics (km²) for the reporting period					
	Declining (km²)	Moderate Decline (km²)	Stressed (km²)	Stable (km²)	Increasing (km²)	No Data (km²)
Tree-covered areas						
Grasslands						
Croplands						
Wetlands						
Artificial surfaces						
Other Lands						
Water bodies						

SO1-2.T3: National estimates of land productivity dynamics for areas where a land conversion to a new land cover class has taken place (in km²) for the baseline period.

Land Conversion		Net land productivity dynamics (km²) for the baseline period					
From	To	Net area change (km²)	Declining (km²)	Moderate Decline (km²)	Stressed (km²)	Stable (km²)	Increasing (km²)
Croplands	Artificial surfaces						
Croplands	Grasslands						
Grasslands	Artificial surfaces						
Grasslands	Tree-covered areas						

SO1-2.T4: National estimates of land productivity dynamics for areas where a land conversion to a new land cover class has taken place (in km²) for the reporting period.

Land Conversion		Net land productivity dynamics (km²) for the reporting period					
From	To	Net area change (km²)	Declining (km²)	Moderate Decline (km²)	Stressed (km²)	Stable (km²)	Increasing (km²)
Croplands	Grasslands						

Land Conversion		Net land productivity dynamics (km²) for the reporting period					
From	To	Net area change (km²)	Declining (km²)	Moderate Decline (km²)	Stressed (km²)	Stable (km²)	Increasing (km²)
Grasslands	Tree-covered areas						
Grasslands	Croplands						
Tree-covered areas	Grasslands						

Land Productivity degradation

SO1-2.T5: National estimates of land productivity degradation in the baseline period

	Area (km²)	Percent of total land area (%)
Land area with degraded land productivity		-
Land area with non-degraded land productivity		-
Land area with no land productivity data		-

SO1-2.T6: National estimates of land productivity degradation in the reporting period

	Area (km²)	Percent of total land area (%)
Land area with improved land productivity		-
Land area with stable land productivity		-
Land area with degraded land productivity		-
Land area with no land productivity data		-

General comments

SO1-3 Trends in carbon stocks above and below ground

Soil organic carbon stocks

SO1-3.T1: National estimates of the soil organic carbon stock in topsoil (0-30 cm) within each land cover class (in tonnes per hectare).

Year	Soil organic carbon stock in topsoil (t/ha)						
	Tree-covered areas	Grasslands	Croplands	Wetlands	Artificial surfaces	Other Lands	Water bodies
2000							
2001							
2002							
2003							
2004							
2005							
2006							
2007							
2008							
2009							
2010							
2011							
2012							
2013							
2014							
2015							
2016							
2017							
2018							
2019							
2020							

If you opted not to use default Tier 1 data, what did you use to calculate the estimates above?

- ○ Modified Tier 1 methods and data
- ○ Tier 2 (additional use of country-specific data)
- ○ Tier 3 (more complex methods involving ground measurements and modelling)

SO1-3.T2: National estimates of the change in soil organic carbon stock in soil due to land conversion to a new land cover class in the baseline period

Land Conversion		Soil organic carbon (SOC) stock change in the baseline period					
From	To	Net area change (km²)	Initial SOC stock (t/ha)	Final SOC stock (t/ha)	Initial SOC stock total (t)	Final SOC stock total (t)	SOC stock change (t)
Croplands	Grasslands		-	-			0
Grasslands	Tree-covered areas		-	-			0
Grasslands	Artificial surfaces		-	-			0
Croplands	Artificial surfaces		-	-			0

SO1-3.T3: National estimates of the change in soil organic carbon stock in soil due to land conversion to a new land cover class in the reporting period

Land Conversion		Soil organic carbon (SOC) stock change in the reporting period					
From	To	Net area change (km²)	Initial SOC stock (t/ha)	Final SOC stock (t/ha)	Initial SOC stock total (t)	Final SOC stock total (t)	SOC stock change (t)
Croplands	Grasslands		-	-			0
Grasslands	Tree-covered areas		-	-			0
Tree-covered areas	Grasslands		-	-			0
Grasslands	Croplands		-	-			0

Soil organic carbon stock degradation

SO1-3.T4: National estimates of soil organic carbon stock degradation in the baseline period

	Area (km²)	Percent of total land area (%)
Land area with degraded soil organic carbon (SOC)		-
Land area with non-degraded SOC		-
Land area with no SOC data		-

SO1-3.T5: National estimates of SOC stock degradation in the reporting period

	Area (km²)	Percent of total land area (%)
Land area with improved SOC		-
Land area with stable SOC		-
Land area with degraded SOC		-
Land area with no SOC data		-

General comments

SO1-4 Proportion of degraded land over the total land area

Proportion of degraded land over the total land area (Sustainable Development Goal Indicator 15.3.1)

SO1-4.T1: National estimates of the total area of degraded land (in km²), and the proportion of degraded land relative to the total land area

	Total area of degraded land (km²)	Proportion of degraded land over the total land area (%)
Baseline Period		-
Reporting Period		-
Change in degraded extent	0	

Method

Did you use the SO1-1, SO1-2 and SO1-3 indicators (i.e. land cover, land productivity dynamics and soil organic carbon stock) to compute the proportion of degraded land?

Which indicators did you use?

☐ Land Cover
☐ Land Productivity Dynamics
☐ SOC Stock

Did you apply the one-out, all-out principle to compute the proportion of degraded land?

○ Yes
○ No

Level of Confidence

Indicate your country's level of confidence in the assessment of the proportion of degraded land:

○ High (based on comprehensive evidence)
○ Medium (based on partial evidence)
○ Low (based on limited evidence)

Describe why the assessment has been given the level of confidence selected above:

The UK has not been able to verify this data at the national level. As per UNCCD steer, we agree for the global metadata estimates to be used for statistical purposes in regional and global estimates.

False positives/ False negatives

SO1-4.T3: Justify why any area identified as degraded or non-degraded in the SO1-1, SO1-2 or SO1-3 indicator data should or should not be included in the overall Sustainable Development Goal indicator 15.3.1 calculation.

Location Name	Type	Recode Options	Area (km²)	Process driving false +/- outcome	Basis for Judgement	Edit Polygon

Perform qualitative assessments of areas identified as degraded or improved

SO1-4.T4: Degradation hotspots

Hotspots	Location	Area (km²)	Assessment Process	Direct drivers of land degradation hotspots	Action(s) taken to redress degradation in terms of Land Degradation Neutrality response hierarchy	Remediating action(s) (both forward-looking and current)	Edit Polygon
Total no. of hotspots	0						
Total hotspot area	0						

What is/are the indirect driver(s) of land degradation at the national level?

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

SO1-4.T5: Improvement brightspots

Brightspots	Location	Area (km²)	Assessment Process	What action(s) led to the brightspot in terms of the Land Degradation Neutrality hierarchy?	Implementing action(s) (both forward-looking and current)	Edit Polygon
Total no. of brightpots		0				
Total brightspot area		0				

What are the enabling and instrumental responses at the national level driving the occurrence of brightspots?

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.

General comments

SO1 Voluntary Targets

SO1-VT.T1: Voluntary Land Degradation Neutrality targets and other targets relevant to strategic objective 1

Target	Year	Location(s)	Total Target Area (km²)	Overarching type of Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) intervention	Targeted action(s)	Status of target achievement	Is this an LDN target? If so, under which process was it defined/adopted?	Which other important goals are also being addressed by this target?	Edit Polygon
Total			Sum of all targeted areas 0						

SO1.IA.T1: Areas of implemented action related to the targets (projects and initiatives on the ground).

