


INDICATORS OF SUCCESS

Demonstrating the shift to Sustainable Consumption and Production

Principles, process and methodology

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A special thanks to the 10YFP M&E Task Force, the International Resource Panel and the Life-Cycle Initiative.



The 10YFP Indicators of Success were developed with generous contributions from the Government of Switzerland and the European Union.



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Confederation

Federal Office for the Environment FOEN



With technical contributions from:

Consumers International, Federal Office for Agriculture of Switzerland, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety of Germany, Korea Environmental Industry & Technology Institute (KEITI), Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES), Ministry of Ecological and Inclusive Transition of France, Ministry of Environment of Finland, Ministry of Environment of Indonesia, Ministry of Tourism of Croatia, , Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT), Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), Tourism and Protected Areas Specialist Group (TAPAS), UN Environment, UN World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP), World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC), and World Wildlife Fund (WWF).

CONTENTS

1) PRINCIPLES	5
2) PROCESS	7
a) The framework into the 10 YFP monitoring and reporting process	7
b) The reporting and monitoring process: requirements and roles	7
c) The online reporting system	8
d) Indicative timelines for the production of the Annual 10YFP Progress Report	9
3) 10YFP INDICATORS OF SUCCESS	10
a) 10YFP objectives and associated indicators	10
b) Indicators general definitions	11
4) SCP IMPACT INDICATORS	11
a) Rationale	12
b) Interpretation	13
c) Impact indicator structure	15
d) Proposed analysis method	16
e) SCP impact indicators and the Sustainable Development Goals	16
ANNEX 1: 10YFP M&E TASK FORCE COMPOSITION	17
ANNEX 2: INDICATOR METHODOLOGY	18
a) General methodology considerations	18
ANNEX 4: METADATA SHEETS FOR THE 10YFP INDICATORS	22
1.1. SCP projects	22
1.2. Financing the shift to SCP	24
1.3. Training for SCP	26
2.1. SCP network	28
2.2. Outreach and communication for SCP	30
2.3. Production of SCP knowledge and technical tools	32
3.1. Policy instruments for SCP	34
3.2. SCP monitoring and reporting	38
3.3. Education on SCP	41
3.4. SCP changes in practices	44
3.5. SCP Commitments	46
3.6. Coordination on SCP	48
3.7. Use of SCP knowledge and technical tools	51
4. SCP Impact Indicators	53
ANNEX 5: GENERAL REFERENCES	69

1) PRINCIPLES

The **overall objective** of the 10YFP Indicators of Success Framework is to guide and measure, in a participatory way, the collective impact in the shift to Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) patterns worldwide. The framework is intended to reflect key milestones towards the global shift to SCP, primarily as supported by the 10YFP, and with the objective of expanding this primary scope beyond.

Such a framework aims to support the 10YFP actors and other stakeholders working on SCP (i) **assess and improve performance** to inform the planning of activities and allocation of funds; and (ii) **report and demonstrate progress** to show accountability towards all actors and donors, communicate results to the wider public, and mobilise political and financial support.

It aligns with the adopted **Rio +20 document and the 10YFP thirteen functions**. It is structured around the **four 10YFP objectives**: (i) Enable all stakeholders to share information and knowledge on SCP; (ii) Support capacity building and facilitate access to financial and technical assistance; (iii) Accelerate the shift towards SCP, supporting regional and national policies and initiatives; and (iv) Contribute to resource efficiency and decoupling economic growth from environmental degradation and resource use, while creating decent jobs and economic opportunities and contributing to poverty eradication and shared prosperity.

It is informed by the relevant **Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)**¹ and associated targets and indicators, especially those associated to SDG 12 on “Ensuring Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns”. It also builds on and recognises other existing methodologies, highlighting support and complementarity of the 10YFP and its programmes to **other relevant international processes** (e.g. UNFCCC).

The framework consists of: (i) a limited and non-exhaustive set of **aggregated indicators which are realistic, measurable, attributable and within the scope of SCP and the 10YFP programmes**, (ii) **associated methodologies**, (iii) a **process** and (iv) **tools** for use of the indicators through the different stages of monitoring and reporting.

