



# Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General  
27 May 2011

English only

---

## Economic Commission for Europe

### Conference of European Statisticians

#### Fifty-ninth plenary session

Geneva, 14-16 June 2011

Item 6c of the provisional agenda

**Manuals, guidelines, recommendations, etc. prepared under the auspices of the Conference: measuring sustainable development**

### **Results of the electronic consultation on a Summary of the Report being prepared by the Joint UNECE/Eurostat/OECD Task Force for Measuring Sustainable Development**

#### **Note by the secretariat**

##### *Summary*

The present note summarises the comments by countries and international organizations on the Summary of the Report currently being prepared by the Joint United Nations Economic Commission for Europe/Eurostat/Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Task Force for Measuring Sustainable Development. The comments were collected through two electronic consultations: with the members of the Bureau of the Conference of European Statisticians in February and with members of the Conference of European Statisticians in April 2011.

Forty-one responses were received to the consultations (from 37 countries and 4 international organizations). The respondents expressed support for the work and noted the good progress achieved. The consultation provided many useful ideas and comments to improve the Report being prepared by the Task Force.

The 2011 plenary session of the Conference of European Statisticians will be informed about the outcome of the electronic consultation and the further work of the Task Force. The full report of the Task Force is planned to be submitted to the 2012 plenary session of the Conference.

## I. Organization of the consultation

1. The Joint United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)/Eurostat/Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Task Force on Measuring Sustainable Development was set up in 2009. The main task of the group is to further pursue the capital approach developed by a previous Joint UNECE/Eurostat/OECD Working Group on this topic, which resulted in the publication “Measuring Sustainable Development”. The new Task Force follows up on dimensions unresolved in the previous work, including on social and human capital. The Task Force is preparing a Report that is planned to be submitted to the 2012 plenary session of the Conference of European Statisticians (CES).

2. An extended Summary of the Report was consulted with the CES Bureau in January/February 2011. The consultation provided many useful comments. The Bureau encouraged the Task Force to continue the work on the Report, taking into account the other ongoing initiatives related to measuring economic performance, wellbeing and sustainable development undertaken by Eurostat and OECD.

3. The CES Bureau decided to proceed with a large consultation on the Summary with all CES members to collect feedback and to allow countries and organizations to provide input to the work. The Summary was updated by the Chair of the Task Force (the Netherlands).

4. The present note summarises the comments from both the Bureau and the CES electronic consultations. These will be taken into account in any further work. The CES Bureau considered it important to allow countries and organizations to continue to provide comments after the CES 2011 plenary session and to take into account the developments in other international groups working on related issues.

5. Following the Bureau decision, the Summary was sent for electronic consultation to all CES members in March 2011. The members of the Conference were asked to structure their comments along six main questions, covering the general approach undertaken by the Task Force and the overall assessment, the use of conceptual versus thematic categorisation, the country experiences in developing and use of sustainable development indicator (SDI) sets, measurement experiences, data availability and visualisation and communication. The majority of countries and international organizations followed the proposed structure. The questionnaire used for the consultation is presented in document ECE/CES/2011/4/Add 2. The individual countries’ replies are available on the UNECE Statistical Division website.

## II. Replies to the consultations

6. **Forty-one responses were received from the following 37 countries and 4 international organizations:** Armenia, Austria, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Eurostat, IMF, OECD and UNDP.

### III. Comments on the general approach undertaken by the Task Force and the overall assessment of the Summary of the Report

7. The majority of countries support the work in terms of underlying concepts, coverage, and relevance, and note the good progress achieved. The general approach is considered to be going in the right direction: it takes into account the outcomes of recent initiatives, presents new challenges and recognises the importance of quality standards of official statistics. The conceptual split into “now, later, elsewhere” was found useful to assess the “state of the nation”. Most of the countries underline the usefulness of the Report in their process of preparing or reviewing sustainable development indicator sets. **Eurostat** noted that the Summary reflects the very substantial work carried out until now. It takes into account other work such as the Stiglitz report and reviews a large number of datasets from statistical offices and international organisations.

8. The underlying concepts are considered relevant, practical and comprehensive. They give important background information to harmonise the measures and the understanding of sustainable development concept.

