



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

ECE/CEP/2009/9  
22 October 2009

Original: ENGLISH

---

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

Sixteenth session  
Geneva, 20–23 October 2009  
Item 4(b) of the provisional agenda

REVIEW OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK

ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS AND MONITORING

**INTERSECTORAL TASK FORCE ON ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS**

Note by the secretariat<sup>1</sup>

*Summary*

The document is submitted in pursuance to decision taken by the Committee at its special session in January 2009 (ECE/CEP/S/152, annex II, para.5). It presents the outcomes of the first meeting of the Joint Task Force on Environmental Indicators that was organized jointly with the United Nations Statistics Division from 31 August to 2 September 2009 in Geneva. The meeting: (a) discussed priorities and modalities of cooperation on methodological issues of environmental indicators between environmental experts and statisticians; (b) reviewed in detail 10 indicators covered by the *Guidelines for the Application of Environmental Indicators in Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia*; (c) exchanged information on international developments related to environmental indicators; (d) initiated discussions on modern presentation formats and tools for effective dissemination of environmental indicators, including the use of modern information technologies; and (e) agreed on two further meetings in 2010. The Committee may take note of these outcomes.

---

<sup>1</sup> This document is submitted on the above date to reflect the results of the first meeting of the Joint Task Force, held from 31 August to 2 September 2009, and subsequent consultations with the parties concerned.

## CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1–10	3
A. Background.....	1–4	3
B. Attendance ... ..	5–8	4
C. Organizational matters ... ..	9–10	4
II. COOPERATION FRAMEWORK ON ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EXPERTS AND STATISTICIANS.....	11–16	4
III. REVIEW OF THE GUIDELINES ON THE APPLICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS .....	17–48	6
A. Indicators on air quality and climate change .....	17–24	6
1. Emissions of pollutants into the atmosphere ... ..	18–21	6
2. Greenhouse gas emissions .....	22–24	7
B. Indicator of final energy consumption .....	25–28	7
C. Indicators on water .....	29–33	8
1. Household water use per capita .....	29–31	8
2. Drinking water quality .....	32–33	8
D. Indicators on land use and agriculture .....	34–39	9
1. Land uptake .....	34–36	9
2. Fertilizer consumption .....	37–39	9
E. Indicators on waste .....	40–48	10
1. Waste generation.....	41–43	10
2. Waste re-use and recycling .....	44–45	11
3. Final waste disposal .....	46–48	11
IV. ADDITIONAL INDICATORS NOT COVERED BY THE GUIDELINES .....	49–50	11
V. MODERN PRESENTATION FORMATS AND TOOLS FOR EFFECTIVE DISSEMINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS .....	51–52	12
VI. CONCLUSIONS .....	53–56	12

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. Background

1. The Joint Task Force on Environmental Indicators was established upon the recommendation of the Committee on Environmental Policy and the Bureau of the Conference of the European Statisticians by a decision of the Executive Committee of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) taken at its meeting of 27 February 2009. According to its terms of reference, the Joint Task Force should assist national statistical agencies and institutions responsible for the production of national reports on the state of the environment in countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus, Central Asia (EECCA) and South-Eastern Europe (SEE). Its objectives are to improve environmental data collection, further strengthen environmental reporting and promote comparability of environmental statistics and indicators in the region (ECE/EX/2009/L.6, annex).

2. The United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD) joined this initiative and agreed to cooperate in the organization of the Joint Task Force's first meeting. The goals of the joint meeting were:

(a) To discuss priorities and modalities of cooperation on methodological issues of environmental indicators between environmental experts and statisticians in 2009–2010;

(b) To review in detail selected indicators covered by the *Guidelines for the Application of Environmental Indicators in Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia* (Indicator Guidelines)<sup>2</sup> to provide practical recommendations on the use of statistical classifications, data collection methods and procedures for the production of indicators. The selection of indicators for the review was made on the basis of proposals received from interested target countries and the gaps in data collection in the target countries. These had been identified in the UNECE programme of environmental performance reviews and in the processes of developing the Indicator Guidelines and the pan-European environmental assessments;

(c) To exchange information on international developments related to environmental indicators that may be important, but are currently not included in the Guidelines, and to provide references to available guidance materials;

(d) To initiate discussions on modern presentation formats and tools for effective dissemination of environmental indicators, including the use of modern information technologies.