Relevant Target	Implemented Action	Location (placename)	Action start date	Extent of action	Total Area Implemented So Far (km²)	Edit Polygon
					Sum of all areas relevant to actions under the same target	

General comments

SO2-1 Trends in population living below the relative poverty line and/or income inequality in affected areas

Relevant metric

Choose the metric that is relevant to your country:

- ○ Proportion of population below the international poverty line
- ○ Income inequality (Gini Index)

Qualitative assessment

SO2-1.T3: Interpretation of the indicator

Indicator metric	Change in the indicator	Comments

General comments

SO2-2 Trends in access to safe drinking water in affected areas

Proportion of population using safely managed drinking water services

SO2-2.T1: National estimates of the proportion of population using safely managed drinking water services

Year	Urban (%)	Rural (%)	Total (%)
2000			100
2001			100
2002			100
2003			100
2004			100
2005			100
2006			100
2007			100
2008			100
2009			100
2010			100
2011			100
2012			100
2013			100
2014			100
2015			100
2016			100
2017			100
2018			100
2019			100
2020			100

Qualitative assessment

SO2-2.T2: Interpretation of the indicator

Change in the indicator	Comments

General comments

SO2-3 Trends in the proportion of population exposed to land degradation disaggregated by sex

Proportion of the population exposed to land degradation disaggregated by sex

SO2-3.T1: National estimates of the proportion of population exposed to land degradation disaggregated by sex.

Time period	Population exposed (count)	Percentage of total population exposed (%)	Female population exposed (count)	Percentage of total female population exposed (%)	Male population exposed (count)	Percentage of total male population exposed (%)
Baseline period		0 .0		0 .0		0 .0
Reporting period		0 .0		0 .0		0 .0

Qualitative assessment

SO2-3.T2: Interpretation of the indicator

Change in the indicator	Comments

General comments

SO-2: To improve the living conditions of affected populations.

SO2 Voluntary Targets

SO2-VT.T1

Target	Year	Level of application	Status of target achievement	Comments

General comments

SO3-1 Trends in the proportion of land under drought over the total land area

Drought hazard indicator

SO3-1.T1: National estimates of the land area in each drought intensity class as defined by the Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI) or other nationally relevant drought indices

	Drought intensity classes				
	Mild drought (km²)	Moderate drought (km²)	Severe drought (km²)	Extreme drought (km²)	Non-drought (km²)
2000					
2001					
2002					
2003					
2004					
2005					
2006					
2007					
2008					
2009					
2010					
2011					
2012					
2013					
2014					
2015					
2016					
2017					
2018					
2019					
2020					
2021					

SO3-1.T2: Summary table for land area under drought without class break down

	Total area under drought (km²)	Proportion of land under drought (%)
2000		-
2001		-
2002		-
2003		-
2004		-
2005		-
2006		-
2007		-
2008		-
2009		-
2010		-
2011		-

SO-3: To mitigate, adapt to, and manage the effects of drought in order to enhance resilience of vulnerable populations and ecosystems.

	Total area under drought (km²)	Proportion of land under drought (%)
2012		-
2013		-
2014		-
2015		-
2016		-
2017		-
2018		-
2019		-
2020		-
2021		-

Qualitative assessment:

General comments

SO3-2 Trends in the proportion of the population exposed to drought

Drought exposure indicator

Exposure is defined in terms of the number of people who are exposed to drought as calculated from the SO3-1 indicator data.

SO3-2.T1: National estimates of the percentage of the total population within each drought intensity class as well as the total population count and the proportion of the national population exposed to drought regardless of intensity.

	Non-exposed		Mild drought		Moderate drought		Severe drought		Extreme drought		Exposed population	
Reporting year	Population count	%	Population count	%	Population count	%	Population count	%	Population count	%	Population count	%
2000		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2001		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2002		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2003		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2004		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2005		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2006		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2007		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2008		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2009		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2010		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2011		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2012		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2013		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2014		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2015		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2016		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2017		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2018		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2019		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2020		-		-		-		-		-	-	-
2021		-		-		-		-		-	-	-

SO3-2.T2: National estimates of the percentage of the female population within each drought intensity class.

	Non-exposed		Mild drought		Moderate drought		Severe drought		Extreme drought		Exposed female population	
Reporting year	Population count	%	Population count	%	Population count	%	Population count	%	Population count	%	Population count	%
2000		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2001		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2002		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2003		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2004		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2005		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2006		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2007		-		-		-		-		-	0	-

SO-3: To mitigate, adapt to, and manage the effects of drought in order to enhance resilience of vulnerable populations and ecosystems.

	Non-exposed		Mild drought		Moderate drought		Severe drought		Extreme drought		Exposed female population	
Reporting year	Population count	%	Population count	%	Population count	%	Population count	%	Population count	%	Population count	%
2008		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2009		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2010		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2011		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2012		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2013		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2014		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2015		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2016		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2017		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2018		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2019		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2020		-		-		-		-		-	-	-
2021		-		-		-		-		-	-	-

SO3-2.T3: National estimates of the percentage of the male population within each drought intensity class.

	Non-exposed		Mild drought		Moderate drought		Severe drought		Extreme drought		Exposed male population	
Reporting year	Population count	%	Population count	%	Population count	%	Population count	%	Population count	%	Population count	%
2000		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2001		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2002		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2003		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2004		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2005		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2006		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2007		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2008		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2009		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2010		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2011		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2012		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2013		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2014		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2015		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2016		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2017		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2018		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2019		-		-		-		-		-	0	-
2020		-		-		-		-		-	-	-
2021		-		-		-		-		-	-	-

Qualitative assessment

Interpretation of the indicator

General comments

SO3-3 Trends in the degree of drought vulnerability

Drought Vulnerability Index

SO3-3.T1: National estimates of the Drought Vulnerability Index

Year	Total country-level DVI value (tier 1)	Male DVI value (tiers 2 and 3 only)	Female DVI value (tiers 2 and 3 only)
2000			
2001			
2002			
2003			
2004			
2005			
2006			
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			
2011			
2012			
2013			
2014			
2015			
2016			
2017			
2018			
2019			
2020			
2021			

Method

Which tier level did you use to compute the DVI?

☐ Tier 1 Vulnerability Assessment ⓘ
☐ Tier 2 Vulnerability Assessment ⓘ
☐ Tier 3 Vulnerability Assessment ⓘ

Qualitative assessment

SO3-3.T2: Interpretation of the indicator

	Change in the indicator	Comments

General comments

SO-3: To mitigate, adapt to, and manage the effects of drought in order to enhance resilience of vulnerable populations and ecosystems.

SO3 Voluntary Targets

SO3-VT.T1

Target	Year	Level of application	Status of target achievement	Comments

General comments

SO4-1 Trends in carbon stocks above and below ground

Soil organic carbon stocks

Trends in carbon stock above and below ground is a multi-purpose indicator used to measure progress towards both strategic objectives 1 and 4. Quantitative data and a qualitative assessment of trends in this indicator are reported under strategic objective 1, progress indicator SO1-3.

SO4-2 Trends in abundance and distribution of selected species

SO4-2.T1: National estimates of the Red List Index of species survival

Year	Red List Index	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Comment
2000				
2001				
2002				
2003				
2004				
2005				
2006				
2007				
2008				
2009				
2010				
2011				
2012				
2013				
2014				
2015				
2016				
2017				
2018				
2019				
2020				

Qualitative assessment

SO4-2.T2: Interpretation of the indicator

Change in the indicator	Drivers: Direct (Choose one or more items)	Drivers: Indirect (Choose one or more items)	Which levers are being used to reverse negative trends and enable transformative change?	Responses that led to positive RLI trends	Comments

General comments

SO4-3 Proportion of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity that are covered by protected areas, by ecosystem type

SO4-3.T1: National estimates of the average proportion of Terrestrial KBAs covered by protected areas (%)

Year	Protected Areas Coverage(%)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Comments
2000				
2001				
2002				
2003				
2004				
2005				
2006				
2007				
2008				
2009				
2010				
2011				
2012				
2013				
2014				
2015				
2016				
2017				
2018				
2019				
2020				

Qualitative assessment

SO4-3.T2: Interpretation of the indicator

Qualitative Assessment	Comment

General comments

SO4 Voluntary Targets

SO4-VT.T1

Target	Year	Level of application	Status of target achievement	Comments

Complementary information

SO5-1 Bilateral and multilateral public resources

Tier 1: Please provide information on the international public resources provided and received for the implementation of the Convention, including information on trends.