9. In terms of coverage, it was noted that the new framework represents a step forward in the area. It adds new causal links between human wellbeing and the influencing factors (human, social, natural and economic capital) through the components of the proposed indicators and their interrelationships. It was suggested to include also a spatial dimension to reflect regional disparities and distribution of resources at a national level and to bring new solutions to areas such as measurement of human and social capital stocks.

10. Most countries support the coverage, including the quality of life aspects and the international dimension of sustainable development. The countries consider it important to develop broader measures of wellbeing and sustainability and integrate the current and future wellbeing. Covering human wellbeing of the current generation makes the indicators more broadly representative of “progress, wellbeing and sustainable development” rather than “sustainable development” alone. Certain advantages are noted by offering a choice between the “future-oriented view” and the “integrated approach”, compared to the approach that is limited only to the future-oriented view. It was emphasized that the two dimensions “here and now” and “later” should be clearly distinguished in the Report. **Eurostat** reckons that only the “integrated approach” allows correct measurement of the broad concept of sustainable development. **Canada** and **Finland**, however, prefer a narrower coverage limited to the capital approach to measuring long-term sustainable development. **Canada** pointed out that including quality of life measures for present generations adds to its complexity and moves the indicators away from measuring sustainable development to simply measuring a suite of indicators of general economic, social and environmental interest.

11. Most of the respondents find the new framework relevant for national level statistics. The majority of the proposed indicators are already compiled by the national statistical offices (NSOs). It is also noted that the proposed set of indicators is relevant for meeting the requirements of statistical data users.

12. The limits of sustainable development concept to official statistics in view of pending measurement problems are pointed out. There are concerns about the methodology for calculating some of the indicators and a number of required assumptions. In several areas, statistical offices can provide technical support and advice to other institutions producing these measures but will not publish them as official statistics. Cooperation with national and international institutions and data providers was highlighted as essential.

**Germany**, however, mentioned that the indicators considered important for measuring sustainable development are already calculated by NSOs in the frame of official statistics.

13. Several countries consider the work very useful as a means to share experience on developing/revising national SDI sets. The Report was found more appropriate for a statistical office with experience in monitoring sustainable development than for beginners.

14. Some of the more specific comments are presented in summary below:

- The **US Bureau of Economic Analysis** pointed out that establishing a set of indicators that measure all of the multifaceted dimensions of “sustainable development” is a daunting task for any NSO. Considering the lack of theoretical studies in the field, the Report contributes to the improvement in the national sets of sustainable development indicators.
- **Australia, Eurostat** and **UNDP** suggested more careful reflection of the discussion on weak and strong sustainability.
- **Austria** noted that “subjective aspects are in general underrepresented” and that “the aspect of wealth in time and its quality is very important”. **Austria** also asked for quality indicators of the various dimensions of the environment.
- **Romania** underlined the fact that the reflection of the factors which determine human wellbeing helps to improve the statistical standards for compiling indicators. The information on the state and distribution of various types of capital provides a wider view of the heritage left to future generations as far as wellbeing is concerned.
- **United Kingdom** recommends building where possible on international frameworks such as System of National Accounts (SNA) and the System of Integrated Environmental and Economic Accounting (SEEA). It is also important that current 'gaps' are recognised in the Report, not rushing to measure what is easy to measure rather than what needs to be measured, e.g. for ecosystems.
- **Eurostat** noted that the Summary aims at reaching a consensus by allowing an “à la carte choice” for the sensitive issue of the methodological approach (it permits the choice between the “future oriented view”, the “integrated approach” and monetised wealth estimates).
- **Eurostat** considers the proposed framework as more important than developing a list of indicators and recommends further effort in refining the framework and themes. It considers that only specific aspects of sustainable development can be measured in a precise way.
- **United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)** proposed to outline already at the beginning the goal of *development of* a system of indicators for monitoring sustainable development as opposed to the currently available list presenting a mixture of existing indicators, proxies of the non-existing ones and a wish list.
- **UNDP** considers that the distributional aspect of sustainable development is relatively well discussed in the Summary, however, the proposed indicators are dominated by averages, and therefore, neglecting the distributional aspects.
- **OECD** noted that the Report needs to mention explicitly that the ‘capital approach’, used to describe the inter-temporal dimension of sustainable development, is broader than the specific (monetary or physical) measures that are used to make it operational. In other words, the discussion of the advantages

and disadvantages of monetization (e.g. of natural or human capital) does not invalidate the usefulness of the ‘capital approach’ to address inter-temporal issues.