3. The joint meeting was originally scheduled to be held in early May 2009 in Chisinau at the invitation of the National Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Moldova. Owing to security concerns after the April 2009 parliamentary elections in the country, the joint meeting had to be postponed. It was finally decided to convene it in Geneva from 31 August to 2 September 2009, back-to-back to the tenth session of the Working Group on Environmental Monitoring and Assessment. It could be organized thanks to travel funds made available by the Government of

---

<sup>2</sup> Published as a United Nations publication, sales No. E 07.II.E.9.

the Russian Federation, by the UNECE from its Regional Programme of Technical Cooperation, by UNSD and by Eurostat.

4. In response to an invitation by the organizing secretariats, participants from the target countries and the Inter-State Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States (ISC-CIS) prepared reviews on the application of environmental indicators in their countries and organizations. These reviews, together with presentations by keynote speakers and interested country representatives, served as basis for the discussions at the meeting.

### **B. Attendance**

5. Environmental experts and statisticians from the following UNECE member States took part in the first meeting: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Finland, Georgia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Montenegro, Norway, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Serbia, Switzerland, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Uzbekistan.

6. A representative of Mongolia participated under article 11 of the Economic Commission for Europe's terms of reference.

7. The meeting was attended by representatives of the European Environment Agency (EEA).

8. Representatives of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP-Armenia), UNSD, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the World Health Organization (WHO) European Centre for Environment and Health (ECEH), the Black Sea Strategic Action Plan and ISC-CIS attended, as did representatives from environmental civil society associations ("Volgograd Ecopress" Information Centre, Russian Federation) and the scientific community (Research Institute "Cadastre", Russian Federation).

### **C. Organizational matters**

9. The Joint Task Force elected Mr. Tihomir Popovic (Serbia) as Chairperson and Mr. Svein Homstvedt (Norway) as Vice-Chairperson.

10. The Director of the UNECE Statistical Division, the Chief of the UNSD Environment and Energy Statistics Branch and the Secretary to the UNECE Working Group on Environmental Monitoring made opening statements.

## **II. COOPERATION FRAMEWORK ON ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EXPERTS AND STATISTICIANS**

11. A representative of the UNECE secretariat presented the activities on environmental indicators undertaken by the Working Group on Environmental Monitoring and Assessment in cooperation with EEA that had led to the endorsement by the Fifth Ministerial Conference "Environment for Europe" (Belgrade, 10–12 October 2007) of the Indicator Guidelines and the recommendations on their application. He described the substance of these documents and the mandate of the Joint Task Force and proposed methodological issues of common interest to environmental experts and statisticians that might merit consideration by the Joint Task Force.

12. A representative of EEA informed the Joint Task Force about the concept of a Shared Environmental Information System (SEIS) that EEA was actively promoting. She presented the benefits of this system, its principles, components, priorities for its implementation and approaches to its extension to countries that were not covered by the EEA networks.

13. An environmental expert from the Russian Federation presented an assessment of the application of indicators from the Indicator Guidelines in EECCA and SEE countries, prepared on the basis of the national reviews. He referred to specific regulations or action programmes adopted in some countries (e.g. in the Russian Federation and Ukraine) to implement the Indicator Guidelines. More than half of the countries in question were using the indicators from the Indicator Guidelines in their national environmental reports. While the indicators on Air temperature, Protected areas and Threatened and protected species were the least complicated to produce, the production of the indicators on Pesticide consumption, Average age of road motor vehicle fleet, and Waste indicators posed the most difficulties. Various institutional and methodological constraints in the production of the indicators were pointed out in the national reviews.

