

1st ENI SEIS II South Support Mechanism
Regional workshop on indicators
17-18 May 2017, Copenhagen

Summary report

13/06/2017 – Version 3



This project is funded by the European Union



European Environment Agency



The first regional workshop on indicators under the ENI SEIS South Support Mechanism gathered experts from Albania, Austria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Libya, Palestine and Tunisia, Union for the Mediterranean Secretariat, Centre for Environment and Development for the Arab Region and Europe (CEDARE), UN Environment/MAP (MED POL, Plan Bleu, Info-RAC) and the European Environment Agency (EEA). The [agenda](#) and [list of participants](#) are available on the [project website](#).

Welcome and Introduction

The workshop was opened by David Stanners (EEA), presenting the context of the cooperation, the agreement reached at the project 1st Steering Committee meeting in December 2016 in Athens and the intended objectives of this technical workshop.

In the frame of the monitoring of the Horizon 2020 Initiative for a Cleaner Mediterranean, a review process based on different level of aggregation and analysis of environmental information has been developed and used to produce the 1st H2020 Mediterranean report, launched in May 2014¹. As part of the review process, a set of H2020 indicators² were identified and developed, underpinning this activity.

Further to that, Ronan Uhel (EEA) underlined that the work programme of the second phase of Horizon 2020 (2015-2020) reaffirmed the relevance of the three sectors approach (waste water, solid waste and industrial emissions), while strengthening its pollution prevention dimension and focused on emerging issues such as hazardous waste and marine litter. In line with the 2015-2020 H2020 programme of work, a second H2020 indicator-based assessment is scheduled for 2019. Several other assessment processes by UN Environment/MAP are on-going or planned in the coming period, such as the Mediterranean Quality Status Report (QSR 2017), the State of Environment and Development Report, Mediterranean Strategy on Sustainable Development dashboard, NAPs implementation review, Mediterranean 2050, etc. Based on this, the 1st ENI SEIS South Steering Committee / 7th H2020 Review and Monitoring group meeting in December 2016 set-up an ad-hoc working group comprising of volunteers from partner countries in the region (namely, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Tunisia, Turkey and CEDARE) to secure convergence among the currently running indicator-based initiatives and to facilitate a common response and communication around it.

The 1st regional workshop was thus aimed to address the needed refinement of the Horizon 2020 review mechanism to take into account other assessment processes and further develop the current H2020 set of indicators to reflect the renewed scope of the H2020 priorities applicable to all Mediterranean countries, in coherence with other existing indicators sets. A second workshop – planned to take place mid-September 2017 is planned to look more into details the indicators methodological aspects (factsheets) and consider the draft outline of the H2020 assessment.

The Chair pointed out that the timeframe towards the production of the 2nd H2020 indicators-based assessment looks realistic, but would require full commitment and timely contributions from all the partners.

¹ <https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/horizon-2020-mediterranean-report>

² <http://eni-seis.eionet.europa.eu/south/areas-of-work/indicators-and-assessment>

Session 1. Refinement of H2020 review mechanism

Cécile Roddier-Quefelec (EEA) presented the 2014 H2020 review process and the state of play for the development of a renewed set of H2020 indicators. For the refinement of the H2020 set, a key question was how we use indicators to evaluate the progress in the framework of H2020 initiative? Complementarity of the existing regional indicators sets, including the IMAP indicators on the quality status of the Mediterranean Sea and coast, to the NAPs and H2020 indicators was pointed out. Further development needs to be done in selecting appropriate indicators for a full DPSIR³ assessment. The speaker pointed to the need for further reflection as regards performance indicators to evaluate whether such indicators will be relevant and useful in this framework. As a starting point, the meeting closely examined the various indicators processes ([indicator mapping](#)) such as core follow-up NAP indicators, IMAP, SDG, MSSD, SCP, Arab League and select the most relevant for H2020 review mechanism. In terms of assessment, the information and analysis from the different other assessment activities (QSR, SoED, MSSD dashboard) would feed into the 2nd H2020 assessment report.

The **representatives of the Union for the Mediterranean Secretariat (UfMS)** – Almotaz Abadi and Alessandra Sensi reported on the outcomes of the UfM Working Group on Environment and Climate Change held in March 2017 in Barcelona, attended by representatives of nearly all the 43 UfM countries that reached consolidated results in support of defining the agenda post-2020. A Task Force on environment has been set up to help the transition to the agenda post-2020. In view of the next Ministerial Meeting (to be held in 2019/2020) UfMS recognised the importance of an indicator based assessment to facilitate different regional processes and decisions. The UfMS representatives also pointed out the importance of relating to the indicators work with the 2015 Ministerial Declaration on Blue Economy and recent Ministerial Declaration on UfM Water Agenda.