Trends in international bilateral and multilateral public resources provided

- ○ Up ↑
- ○ Stable ←→
- ◉ Down ↓
- ○ Unknown ∾

Trends in international bilateral and multilateral public resources received

- ○ Up ↑
- ○ Stable ←→
- ○ Down ↓
- ○ Unknown ∾

This return covers UK ODA funding to support the implementation of the Convention, that is direct or indirect spend against tagged against the Rio Convention marker on desertification. The majority of resource was focused in Africa – as regional or direct country programming. Aggregate data has been provided on the range of project level activity the UK has supported. This does not include multilateral ODA spend which makes up a significant proportion of UK ODA budget (see explanatory note in section below). The assessment of trends in international resources provided to implement to the convention is based solely on bilateral data and is an imperfect assessment as it does not include the range of UK support through multilateral institutions. This is not the result of any policy decision. A summary is provided below with further details on a selection of programmes supporting implementation directly or indirectly of the Convention in developing countries during the reporting period. Building Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Extremes and Disasters (BRACED) – 2014-2019. Programme value - £140m. https://devtracker.fcdo.gov.uk/projects/GB-1-202921/documents. The intended outcome of BRACED was for poor people in developing countries, largely at household and community level, to improve their resilience to climate related shocks and stresses. BRACED was designed as a 'learning programme' to test innovative approaches to building resilience, and how to integrate disaster risk reduction and climate adaptation into broader development decision making and planning. As such, BRACED delivered a range of interventions to help poor people to become more resilient to climate extremes and disasters, including: helping traditional livestock herders (pastoralists) mitigate the impact of drought; sharing skills and technology to help farmers' plan their agricultural production in climate smart ways; improving the delivery of weather and climate information services; and facilitating increased local access to international climate finance (ICF). BRACED also initiated a process of influencing local, national and international policy towards supporting community level climate resilience. It worked within some of the most fragile states in the world, working across 13 countries in Asia, East Africa and West Africa and the Sahel. Key results from BRACED: Since 2014, BRACED has: - Supported over 14 million people to cope with climate and weather extremes; - Improved the resilience of over 7m people, 48% of whom were women and 47% men; - Improved knowledge, learning and the evidence base, showing how improved resilience has helped households and communities deal with climate extremes and disasters; - BRACED projects have started to influence policy change and policy development at local, national and international levels to demonstrate how a supportive policy environment can support public and private investments in climate resilience that can improve the capacity of poor people to anticipate, adapt to and absorb the impacts of climate extremes and disasters. Significant achievements include: o In Nepal: the Anukulan project was asked to present at national level alongside the Government of Nepal at the COP24 Climate Summit in Poland, indicating the successful influence of this project and it approach to building the resilience of small holder farmers in Nepal; and o In Kenya: the PROGRESS project development of Ward Adaptation Planning Committees (WAPC) and decentralized climate finance models supported by BRACED in Wajir County have been adopted by the Kenyan government to scale up across the country. Science for Humanitarian Emergencies and Resilience (SHEAR) Programme. 2016-2021. Programme value – £17.87m. https://devtracker.fcdo.gov.uk/projects/GB-1-201884/summary. The SHEAR programme supports improved disaster resilience and humanitarian response by advancing the monitoring, assessment and prediction of natural hazards and risks across Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, and through working with users, brings this into use in reducing the impacts of disasters. SHEAR aims to catalyse earlier and more effective action to respond to imminent natural hazards and enable greater and more effective investment in disaster resilience and preparedness. SHEAR has three 'pillars': SHEAR Applications, SHEAR Research, and SHEAR Applied & Innovation (see below). The programme also has a knowledge broker (KB) and a research consortium coordination team (CCT) to drive better learning, information exchange and coherence between the different research projects and activities. A large component of the programme is a partnership between DFID and the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC). More information on the programme can be found at http://www.shear.org.uk. The programme budget was £17.87 million over period (2016-2021) to enable greater and more effective investment in disaster resilience and earlier action to respond to imminent natural hazards by providing decision makers with enhanced risk mapping and analyses, and more reliable warning systems. The programme focuses on flood and drought risk monitoring and warning systems in sub-Saharan Africa and multi-hazard risk assessment and monitoring across South Asia, with a focus on the interaction of 'cascading hazards' such as landslides, which can be triggered by heavy rainfall. It also supports work on more global early warning and risk assessment systems such as El Nino. It covers four areas: disaster risk assessment (mapping and analyses), sub-seasonal to seasonal forecasting, disaster risk monitoring, and the integration of these into practical decision making. WISER - Weather and climate Information and SERvices for Africa. 2015 – 2022. Programme Value – £32.1m. https://devtracker.fcdo.gov.uk/projects/GB-1-204624/summary. WISER will help at least 24 million people across Africa (focusing initially on East Africa (Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi) to be more resilient to natural disasters and climate change by 2030 by improving early warning systems (giving more time to prepare for heavy rains for example) as well as helping them make better decisions by knowing what the weather and climate is likely to be (enabling them to make better crop choices or alter planting times in farming, for example). We estimate that this will save over £190 million in terms of avoided damage to health, homes, livelihoods and infrastructure between now and 2030. WISER was designed to enhance the resilience of African livelihoods and Africa's economic development to weather-related shocks by improving the generation and use of Weather and Climate Information and Services (WCIS) across Sub-Saharan Africa and bringing science and research into the decision-making process.