14. A moderator of the session from the statistical agency from Norway introduced 10 “commandments” (principles) from the Eurostat code of practice for statistical authorities that could be used by the Joint Task Force in its activities (professional independence, quality commitment, statistical confidentiality, impartiality and objectivity, sound methodology, relevance, accuracy and reliability, timeliness and punctuality, coherence and comparability, and accessibility and clarity). He shared with the Joint Task Force the Norwegian experience with the application of these principles in cooperation between Statistics Norway and environmental authorities. He stressed the comparative capital that statisticians bring to data collection on the environment, namely their access to data sources (e.g. the general mandate for data collection, the access to administrative databases and the availability of basic statistics within the statistical office), the use of statistical methods and the freedom to publish data. He elaborated on the role of indicators as analytical tools that should be understandable, communicative and comparable between countries.

15. In the ensuing discussion, participants stressed the importance of (a) establishing inter-agency cooperation mechanisms to produce indicators, (b) ensuring data quality by the application of effective quality-assurance and control procedures, (c) developing specific statistical forms in close cooperation between statisticians and environmental experts at the national level to underpin data collection on several indicators from the Indicator Guidelines, (d) training of statisticians at the national and subnational levels, (e) providing countries with further methodological guidance on indicators that pose difficulties, and (f) developing or improving the production of important indicators not covered by the Indicator Guidelines. They also emphasized the importance of providing the countries with practical advice on how to raise the needed financing, ensure a high level of professionalism, and at the same time preserve an element of independence (including resistance to political interference) when publishing indicators.

16. The Joint Task Force agreed to consider the above-mentioned issues in its future activities. It voiced the need to have two more meetings in 2010 and to use communication by e-mail as an auxiliary working method between its meetings. A testing of the Guidelines should be undertaken by the countries through reporting time series data on an agreed set of indicators from the Guidelines, following the example of the trial compendium prepared by EEA and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in 2007. Proposals were made to create a coordinating and analytical centre to support countries' efforts on environmental indicators and to develop policy

recommendations for the Seventh Ministerial Conference “Environment for Europe” (to be held in Astana in 2011).

### **III. REVIEW OF THE GUIDELINES ON THE APPLICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS**

#### **A. Indicators on air quality and climate change**

17. A moderator from the United Kingdom made an introductory presentation on indicators on air and climate change. The importance of regular reporting on pollutant emissions by source, the ecological impacts of air pollution, air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by source and by energy use was demonstrated. The first results on adaptation indicators (e.g. water stress, properties at risk of flooding and spring index-phenology) were also presented.

#### **1. Emissions of pollutants into the atmosphere**

18. A keynote speaker from EEA made a presentation on the indicator on Emissions of pollutants into the atmospheric air. He provided the definition of the indicator and explained the two ways of data measurement, namely either direct measurements of emissions (e.g. from chimney measurements at industrial facilities) or estimation by technological calculation. The importance of taking advantage of existing emissions data when developing an indicator was highlighted. The Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (CLRTAP) set reporting requirements that specify pollutants and formats for calculating emissions that are consistent with the common reporting format under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

19. The keynote speaker informed the Joint Task Force that reporting of emission inventories to CLRTAP by countries from EECCA was rather limited. The main problems related to data collection of estimation on emissions from domestic combustion, agriculture and transport. Problems with the lack or unreliable statistics for the vehicle fleet, fuel sold and fuel use by vehicle type have to be resolved. Problems with data-sharing should be addressed by concluding, for instance, annual data supply agreements between relevant national institutions. To help the countries to improve their emission reporting, he advised them to better use the available national GHG inventories, as these were frequently prepared using vehicle estimates. The updated technical guidance for estimating emissions – the *EMEP<sup>3</sup>-EEA Air Pollutant Emission Inventory Guidebook* (to be translated into Russian by mid-2010) – was available on the EEA website and contained certain sector-specific “default” emission factors relevant to EECCA countries. The planned CLRTAP annual meetings of emission experts from EECCA countries would also be of help.

20. Representatives of statistical agencies of Finland and the Russian Federation shared their national experiences with the indicators under discussion. Success stories were recounted, in particular, concerning written agreements on data exchange between relevant institutions, the harmonization of the indicator presentation by the statistical agency and the environmental institute (Finland), the creation of an integrated system of environmental indicators and of the uploading of all statistical compendiums on the Internet (Russian Federation).