To support distinction between different degrees of attribution and timescales for results, indicators have been split up into **output, outcome and impact**² indicators. This intends to help dissociation between direct, short-term results of activities and achieved or projected longer-term and more indirect effects, with impact indicators providing for the long-term vision and ultimately desired changes on the ground. This **split up is indicative** and one indicator may for instance qualify as output or outcome depending on the nature of the associated activity.

¹ [The Sustainable Development Goals](#) as adopted at the UN Sustainable Development Summit 25 September 2015 and the indicators presented in the [Provisional Proposed Tiers for Global SDG Indicators as of March 24, 2016](#)

² As per [UNEP Programme Manual](#) (May 2013) these are defined as follows:

Output: products and services which result from the completion of activities within an intervention.

Outcome: intended or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs, usually requiring the collective effort of partners. Outcomes represent changes which occur between the completion of outputs and the achievement of impact. Outcomes could be a change in capacity (immediate outcome) or behaviour (medium-term outcome).

Impact: positive and negative, primary and secondary, lasting and significant effects contributed to by an intervention. In UNEP, these effects usually concern the environment, and how it affects human life and livelihood.

The establishment of **baselines and targets for each indicator is encouraged** as supporting the overall objective of the framework. Whenever possible baselines and targets are established for each indicator, with the baseline set at the earliest possible moment in the implementation of activities. When not possible, the evolution of the indicator in one direction as specified in its interpretation, is considered as an indication of success.

Sources of data for indicators, primarily include documents and other materials produced by the 10YFP programme portfolios, activities and collaborations. Other sources of data coordinated from the secretariat may include the 10YFP Global Survey on National SCP Policies and Initiatives, reporting on SDG target 12.1 and information from the 10YFP focal points and other actors and stakeholders, as appropriate. Other international data sources may also be used.

For each indicator, **collection of quantitative information** per identified **disaggregation categories** (e.g. by sex, country, type of actors) is encouraged as well as provision of a **supporting narrative** putting data into context. This allows measurement of **sub-indicators focused on programmes' priorities**, as needed, and linkages to other international indicators. Detailed definition, data disaggregation, as well as interpretation and rationale, measurement units, attribution considerations and linkages to specific SDGs and relevant international references are described in a **metadata sheet**³ for each indicator.

The Indicators of Success have been defined as a meaningful set of indicators providing global direction and vision to support the shift to SCP worldwide, the core mandate of the 10YFP and to an extent that of a range of other international cooperation frameworks and organisations focusing on the environment and sustainable development. However, the ability of the 10YFP and its programmes to report against all indicators for their own action and beyond is subject to resources and data availability. Recognizing that **resources and data availability** may vary over time and from one activity to another, the framework has been designed to be **flexible. Not all indicators may apply to and be reported on by all activities and programmes** monitored under this framework. It is expected that in a first phase efforts may mainly focus on reporting against output and some of the outcome indicators, speaking to the most direct and short term results of the 10YFP activities. In a second phase (over the next 5 years), as resources become available and progress is delivered by enhanced capacities, more reporting on other longer term outcome and impact indicators, including beyond the direct influence of the 10YFP, may become possible.

The framework **can be revised as needed** in a coordinated effort of the programmes and secretariat, through the established M&E Task Force (annex 1). This may occur in the case of difficulties, or need for clarification or reformulation of methodologies and possibly of indicators, as well as for alignment with the ongoing work under the SDGs. Major changes to the framework should be presented to the Board for validation.

³ 10YFP template to be based on [metadata template for SDG indicator](#).

