



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
27 July 2010

Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe

Committee on Environmental Policy

Conference of European Statisticians

Joint Task Force on Environmental Indicators

Second session

Geneva, 3-4 May 2010

Report of the First Session of the Joint Task Force on Environmental Indicators

Note by the secretariat

Summary

The document presents the outcomes of the second meeting of the Joint Task Force on Environmental Indicators that took place on 3-4 May 2010 in Geneva. The meeting: (a) made a revision of 5 indicators that were discussed at the first meeting of the Joint Task Force and were selected for further consideration; (b) reviewed in detail 6 further indicators from the *Guidelines for the Application of Environmental Indicators in Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia*; and (c) had an initial discussion on 3 sets of indicators that are not included in the Guidelines but are important in the international context.

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	3
A. Background.....	3
B. Attendance... ..	3
C. Organizational matters.....	3
II. Review of the guidelines on the application of environmental indicators.....	3
A. Revision of indicators that were discussed at the first Joint Meeting and selected for further consideration.....	3
B. Review of additional indicators from the Guidelines.... ..	7
III. Review of selected indicators not covered by the guidelines.....	10
A. Indicator of environmental expenditures	10
B. Agri-environmental indicators	11
C. Energy and environment indicators.....	11
IV. Other business	11
V. Conclusions	12

I. Introduction

A. Background

1. The first session of the Joint Task Force on Environmental Indicators was held in Geneva from 3-4 May 2010. In response to an invitation by the organizing secretariats, participants from the countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus, Central Asia and South-Eastern Europe (SEE), and from the Inter-State Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS-STAT) 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

2. Environmental experts and statisticians from the following UNECE member States took part in the second meeting: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Finland, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Montenegro, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Serbia, Tajikistan, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.

3. Representatives of Mongolia and the United Arab Emirates participated under article 11 of the Economic Commission for Europe's terms of reference.

4. A representative of the European Environment Agency (EEA) attended the meeting.

5. The meeting was also attended by representatives of the United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD), United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (UN ESCWA), World Health Organization (WHO) European Centre for Environment and Health (ECEH) and the Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS-STAT).

C. Organizational matters

6. The Joint Task Force was chaired by Mr. T. Popovic (Serbia). As Mr. S. Homstvedt (Norway), Vice-Chairperson was not able to participate in the meeting, Ms. V. Vasylenko was elected as a Vice-Chairperson.

II. Review of the guidelines for the application of environmental indicators in Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia

A. Revision of indicators that were discussed at the first Joint Meeting and selected for further consideration

7. The following countries and organizations submitted written proposals for amendments to 5 of the indicators reviewed at the first Joint Meeting on Environmental Indicators: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Uzbekistan and CIS-STAT.

8. For each indicator the discussion started with a summary of countries' proposals for amendments, presented by a member of the Joint Task Force from the Russian Federation, and was followed up by a presentation by a consultant to the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) secretariat of the amended methodology sheets.

1. Emissions of pollutants into the atmospheric air

9. A number of participants proposed to add definitions of specific pollutants from stationary sources and mobile sources. The proposal for unit of measurement was discussed in depth being important for the purpose of international comparability. Further methodological issues were raised. It was proposed to resort to simulation models in accordance with the European Monitoring and Evaluation Programme/ The Core Inventory of Air Emissions in Europe (EMEP/CORINAIR) guidelines on the inventory of air emissions, in particular in areas where there is no evidence of direct measurement and technical calculations.

10. The following specific suggestions for changes in the *Guidelines* were discussed:

(a) The environmental impact should be evaluated not by annual emissions but by the intensity of the emissions and their spread in the time and space;

(b) Information on emissions of pollutants can also be used for the calculation of environmental costs in the System of National Accounts when constructing the environment accounts; and

(c) The indicator should allow to assess the emissions not only from main economic activities (energy, transport, industry, agriculture, etc.) but also from households (broken down by emissions from fuel used for domestic purposes in households, from the burning of biomass and from the use of fuel for private vehicles). The emissions from mobile sources of enterprises should be broken down by type of vehicles (road, air, water transportation and industrial machinery). There was also a proposal to have thresholds towards which to set indicator targets.