---

<sup>3</sup> Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe.

21. In the ensuing discussion, several participants referred to difficulties in their countries with data collection on emissions by mobile sources and from households. They called for sharing existing methodologies on these emission sources in the Russian language. Methodological problems were mentioned by certain other participants, namely those of presenting the air emissions indicator per capita and per unit of gross domestic product (GDP) both in constant prices in United States dollars in parity of purchasing power (PPP) and in constant prices in national currency.

## **2. Greenhouse gas emissions**

22. A keynote speaker from Norway presented his country's experience with the publication and communication of the GHG indicator. National statistics covered all emission sources within the country territory. Norwegian activities abroad were not accounted for, nor were international aviation and shipping. He indicated some challenges with the emissions per capita indicator, including the lack of correction for exports/imports, and mentioned data relevance and quality as well as the accounting of GHF sinks and storage as further challenges. In improving indicator production, particular attention should be paid to (a) further developing energy statistics, (b) using a set of calculation methods that were agreed by all cooperating institutions, (c) applying sound conversion factors (energy commodity and use, technology etc.), (d) making recalculations to reflect new knowledge and to account all actual years, and (e) ensuring transparency and documentation in the process.

23. A representative of the statistical agency of the Russian Federation presented her country's experience with producing the GHG indicator, describing in particular the supporting legal and regulatory framework, the institutional scheme for calculating anthropogenic GHG emissions by sources and removals by sinks, and the resulting data on the indicator. She referred to problems with the production of the indicator that arose from differences in classifications of economic activities used by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and those of UNSD and Eurostat. This led to differences in emission levels calculated by different methodologies.

24. In the discussion that followed the presentations, participants referred to the lack of methodologies to calculate emissions other than carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide and methane. The issue of confidentiality of data reported by enterprises was also mentioned; this would have to be addressed by the Joint Task Force in its future activities.

### **B. Indicator on final energy consumption**

25. In her introduction, the moderator from the EEA presented the results of data collection on the indicator on final energy consumption obtained in 2007 when UNEP and EEA had prepared a trial compendium of indicators from the Indicator Guidelines from EECCA countries.

26. In his presentation, a keynote speaker from Statistics Norway highlighted the importance of the indicator on final energy consumption for emission calculation, indicated advantages and obstacles in communicating the indicator. He presented his country's and international experiences with the calculation of energy balance, stated key principles for energy balances and accounts, indicated main differences between energy balances and energy accounts, and highlighted the needs of basic statistics to account for individual renewable and non-renewable energy sources.

27. A representative of the statistical agency from Finland presented his country's experience with the production of energy statistics, emphasizing an institutional arrangement established in Finland for the purpose, the use of energy statistics in various publications and the publication of resulting indicators. He underlined the challenges that energy statistics was facing related to energy consumption of households and services and to data collection on new types of renewable energy.

28. In the ensuing discussion, the need was stressed to encompass all energy sources and uses supplementing collected data by surveys so as to account for, inter alia, energy use by households in remote areas. The importance was also highlighted of further developing the methodology for producing the indicator on final energy consumption and complementing this indicator by other energy indicators that were relevant to environmental policy.

### **C. Indicators on water**

#### **1. Household water use per capita**

29. A keynote speaker from the UNECE secretariat described the definition of household water use and gave examples of average water use per capita in the UNECE region. The indicator covered the household needs and, in some cases, utility needs regarding drinking water use. It was a measure of the development of water economy services, the degree of water accessibility to cover all household needs of the population, and the impact of water pricing. The speaker stressed the importance of developing legislation on household water use in rural areas. This would help the production of the indicator as well as the splitting of the data on household water use by activity (e.g. for washing, cooking, etc.). Enhancing training opportunities would also support the indicator's production.

30. A representative of UNSD noted that the indicator on Household water use per capita was one of the most problematic from the point of view of relevance, definition and methodology. She pointed out that the definition of the indicator was not clear with regard to whether it included the water used by households plus water not used for production purposes in industries (e.g. sanitation). It was also not clear whether the indicator included self supply or not. She noted that water abstraction was different from water use, and pointed out that the terms "basic human needs" and "adequate quantity" were not clear. She proposed that the purpose of the indicator be better clarified in order to link it with the goals of environmental policy. Finally, she presented a summary of the responses to the water section of the UNSD/UNEP Questionnaire 2008 on Environment Statistics.