2) PROCESS

a) The framework into the 10YFP monitoring and reporting process



Figure 1: 10YFP monitoring and reporting process

b) The reporting and monitoring process: requirements and roles

10YFP actors, implementing initiatives and activities included in the 10YFP Programme portfolio (as defined in the 10YFP programme portfolios: key principles and approaches⁴) are responsible for monitoring the progress of their activities and for reporting directly to the relevant programmes and the secretariat through the 10YFP reporting process

10YFP programme Coordination Desks (CD), composed of representatives of programmes lead and co-leads, with support from and in coordination with their **Multi-stakeholder Advisory Committee (MAC)** and **programme partners**, as well as other relevant 10YFP actors (as per the 10YFP organisational structure), should respond to the following reporting requirements:

- Reporting on activities implemented by the Coordination Desk
- Monitoring and quality assurance of reported progress of their programme and associated activities, including those directly supported by the 10YFP, and, if possible, beyond, in areas relevant to their thematic focus, and in accordance with agreed priorities and the 10YFP indicators
- Preparing Annual Programme Progress Reports
- Providing regular inputs to the 10YFP newsletter
- Informing the secretariat of their progress on a continuous basis and responding to information requests from the secretariat as appropriate

Template and timelines for these submissions are provided by the secretariat.

The secretariat, in coordination with relevant programmes and 10YFP actors is responsible for:

- Monitoring the overall progress of the 10YFP and beyond, to the extent possible, including through the compilation of Annual Programme Progress Reports, regional and national level initiatives (for

⁴ LINK TO PORTFOLIO KEY PRINCIPLES DOCUMENT

instance through the reporting on SDG target 12.1), and the administrative monitoring of the 10YFP trust fund and associated contracts, in accordance with agreed priorities and the 10YFP indicators.

- Preparing Annual 10YFP Progress Reports on the activities of the 10YFP and financial performance of the trust fund, based on Annual Programme Progress Report as well as other relevant inputs, and to convey it to the High Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF) through the Board.
- Preparing the Mid-term review of the 10YFP on implementation progress, benefits and challenges, to be submitted to the Board by the end of 2017.
- Informing the Board of progress of the programmes on a continuous basis and responding to any request for information
- Developing and overseeing yearly reporting timelines, detailing out the reporting calendar for programmes and other stakeholders
- Developing and managing the reporting system and process, ensuring appropriate linkages with the SCP Clearinghouse⁵.

The Board is responsible for reviewing Annual 10YFP Progress Reports and for reporting annually to the **HLPF** in charge of overseeing the progress of the 10YFP and 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

National focal points are encouraged to report on national SCP policies and initiatives to the Secretariat, for instance through reporting on SDG 12.1 on national SCP policies and policy instruments.

Stakeholder focal points and other 10YFP actors included in the 10YFP organisational structure (e.g. UN interagency coordination group, regional SCP dialogues and roundtables, etc.), might also support the 10YFP monitoring and reporting process, as appropriate.

c) The online reporting system

The 10YFP online reporting system, developed by the 10YFP Secretariat in close collaboration and consultation with the Programmes, will be launched on 15 October 2017. As of this date all reporting on the Indicators of Success will be done directly through this system and the system will remain live for year-round reporting on activities. Whereas continuous improvements on the reporting system are envisaged; if necessary alternative means of reporting may be agreed upon.

The online reporting system is located in the “MySCP” section of the SCP Clearinghouse. Reporting on activities by all actors (as per list of roles and responsibilities in section 2b above) will be done through the “My reporting” section of the reporting system. A separate section “Programme reporting” will be available only to Coordination Desks and will provide them with an overview of all activities reported under their respective programme for quality assurance.

It is encouraged, to facilitate effective reporting, that actors upload their portfolio initiatives to the SCP Clearinghouse initiative database on a running basis or prior to reporting on activities (indicators). Activities reported through the online reporting system can be linked to portfolio initiatives already uploaded in the initiative database, providing an easy overview for the reporting entity, quality assurance process and for data analysis purposes. Unlike portfolio initiatives, data on activities will not be made publicly available as raw/full data submitted, but are captured for the purpose of reporting on Indicators of Success.

⁵ The secretariat has developed an online reporting system housed within the SCP Clearinghouse. If necessary, alternative means of reporting might be agreed on.