WISER included two inter-related components: - East Africa component (WISER EA): implemented through the Met Office UK (MO UK) and focused on strengthening weather observation networks and forecasting, developing WCIS, and ensuring that information is user-driven and reaches users in a timely and accessible way to inform decision making. - Pan African Policy and Enabling Environment Component (WISER PEEC): implemented through the Africa Climate Policy Centre (ACPC) housed in the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) and focused on strengthening the enabling environment around WCIS, including donor co-ordination, and supporting African-led research through the Climate Research for Development (CR4D) initiative. A key innovation and foundation of the program has been 'co-production' between weather and climate information service (WCIS) producers and end users with the aim of increasing the uptake and use of WCIS to improve decision making and enhance resilience. Notable achievements in the programme included: - Supporting the improved generation and use of weather and climate services: WISER produced 65 joint analysis and learning initiatives which support an enabling environment for the delivery of WCIS. It attracted £28.8m of additional funding for improved generation, uptake and use of WCIS. It produced 89 research or knowledge management outputs on WCIS and established and operationalized CR4D functional structures, which supported African-led climate science research. Furthermore, the programme ensured 3.3m households can access new or improved WCIS and supported 482,000 households to use new or improved WCIS to inform decision-making. - Modernising national meteorological services: WISER supported 24 National Meteorological and Hydrological Services (NMHSs) and Regional Climate Centres (RCCs) to have new and/or upgraded data sets and trained over 6,000 people, improving their knowledge and skills to produce, access and use more effective WCIS. - Building collaboration between global, regional, and national met service providers: WISER organised 33 forums from global to national level, strengthening networks and partnerships. - Supporting avoided losses and improving resilience: WISER supported over £207m of avoided losses in East Africa due to the use of climate information and improved the resilience of more than 8 million people, who are all direct end users of WISER WCIS, contributing to International Climate Finance (ICF) Key Performance Indicator (KPI) 42. - Putting co-production at the core of programme delivery: WISER produced 146 new or improved coproduced climate service products and facilitated 53 coproduced processes, with co-production underpinning WISER's approach to WCIS Ecosystem Services for Poverty Alleviation (ESPA). 2009 – 2018. Programme value - £43.9m. https://devtracker.fcdo.gov.uk/projects/GB-1-112082/documents. ESPA is an eight-year interdisciplinary research programme funded by the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID), the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) and the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). ESPA's goal is to ensure that ecosystems will be conserved and managed more sustainably, in ways that alleviate poverty and enhance well-being. The ESPA programme memorandum was signed in mid-2010 and programme activities launched shortly afterwards through NERC managed research calls generating over 125 projects of various sizes and duration. Examples of the work completed under the ESPA programme include in 2017, the programme recording 36 examples of ESPA research outputs being reflected in national, regional or international development policies and practice (against a target of 20), and captured £54.6 million of development spend being informed by ESPA science (against a target of £40 million). For example, a Payment for Ecosystem Services project in Bolivia generated new hydrological data that was used to estimate how many hectares of forest need to be conserved to recover 1 million cubic metres of water. This persuaded Coca Cola that the company could recover the 1 million cubic metres of water it uses in Bolivia by investing in forest conservation, which in turn catalysed an investment by Coca-Cola, matched by local support, for a combined investment of £1 million in five new municipalities. Productive Safety Net Programme Phase 4 (Ethiopia). 2015-2021. Programme value - £301m (£176.2m ICF funding). https://devtracker.fcdo.gov.uk/projects/GB-1-204290/summary. Programme description: To reduce hunger, improve livelihoods and reduce the risk of famine in rural Ethiopia by (i) providing cash and food transfers, livelihoods advice and access to microfinance to 1.2 million extremely poor Ethiopians and (ii) creating local infrastructure which reverses environmental degradation and improves access to markets and basic services. 85% of participant households receive transfers as wages for labour on public works projects (including 32,000 km of hillside terraces, 3,000 km of rural roads and 400 new or expanded schools); while the remainder (the elderly, those with disabilities, and pregnant women) receive cash and / or food without a labour requirement. In the design of the fourth phase of the PSNP, the Government of Ethiopia (GoE) and their development partners shifted the level of ambition from a time-bound programme-based approach to social protection to creating a whole system approach for social protection at national level and to provide a shock-responsive safety net that can be scaled up in times of crises to meet increased needs for the most vulnerable households. The programme objectives contribute to four key areas of GoE policy: the Social Protection Policy, National Policy and Strategy on Disaster Risk Management, National Nutrition Programme and the Climate Resilient Green Economy, thus building on the opportunity of the wide outreach of the programme as a vehicle to achieve further development outcomes, for example, in nutrition and early childhood development. PSNP4 (2015-21) was supported by 11 development partners. Delivering through Government systems (using direct government to government financing), FCDO contributed £301 million over five years, of which £176.2m is from the UK International Climate Fund (ICF). Selected key results from programme relevant to implementation of Convention: The public works impact evaluation conducted in 2019 found that this component has been cost-effective in mitigating and adapting to climate change, reversing land degradation and raising its productivity, enhancing social infrastructure and curbing gender disparities. Cost-benefit analysis for soil and water conservation, irrigation and carbon sequestration found positive net present values for all sampled watersheds, with benefit-cost ratios ranging from 2.0 to 3.4. Although there are some shortcomings in post-construction maintenance, these productivity benefits are likely to have outweighed losses in social transfer cost-effectiveness resulting from client opportunity costs (SuDCA 2019, White 2020). Output indicator 3.1 Public works activities are selected to provide the required labour opportunities and to address vulnerability to drought. Public works consist of soil and water conservation measures, nurseries and forestry projects, road construction and maintenance and social infrastructure projects. Over the lifetime of PSNP4, more than 11,000 watersheds have been rehabilitated to enhance productivity and build resilience against climate change. In addition, 2,173 health posts, 4,784 classrooms and 59,873km of road were built improving access to social and productive services (AR2019). Output indicator 3.2 An impact evaluation of public works was conducted in 2019. It found that the public works for soil and water conservation had successfully reduced soil loss and excess run-off, thereby increasing vegetation cover. Crop productivity increased by almost 24% between 2015 and 2019. Carbon sequestration increased from 133,000 to 183,000t CO2/year (MoA/SuDCA 2019). Output indicator 3.3 Qualitative data collected for the midline evaluation shows that both highland and lowland regions report numerous positive benefits of public works on the environment, on livelihoods, and on access to services. In the highlands, there is also some evidence that PSNP clients are applying what they learn on the work sites to their own plots. PDS clients are benefiting from soil and water conservation activities carried out on their land. However, some women report no benefits to their livelihoods, either because they lack the assets from which public works investments might allow them to build, or because their overriding concern is the low transfer size relative to the cost of living (IFPRI 2018c). Arid Lands Support Programme (Keyna). 2012 – 2016. Programme value - £14.3m. https://devtracker.fcdo.gov.uk/projects/GB-1-202619/documents. Between December 2012 and December 2016 the UK provided £14.3m under the Arid Lands Support Programme (ASP) to help build more resilient livelihoods for some of the poorest people in the four poorest arid and semi-arid (ASALs) counties in Kenya: Turkana, Marsabit, Wajir and Mandera. ASP supported: (i) improved government coordination and planning at national and county levels (£0.74m); (ii) community-level adaptation initiatives (£9.7m); (iii) research and scaling up of a livestock insurance scheme (£1.37m); and (iv) created an internal risk facility fund, designed to improve rapid disaster response and reduce risks associated with shocks such as drought (£2.6m). The interventions were implemented by: Government partners; seven International Non-Governmental Organisations (INGOs); and the

International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI).

Data provided by UNCCD reporting team from OECD dataset was validated by UK Government. Project level data was updated to reflect weighting of 40% against 'indirect' attribution against Rio Convention marker on desertification. Data on multilateral core contributions does not include Rio Convention marker on desertification – therefore UK imputed ODA share through multilaterals is not included in data reported resulting in an underestimation in UK ODA support to implement the convention. Core contributions are a significant share of UK ODA flows. See summary of core bilateral/multilateral split included below: 2016: Bilateral ODA – 63.8%, Core Multilateral ODA – 36.2% 2017: Bilateral ODA – 62.6%, Core Multilateral ODA – 37.4% 2018: Bilateral ODA – 63.5%, Core Multilateral ODA – 36.5% 2019: Bilateral ODA – 67.5%, Core Multilateral ODA – 32.5% Source: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/statistics-on-international-development-final-uk-aid-spend-2019 Using best available proxy indicator for imputed UK share of multilateral net ODA by sector code estimates that UK ODA multilateral support to implementation of the convention has remained steady over the reporting period (with some volatility between years). See table below: Table A9: Imputed UK share of Multilateral Net ODA by sector (£ thousand) 2016 2017 2018 2019 41010 Environmental policy and administrative management 113,905 83,320 86,833 127,223 Source: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics /statistics-on-international-development-final-uk-aid-spend-2019 (based on OECD data)

Tier 2: Table 1 Financial resources provided and received

		Total Amount USD	
Provided / Received	Year	Committed	Disbursed / Received
Provided	2016	Committed 75 534 675 .95	Disbursed 202 327 190 .5
Provided	2017	Committed 38 046 709 .05	Disbursed 141 883 767 .1
Provided	2018	Committed 76 492 414 .28	Disbursed 161 420 445 .4
Provided	2019	Committed 137 823 421 .1	Disbursed 144 114 457 .7
Received	2016	Committed 0	Received 0
Received	2017	Committed 0	Received 0
Received	2018	Committed 0	Received 0
Received	2019	Committed 0	Received 0
Total resources provided:		327 897 220 .38	649 745 860 .7
Total resources received:		0	0

Documentation box

	Explanation
Year	
Recipient / Provider	
Title of project, programme, activity or other	
Total Amount USD	
Sector	
Capacity Building	
Technology Transfer	
Gender Equality	
Channel	
Type of flow	
Financial Instrument	
Type of support	
Amount mobilised through public interventions	
Additional Information	

General comments

SO5-2 Domestic public resources

Tier 1: Please provide information on the domestic public expenditures, including subsidies, and revenues, including taxes, directly and indirectly related to the implementation of the Convention, including information on trends.