- **OECD** stressed that more attention should be given to the economic aspects of sustainability. The recent crisis highlights that unsustainable patterns of development may not reflect only a shrinking size of the capital (per capita) left to future generations, but also imbalances in the structure and distribution of that capital. The capital approach needs to look beyond economy-wide measures of the (net) capital stock left to future generations, to consider: i) the separate role of prices and quantities, as well as of assets and liabilities, in shaping the ‘net’ position of each country; ii) the distribution of that capital between institutional sectors; iii) the concentrations of risks in specific groups or individuals within these sectors; iv) the possible mismatches in the maturity of various financial instruments, as well as between domestic and foreign financing. Addressing (mentioning) these issues would provide a golden opportunity to underscore the relevance of sustainable development to how economists and statisticians think about crises.
- **OECD** also considers that the main value added of the report will be Section II “Measuring Sustainable Development” and the identification of the measurement approaches and challenges with respect to each of the elements of the conceptual approach presented in Section I “Conceptual Framework”.

#### **IV. Use of the conceptual versus thematic categorization**

15. The Summary includes a conceptual and a thematic categorization of Sustainable Development Indicators (SDI). In the conceptual categorization, three dimensions are distinguished: current human wellbeing, future human wellbeing (“capital approach”) and the international dimension. In the thematic approach, sustainable development is split into policy themes (education, health, etc). Countries discussed the advantages and disadvantages of both approaches.

16. Most countries find it useful to link a conceptual approach with a thematic (policy based) approach. This allows making a bridge between producers and users of the indicators, and between sustainable development theorists and practitioners responsible for the monitoring specific themes. The advantages in linking the conceptual and thematic categorisations are seen to be of great relevance for building a sustainable development policy. A combination of both approaches are recommended: first, a conceptual approach, based on an indicator typology, to define the process of sustainable development in the main policy fields; second, a thematic approach that facilitates the communication with the politicians and the general population. Since both systems are linked, mixing the conceptual strictness with the practical flexibility can only bring benefits.

17. The conceptual framework is considered more comprehensive than other approaches to the measurement of sustainable development. The conceptual approach is regarded as a theoretical background for understanding the broad sustainability concept of capital and its dimensions. Although it was said that trade-offs of human wellbeing between current and future generations can not be very clearly tracked, a policy concept would enable the main problematic areas to be detected. The possibility to add sub-indicators that will support the headline indicators and explain the factors that influence the headline indicators is appreciated. Several countries highlight the usefulness of the conceptual approach for the international dimension and detecting the trade-offs between wellbeing in high-income and

developing countries. The conceptual approach is also supported as useful in linking sustainable development to the economic information derived by the SNA.

18. The thematic approach is considered in general to be more practical, easier to implement, and helpful for elaboration of various policies. The draft set of sustainable development themes and potential indicators covers a wide range of indicators and needs to be further focused in order to provide a coherent story about sustainable development. The thematic approach is said to be valuable in providing policy makers with the means to know what actions they can take and how they can influence certain policies with the help of the information from the sub-indicators. The importance to analyse the links between the themes is highlighted. Their interactions can provide a better understanding of how underlying trends in society can contribute to a more sustainable path. The information on capital may be not easy to interpret and be used as a basis for crucial decisions that need to be taken today, e.g. on investments in education, health and energy systems.

19. A strong convergence between themes and concepts is noted: both cover a set of indicators and include logical relations between sub-domains. The integration, however, of both current and future wellbeing is stressed as being the most important. It shows the key trade-offs that are important in the Brundtland definition.

20. It is considered useful to present options in the report allowing flexibility in their application reflecting the different policies and country priorities.

21. Several replies touch upon the use of composite indicators and a related concern that often the methodology used to construct composite indicators does not meet the quality standards of official statistics.

## V. Experiences with developing and use of sustainable development indicator sets

22. Most countries have a system of SDI, some are currently developing or plan to develop a national set of SDI, and only a few responded that they do not have a SDI set. The SDIs of European Union (EU) member countries are often based on (or identical to) the EU SDI set. Some countries have produced indicators on sustainable development but do not maintain an official and comprehensive SDI set. The **United States** and **Canada** produce a wide range of statistics on sustainability, although they do not have an official set of SDI indicators.

