



CCPIE information & exchange session with Multi-pilotes

Presentation of

United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) &
Intergovernmental Working Group on Drought (IWG-D)

UNCCD: context and key issues :

- UNCCD: one of the 3 “Rio Convention” (with GEF as main financial mechanism)
- SDG 15.3: Achieve LDN by 2030
(integrated at COP13 in Strategic Framework 2018-2030)
- Today: 40% of global land is degraded (60% in Europe)
- LDN TSP > LDN TSP 2.0 + implementation of LDN Targets
- NDP + implementation



UNCCD: context and key issues :

- CBD COP15: adoption of the GBF >> Target 2 (& Target 3) ;
- Ensure that by 2030 at least 30 per cent of areas of degraded terrestrial, inland water, and coastal and marine ecosystems are under effective restoration, in order to enhance biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services, ecological integrity and connectivity
- CRIC-21 (Nov'23) to prepare COP-16 (Dec'24) decisions on 10 topics (Drought, Financing, LDN targets, Land Tenure, Gender, MTE, Synergies,...);
BE contribution to EU Positions/ Statements on 7 topics
- * COM proposal to declare EU as affected party under UNCCD: (+) & (-)
→ may have implications for BE → Consultation of CCIEP SG-Soil consultation to decide BE positions (perhaps COORMULTI)
- Meetings of the IWG on Drought (Nov. 2023 & May 2024) :
BE = Sponsor/pilot of 1 option (COP Dec. to the GEF and GM)



4 WPIEI Desertification under BE PRES.

- Friday 19 January 2024 (in person)
- Friday 15 March 2024 (virtual)
- Friday 07 May 2024 (in person, tbc)
- Friday 07 June 2024 (virtual)



BE Team for WPIEI-Desertification

- GENIN Corentin : Chair (FPS FA)
- WILLEMART Sébastien: Co-Chair/ Expert (FPS FA)
- HERTENWEG Kelly: BE Representative (FPS Env.)
- SIEMERS Maarten: Expert/ Admin. Support (FPS FA)
- D'HAVÉ Julie: Expert (FPS Env.)



Focus on 2nd IWG-Drought (Dec. 23/COP.15): Mandate:

- Review and analyze the reports which came out of the first IWG + other relevant documents, and the COP' decisions related to Drought;
- **Identify and evaluate all options**, including global policy instruments and regional policy frameworks; and linking, where relevant, to national plans; and, where appropriate, **to effectively manage drought under the Convention, including supporting a shift from reactive to proactive drought management**;
- Prepare justifications and outline possible elements, processes, institutional arrangements, and mechanisms for the establishment of each policy option.



Intergovernmental Working Group on Drought II (IWG 2022 - 2024)

Membership

- 3 representatives per regional group (ie. 5 UNCCD annexes + EU + JUSCANZ), 2 CSO observers and 2 independent experts
- EU = well represented (BE, ES, IT, COM + DE as co-chair); each option proposal put forward by a EU member is supported by the others

BE Position (= EU consensus):

- **More financing** for Drought BUT avoid creation of a new Fund, Protocol on Drought or an amendment to the Convention (supported by Africa), Risk: may lead to further fragmentation/complexification of Global environmental governance/ architecture
- Strengthen existing financ. mechanism: i.e. Request **GEF** to **increase the volume of funding** and better exploit programmatic synergies; Request **GM** to support countries in presenting a **pipeline of bankable projects** tailored to donors & investors



Overview & Calendar

Date	Meeting	Location	Expected outcomes
22/11/2022	IWG#1	Bonn, Germany	Agree on calendar & deliverables, review existing work, collect alternative options from IWG members
13/03/2023	IWG#2	Yerevan, Armenia	Reduce # options (48 => 26), discuss and agree on criteria, agree on evaluation methodology
21/06/2023	IWG#3	Madrid, Spain	Reduce # options (26 => 8), finalize report to CRIC21, establish task group to spell out options
18/11/2023	IWG#4	Samarkand, Uzbekistan	Exchange on options spelled out and CRIC21 feedback, identify potential information gaps to apply evaluation methodology
May or June 2024 (tbc)	IWG#5	Santiago, Chile	Evaluate (SWOT analysis) retained options, provide justifications, finalize report to COP16 (end 2024, Saudi Arabia)



Retained options

Category	Option	Sponsor & sub-group members
1. Finance	Create new financial mechanisms for drought resilience	None at the moment
	Strengthen existing financial mechanisms such as the GEF and the Global Mechanism	Belgium, Honduras, Uzbekistan
2. Technical	Define a global target for drought resilience	Italy, Turkey, Germany, Armenia, Australia, CSO representative
	Create a global work programme on proactive drought management	Saudi Arabia, Armenia, Georgia, Belarus, Australia, independent expert
3. Legally binding	Adopt a legally binding Amendment to the Convention	Eswatini, South Africa, Kenya, CSO, expert, EU Commission (as an observer)
	Adopt a Protocol under the auspices of the Convention	
4. Non binding	Adopt decisions, political declaration, or other kind instrument under the Convention	Spain, EU Commission, CSO representative, independent expert
	Adopt decisions, political declaration, or other kind instrument outside of the Convention	



Eight Selected Options

1. Finance Options

- 1.1 Creating new funding instruments
- 1.2 Strengthening existing mechanisms (GEF, GM)

1.2
Honduras,
Uzbekistan &
Belgium

3. Legally binding Options

- 3.1 Amendment to the Convention
- 3.2 Protocol or Agreement

3.
Africa, EU, C. King
(Expert) & H. Withanage
(CSO)

2. Technical Options

- 2.1 Define a global target
- 2.2 Create a global work programme

2.2.
Saudi Arabia,
C. King (Expert),
Annex V & Australia

2.1
Italy, Turkey, Co-chair
(M. Brüntrup), Armenia,
Australia & H.
Withanage (CSO)

4. Non-Legally binding Options

- 4.1 Instruments outside (UNEA and/or GA) the convention
- 4.2 Instrument inside the convention (COP decision, declaration)

4.
Spain, EU, GWP & A.
Pangraco (CSO)



Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Lead Questions
1. Socio-Ecological Effectiveness To what degree does the option/instrument meet the policy objectives?	What is the capacity of the option to meet the policy objectives? How quickly will the option achieve its maximum capacity? Is the option flexible? Is the option comprehensive, ambitious, and able to activate political commitment?
2. Economic Efficiency In achieving the projected level of effectiveness, is use of the option likely to result in benefits outweighing costs?	What are the likely incremental cost outcomes? How affordable is this option? What are the likely incremental benefits of the option? Does the option allow flexibility in decision making on the part of the targeted sector/area or stakeholder group?
3. Impact on Equality Would this option result in inequitable distribution of costs and benefits between social groups, sectors and regions?	Does the option result in a change in the benefits, costs, or employment of one social group more than of other groups? Does the option result in a positive change in ecosystem functions and ecosystem restoration capacities?
4. Acceptability and Compatibility Would this option receive political and public support, and would it be compatible with existing or proposed measures in other jurisdictions?	What is the expected buy-in from the public, community, stakeholders, and governments? Is the option compatible with constitutional jurisdictions, established jurisdictional responsibilities, and global environmental goals/policies?