Trends in domestic public expenditures and national level financing for activities relevant to the implementation of the Convention

- ○ Up ↑
- ○ Stable ←→
- ◉ Down ↓
- ○ Unknown ∾

Trends in domestic public revenues from activities related to the implementation of the Convention

- ○ Up ↑
- ○ Stable ←→
- ○ Down ↓
- ○ Unknown ∾

Case Study on domestic activity to address land restoration: The Great North Bog The Great North Bog (GNB) is a landscape-scale coalition aiming to restore and maintain peatland soils across nearly 700,000ha in the north of England. Peatlands in the area, which includes 5 National Parks and 3 AONBs, currently store approximately 400 million tonnes of carbon and encompass 92% of the upland peat in England*. Once restored, they have the potential to lock in up to 3.7 million tonnes of carbon each year, encourage the recovery of peatland flora and fauna, support flood risk mitigation, and provide mental and physical wellbeing benefits to local residents and visitors. The coalition is formed of six peat partnerships: North Pennines AONB Partnership, Moors for the Future Partnership, Yorkshire Peat Partnership, Northumberland Peat Partnership, Lancashire Peatlands Initiative and the Cumbria Peat Partnership. The coalition has been made possible through long term support for partnership development, capacity building and restoration funding from Defra, Natural England and the Environment Agency. Together they are aiming to deliver a 20-year restoration and maintenance plan, and the partnerships have already brought over 110,000ha of peatland under restoration in the last two decades. To ramp up restoration levels further over the coming years, GNB partnerships have been awarded over £2m through round one and two of the NCF Discovery Grant and have already benefitted from over £11.5m through the first and second round of the NCF Restoration Grant. The work of the GNB coalition will contribute towards the 25 Year Environment Plan, the England Peat Action Plan, 30by30, Environment Act and the long-term Net Zero Strategy commitments. Case Study: 'A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improvement the Environment' Environmental Plan (launched in 2018). https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/25-year-environment-plan. This 25 Year Environment Plan sets out UK Government action to help the natural world regain and retain good health. It aims to deliver cleaner air and water in our cities and rural landscapes, protect threatened species and provide richer wildlife habitats. It calls for an approach to agriculture, forestry, land use and fishing that puts the environment first. It seeks through ambitious proposals to tackle the growing problems of waste and soil degradation – issues that affect our urban areas as well as our countryside. The EIP lists a summary of key policy areas for UK action (some of these areas fall under responsibilities of Devolved Administrations): Using and managing land sustainably 1. Embedding an 'environmental net gain' principle for development, including housing and infrastructure 2. Improving how we manage and incentivise land management i. Designing and delivering a new environmental land management system ii. Introducing new farming rules for water iii. Working with farmers to use fertilisers efficiently iv. Protecting crops while reducing the environmental impact of pesticides 3. Improving soil health and restoring and protecting our peatlands i. Developing better information on soil health ii. Restoring vulnerable peatlands and ending peat use in horticultural products by 2030. Focusing on woodland to maximise its many benefits i. Supporting the development of a new Northern Forest ii. Supporting larger scale woodland creation iii. Appointing a national Tree Champion Reducing risks from flooding and coastal erosion i. Expanding the use of natural flood management solutions ii. Putting in place more sustainable drainage systems iii. Making 'at-risk' properties more resilient to flooding Recovering nature and enhancing the beauty of landscapes 1. Protecting and recovering nature i. Publishing a strategy for nature ii. Developing a Nature Recovery Network iii. Providing opportunities for the reintroduction of native species iv. Exploring how to give individuals the chance to deliver lasting conservation v. Improving biosecurity to protect and conserve nature Respecting nature in how we use water i. Reforming our approach to water abstraction ii. Increasing water supply and incentivising greater water efficiency and less personal use Greening our towns and cities i. Creating more green infrastructure ii. Planting more trees in and around our towns and cities Increasing resource efficiency and reducing pollution and waste 1. Maximising resource efficiency and minimising environmental impacts at end of life. i. Achieving zero avoidable plastic waste by the end of 2042 ii. Reducing food supply chain emissions and waste iii. Reducing litter and littering iv. Improving management of residual waste v. Cracking down on fly-tippers and waste criminals vi. Reducing the impact of wastewater 2. Reducing pollution i. Publishing a Clean Air Strategy ii. Curbing emissions from combustion plants and generators iii. Publishing a Chemicals Strategy iv. Minimising the risk of chemical contamination in our water v. Ensuring we continue to maintain clean recreational waters and warning about temporary pollution Protecting and improving our global environment 1. Providing international leadership and leading by example i. Tackling climate change ii. Protecting and improving international biodiversity 2. Helping developing nations protect and improve the environment i. Providing assistance and supporting disaster planning ii. Supporting and protecting international forests and sustainable global agriculture 3. Leaving a lighter footprint on the global environment i. Enhancing sustainability ii. Protecting and managing risks from hazards iii. Supporting zero-deforestation supply chain A summary of key targets is included here: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/25-year-environment-plan/25-year-environment-plan-our-targets-at-a-glance.

This assessment of trends is based on expenditure data under Agri-Environment schemes include Countryside Stewardship Scheme (England), Glastir (Wales), Agri-Environment Climate Scheme (Scotland), and Environmental Farming Scheme (Northern Ireland) for the time period 2016-2019 as the best available data to assess relevant activities either directly or indirectly related to the implementation of the Convention at national level. Dataset: Agriculture in the UK. Chapter 10 - public payments. https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/agriculture-in-the-united-kingdom.

Tier 2: Table 2 Domestic public resources

	Year	Amounts	Additional Information
Government expenditures			
Directly related to combat DLDD			
Indirectly related to combat DLDD			
Subsidies			
Subsidies related to combat DLDD	2016	398	(£ millions)
Subsidies related to combat DLDD	2017	365	(£ millions)
Subsidies related to combat DLDD	2018	373	(£ millions)
Subsidies related to combat DLDD	2019	360	(£ millions)
Total expenditures / total per year			

	Year	Amounts	Additional Information
Government revenues			
Environmental taxes for the conservation of land resources and taxes related to combat DLDD			
Total revenues / total per year			

Documentation box

	Explanation
Government expenditures	
Subsidies	https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/agriculture-in-the-united-kingdom. This data is drawn from UK national statistics publication - historical datasets on public payments and agri-enviromental schemes are available in Table 10_1 row 34.
Government revenues	
Domestic resources directly or indirectly related to combat DLDD	

Has your country set a target for increasing and mobilizing domestic resources for the implementation of the Convention?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No

See information in SO5-05 on 25 year Environmental Improvement Plan and Environmental Land Management Schemes. This sets out forward looking approach to Environmental Improvement and to land management schemes.

General comments

SO5-3 International and domestic private resources

Tier 1: Please provide information on the international and domestic private resources mobilized by the private sector of your country for the implementation of the Convention, including information on trends.