Reporting on the Indicators of Success is available only to actors in the 10YFP and requires a SCP Clearinghouse account.

d) Indicative timelines for the production of the Annual 10YFP Progress Report⁶

	Lead	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	April
Monitoring of progress	All 10YFP actors												
Annual Programme Progress Report to the secretariat, including data quality assurance	Programme Coordination Desks										Due by 15		
Annual 10YFP Progress report to the Board	Secretariat											Due by 31	
Board review of the Annual 10YFP Progress Report	Board												Due by 10
HLPF submission	Board												

Table 1: Annual 10YFP Progress Report timeline

⁶ To date, the HLPF report is due in April of each year and as such an indicative schedule is proposed below. It is understood that if the HLPF reporting timelines change, the 10YFP monitoring and reporting timelines will be adjusted accordingly.

3) 10YFP INDICATORS OF SUCCESS

a) 10YFP objectives and associated indicators




Figure 2: 10YFP Indicators of Success diagram

b) Indicators general definitions

Objective 1 (output level): Support capacity building and facilitate access to financial and technical assistance	
1.1. SCP Projects - # of projects supporting the shift to SCP (<i>main associated SDG indicators: 11.c.1, 12.a.1, 17.7.1, 7.b.1</i>)	
1.2. Financing the shift to SCP - Amount of financial resources (US\$) made available in support to the shift to SCP (<i>main associated SDG indicators: 11.c.1, 12.a.1, 17.7.1, 7.b.1</i>)	
1.3. Training for SCP - # person-days of training on SCP	
Objective 2 (output level): Enable all stakeholders to share information and knowledge on SCP	
2.1. SCP network - # of governments and other organisations engaged in the 10YFP and its programmes	
2.2. Outreach and communication for SCP - # of outreach and communication activities focusing on SCP issues and # of recipients	
2.3. Production of SCP knowledge and technical tools - # SCP knowledge resources and technical tools produced (<i>main associated SDG indicators: 17.6, 17.16</i>)	
Objective 3 (outcome level): Accelerate the shift towards SCP, supporting regional and national policies and initiatives	
3.1. Policy instruments for SCP - # of governments and other organisations developing, adopting, or implementing (or in process of) policy instruments supporting the shift to SCP (<i>main associated SDG indicators: 12.1.1, 13.2.1, 12.7.1, 12.b.1</i>)	
3.2. SCP monitoring and reporting - # of governments and other organisations officially establishing monitoring and reporting on SCP (<i>main associated SDG indicators: 12.6.1, 17.16.1, 12.4.1</i>)	
3.3. Education to SCP - # of countries integrating SCP topics in education practices) (<i>main associated SDG indicators: 12.8.1/ 4.7.1., 13.3.1</i>)	
3.4. SCP changes in practices - # of changes in practices and production processes supporting the shift to SCP	
3.5. SCP Commitments - # of high level commitments covering SCP	
3.6. Coordination on SCP - # of inter-sectoral and/or multi-stakeholder mechanisms for coordination on SCP; # of participating governments and other organisations) (<i>main associated SDG indicator: 17.14.1</i>)	
3.7. Use of SCP knowledge and technical tools - # of downloads on SCP clearing house and any other quantitative representation of use (reported together with 2.3.) ⁷	
Objective 4 (impact level): Contribute to resource efficiency and decoupling economic growth from environmental degradation and resource use, while creating decent jobs and economic opportunities and contributing to poverty eradication and shared prosperity.	
4.1 Resource Efficiency Key projection measurement: Material footprint	Material use efficiency (<i>main associated SDG indicator: 12.2.1</i>) Waste reduction (<i>main associated SDG indicator: 12.5.1</i>) Water use efficiency (<i>main associated SDG indicator: 6.4.1</i>) Energy use efficiency (<i>main associated SDG indicator: 7.3.1</i>)
4.2 Environmental Impact Key projection measurement: Global Warming Potential (GWP100); Global Temperature Potential (GTP100)	GHG emissions reduction (<i>main associated SDG indicator: 9.4.1</i>) Reduction of air, soil and water pollutants (<i>main associated SDG targets and indicators: 3.9, 6.3, 11.6.2, 12.4</i>) Biodiversity conservation and sustainable land-use (<i>main associated SDG indicators: 2.4.1, 15.1.1, 15.1.2, 15.3.1</i>)
4.3 Human Well-Being Key projection measurement: Human Development Index (HDI)	Gender (<i>main associated SDG indicator: 8.5.1</i>) Decent work (<i>main associated SDG target: 8.5</i>) Health (<i>main associated SDG indicators: 3.4.1, 3.9.1, 3.9.2, 3.9.3</i>)

Table 2: 10YFP Indicators of Success general definitions and SDG association


⁷ This unit of measure has been chosen for the pilot phase as the easiest to measure. However, is expected to evolve with time toward a more meaningful one for measurement of knowledge and tools use.