23. Several themes applied in certain countries were suggested as additional themes to the ones covered by the Summary. These include regional disparities, culture, natural hazards, nuclear safety, transport, financial flows towards less developed countries, sustainable production and consumption patterns, social inclusion, demography, migration, education and vocational training, availability of public cultural services, share of built-up area, environmental expenditures, use of fertilizers, use of pesticides, share of organic farming, logging intensity, etc. **Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, France, Latvia** and **Portugal** provided more detailed lists of indicators that could be added to the Summary. A possibility to bundle some themes into a larger policy domains such as energy or climate is proposed (e.g. oceans and costal areas could be classified into ecosystems).

24. The countries' experiences in respect to optimal number of indicators vary. Most countries consider it difficult to specify the "optimal" number. Extracts of SDI sets should be made from a wider and comprehensive list to be communicated in pocket books, reports, and other publications. As an alternative, visualisation techniques are proposed to be used to summarise the information from the indicators instead of reducing the number of indicators. For monitoring purposes, it is proposed to assign for policy targets as many SDI

indicators as possible in order to make the SDI set relevant for policy makers and society in general.

25. Most countries indicate no special experience in maintaining a “small” set of indicators. Some note that a “small” set of indicators (for example 10-12 indicators) could be important for communication purposes. **Spain**, however, made a warning with regard to the use of sophisticated mechanisms for integration of indicators. Transparency and clarity are noted as essential for users. **Brazil** indicated its awareness of some academic experiences using mathematical techniques to make successive reductions of data without losing information on the original indicators.

## VI. Measurement experiences

### A. Current wellbeing

26. Several countries have experience in measuring current wellbeing and quality of life. **Brazil**, **Croatia** and **The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** indicate that they produce wellbeing or social indicators based on available data sets. **Turkey** produces numerous indicators to measure wellbeing in the area of poverty, health, education, employment, income and wealth, shelter, natural environment, political participation, civil society, economic participation, human rights, national stability and sustainability, family wellbeing, and personal wellbeing. **Lithuania** points out indicators on life expectancy, educational attainment, groundwater quality, protection of biodiversity, etc. **Kazakhstan** conducts a sample household survey to assess quality of life, including income and consumption patterns, with the purpose to identify the level of welfare and to study the causes and conditions of poverty (subjective assessment). **Armenia** considers individual components of quality of life as part of its household surveys on living conditions, demographic and health surveys.

27. Only a few countries are measuring wellbeing in a more systematic way. **Australia** has a broad ranging social statistics program which measures social wellbeing of population, family and community, health, education and training, work, economic resources, housing, crime and justice, and culture and leisure. Most of the measures are objective, however, in recent years, **Australia** has produced an increasing range of subjective measures, including self-assessed health, life satisfaction, feeling rushed or pressed for time, and feelings of safety. The **Netherlands** has a program to measure subjective wellbeing which started in 2010. **Sweden** notes a long tradition in measuring human wellbeing since the 1970's.

28. Several countries have plans or work in progress on measuring human wellbeing and quality of life. The **US Bureau of Economic Analysis** is exploring alternative measures of growth, income, income distribution, household and non-market production, health care output and spending, and sustainability. **Switzerland** is also currently working on supplementing the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) with wellbeing indicators. **France** is preparing a pilot survey to test questions on both objective and subjective quality of life. Wellbeing measures are included as a target in the political programme of the present Government of **Finland**. The **Netherlands** started a programme for measuring subjective wellbeing in 2010. In June 2010, **Austria** made a study on how to monitor wellbeing of Austria's population financed by Eurostat. **Austrian** subjective indicators were evaluated recently and enhanced by a survey on wealth in time. **Luxembourg** has proposed about hundred wellbeing indicators under a project “GDP of wellbeing”. **Poland** is currently working on identifying possibilities to measure wellbeing within the frame of “Beyond GDP” and to improve the scope of its living conditions surveys. A few countries (**Ireland**,

**Finland, Romania**) point out that their methodology is still under development or in a research stage.

29. References are made to various surveys, including SILC, the European Quality of Life Survey, household budget surveys, time use surveys, NGOs surveys on social needs, living conditions surveys, etc.