11. Some participants questioned the need to produce indicators on lead emissions as lead in fuel is not used anymore. More detailed description of the indicator was requested in the case when no international is adopted. A clarification was needed when considering transport as an economic activity – should transport be considered as a service provided to others or as a term for all mobile ways of moving people and goods? According to the EMEP methodology emissions from all mobile sources are taken independently of economic activity (i.e. the cause of mobility). If however the indicator is broken down by economic activities based on International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC) then transport covers the establishments providing transport services to others, while own-account transportation will be covered under the economic activity where it is carried out. It was suggested to refer in the methodology to ISIC Rev. 4, which has been officially released in 2008.

2. Greenhouse gas emissions

12. The written amendments submitted on this indicator proposed to focus on the absorption capacity of greenhouse gases (GHG) and to include the emissions of those GHG which were not sufficiently described in the *Guidelines*. Three countries made a consolidated proposal on measurement units of the indicator: in million tons of CO₂-equivalent per km² of the country, million tons of CO₂-equivalent per capita and million tons of CO₂-equivalent per unit of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) expressed in the national currency or in United States dollars (USD), and in USD in purchasing power parity (PPP).

13. It was noted that future GHG emissions would largely depend on economic trends, technologies and social change, as well as on the capacity to absorb GHG in the country (primarily forests). Furthermore, in accordance with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Guidelines, the data should be developed by sources and be as detailed as possible. To obtain a complete picture of GHG emissions, emissions from fuel used for domestic purposes in households and emissions from the burning of biomass should also be taken into account. It was noted that data on emissions of GHG are widely used for construction of environmental satellite accounts.

14. The amendment for a GHG sink indicator was discussed in depth. It was highlighted that there are uncertainties in the calculation of sinks and some countries do not have an established methodology, therefore, data are difficult to use for international comparison. It was suggested to calculate the GHG emissions with and without sinks.

15. The UNSD clarified that the IPCC Guidelines use the word “sectors” but do refer to economic sectors or activities as used in economics statistics or in the national accounts. The IPCC Guidelines are based on the industrial processes behind the production/consumption, which produce the GHG and these industrial processes are not easily transformed into the ISIC categories.

16. It was proposed to upload on the Joint Task Force’s website information on national practices in the methodological descriptions to serve as a knowledge base for other countries.

3. Household water use per capita

17. One country made a written proposal on the data collection and calculation for this indicator. It specified that the indicator should be based on data submitted by enterprises and organizations involved in water supply according to the activity and product classification, harmonized with European standards. The need was stressed to cover water use by population who do not have access to centralised water supply systems.

18. The UNSD made a presentation on the indicator. The presenter informed the meeting that in February 2010 the UN Statistical Commission had adopted the International Recommendations for Water Statistics. These recommendations are fully in compliance with the terminology used for the water accounts. The following points were made:

(a) In the brief definition of the indicator a clarification is needed on whether the “household use” should include only households or should include all kind of uses similar to household use independently of the activity where the needs emerge (e.g. sanitary water use at workplaces). The definitions used by the UNSD/United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Questionnaire and by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) were explained and the discrepancies between these definitions were pointed out. The UNSD proposal was to use the UNSD/UNEP definition that covers fresh water used by households from all sources, including water supplied by the water supply industry and abstraction by households for own use;

(b) Data is easily available for the part of fresh water provided to households by the public infrastructure, however, issues may arise, for example when trying to estimate the proportion of the water used by the household itself and the proportion used for residential services, by small business, etc. Additional estimation on the size of the building and number of households should be done in the case the measurements are taken per building (not household);

(c) Data on the volume of water used by other sources than public water supply has to be estimated (e.g. based on coefficients and data from household or specialised surveys).