4) SCP IMPACT INDICATORS

The impact indicators of success fall under the 10YFP objective (4) to increase resource efficiency and decouple economic growth from environmental degradation, creating decent jobs and contributing to poverty eradication and shared prosperity.

Considering the transversal nature of Sustainable Consumption and Production and the interconnectedness of the SDGs, it is key for the 10YFP to identify a limited set of common impacts providing the longer term vision and ultimately desired changes on the ground of the shift to SCP, whether achieved or projected.

To ensure strong scientific foundation that informs the 10YFP stakeholders, the SCP impact indicators are developed in cooperation with the secretariat of the International Resource Panel (IRP) and the Life-Cycle Initiative.



a) Rationale

“The remarkable economic and population growth of the 20th century was closely coupled to substantial increases in the extraction and consumption of natural resources, leading to increasingly-damaging negative environmental impact. However, economic growth globally was faster than growth of the rate of consumption of natural resources, and some negative environmental impacts have been reduced. Globally, about 25% less material input was required in 2002 compared to 1980 to produce one unit of real GDP. It appears that some ‘dematerialization’ of the world economy has occurred spontaneously. **Accelerating this process of decoupling economic activity from consumption and environmental impacts is fundamental to future human well-being.**”⁸

“Decoupling will require significant changes in government policies, corporate behaviour, and consumption patterns by the public.”⁹ These changes will not be easy, as indicated by the three scenarios on decoupling from the IRP (see *potential modelling scenarios* below).

One of the four objectives of the 10YFP is to increase resource efficiency and decouple economic growth from environmental degradation, creating decent jobs and contributing to poverty eradication and shared prosperity.

In the context of resource efficiency and sustainable consumption and production, the IRP defines decoupling as: “*reducing the amount of resources used to produce economic growth (...) and delinking*

⁸ International Resource Panel, 2011: “[Decoupling Natural Resource Use and Environmental Impacts from Economic Growth](#)”, factsheet page 1

⁹ International Resource Panel, 2011: “[Decoupling Natural Resource Use and Environmental Impacts from Economic Growth](#)”, summary page 4 & factsheet page 2

*economic development from environmental deterioration*¹⁰. The IRP outlines four key aspects of understanding and measuring decoupling of economic growth from environmental impact (*figure 3*)¹¹.

- Human well-being;
- Economic activity (defined as GDP);
- Resource use; and
- Environmental impact.




Figure 3: The two aspects of decoupling

Resource decoupling: reducing the rate of resource use per unit of economic activity (*the link between resource use and economic activity*).

Impact decoupling: increasing economic output while reducing negative environmental impacts (*the link between economic activity and environmental impact*).

b) Interpretation

Projected/achieved impacts: The 10YFP Indicators of Success' objective is to guide and measure the collective impact in the shift to SCP; it is intended to reflect key milestones towards the global shift to SCP. **The impact indicators are therefore primarily intended as the long term vision on the impacts and desired changes that SCP contributes to.** The reporting on impacts aims to capture the potential/projected and if possible achieved impact(s) of the activities implemented by the actors within the 10YFP network. While, when sufficient data becomes available, the data collected on achieved impact of activities could be aggregated at different levels depending on the purpose of specific analysis (see *proposed disaggregation* below), the main objective at present is to guide the 10YFP network members in their process of integrating the monitoring of impact level indicators to their current

¹⁰ International Resource Panel, 2011: "[Decoupling Natural Resource Use and Environmental Impacts from Economic Growth](#)", summary page 4

¹¹ International Resource Panel, 2011: "[Decoupling Natural Resource Use and Environmental Impacts from Economic Growth](#)"

practice and therefore quantifications would mainly focus on aggregating the number of 10YFP actors taking action to integrate the impact level indicators, i.e. on quantifying the progressive increase of the commitment to monitor; as well as taking stock of examples of monitoring good practices related to the impact level. A consistent approach will be taken in the interpretation of impacts in relation to the potential relevance for SCP scenarios, as established by the IRP and other scientific projections (by UNDP, ILO, LCI, IPCC etc.).