31. In the discussion that followed, reference was made to the links between the indicator in question and the 20 indicators with a methodology on how to calculate them developed under the Protocol on Water and Health. The issue of the lack of clarity in international practice regarding the definitions of safe drinking water and access to drinking water was raised. The difficulty of making a distinction between household water use and drinking water by household was also mentioned.

### **B. Drinking water quality**

32. A keynote speaker from the UNECE secretariat described the drinking water quality standards according to the WHO Guidelines and mentioned that the data availability was relatively poor for this indicator in the EECCA countries. He described the WHO Guideline values for chemical quality (e.g. for nitrates, arsenic, lead) and for microbiological quality (e.g. for *E. coli* and

*Enterococci*). He also presented the reporting requirements under the Protocol on Water and Health with regard to water-quality determinands covering both chemical and microbiological quality of drinking water.

33. In the ensuing discussion, the need was stressed of measuring some heavy metals both at the point of water abstraction for drinking water purposes and at the tap. Problems with the production of one single indicator covering a series of variables were mentioned. The need was stressed of taking account of drinking water pollution caused by transport in worn-out and old water distribution systems as well as the problem of natural high chemical content in water bodies used for drinking water supply in some geochemical provinces. Participants suggested that either the proportion of samples that did not meet the standards or the proportion of samples that did meet the standards could be calculated for the indicator.

#### **D. Indicators on land use and agriculture**

##### **1. Land uptake**

34. A keynote speaker from FAO presented land uptake concepts and land use categories, and explained the definition of the indicator and the methodology for its production. He indicated that the FAO Land Cover Classification System (LCCS) was under review for recognition as an ISO (International Organization for Standardization) standard. A reference was also made to a World Bank/FAO sourcebook of indicators for monitoring and evaluation that could be helpful to the participants.

35. A keynote speaker from EEA presented a Land uptake indicator from the EEA Core set of indicators and explained how it was used in support to policy process. The indicator was defined as the amount of agriculture, forest and other semi-natural and natural land taken by urban and other artificial land development. It was presented as: (a) average annual change, (b) percentage of total area of the country, and (c) percentage of the various land cover types taken by urban and other artificial land development. Reference was also made to the IRENA operation (Indicator Reporting on the Integration of Environmental Concerns into Agriculture Policy), which aimed at further development of agri-environmental indicators in the European Union.

36. In the ensuing discussion difficulties were mentioned of incompatibility of land data collected by different public authorities at the national level using different classifications. The lack of an international agreement supporting inter-agency cooperation on land use data collection was partly responsible for these difficulties. The needs to improve certain methodologies (e.g. those accounting for land use by roads), to complement ground-level data reporting by satellite mapping data and to link the indicator more closely with policymaking were also mentioned.

##### **2. Fertilizer consumption**

37. A keynote speaker from FAO explained the definition of the indicator and the methodology for its production as described in the Indicator Guidelines. He presented the FAOSTAT database on fertilizer production and fertilizer domestic availability. He also mentioned complications with the collection of fertilizer data relating, in particular, to confidentiality of production data, insufficient levels of expertise in national statistics offices and double counting in calculations. Finally, he made

a summary overview of EECCA countries' response to the 2008 fertilizer resources questionnaire of FAO.

38. A representative of the statistical agency from the Russian Federation presented her country's experience with the production of indicators of fertilizer and pesticide consumption. The country had improved data collection by covering land under permanent crops separately from arable land. However, fertilizer consumption by farm, small agricultural enterprise, household and for forestry remained unaccountable. Unresolved problems with collecting data on pesticide consumption related to the lack of methodology to aggregate data by pesticide groups, e.g. insecticides, herbicides and fungicides.

39. In the ensuing discussion, it was proposed to discuss methodologies for the indicator on Pesticide consumption in depth at the next meeting and to consider additional indicators that would allow to measure better the pressures of agriculture on the environment.