19. Comments were made on the difficulty of measuring the proportion of water used outside the centralized water supply system. It was underlined that data on freshwater use by enterprises and household is obtained easily. At the same time data for other indicators which are applicable only to households like the access to clean drinking water is more difficult to collect and is normally estimated on the basis of household surveys. It was stressed that in some countries there are no centralised water supply systems that reaches all households, and therefore, methodology and reliable sources are needed to calculate water use (volume but also quality) from alternative sources of water. It was also noted that if only data covering the centralized water system are used than the whole population should not be used as denominator but only the part of it connected to the centralized system.

4. Land uptake

20. Among proposed changes to this indicator were the following: a) to extend the brief description of the indicator to include also land uptake by *industrial infrastructure* and *legal waste disposal*, and b) to specify when describing the purpose of the indicator that it provides a measure of the impact on environment and that it shows trends in the expansion and use of built-up land which is not used for agricultural purposes and does not involve building up on forests and protected areas. The measurement of land uptake from illegal waste disposal and waste dumps was mentioned as a major difficulty.

21. The consultant to the UNECE secretariat presented some figures on the average land uptake per year in 23 European countries, broken down by types of human activity, for the period 1990-2000.

22. In their comments, the participants noted that the distinction between natural and semi-natural is not being clear and that the unit of measurement should reflect the year-to-year change rather than the average annual change. Clarifications were made on the tailing pits calculation and whether they are accounted as land uptake or being reported as part of certain industries, e.g. mining industry.

23. UNSD made a comment that the EEA classification referred to in the *Guidelines* is more on land cover not on land use. Land cover and land use are two different concepts. The major data source for land cover is remote sensing and the major data source for land use is the land cadastre or register. Experience shows that countries have data on the main land use categories, especially on cultivated land, but not on the origin of and direction of land transfers between the individual use categories. Data on transfers between land cover categories and data on "land without use" (such as dry and wet open land with and without vegetation, etc) are available only from satellite images and by comparing them in different points in time. It was discussed that the term "anthropogenic" comes in translation to the English word "artificial", however "artificial" in Russian has been taken to indicate "artificially formed territories", for example to illustrate the water withdrawn from the land, and therefore, anthropogenic is a more appropriate word to use.

5. Waste reuse and recycling

24. A proposal was made to introduce additional break-downs to the ratio of waste reused and recycled to total waste generated in the country, i.e. by type of waste (industrial and municipal solid waste), but also by economic activities and by type of harmful effects of hazardous waste. However, it was mentioned that data on waste reuse and recycling are usually only available for specific waste streams or materials. To ensure comparability of statistics about recycling and reuse of waste it was recommended to use the European statistical classification of waste by material based on the "European Waste Catalogue" (EWC-Stat), the classification of "Operations of waste management" or national classifications harmonized with the classification of EWC-Stat. It was further proposed to

include reference to international standards of waste classification used in the data source of the reporting.

25. It was clarified that “reuse” means a “secondary use” or “repeated use”, and therefore, it was relevant to many types of hazardous waste. The processing of waste for energy purposes is not covered by this indicator. It was explained that the purpose of this indicator is to show how much of the waste is diverted from waste and sent back for production processes (reprocessed or in its original form).

26. A comment was made that the secondary material resources are considered as waste independently how they are reused - they can be used as raw materials in the enterprise that produced them or in other enterprises or for other purposes. Currently the indicator excludes recycling or reuse at the place of generation. Another point made was on the need to clarify the difference between the categories “industrial” and “production” waste.

B. Review of additional indicators from the Guidelines

27. The Joint Task Force discussed six further indicators from the *Guidelines*. The discussion focused on the use of statistical classifications, data collection methods, and procedures for the production of indicators. Prior to the session countries were asked to respond to a data questionnaire on each of the six indicators. The questionnaire covered time-series data for 2003-2008 period and several aspects related to the data, including effective inter-agency cooperation mechanisms to produce indicators, evidence of indicators published in statistical compendiums and state-of-the-environment reports, and procedures applied to ensure data quality assurance and control. The six indicators and the summary of countries responses have been discussed in detail.