Trends in international private resources

- (●) Up ↑
- ( ) Stable ←→
- ( ) Down ↓
- ( ) Unknown ∾

Trends in domestic private resources

- ( ) Up ↑
- ( ) Stable ←→
- ( ) Down ↓
- (●) Unknown ∾

DFID published an Economic Development Strategy in 2017 to approach to supporting economic development. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/587374/DFID-Economic-Development-Strategy-2017.pdf. A key message of that strategy was Life-changing progress comes from growth that transforms economies; that creates productive jobs and private sector investment; and that spreads benefits and opportunities right across society. This is essential to eradicate extreme poverty, deliver the Global Goals that the world adopted in 2015 and end reliance on aid. It highlighted the role of development capital to create jobs, catalyse private sector investment and build markets in challenging settings. In this way, DFID-supported investments can draw in multiples of the funds invested and put economic development on a sustainable footing. It highlighted that Development Capital can also build countries' resilience to climate change through innovative investments in the insurance market. As the UK's development finance institution, CDC (now British Investment International) is our principal partner on Development Capital (with total assets worth over £7.5bn in 2022 and investments c. £1.5bn - £2bn per annum). The strategy spoke of working to make investments take account of conflict and fragility and to make gender, climate and environment-related considerations more central to our Development Capital work. Additional examples of UK support to incentivise private sector support to implementation of the Convention include: The eco.business Fund. 2015 – 2031. Programme budget - £32.6m (period FY 2015/16 – FY2019/20). https://devtracker.fcdo.gov.uk/projects/GB-GOV-7-ICF-P0003-EcoB/summary. https://www.ecobusiness.fund/en/. The eco.business fund is a public-private partnership investment fund which aims to shift incentives in financial institutions (i.e. Banks) towards investing in nature, by embedding social and environmental risk into investment decisions, catalysing transformational change in the financial sector. The fund will increase lending to businesses which incorporate sustainable practices that contribute to biodiversity conservation, sustainable use of natural resources, climate change mitigation and adaptation to its impact across South America: Ecuador, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Columbia, Panama and Honduras, and subsequently Sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean. The fund has been supported by 14 investor partners. Eco-business fund has $692m assets under management and has made $964m cumulative investments to partner institutions. Since its inception in December 2014, the eco.business Fund has contributed to: 923,000 hectares of farmland under sustainable management, 4.8m(cubed) of irrigation water saved, 500m(cubed) of soil erosion avoided, 451,000 hectares of farmland under soil conservation practices supported. Land Degradation Neutrality Fund. 2019 – 2034. Programme budget - £10m. https://devtracker.fcdo.gov.uk/projects/GB-GOV-7-PO009-LDN/summary. The LDN Fund invests in projects which reduce or reverse land degradation and thereby contribute to 'Land Degradation Neutrality'. The LDN Fund is co-promoted by the Global Mechanism of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and Mirova. It is a public-private partnership using public money to increase private sector investment in sustainable development. The fund invests in sustainable agriculture, forestry and other land uses globally.

The trend estimate is based on a small number of available project activities (5) that reported under OECD and UK International Climate Finance data (which reports to the OECD-DAC). The data is therefore weak as an assessment of trends. Data source: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/830656/ICF-Results-2019.pdf. See figures in SO5 dataset uploaded.

Tier 2: Table 3 International and domestic private resources

Year	Title of project, programme, activity or other	Total Amount USD	Financial Instrument	Type of institution	Recipient	Additional Information
	Total	0				

Please provide methodological information relevant to data presented in table 3

Has your country taken measures to encourage the private sector as well as non-governmental organizations, foundations and academia to provide international and domestic resources for the implementation of the Convention?

General comments

SO5-4 Technology transfer

Tier 1: Please provide information relevant to the resources provided, received for the transfer of technology for the implementation of the Convention, including information on trends.

Trends in international bilateral and multilateral public resources provided

- Up ↑
- Stable ←→
- Down ↓
- Unknown ∾

Trends in international bilateral and multilateral public resources received

- Up ↑
- Stable ←→
- Down ↓
- Unknown ∾

Examples from programmes

Tier 2: Table 4 Resources provided and received for technology transfer measures or activities

Provided Received	Year	Title of project, programme, activity or other	Amount	Recipient Provider	Description and objectives	Sector	Type of technology	Activities undertaken by	Status of measure or activity	Timeframe of measure or activity	Use, impact and estimated results	Additional Information
Total provided:			0			Total received:		0				

Please provide methodological information relevant to data presented in table 4

Include information on underlying assumptions, definitions and methodologies used to identify and report on technology transfer support provided and/or received and/or required. Please include links to relevant documentation.

Please provide information on the types of new or current technologies required by your country to address desertification, land degradation and drought (DLDD), and the challenges encountered in acquiring or developing such technologies.

General comments

SO5-5 Future support for activities related to the implementation of the Convention

SO5-5.1: Planned provision and mobilization of domestic public and private resources

Please provide information relevant to the planned provision and mobilization of domestic resources for the implementation of the Convention, including information relevant to indicator SO5-2, as well as information on projected levels of public financial resources, target sectors and planned domestic policies.

The UK Government is undertaking the most significant reform of agricultural policy and spending in England in decades as we move from the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) to our Environmental Land Management schemes, designed for our countryside and environment. Through the Agricultural Transition, we are expanding our schemes to pay farmers and land managers to provide environmental goods and services alongside food production; and providing one-off grants to support farm productivity, innovation, research and development in a way that also helps us to achieve these goals. These reforms are essential to help grow and maintain a resilient, productive agriculture sector over the long term and at the same time achieve our ambitious targets for the environment and climate, playing our role in tackling these huge, global challenges. As transition progresses with direct payments gradually falling, he UK Government will increase the funding and roll out of our Environmental Land Management schemes. There are three schemes to pay for environmental and climate goods and services: The Sustainable Farming Incentive (SFI) will pay farmers to adopt and maintain sustainable farming practices that can protect and enhance the natural environment alongside food production, and also support farm productivity (including by improving animal health and welfare, optimising the use of inputs and making better use of natural resources) Countryside Stewardship (CS) will pay for more targeted actions relating to specific locations, features and habitats. There will be an extra incentive through CS Plus for land managers to join up across local areas to deliver bigger and better results Landscape Recovery will pay for bespoke, longer-term, larger scale projects to enhance the natural environment Currently, there are about 40,000 agreements in Countryside and Environmental Stewardship schemes, covering about 34% of agricultural land. There are 94% more CS agreements now than in January 2020. By 2028, we plan to increase this to at least 70,000 in our schemes, covering 70% of farmed land and 70% of all farms, so that farmers and land managers can collectively deliver our ambitious targets for the environment and climate, alongside food production. The schemes will collectively pay farmers and land managers to deliver, alongside food production, significant and important outcomes for the climate and environment that can only be delivered by farmers and other land managers in the wider countryside. These include: - creating and restoring a broad range of wildlife-rich habitat, as well as continuing to protect habitat already managed under our existing agri-environment schemes - improving water quality, by reducing nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment pollution from agricultural activities, building on our existing Catchment Sensitive Farming approach - increasing resilience to flooding and drought through nature-based solutions such as natural flood management - creating more new woodlands and treescapes to increase tree and woodland cover, and encouraging management of existing woodlands, including to increase their resilience to pests and diseases - reducing carbon emissions, storing carbon and increasing resilience to climate change, for example through management of soils, water, peatland and trees The farming budget in England is an average £2.4 billion per year to 2024/2025. We are now two years into our 7-year transition period where we are phasing out farm subsidies and instead investing the money in farming and the environment. The budget available for the sector is the same. Further detail on the Environmental Land Management Schemes (for England) can be found here - https://www.gov.uk /government/publications/environmental-land-management-update-how-government-will-pay-for-land-based-environment-and-climate-goods-and-services/environmental-land-management-elm-update-how-government-will-pay-for-land-based-environment-and-climate-goods-and-services. Five years ago the 25 Year Environment Plan (25YEP) set out the UK Government's vision for a quarter-of-a-century of action to help the natural world regain and retain good health. The Environmental Improvement Plan (EIP) 2023 for England is our first revision of the 25YEP. It builds on the 25YEP vision with a new plan setting out how we will work with landowners, communities and businesses to deliver each of our goals for improving the environment, matched with interim targets to measure progress. Taking these actions will help us restore nature, reduce environmental pollution, and increase the prosperity of our country. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications /environmental-improvement-plan. The apex goal is to improve nature. This is a large task but we have already started: we have created or restored wildlife habitats the size of Dorset, we are investing more than £750 million in tree-planting and peatland restoration through our Nature for Climate Fund. The UK Government's goals and targets at home will support progress towards the UN's Sustainable Development Goals internationally. To make further progress, we will: • Launch the Species Survival Fund to create, enhance and restore habitats. • Create, restore, and extend around 70 areas for wildlife through projects including new National Nature Reserves, and the next rounds of the Landscape Recovery Projects. • Protect 30% of our land and sea for nature through the Nature Recovery Network and enhanced protections for our marine protected areas. We intend to designate the first Highly Protected Marine Areas this year. • Implement the Environment Act 2021, including rolling out Local Nature Recovery Strategies to identify areas to create and restore habitat, and Biodiversity Net Gain to enhance the built environment. - Support a transformation in the management of 70% of our countryside by incentivising farmers to adopt nature friendly farming practices. • Publish an updated Green Finance Strategy, setting out the steps we are putting in place to leverage in private finance to deliver against these goals. We have a goal to raise at least £500m per year of private finance into nature's recovery by 2027 and more than £1bn by 2030. The Outcome Indicator Framework is a comprehensive set of indicators describing environmental change that relates to the 10 goals within the 25 Year Environmental Plan. This contains 66 indicators across 10 broad themes - including on water, natural resources, resilience. These indicators are extensive and cover natural capital assets, together showing the condition of these assets, the pressure to act upon them and the provision or services or benefits this provide. https://oifdata.defra.gov.uk/. The UK is also leading work in estimating the finance and societal value of natural resources to people in the UK through the UK natural capital accounts. https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/environmentalaccounts/bulletins/uknaturalcapitalaccounts /2022#:~:text=Natural%20capital%20accounting%20estimates%20the,on%20the%20GOV.UK%20website. In 2020, the assets of the natural capital services that were able to be valued were estimated to be worth £1.8tn. A report was published on the natural capital accounts of the UK's peatlands in 2019. This estimated the cost of restoring 100% of Peatlands (which cover 12% of the UK land area) could be significant, estimated between £8bn and £22bn but these are approximately one-tenth to one-fifth of the carbon emissions benefits that would be gained. Conservative estimates on meeting 55% of peatland in good status were of the order of £45bn to £51bn over the next 100 years. https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/environmentalaccounts/bulletins/uknaturalcapitalforpeatlands/naturalcapitalaccounts.