## **E. INDICATORS ON WASTE**

### **1. Waste generation**

40. A moderator from EEA gave an overview of the topic, described the EEA indicators on generation of waste per capita and recycling, and presented the trends for the EEA member countries.

41. A representative of UNSD described the main concepts and definitions underlying the indicator. She presented the relevant tables in the UNSD/UNEP Questionnaire on Environment Statistics through which the variables needed to compile the indicator could be obtained. She explained that the UNSD/UNEP Questionnaire on Environment Statistics used the International Standard Industrial Classification of all Economic Activities (ISIC) to define the source categories of waste. As a result, the category "industrial waste" could not be obtained from the questionnaire. She also noted that countries were often providing the value for "Municipal waste collected" instead of "Municipal waste generated", so it had been decided not to include the latter in the Questionnaire. Municipal waste did not describe the source of the waste, but rather the way that it was collected. The amount of "Municipal waste generated" could be estimated if data were available for the variables "Total amount of municipal waste collected" and "Percentage of total population served by municipal waste collection". She recommended that the indicator methodology sheet in the Indicator Guidelines be revised according to the methodologies in the UNSD/UNEP Questionnaire 2008.

42. A representative of the statistical agency from Finland made a brief presentation of national experiences with all waste indicators. He explained that Statistics Finland was responsible for waste statistics and that construction waste was quite difficult to estimate. He noted that landfill waste formed a large part of municipal waste treatment and that incineration of waste was a controversial issue in Finland. He mentioned that it was not possible to obtain data on recycling of waste according to sectors, but rather by material. He also noted that the definition of hazardous waste had changed a lot over the years, so that many time series had been lost. Country comparisons were also difficult.

43. In the discussion that followed, references were made to new classifications of hazardous waste adopted in some countries. The practice of one country of using surveys to obtain waste data from landfills was presented. Difficulties with completing the UNSD/UNEP Questionnaire were mentioned, including the difficulty of obtaining data on recycling of waste by industry, since the waste generated by different industries was combined for treatment (recycling) in some countries.

## **2. Waste reuse and recycling**

44. A representative of UNSD described the main concepts and definitions underlying the indicator on Waste reuse and recycling as a share of the total waste in a country. She presented the relevant tables in the UNSD/UNEP Questionnaire on Environment Statistics through which the variables needed to compile the indicator could be obtained. She indicated that the indicator was called “Waste reuse and recycling”, but in the indicator methodology sheet the indicator definition actually referred to recycling only. She presented the results from the countries in response to the UNSD/UNEP Questionnaire 2008 on Environment Statistics, and in particular focused on the data on Recycling of Selected Waste Materials.

45. In the ensuing discussion, representatives of some countries proposed to delete the term “reuse” from the indicator. Some national recycling practices were presented.

## **3. Final waste disposal**

46. A representative of UNSD described the main concepts and definitions underlying the indicator. She described the main purpose of and the policy issues connected with the indicator, as well as the relevant international and regional agreements related to final waste disposal. She presented the relevant tables in the UNSD/UNEP Questionnaire on Environment Statistics through which the variables needed to compile the indicator could be obtained. It was possible to obtain data for the “Total amount of waste incinerated (without energy recovery) using the annual capacity” value and to obtain data for the “Total amount of waste landfilled (of which controlled) using the ‘annual inputs’” value of the UNSD/UNEP Questionnaire. Finally, she presented the results from the countries in response to the UNSD/UNEP Questionnaire 2008.

47. A representative of the statistical agency from Ukraine made a brief presentation of national experiences on all waste indicators. She mentioned that her agency used international questionnaires when developing their national-level methodologies. She explained in detail several indicators on hazardous waste and presented several charts to show various trends such as the amount of hazardous waste generated. She also described the data regarding the management of hazardous waste.

48. In the discussion representatives of some countries described national situations regarding hazardous waste. A request for a methodology was made that would allow for comparing data on exports and imports of hazardous waste reported by Customs with data collected through surveys.