28. It was proposed that data provided by the countries should be used for the “Assessment of Assessments” report and reported to the Ministerial Conference “Environment for Europe” in Astana, Kazakhstan in 2011.

1. Renewable freshwater resources

29. A representative from UNSD made a presentation on this indicator. Renewable freshwater resources are usually estimated based on regular measurements from a representative set of hydrological stations on levels and horizons, flow rates, and countrywide precipitation. However, the indicator does not address the intra-national and seasonal distribution of resources or the quality of the resources. Illustrations were provided on the volume of freshwaters resources and renewable freshwaters resources per capita. It was recommended to use clear definitions and terminology. It was noted that both indicators require strong cooperation with national hydrology experts and that while data availability in international databases is currently still very limited for cross-country and time series analysis, it is improving.

30. A member of the Joint Task Force from the Russian Federation presented a summary of national reviews made by countries on renewable freshwater resources indicator. Three countries have reported complete data on all parameters of this indicator. Six countries reported data on measurements from one to five parameters only. The countries of this group presented measurements of rainfall, which perhaps is due to the fact that there is also a separate indicator on precipitation. The majority of countries consider that they have an interagency coordination and control of the quality of this indicator. Only in two countries the data received is not published, in most of the countries it is published partially, and in three countries it is published in full.

31. In the ensuing discussion, some countries explained that incomplete data was due to reorganization of their water statistics or due to the fact that the data was produced by

specialised “water” agencies. UNSD encouraged countries to resubmit the tables provided in the data questionnaire to UNSD with updated data on this indicator.

2. Freshwater abstraction

32. A representative from UNSD made a presentation on this indicator. Illustrations were provided on the proportion of renewable resources abstracted, abstraction by industry and water use efficiency in countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus, Central Asia and SEE. The member of the Joint Task Force from the Russian Federation presented a summary of national reviews made by the countries on freshwater abstraction indicator and its 16 variables. This was the most voluminous review in terms of data received and a number of parameters for data submission. None of the countries provided data on all of the variables. Two countries did not submit data. Relatively complete data was provided by eight countries. Only four countries calculated water exploitation index. All countries, except one, publish the data. It was noted that the data on household’s water abstraction was important, nevertheless, only three countries had provided data on this parameter. It was proposed to share the methods used by these three countries with other countries.

33. Representatives of the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine presented their national experiences with the production of the indicator on freshwater abstraction. They made a brief overview of the data collection and dissemination process on water resources, and methodologies used for the calculation of the indicator.

34. In the discussion participants made the following comments:

a) Clarification of the calculation of “total water abstraction” and “water abstraction by economic activities” was needed, and in particular whether “total” includes also household’s water abstraction (in this regard the difficulty of producing data on household abstraction was specifically mentioned); and

(b) It is not clear whether the calculation on freshwater abstraction includes the usage of freshwater by hydroelectric power stations. It was finally clarified that total water abstraction includes abstractions by all economic activities and households, and that freshwater for hydroelectricity generation is not included as abstraction (however, it is part of abstraction in water accounting).

3. Protected areas

35. The member of the Joint Task Force from the Russian Federation presented a summary of national reviews made by countries on the indicator. Most of the countries shown to a large degree a complete data availability. Most of the countries have interagency coordination and the data is regularly published. The share of protected area in the total area differs significantly from one country to another, for example the data for 2008 shows a variation ranging from 2% in Bosnia and Herzegovina to 24% in Uzbekistan.

36. Representatives from the Russian Federation and the Republic of Moldova presented their national experience on the indicator in question. The Russian Federation has a full registry of protected areas in the country. Categories of the protected areas (state natural reserves, natural parks, botanical gardens, etc) in this country are not harmonized with the World Conservation Union (IUCN) classification.