SO5-5.2: Planned provision and mobilization of international public and private resources

Please provide information relevant to the planned provision and mobilization of international resources for the implementation of the Convention, including information on projected levels of public financial resources

and support to capacity building and transfer of technology, target regions or countries, and planned programmes, policies and priorities.

The UK Governments Strategy for International Development was published in May 2022. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk /government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1075328/uk-governments-strategy-international-development.pdf. The 2022 strategy notes: The Prime Minister has promised to double our International Climate Finance (ICF) contribution to at least £11.6 billion between 2021-2026, including investing at least £3 billion of ICF in development solutions that protect and restore nature. The strategy also covered other elements of what this sustained commitments will mean, as the UK will: - Employ the full range of our development finance toolkit, including British International Investment, and put the UK's strengths – our capital markets, innovation, and expertise – to work in mobilising more private finance to advance our climate and nature goals - Ensure that all new bilateral UK Official Development Assistance (ODA) aligns with the Paris Agreement in 2023. This means our bilateral ODA spend drives progress towards mitigating our impact on the climate, and helps partners adapt to a rapidly changing environment. We will also build on our 2021 commitment to ensure all new UK bilateral aid spending does no harm to nature by taking steps to ensure UK bilateral ODA becomes 'nature positive', aligning with the international goal to halt and reverse biodiversity loss by 2030, and the post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. • Develop innovative approaches to tackle climate change and protect nature – for instance, through the Ayrton Fund for clean energy innovation. We will harness the world-leading science, technology, research and policy experience the UK has to offer to accelerate progress towards these goals. • Support the Dasgupta Review on the Economics of Biodiversity recommendations, working with others to protect at least 30% of the ocean and 30% of land globally by 2030. We will take forward the Glasgow Leaders' Declaration on Forests and Land Use, including through efforts to end deforestation and promote climate-resilient, sustainable food systems. Some example emerging UK programmes that will support implementation of the Convention include: CLARE - Climate and Resilience Framework Programme. 2019 - 2027. Programme budget - £102.1m. https://devtracker.fcdo.gov.uk/projects/GB-GOV-1-300126/summary. Description: To develop new, more demand responsive evidence, innovation and capacity to enable developing country governments and communities to better address climate change challenges and opportunities and develop more effective disaster risk management and recovery. The programme will support research to improve our understanding of weather and climate systems across African and the likely impacts of future change. It will also support research and innovation focused on low-carbon and climate resilient technology as well as help strengthen local capacity to do and use cutting edge climate research and evidence for development. Reversing Environmental Degradation in Africa and Asia (REDAA) - Innovative research for the environment, livelihoods and wildlife. 2019 - 2028. Programme budget - £35m. https://devtracker.fcdo.gov.uk/projects/GB-GOV-1-300760/summary. Description: This programme focuses on addressing the challenge of environmental degradation in Africa and Asia - seeking to improve the condition of natural landscapes in ways that enable people and nature to thrive together. REDAA will expand the technical knowledge and evidence base for environmental restoration and sustainable natural resources management in Africa and Asia; and develop innovative solutions that address serious environmental challenges and support the design and implementation of sustainable livelihoods strategies for local communities.

SO5-5.3: Resources needed

Please provide information relevant to the financial resources needed for the implementation of the Convention, including on the projects and regions which needs most support and on which your country has focused to the greatest extent.

General comments

Financial and Non-Financial Sources

Increasing the mobilization of resources:

Would you like to share an experience on how your country has increased the mobilization of resources within the reporting period?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No

Using Land Degradation Neutrality as a framework to increase investment:

From your perspective, would you consider that you have taken advantage of the LDN concept to enhance the coherence, effectiveness and multiple benefits of investments?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Use this space to describe the experience:

What were the challenges faced, if any?

What do you consider to be the lessons learned?

Improving existing and/or innovative financial processes and institutions

From your perspective, do you consider that your country has improved the use of existing and/or innovative financial processes and institutions?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Was this through any of the following (check all that apply)?

- ☐ Existing financial processes
- ☐ Innovative financial processes
- ☐ The GEF
- ☐ Other funds (please specify)

Use this space to describe the experience:

What were the challenges faced, if any?

What do you consider to be the lessons learned?

Did your country support other countries in the improvement of existing or innovative financial processes and institutions?

- Yes
- No

Policy and Planning

Action Programmes:

Has your country developed or helped develop, implement, revise or regularly monitor your national action programme?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Policies and enabling environment:

During the reporting period, has your country established or helped establish policies and enabling environments to promote and/or implement solutions to combat desertification/land degradation and mitigate the effects of drought?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

These policies and enabling environments were aimed at (check all that apply):

- ☒ Promoting solutions to combat desertification, land degradation and drought (DLDD)
- ☒ Implementing solutions to combat DLDD
- ☒ Protecting women's land rights
- ☒ Enhancing women's access to natural, productive and/or financial resources
- ☐ Other (please specify)

How best to describe these experiences (check all that apply):

- ☒ Prevention of the effects of DLDD
- ☒ Relief efforts after DLDD has caused environmental and or socioeconomic stress on ecosystems and or populations
- ☒ Recovery efforts after DLDD has caused environmental and or socioeconomic stress on ecosystems and or populations
- ☒ Engagement of women in decision - making
- ☒ Implementation and promotion of women's land rights and access to land resources
- ☒ Building women's capacity for effective UNCCD implementation
- ☐ Other (please specify)

Use the space below to share more details about your country/sub-region/region/institution's experience.

Please see examples programmes provided in SO5 - 01 that UK ODA has supported to implement against the above criteria.