## B. Capital

30. The extent to which natural capital is measured varies significantly between countries. **Australia** produces a range of data which contribute to the understanding of natural capital, including natural assets such as land, timber and subsoil assets. **Australian's** enviro-economic accounts include information on water, energy and land. **Canada** has been measuring physical stocks of energy, minerals, timber, land and water since the 1990s. The **Netherlands** has an extensive programme of environmental accounts and statistics and produces many of the SEEA accounts on a regular basis. **Mexico** is monitoring some aspects of natural capital by means of the Economic and Ecological Account System. **The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** has some experience on measuring natural capital concerning water, soil and air quality, and their interdependence with the climate changes but they rely on irregular project surveys. **Latvia** plans to calculate natural capital in the long run.

31. **Australia, Canada, the Netherlands and Italy** describe their practices in measuring human capital. **Australia** has undertaken a range of work in measuring human capital over a number of years. **Canada** participates in research on the measurement of human capital but has not produced official statistics in this domain. The **Netherlands** and **Norway** have started a program, to measure human capital according to the J-F framework (lifetime income approach). **Italy** has recently set up an overall strategy for the measurement of human capital. It is internationally harmonized and includes both measuring capital stocks of human capital and advancing towards the construction of a satellite account for human capital. Stocks are measured according to the life-time labour income approach (J-F) limited to the working population (15-64 years), with breakdowns by sex, level of education (3 or 4 levels), employees/self-employed and economic activity. Only SNA economic activities are taken into account at this stage.

32. Very few countries mention any experience in measuring social capital. **Austria, Australia, and Sweden** have done some studies on capital stocks, and in particular on social capital. **Ireland** has done a small module on social capital as part of its Labour Force Survey in 2006. **France** measures social capital based on information from the European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC) survey, for example on participation in public life and contact with the others. Participation in public life is measured according to three aspects: political commitment (including participation in the electoral process), professional commitment, and participation in groups or organisations (holding a position of responsibility in an association, including voluntary work). **Italy** has begun a research project for an Atlas of Social Capital and Institutions, with the aim of observing the presence/absence of institutions, how this presence is or is not supported by social networks, social and civic participation and their relation with socio-economic development by territorial breakdown. The **Netherlands** has written a number of reports on social capital from macro-economic perspective. **Latvia** shares its experience on calculating a Social Capital Index, mainly in the research field. **Italy** and **Turkey** are using definitions in conformity with the OECD definition of social capital.

33. **Azerbaijan, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Germany, Kazakhstan, Luxembourg, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, and Switzerland** indicate explicitly that they do not have experience in measuring natural, human or social capital stocks.

34. In general, there is a high awareness of the limits with regard to the issue of monetization. The **Netherlands** monetises the SNA assets, intangible capital, research and development (R&D) and is exploring the (monetary) human capital accounts. As far as natural capital is concerned, only sub-soil assets are monetized. **Austria** has no plans for monetisation of natural and social capital. Although monetisation requires assumptions about the future (especially prices), **Canada** considers it useful to determine approximate values and to assess trade-offs. **France** also supports the establishment of reference values for different non-marketed goods in certain cases, especially in the environment domain. On the contrary, in many cases, **Spain** prefers to restrict to physical measures instead of using methodologically weak monetisation techniques. **Germany** has explored possibilities for monetisation of natural capital but so far did not find any convincing approaches. **Australia** would support monetisation where market values are available or where good proxies can be readily obtained through analytical techniques, but would be more wary of valuation techniques that are not based in some way on prices that are revealed in a market. Given the benefits of comparability that monetisation brings, **Australia** considers it worth pursuing by official statisticians, even if some estimates may need to be labelled experimental because the estimation techniques are not fully established or because alternative methods are available and there is no single agreed upon method. **Norway** notes that methods of monetisation could be improved, and more stocks such as the global climate and biodiversity should be included.

### C. International dimension

35. The inclusion of the international dimension of sustainable development in the Report is received positively and further work in this area is encouraged. **Eurostat** considers the international dimension crucial. **Finland** asks for more clarity about the international dimension and alerted that the issue of distribution on a global scale has a political aspect, and therefore, difficult to describe.