## **IV. ADDITIONAL INDICATORS NOT COVERED BY THE GUIDELINES**

49. Representatives of participating organizations and institutions made the following presentations: (a) on the practical application by EEA of its core set of indicators and perspectives of its further development; (b) on environmental indicator developments in FAO; (c) on progress

made by WHO/ECEH vis-à-vis the development of health and environment indicators; and (d) on environmental indicators for Black Sea cooperation.

50. A representative of the statistical agency from the Russian Federation made a presentation on the methodology and the procedure for the production of aggregated environmental expenditures in her country.

## **V. MODERN PRESENTATION FORMATS AND TOOLS FOR EFFECTIVE DISSEMINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS**

51. A representative of the UNECE Statistical Division made a presentation (“Making data meaningful through effective visual presentation”) providing advice to participants on how to better communicate statistics to the general public.

52. A keynote speaker from the United Kingdom shared the good practices applied in his and certain other countries as well as in Eurostat with regard to the publication of reports, leaflets and pocket booklets with environmental indicators and statistics, the uploading of this data on websites and communicating data using PowerPoint.

## **VI. CONCLUSIONS**

53. In the light of the discussions on previous agenda items, the Bureau proposed the way forward. The Joint Task Force agreed that its next two meetings would be organized as follows:

(a) The second meeting, provisionally scheduled to be held on 22 and 23 April 2010, would review six further indicators from the Indicator Guidelines, namely those on (i) Renewable freshwater resources, (ii) Freshwater abstraction, (iii) Protected areas, (iv) Renewable energy consumption, (v) Passenger transport demand, and (vi) Freight transport demand;

(b) The indicator evaluation would be supported by countries’ written communications presenting examples, indicator-by-indicator, of (i) effective inter-agency cooperation mechanisms to produce indicators, (ii) evidence of the publication of indicators in statistical compendiums and state-of-the-environment reports, (iii) procedures applied to ensure data quality assurance and control, and (iv) time series data on the six indicators for 2003–2008;

(c) The second meeting would also come back to five of the indicators that were discussed at the first meeting to clarify their purpose and/or methodologies. These would include (i) Emissions of pollutants into the atmospheric air (with a focus on emissions from mobile sources), (ii) GHG emissions (with a focus on emissions by perfluorocarbons, hydrofluorocarbons and sulphur hexafluoride, and on sinks), (iii) Household water use per capita (with a focus on purpose, targets, pressure, use by individual users and on self-supply), (iv) Land uptake (with a focus on definitions, classifications and nomenclatures), and (v) Waste reuse and recycling (with a focus on definitions, classifications and nomenclatures);

(d) In addition, the second meeting would consider latest developments regarding the production at the international level of the indicator on Environmental expenditures, Agri-environmental indicators, and Energy and environment indicators;

(e) The third meeting, provisionally scheduled to be held from 31 August to 1 September 2010, would discuss general issues such as professionalism, independence and confidentiality in producing environmental indicators, indicator reporting to the international community, financing of indicator production, and training experiences and needs. The meeting would prepare a final report to be submitted to the Committee on Environmental Policy and the Conference of the European Statisticians. The report would describe the meetings held, the inputs made by country members, the indicators reviewed, the revisions to indicators recommended and the additional indicators proposed. It would contain general recommendations to countries and proposals for follow-up.

54. The Joint Task Force requested the UNECE secretariat to prepare specific guidance to meeting participants, providing them with templates for the preparation of their contributions to the upcoming meetings. For the second meeting, country reports should be submitted to the secretariat by 1 February 2010 at the latest.

55. The Joint Task Force called on the participants to make efforts to ensure that their organizations and agencies provided funds for travel to the two meetings planned. It took note of the information from the partner secretariats that only limited travel funds were available for the Joint Task Force in 2010. These funds would support the travel of up to 10 experts only.

56. Meeting documentation including national reviews, presentations and the list of participants are available online from the UNECE website<sup>4</sup>.

-----

---

<sup>4</sup> [www.unece.org/stats/documents/2009.05.enviro.htm](http://www.unece.org/stats/documents/2009.05.enviro.htm)