37. The Republic of Moldova is planning to develop further regulations for different categories of protected areas, develop a strategy for a more effective management of protected areas, raise access to information to the public, and complete a system of national parks.

4. Renewable energy consumption

38. The member of the Joint Task Force from the Russian Federation presented a summary of national reviews made by the countries on renewable energy consumption indicator. Only a few countries provided data on this indicator and followed the EEA and Eurostat methodologies to calculate the indicator in a correct way. Some countries provided data on energy production instead of on energy consumption. It was pointed out that these are different terms (e.g. energy production does not account for the energy wasted during distribution).

39. Participants discussed methodological discrepancies and different approaches in the evaluation of this indicator. It was noted that in most countries all sources of energy enter in the so-called central energy distribution system. This makes it difficult to measure the waste of energy from distribution and produce an indicator on energy consumption according to the distinction of renewable and non-renewable sources. Methodologies of developing energy balances could help resolving the above problems.

40. A representative of Belarus made a presentation describing the state of renewable energy consumption in country. The presenter discussed in details the various categories of renewable energy sources. Despite the fact that in Belarus there are only 30 sunny days in the year, data on solar energy consumption is also being collected.

41. A representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia presented her country's experience with calculating the renewable energy indicator. Renewable energy consumption is presented by hydropower, geothermal and biomass (i.e. wood fuel). Statistical full-scale surveys with questionnaires sent to the reporting units are used to collect the data.

42. A representative of Serbia presented her country's experience with energy statistics. Energy statistics unit of the statistical office was established in 2005, and therefore, energy statistics are relatively new in Serbia. Some of the problems mentioned include the issue of not clearly established responsibility for energy data collection, insufficient staff resources, time series data gaps during the transitional period and the lack of harmonization of legislation with international standards.

5. Passenger transport demand

43. The secretary to the UNECE Working Party of Transport Statistics made a presentation. The UNECE Transport Division is collecting and disseminating transport statistics on inland infrastructure, including motor traffic, road traffic accidents and rail traffic. It is also developing common methodologies to facilitate and improve the collection of information on road and rail traffic flows and infrastructure parameters through surveys and censuses. Among the main activities mentioned were the glossary of transport statistics, development and maintenance of transport database, maintenance of road safety data, and developing recommendations to Governments on motor traffic and rail traffic censuses. The speaker also presented in details indicators of passenger transport.

44. The member of the Joint Task Force from the Russian Federation presented a summary of national reviews submitted by countries on passenger transport demand indicator. None of the countries have data on motorcycles' passengers. Most of the countries have provided complete data on passenger turnover of railways, bus and air transport. Some countries have provided further break down on public passenger transport to include metro, tram, and cable car transport. In some countries passenger turnover in personal transport is not recorded. In most countries bus transport is the main way for transport of passengers. Three countries reported that they developed the passenger transport data on the basis of international methodologies. In most countries statistical offices are involved in the collection, analysis and control data on passenger traffic in

cooperation with other agencies. It was recommended to include in the future in the calculation of the rate of passengers a break down by subway, tram, cableways, and river and sea vessels, in the countries where such services are provided.

6. Freight transport demand

45. The secretary to the Working Party of Transport Statistics made a presentation on the indicator. The speaker gave the definitions for each type of freight transport as well as the unit of measure of goods transport.

46. The member of the Joint Task Force from the Russian Federation presented a summary of the national reviews submitted by the countries on freight transport demand indicator. The summary showed that most of the countries have relatively good data on this indicator. It was recommended to include in the freight turnover indicator goods carried by other transport modes, especially rail, because this will help better represent the entire balance of freight in the country. Most of the countries showed that they had carried out an inter-ministerial coordination in the development of the indicator, conducted quality control and publish the relevant data.

47. A representative of Kazakhstan presented her country experience with the production of the indicator. Data are publicly available and regularly uploaded on the website. It was explained how the exchange of data is carried out between The Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Statistical Office. Some problems with the calculation of the indicator were pointed out, i.e. in relation to the transit cargo transported by various modes of transport, the distribution of freight volumes by rail and pipeline transport, and the lack of data on the carrying capacity and fuel type.