Key projection measurements: Key projection measurements are data that is currently being collected at national level by other entities, which would be key for any projections and comparisons that the 10YFP may wish to make in future. These are: i) Material Footprint, ii) Human Development index, iii) Global Warming Potential (GWP100) and Global Temperature Change Potential (GTP100), iv) Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

Potential modelling scenarios

The IRP has outlined three scenarios in relation to “decoupling”¹²:

- 1) **business as usual and convergence**, where industrialized countries maintain their per capita resource consumption, and developing countries increase their consumption rates to the same level as industrialized countries. This would lead to a tripling of global annual resource extraction by 2050.
- 2) **moderate contraction and convergence**, where industrialized countries halve their per capita resource consumption, and developing countries increase their consumption rates to the same level as industrialized countries. This would lead to a 40% increase in global annual resource extraction by 2050;
- 3) **tough contraction and convergence**, where total global resource consumption is maintained at the year 2000 level, and the per capita resource consumption is the same in all countries. This by definition would keep global resource extraction at its current levels.

Example projections:

Projection on water use efficiency: The landmark study “Charting Our Water Future” by the 2030 Water Resources Group (2009) argues that if ecosystem water uses are taken into account, a 40% gap exists between projected water supplies and demands in 2030. The projection assumes a so-called “business-as-usual” scenario in which current approaches to water supply development and water management continue. Continuing with the current demand and supply-side efficiency measures such as desalination, irrigation scheduling, reduced waste in the mining sector, and other typical groundwater supply.

Projection on material use efficiency: A resource efficient scenario applying a mix of resource efficiency policies globally could cut the use of natural resources by up to 28 per cent by 2050.

¹² International Resource Panel, 2011: “[Decoupling Natural Resource Use and Environmental Impacts from Economic Growth](#)”, summary page 10

c) Impact indicator structure

Objective 4 of 10YFP Indicators of Success in combination with the four key aspects outlined in the IRP definition of decoupling serves as the basis for the further development of a set of clear and scientifically supported impact indicators.

In addition, a priority in the development of the proposed impact indicators was ensuring that all three dimensions of sustainability were covered (environmental; economic; social).

“**Impact:** Social, economic or environmental improvements to a situation that respond to identified needs under a long-term vision. Only indicators related to long-term benefits, such as emission reductions, are categorised as impact indicators.”¹³

The new proposed structure of capturing the contribution to impact(s) of activities in the 10YFP network would then consist of **3 impact levels**, corresponding to three of the four aspects of decoupling, supported by a total of **10 impacts**, which will be integrated into the online reporting tool as questions underneath the overall impact levels. It is proposed that reporting entity may choose a maximum of three main impacts their activities contribute to, in order to identify the key contributions of the 10YFP network to impacts related to SCP.