Overview of existing regional indicators processes and activities linked to H2020

Stavros Antoniadis (MAP/MED POL) presented the **core NAP** follow-up indicators, recalling the approach for the establishment of the core NAP indicators and indicating suggestion for the new H2020 set.

Further on, Jean-Pierre Giraud (Plan Bleu) presented the core set of **indicators for the monitoring of the Mediterranean Strategy on Sustainable Development 2016-2025**, the MSSD dashboard as well as prototype of the sustainability dashboard as part of the observatory function of Plan Bleu (<http://obs.planbleu.org>). The MSSD factsheets would be finalised later in 2017, and MSSD core set expected to be adopted at the COP 20 to the Barcelona Convention in December 2017. J-P Giraud raised the issue about lack of data and information and the need for strong cooperation to finalise the indicators. The involvement and contribution with the ENI SEIS project would be an added value to this end.

³ DPSIR - Drivers, Pressures, States, Impacts and Responses framework

Ahmed Abdelrehim (CEDARE) updated the meeting about the last development of the **Arab list of Sustainable Development Indicators (SDI)** and the outcomes of the last meeting of the data working group about a consolidated list of 30 SDIs.

Further to that, EEA introduced the mapping of all these indicator initiatives and processes as well as the connection and relevance with the H2020 Initiative. This mapping was the basis of the group work on the revision of the H2020 indicator set.

Overview of planned indicator-based assessment

Following the presentation of the indicators processes, MED POL, Plan Bleu and EEA presented the different assessment reports planned in the coming years: Quality Status report 2017 assessment factsheets; State of the Environment and Development 2019 (most probably to be published end 2019/beginning 2020), as well as the EEA marine road-map.

Based on this diverse assessment landscape, EEA introduced the current reflection as regards the assessment framework to be developed and used for the H2020 review. Linkages and complementarities between the different assessments and information/analytical sources need to be further developed, in particular with respect to the revised set of H2020 indicators and to also reflect national situation. Participants have been invited to refer to the proposed assessment framework as background while discussing the refinement of the H2020 indicators.

Session 2. Review of H2020 indicators

For this session, the participants split into two groups (Group 1: Tunisia, Israel, Egypt (Libya – on the second day) and Group 2: Jordan, Palestine, Albania) and each group discussed the following 4 issues:

- Water – facilitated by EEA & UfMS
- Waste (incl. marine litter) – facilitated by UN environment/MAP & CEDARE
- Industrial emissions (incl. hazardous waste) – facilitated by UN environment/MAP & CEDARE
- Other areas – facilitated by EEA & UfMS.

The meeting provided a good way forward for an agreed selection of indicators, recognising the fact that not all countries were present and that further discussions at national level are needed, in particular on issues of data availability for some indicators. Thus, the participants suggested to take the proposal and have it further explored at country and regional level before coming to an agreed final list of indicators, potentially at the second workshop in September 2017. Summary of the discussions during the breakout sessions is included in the next section.

Main outcomes from the breakout sessions:

Waste (incl. marine litter)

Existing H2020 Indicators:

IND 1 - Municipal waste generation (and composition)

IND 2 - Collected and treated municipal waste

IND 1: Municipal waste generation and composition should remain. However, countries expressed their concerns on the lack of data on waste generation as the indicator is currently based on estimation. The country representatives expressed the need to have project support to develop waste survey and update production coefficient. As regards composition, the participants stressed the need to have data on plastics reaching the sea (using existing marine litter projects).

The participants proposed to split IND 2 and consider collection and treatment separately (i.e. Municipal waste collected; Municipal waste treated). As regards waste treatment, special reference should be made to the type of treatment. Suggestion was made to integrate the NAP common indicator 12 (and SDG 12.5.1) "Share of recycled landfilled and incinerated municipal waste with respect to collected amount". New indicator could be labelled as Municipal waste treated, by type of treatment (recycle, landfill, incineration) and share of treatment with respect to collected amount.

There was a suggestion to consider having a separate indicator on recycling. Under this indicator, specific information can be requested for plastics (e.g. share of plastics recycled with respect to the total amount of waste recycled).

The existing H2020 sub-indicator "number, type and location of landfills" should be a separate Indicator "Number, type and location of landfills".

Under this indicator, the NAP common indicator 15 could be a sub-indicator "share of existing illegal solid waste dumpsites on land that have been closed (in the past 10 years) with respect to the total number. Some countries expressed concerns as regards data availability for this indicator.