III. Review of selected indicators not covered by the guidelines

48. The Joint Task Force discussed the following proposals for additional indicators to be included in the *Guidelines*:

A. Indicator of environmental expenditures

49. The consultant to the UNECE secretariat made a presentation on the indicator of environmental expenditures (ECE/CEP-CES/GE.1/2010/3). Two systems for recording of environmental protection expenditure were noted: the OECD's Environmental Protection Expenditure and Revenues (EPER) collection system and the Eurostat's European System for the Collection of Economic Information on the Environment (SERIEE). The indicator's purpose, brief definition, unit of measurement, and methodology and guidelines were presented for the indicator.

50. In the comments following the presentation, a clarification was requested on subsidies being calculated as capital investment and current expenditures carried out from state and local budgets, and whether this approach is in line with the general methodological principles. It was noted that the Classification of environment protection activities (CEPA) does not include natural resource management, which is now being recognized as a shortcoming and a new classification is being developed. Meeting participants shared their countries' experience with data on environmental taxes. The importance of working together with national accounts experts in each country was stressed as the indicator of environmental expenditures relates closely to integrated environmental-economic accounting.

B. Agri-environmental indicators

51. The consultant to the UNECE secretariat made a presentation on three agri-environmental indicators proposed to be included in the *Guidelines*, namely water-use intensity by agriculture, cropping and livestock patterns and gross nitrogen balance (ECE/CEP-CES/GE.1/2010/4). Three sources of agri-environmental indicators used by the international organizations were reviewed:

(a) IRENA (Indicator Reporting on the Integration of Environmental Concerns into Agriculture Policy), which is developed by the European Commission, Eurostat, Joint Research Center and the EEA;

(b) OECD's framework and approach to establish a set of agri-environmental indicators, including a pilot survey on agri-environmental indicators in OECD Member countries undertaken in 1995; and

(c) The report "Environmental Performance of Agriculture in OECD Countries Since 1990" launched in 2008.

52. A representative of UNSD made a presentation on behalf of FAO on agri-environment activities. The participants were informed about the FAO's database that contains a global coverage of integrated and compatible time series of statistics for 200 countries covering agricultural production, trade, forestry, fisheries, land use and agricultural inputs. Some other FAO's databases include Global Forest Resources Assessments and AQUASTAT, which is FAO's global information system on water and agriculture. FAO cooperation with OECD and Eurostat was mentioned on convergence of indicators, concepts, methodologies in the production of agri-environmental statistics and indicators. The speaker also informed about FAO's work on preparing country-level gross nutrient balances in collaboration with OECD and Eurostat.

53. The Joint Task Force agreed to return to the discussion of the proposed agri-environmental indicators in the future.

C. Energy and environment indicators

54. The consultant to the UNECE secretariat presented the proposal for three additional energy and environment indicators: final electricity production, gross electricity consumption, and efficiency of conventional electricity and heat production (ECE/CEP-CES/GE.1/2010/5). The speaker noted the international work in the area. In particular, she pointed out the EEA set of 24 indicators for energy and environment that are updated regularly, the OECD set of energy and environment indicators to better integrate environmental concerns into energy policy and the set of Energy Indicators for Sustainable Development developed by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in cooperation with the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), the International Energy Agency (IEA), Eurostat and EEA.

IV. Other business

55. A representative of the EEA welcomed the methodological work done by the Joint Task Force and stressed the need to produce indicators that ensure coherent and comparable picture at the pan-European level. The speaker informed the Joint Task Force about a plan to launch at the end of 2010 a project to promote the participation of countries of Eastern Europe and Caucasus in a Shared Environmental Information System (SEIS).