36. Several countries note experience in this area, including the calculation of “ecological footprint”. **Finnish** Ministry of Environment has actively taken part in development of the “ecological footprint” calculations. **Luxembourg** has begun calculating the “ecological footprint” as part of a project carried out by a Research Centre. **Luxembourg** considers the “ecological footprint” an excellent communication tool, which however is not applicable when evaluating policies in one or other economic sectors. **Sweden** measures emissions for the Swedish consumption as part of the work on the environment accounts. The **Latvian** Sustainable Development Strategy 2030 has included the “ecological footprint” as a strategic indicator to monitor sustainable development. **Norway** considers the “ecological footprint” as being a problematic measure since it does not take properly into account the specialisation in production induced by the international trade. The **Netherlands** measures greenhouse gas emissions from both production and consumption perspectives. **France** takes into account the international dimension in its sustainable development scoreboard with a headline indicator of direct income transfers (official development aid) from France to the developing world. Furthermore, **France** estimates certain environmental relationships, e.g. the carbon footprint both from a territory and a final demand perspective. **France** and **Germany** are currently working on estimating a water footprint. **Germany** points out the need for an internationally agreed method to calculate the carbon footprint.

37. **Austria** has developed a footprint calculator, which is used only for communication purposes. Two on-line calculators on the webpage of World Wildlife Fund in **Latvia** allow calculating the personal “ecological footprint”.

38. The **Netherlands** estimates trade balance on a bilateral trade basis. **Sweden** considers the trade balances difficult to interpret and makes a proposal to use the environmental pressure connected to consumption on a per capita basis.

39. **Australia** expresses concerns with ecological footprints as statistical measures and has no plans to produce such measures.

## VII. Data availability

40. Most countries indicate that they produce the indicators listed in Tables A1 and A2 in Annex 2 of the Summary (Document 4/Add 1).

41. Some countries note additional indicators that are not included in Annex 2. **Bulgaria** produces additional indicators on fresh water resources, waste water disposal, surface and groundwater extraction, and the extraction of metal and non-metals ores. **Mexico** has indicators on biodiversity, resource reserves, water quality, and freshwater resources. **Australia** lists supplementary indicators on housing affordability, victims of burglary (households) and assault (persons), obesity, educational attainment of young people, contact with family and friends, fossil fuel reserves, biodiversity and fresh water resources, early school leavers, PISA and PIAAC scores, etc. Additionally, **Portugal** notes the existing information on the indicators “Time spent on recreation (hours)” and “Time spent with friends, family, volunteering (hours)” (TUS of 1999). **Poland** has also done work on measuring volunteering.

42. **Italy** notes that for each chosen indicator, its meaning in terms of sustainability and goals to be reached (if any) has to be clearly stated and suggests defining a single direction for all indicators, also from a conceptual point of view, so that a positive or an increasing value for a given indicator would indicate an improvement in terms of sustainability.

## VIII. Visualisation and communication

43. Not many countries indicate experience in visualisation and communication of SDI sets. **Mexico** has several systems for visualisation and communication of environmental, socio-demographic and economic indicators. **Romania** regularly works on new tools for visualisation of SDIs. Maps developed by Eurostat in relation to the SDI work were given as a good example of visualisation. **The Netherlands** is planning to introduce a web-visualisation tool in 2011.

44. Most countries consider trends in the SDIs, link them to policy targets and compare SDIs to other countries. **Hungary** makes comparisons with other EU and neighbourhood countries. **Switzerland** makes assessments of trends in indicators and illustrates the results with a traffic-light symbol. In the **Latvian** Sustainable Development Strategy 2030, 7 strategic themes are described by a list of 4 -10 indicators per theme, thus in general the indicators are linked to policy targets. The values of the indicators are compared to the EU-27 average. **Ireland** is developing and disseminating competitiveness indicators (Measuring Ireland’s Progress).

45. **Finland** has produced a publication on SDI communication “SDI: Much wanted less used”. Although data on sustainable development are not always published, most of the countries make references to various publications on sustainable development aspects.

## **IX. Conclusion**

46. The results of the consultation were reviewed in-depth during the meeting of the Task Force on 19-20 May 2011. The Task Force appreciated the many useful comments received and will take them into account in finalising the Report.

---