The countries supported the idea of having an indicator on waste collection efficiency. In this respect the use of NAP common indicator 11 was suggested for further consideration "Proportion of urban solid waste regularly collected and with adequate final discharge out of total urban solid waste generated by cities". Again some countries raised the issue of data availability and estimation for waste generation.

Countries confirmed the usefulness of having waste indicators at coastal level, which require sound statistics of population in coastal areas.

As regards marine litter, the countries expressed concerns on data availability to properly develop indicators, indicating that further work is needed. It was suggested to consider as well the NAP common indicator 14 (SDG indicator 14.1.1) "Index of coastal eutrophication and floating plastic debris density". The country representatives questioned the geographical scale to be applied for marine litter.

Water

Existing H2020 water related indicators:

IND 3 - Share of population with access to an improved sanitation system (total, urban, rural)

IND 4 - Volume of waste water collected, of which volume of waste water treated (and type of treatment)

IND 5 - Nutrient concentrations in transitional, coastal and marine waters

Participants agreed to keep the 3 existing indicators, with the following adjustments.

IND 4 – Type of treatment needs to be complemented by more information about the wastewater treatment infrastructure such as design/actual capacity, age, performances over time.

IND 5 – The quality of treated water/effluents needs also to be addressed. Propose to look at bathing water quality as well.

Taking into account the enlarged scope of the second phase of H2020 to the whole water area, the participants pointed out the importance to address water resources with a particular focus on water scarcity/water shortage issues as well as non-conventional water resources. Several indicators have been identified in existing lists that should be considered to be included in the H2020 set, such as *Change in water-use efficiency over time* (SDG 6.4.1) – *Water efficiency index* (MSSD 2.2), *Exploitation index of renewable natural resources* (MSSD 2.1.2), *Water Exploitation Index+* (EEA CSI 018), *Level of water stress - freshwater withdrawal as a proportion of available freshwater resources* (SDG 6.4.2, SCP 2.1).

For this sector, participants raised the importance to explicitly introduce climate change as a key driver of change.

The aspects of water governance, water pricing, awareness raising, and the nexus pollution/public health have also been identified as relevant elements to be further explored and analysed in the framework of H2020, in particular in relation to long-term investments and post-2020 vision.

The participants indicated the importance of developing detailed rationale for each potential additional indicators before inclusion in a renewed H2020 set. For some aspects inputs from thematic analysis and other assessments might be sufficient to complement the H2020 review without inclusion of a specific additional indicator.

The participants indicated as well the importance for this sector to address external pressures, such as refugees, conflicts, economic crisis, etc.

Industrial Emissions (incl. HW)

Existing H2020 indicator:

IND 6 Release of toxic substances and nutrients from industrial sectors

The participants proposed to split the existing indicator and to develop one indicator on toxic substances and one on nutrients such as:

- *Release of toxic substances from industrial sectors*
- *Release of nutrients from industrial sectors and WWTP*

As regards toxic substances, the proposal was to use NAP common indicator 6 as sub-indicator or as a new indicator: *Number of substances covered by national standards (ELV), for point source discharges into water or air* and/or NAP common indicator 10

Share of contaminated sites with toxic, persistent and liable to accumulate substances in the coastal area which have been closed/remediated including spills from industrial accidents.

As regards hazardous waste, the participants proposed to use SDG Indicator 12.4.2 and Arab League 41 *Hazardous waste generated per capita and proportion of hazardous waste treated, by type of treatment.*

NAP common indicator 7 (and IMAP 17): *concentration of key harmful contaminants measured in the relevant matrix (biota sediment, seawater) and their loads* has also been identified for consideration in particular for heavy metals.

Other issues discussed:

- Countries supported the idea of having an indicator on the reduction of hotspots number, as identified in the NAPs;
- To consider an indicator on links between pollution (mainly atmospheric) with health;
- To consider sea-based pollution (number and quantity of spills) (currently out of scope the H2020);
- To consider links of pollution with biodiversity/ecosystem degradation and climate change were also discussed, but it was agreed that such indicators, if relevant to H2020, are cross-cutting and are relevant for all the three themes (water, waste, industrial emissions).

Other dimensions

Under this group, the participants addressed the need to complement the thematic indicator set with information related to process, performance and governance.

It has been suggested to first provide a background analysis to have a baseline on measures, legislation, actions taken in the last 15 years. This would consist of reviewing through the H2020 lenses the existing reports and analyses undertaken at regional level after 2003 to identify all relevant information providing a baseline on trends in efforts of pollution reduction.

As mentioned under the water discussion, the participants indicated the need to specifically address the drivers of pollution and external pressures impacting directly the state of the resources but also the measures/actions taken, such as the refugees, economic crisis, war situation etc.