Do you consider these policies to be successful in promoting or implementing solutions to address DLDD, including prevention, relief and recovery, and what do you consider the main factors of success or lack thereof?

What were the challenges faced, if any?

What would you consider to be the lessons learned?

Has your country supported other countries in establishing policies and enabling environments to promote and implement solutions to combat desertification/land degradation and mitigate the effects of drought, including prevention, relief and recovery?

- (•) Yes
- ( ) No

Has your country offered support related to or including the setting of policy measures in terms of mainstreaming gender in the implementation of the UNCCD?

- (•) Yes
- ( ) No

Use the space below to describe your country's experience.

As above.

Do you consider this experience a success and, if so, what do you consider the reasons behind this success (or lack thereof)?

What were the challenges faced, if any?

What would you consider to be the lessons learned?

Are women's land rights protected in national legislation?

- ( ) Yes
- ( ) No

If so, how (please provide the reference to the relevant law/policy)

Synergies:

From your perspective, has your country leveraged synergies and integrated DLDD into national plans related to other MEAs, particularly the other Rio Conventions and other international commitments?

- (•) Yes
- ( ) No

Your country's actions were aimed at (please check all that apply):

☒ Leveraging DLDD with other national plans related to the other Rio Conventions
☐ Integrating DLDD into national plans
☐ Leveraging synergies with other strategies to combat DLDD
☐ Integrating DLDD into other international commitments
☐ Other (please specify)

Use the space below to describe your country's experience.

The UK was active under its UK COP26 Presidency and in general engagement in building synergies between the Rio Conventions. See below event as example of the activities the UK Government has supported to build synergies in partnership with the Rio Conventions. https://www.stockholm50.global/events/enhancing-synergies-between-rio-conventions-national-and-global-levels-deliver-decade-action

Do you consider this experience a success and, if so, what do you consider the reasons behind this success (or lack thereof)?

The past 12-18 months has seen progress in building synergies between the Rio Conventions with events across UNCCD 15, UNFCC COP26 and COP27 and UNCBD COP15. The text reflected in UNCCD COP15 was indicative of positive progress. We would assess there is further to go on making these synergies a reality at the national level in a way that streamlines and adds value in national planning and reporting.

What were the challenges faced, if any?

What would you consider to be the lessons learned?

Mainstreaming desertification, land degradation and drought:

From your perspective, did your country take specific actions to mainstream, DLDD in economic, environmental and social policies, with a view to increasing the impact and effectiveness of the implementation of the Convention?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Drought-related policies:

Has your country established or is your country establishing national policies, measures and governance for drought preparedness and management?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Has your country supported other countries in establishing policies, measures and governance for drought preparedness and management, in accordance with the mandate of the Convention?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Use the space below to describe your country's experience.

As above - see SO5 O1

Do you consider this experience a success and, if so, what do you consider the reasons behind this success (or lack thereof)?

What were the challenges faced, if any?

What would you consider to be the lessons learned?

Action on the Ground

Sustainable land management practices:

Has your country implemented or is your country implementing sustainable land management (SLM) practices to address DLDD?

- (•) Yes
- ( ) No

What types of SLM practices are being implemented?

- ☐ Agroforestry
- ☐ Area closure (stop use, support restoration)
- ☐ Beekeeping, fishfarming, etc
- ☐ Cross-slope measure
- ☐ Ecosystem-based disaster risk reduction
- ☐ Energy efficiency
- ☐ Forest plantation management
- ☐ Home gardens
- ☐ Improved ground/vegetation cover
- ☐ Improved plant varieties animal breeds
- ☐ Integrated crop-livestock management
- ☐ Integrated pest and disease management (incl. organic agriculture)
- ☐ Integrated soil fertility management
- ☐ Irrigation management (incl. water supply, drainage)
- ☐ Minimal soil disturbance
- ☐ Natural and semi-natural forest management
- ☐ Pastoralism and grazing land management
- ☐ Post-harvest measures
- ☐ Rotational system (crop rotation, fallows, shifting, cultivation)
- ☐ Surface water management (spring, river, lakes, sea)
- ☐ Water diversion and drainage
- ☐ Water harvesting
- ☐ Wetland protection/management
- ☐ Windbreak/Shelterbelt
- ☐ Waste management / Waste water management
- ☐ Other (please specify)

Use the space below to share more details about your country's experience:

See SO5 - 02 and SO5 - 05. Details on Environmental Land Management Schemes and 25 year Environmental Improvement Plan.

Would you consider the implemented practices successful and what do you consider the main factors of success?

What were the challenges faced, if any?

What do you consider to be the lessons learned?

How did you engage women and youth in these activities?

Has your country supported other countries in the implementation of SLM practices?

- (•) Yes
- ( ) No

Use the space below to share more details about your country's experience:

See SO5 01 for examples of UK ODA support.

Would you consider the implemented practices successful and what do you consider the main factors of success?

What were the challenges faced, if any?

What do you consider to be the lessons learned?

Restoration and Rehabilitation:

Has your country implemented or is your country implementing restoration and rehabilitation practices in order to assist with the recovery of ecosystem functions and services?

- (•) Yes
- ( ) No

What types of rehabilitation and restoration practices are being implemented?

- ☐ Restore/improve tree-covered areas
- ☐ Increase tree-covered area extent
- ☐ Restore/improve croplands
- ☐ Restore/improve grasslands
- ☐ Restore/improve wetlands
- ☐ Increase soil fertility and carbon stock
- ☐ Manage artificial surfaces
- ☐ Restore/improve protected areas
- ☐ Increase protected areas
- ☐ Improve coastal management
- ☐ General instrument (e.g. policies, economic incentives)
- ☐ Restore/improve multiple land uses
- ☐ Reduce/halt conversion of multiple land uses
- ☐ Restore/improve multiple functions
- ☐ Restore productivity and soil organic carbon stock in croplands and grasslands
- ☐ Other/general/unspecified

Use the space below to share more details about your country's experience:

As above

Would you consider the implemented practices successful and what do you consider the main factors of success?

What were the challenges faced, if any?

What do you consider to be the lessons learned?

How did you engage women and youth in SLM activities?

Has your country supported other countries with restoration and rehabilitation practices in order to assist with the recovery of ecosystem functions and services?

- (•) Yes
- ( ) No

Use the space below to describe your country's experience.

As above.

Do you consider this experience a success and, if so, what do you consider the reasons behind this success (or lack thereof)?

What were the challenges faced, if any?

What would you consider to be the lessons learned?

Drought risk management and early warning systems:

Is your country developing a drought risk management plan, monitoring or early warning systems and safety net programmes to address DLDD?

- ( ) Yes
- ( ) No

Has your country supported other countries in developing drought risk management, monitoring and early warning systems and safety net programmes to address DLDD?

- (•) Yes
- ( ) No

Use the space below to describe your country's experience.

as above.

Do you consider this experience a success and, if so, what do you consider the reasons behind this success (or lack thereof)?

What were the challenges faced, if any?

What would you consider to be the lessons learned?

Alternative livelihoods:

Does your country promote alternative livelihoods practice in the context of DLDD?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Do you consider your country to be taking special measures to engage women and youth in promoting alternative livelihoods?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Establishing knowledge sharing systems:

Has your country established systems for sharing information and knowledge and facilitating networking on best practices and approaches to drought management?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Please use this space to share/list the established systems available in your country for sharing information and knowledge and facilitating networking on best practices and approaches to drought management.

See programmes listed in SO5 - 01.

Do you consider this experience a success and, if so, what do you consider the reasons behind this success (or lack thereof)?

What were the challenges faced, if any?

What would you consider to be the lessons learned?

Do you consider that your country has implemented specific actions that promote women's access to knowledge and technology?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Other files for Reporting

United Kingdom - SO5-1 provider	Download	121.2 KB
United Kingdom - SO5-1 provider - attribution applied + PFM data	Download	128.6 KB