56. A representative of WHO/ECEH informed about the Task Force on Health Effects. She also made a presentation on Environment and Health Indicators. The presenter informed about the Fifth Ministerial Conference on Environment and Health held in Parma, Italy on 10-12 March 2010. During the meeting, the European Governments adopted a comprehensive plan to reduce environmental risk to health by 2020 with measurable targets. The Sixth Ministerial Conference on Environment and Health will be held in 2016.

57. A representative of ESCWA made a presentation on environmental indicators in the ESCWA region. Representatives of statistical offices and ministries of environment develop a core set of indicators. The indicators were adopted by a ministerial meeting in 2007. The speaker recommended using international statistical standards, in particular the international recommendations for water and energy statistics developed by UNSD.

58. UNSD made an announcement that the 2010 UNSD/UNEP questionnaire on water and waste have been sent out to the countries.

59. The Joint Task Force thanked the Governments of Finland, the Russian Federation and Switzerland as well as UNSD and Eurostat for providing travel funds to the participants of the first session from Eastern Europe, Caucasus, Central Asia and SEE.

V. Conclusions and close of the meeting

60. In the light of the discussions, the Joint Task Force agreed on follow up on several issues from the agenda:

(a) The Joint Task Force, at its next session will review and agree on the revised texts for five indicators that the secretariat will prepare in the light of the discussions held at two previous joint meetings on environmental indicators. The five indicators are:

- (i) Emissions of pollutants into the atmospheric air;
- (i) Greenhouse gas emissions;
- (iii) Household water use per capita;
- (iv) Land uptake;
- (v) Waste reuse and recycling;

(b) With regards to the six additional indicators that were discussed, for the first time, at the present session:

- (i) Countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus, Central Asia and SEE are recommended to cover the gaps in the publication of individual indicators taking into account good national experiences presented at the present session and using the recommended international methodologies and standards;
- (ii) Members of the Joint Task Force are invited to send to the secretariat amendments or additions to their data on these indicators within ten days after the present session;

(c) With regard to the proposed indicators not covered by the *Guidelines*, the Joint Task Force:

- (i) Recommended to countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus, Central Asia and SEE to use the indicator of environmental expenditures as presented in document ECE/CEP-CES/GE.1/2010/3;
- (ii) Invited members of the Joint Task Force to send to the secretariat by 13 August 2010 written comments on the proposed agri- environmental indicators

(ECE/CEP-CES/GE.1/2010/4), in particular on the indicator on cropping and livestock patterns, after consultation with their experts in agricultural statistics and Ministries of Agriculture, and;

(iii) Invited members of the Joint Task Force to consult with their energy experts on the proposed three energy and environment indicators (ECE/CEP-CES/GE.1/2010/5) in order to restart the discussion of these indicators at the next session;

(d) The next session will review five further indicators from the Guidelines, namely:

- (i) Reuse and recycling of freshwater;
- (ii) Polluted (non-treated) wastewaters;
- (iii) Forest and other wooded land;
- (iv) Energy intensity;
- (v) Composition of road motor vehicle fleet by fuel type.

61. The second session of the Joint Task Force is scheduled to be held on 1-2 September 2010. The meeting will discuss, inter alia, 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 will discuss results of the Joint Task Force's activities in 2009–2010, including accomplishments and difficulties met in the implementation of its mandate. Members of the Joint Task Force are expected to share examples of impacts that the Joint Task Force has made on country situations with the production of environmental indicators. The Joint Task Force may also consider possible follow-up to its activities and proposing, for this purpose, terms of reference for consideration by its parent bodies, the CEP and the CES Bureau.

62. The Joint Task Force requested the UNECE secretariat to prepare a specific guidance to meeting participants, providing them with templates for the preparation of their contributions to the upcoming meetings. For the second session, country reports should be submitted to the secretariat by 13 August 2010 at the latest.

63. The Joint Task Force called on the participants to make efforts to ensure that their organizations and agencies provided funds for travel to the 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 September 2010.

64. Meeting documentation including national reviews, presentations and the list of participants are available online from the UNECE website¹.

¹ www.unece.org/stats/documents/2010.05.envIRON.htm