In line with the discussion on the waste topic, the participants agreed on the need to address and analyse specifically the demography and climate change – some key indicators to be identified, synergies/common work with the analysis to be done for the SoED 2019.

The participants raised also the need to run a qualitative evaluation of the legislation and enforcement, making linkages with the regular analysis of the governance/compliance obligations under the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols.

As regards the prevention measures, the participants indicated interest to look at green procurements (investment) and to ensure strong links and inputs from the work of SCP/RAC and MSSD.

As raised in the thematic discussions, the review process should look at the links between hotspots and investments. The production (through MED POL information) of a map of existing and removed hotspots was considered essential.

The issue of public information and participation was also largely discussed. It should be considered that none of the partner countries is a Party to the Aarhus Convention. However all the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention shall implement the principles of public information and participation, as provided for by the Convention article 15. In addition, it has to be noted that the SEIS principles have been integrated into COP decisions (e.g. IMAP decision IG.22/07 adopted by COP 19) and as such are binding for the Contracting Parties.

Reporting process, Infrastructure development, data requirements, meta data catalogue, links with IMAP implementation

Michael Assouline (EEA) informed the participants about the latest developments as regards infrastructure and data management, in particular the set-up of a reporting system to support H2020 related data exchange. The key elements of this work for 2017 are:

1. identification of the state of the national databases for data management. Online survey to be launched in mid-June, building metadata catalogue based on the results of the survey;
2. definition of .xml schemas to be used for data reporting. This activity is based on a preliminary analysis of IMAP guidelines and H2020 indicators data dictionaries developed in the first phase.
3. development of data policy documents at country level to support the common regional standards. This will be developed from the analysis of the metadata catalogue from July 2017.
4. Implementation of SDI at country level and training national experts on the use of SDI and reporting infrastructure.

Celine Ndong (InfoRAC) presented the InfoMap platform including: architecture and services (InfoMap portal, data centre, resources management, capabilities for information exchange, modules, SDI, data collection for the Barcelona Convention, existing databases managed by InfoRac such as the MEDPOL/NBB Information systems).

The online survey, mentioned above, is currently being designed as a metadata questionnaire inspired by the metadata questionnaire developed by CEDARE in the framework of the Arab WG on environmental indicators.

The meeting participants were informed that Michael Assouline (EEA) will contact the project NFPs to identify the appropriate person/network to fill in the online survey.

The meeting participants agreed that the ad-hoc working group on indicators will be consulted to provide comments on the draft version of the online survey.

Session 3. Towards 2019 H2020 assessments

Following the discussions held during the breakout sessions and the need for further reflection on the information flow to be developed to support the regular H2020 review process and the setting-up of integrated information systems, the participants agreed to postpone the discussion on the assessment framework and outline of the next H2020 report once a consolidated list of indicators would be available.

Session 4. Next steps

Cécile Roddier-Quefelec (EEA) presented the overall work plan of the ENI SEIS project with a focus on 2017, with an emphasis on the planned activities under work package 2 - Indicator and assessments.

During the discussion, the country representatives pointed out the need for political support to implement these assessments and indicators work. A strong political will is critical to ensure implementation of the SEIS principles on data exchange and availability and to support any assessment work. The meeting called for enhanced opportunities for sharing and transferring good practices and experiences. The H2020 Review and Monitoring group together with the ENI SEIS project offer the possibility to provide both technical and political support when needed.

Key conclusions and next steps:

i. Indicators

- Refine outcomes of the workshop (further explore additional indicators/areas identified, data availability, feasibility) and propose corresponding assessment framework – remote work with ad hoc working group (links with meta data survey, setting-up of the reporting process)
- 2nd indicator workshop (to agree on final list of indicators and corresponding specification/methodology factsheets, agree on report outline) – **19 September (webinar)**
- From October 2017 initiate indicator production/data collection
- 3rd indicator workshop (initial review of indicator produced/initial assessment, key messages) – **February 2018 (tbc)**

ii. Assessment

- Q2 2018 Analysis incl. initial review of H2020 results vs baseline, initial manuscript regional report / national contributions
- Q3 2018 Peer review
- Q4 2018 Final analysis, text, illustration (graph, maps, infographics), web-portal
- Q1 2019 Editing, translation
- Q2 2019 Publication main report / development summary for policy maker
- Dissemination, contribution to policy process (ministerial meeting)

iii. General

- Inform MED POL FP Meeting in early June on the outcomes of the workshop

- Launch of meta data questionnaire (June/July 2017) – contact person to be confirmed/reconnect with former member of IT WG
- Development of data dictionary.