Impact level	Impact	Recommended Indicator	Existing measurements/protocols
4.1 Resource Efficiency Key projection measurement: Material footprint	Material use efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of material used that is remanufactured or recycled 	SDG 12.2.1 (material footprint) (UNEP/IRP) – Tier III
	Waste reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % recycle rate (tons of material recycled) (3Rs – reduce, reuse, recycle) 	SDG 12.5.1 (3Rs) (UNSD/UNEP) – Tier III (methodology still under development)
	Water use efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % reduction in water use Change in water-use efficiency over time 	ISO 14046: 2014 (ISO) on water footprint as recommended by WULCA
	Energy use efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of energy consumption from renewable resources 	SDG 7.2.1 (energy efficiency) (IEA, UNSD, UN Energy, SE4ALL) – Tier I
4.2 Environmental Impact Key projection measurement: Global Warming Potential (GWP100) and Global Temperature Potential (GTP100)	GHG emissions reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kg/ton CO2 emissions Kg/ton non-CO2 GHG emissions (as CO2 equivalent) 	2006 IPCC Guidelines on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (IPCC, UNFCCC)
	Reduction of air, soil and water pollutants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) – as ratio of fertilizer removed to fertilizer applied (nitrogen per hectare) % decrease of SLCP emissions/fine particulate matter 	Nitrogen Use Efficiency as an Agro-Environmental Indicator (OECD) Supporting National Planning for Action on Short-Lived Climate Pollutants (SNAP): SLCP National Planning Guidance Document (SEI, CCAC)
	Biodiversity conservation and sustainable land-use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proportion of land that is degraded over total land area % of terrestrial/coastal/marine area under protection/certification schemes 	SDG 15.1.1 (forest area) (FAO) – Tier I SDG 15.1.2 (biodiversity) (UNEP-WCMC, BLI, IUCN) – Tier I SDGs with methodology still under development: 2.4.1 (agricultural land); 11.3.1 (land-use); 15.3.1 (land degradation)
4.3 Human Well-being Key projection measurement: Human Development Index (HDI)	Gender	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average hourly earnings of female and male employees Female and male labour force participation rates 	SDG 8.5.1 (hourly earnings)/ILOSTAT (ILO) – Tier II Labour force participation rate (ILO)
	Decent work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum wage as a percentage of the median wage Total household income/consumption 	Decent Work Indicators: guidelines for producers and users of statistical and legal framework indicators, ILO Manual (ILO)
	Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % relative reduction in the risk of premature mortality from NCDs, such as cardiovascular diseases, cancer, diabetes or chronic respiratory diseases Mortality rate attributed to household and ambient air pollution, unsafe water, unintentional poisoning or toxicity 	SDGs 3.4.1 (NCDs) ; 3.9.1 (air pollution) ; 3.9.2 (water) ; 3.9.3 (poisoning) (WHO) – Tier II (3.9.1 is Tier I) Disability-Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) (WHO)

Table 3: SCP Impact Indicators overview

¹³ CCAC, 2017: “Demonstrating Impacts Of Activities: Framework, process, and methodology”

Methodological inputs for the impact indicators

- 4.1 Resource efficiency; 4.2 Environmental impact: methodological inputs provided by the International Resource Panel, Life-Cycle Initiative, and UNEP Green Economy. In addition a range of other scientific sources were reviewed, including relevant SDG indicator methodology.
- 4.3 Human well-being: based on ILO Decent Work Indicators, Human Development Index (HDI), and WHO Disability-Adjusted Life Years (DALYs). In addition a range of other scientific sources were reviewed, including relevant SDG indicator methodology.

d) Proposed analysis method

Example: In its “World Employment Social Outlook – Trends 2017” the ILO highlights that the progress on reducing decent work deficit has stalled, pointing out in particular the rise of global unemployment, vulnerable forms of employment, working poverty, and gender disparities as key trends projected to continue into 2018. Key concerns surround “the ability (or inability) of the global economy to (i) generate a sufficient number of jobs, (ii) improve the quality of work for those with a job, and (iii) ensure that the gains of growth are shared in an inclusive manner (ILO, 2017:11-14). XX (number) of the activities implemented by actors in the 10YFP network in 2017 seek to impact this trend in a positive direction. XX% of the activities have a projected impact on job creation, XX% on gender balance in the workplace, XX% on creating a safer work environment, and XX% aim to have a lasting impact on household income/consumption.

e) SCP impact indicators and the Sustainable Development Goals




Figure 4: SCP Impact Indicators and the SDGs

ANNEX 1: 10YFP M&E TASK FORCE COMPOSITION

	Name	Organisation	Role in the M&E task force
Chair & SBC	Pekka Huovila	MoE, Government of Finland	Chair of the task force & lead member for SBC, lead on 1.1.
	Usha Iyer-Raniga	RMIT	Alternate chair & alternate lead for SBC, lead on 1.1. and 3.3.
	Martina Otto	UNEP	Task force member
CI-SCP	Vrilly Vrondonuwu	MoEF, Government of Indonesia	Lead task force member for CI-SCP, lead on 2.2
	Bettina Heller	UNEP, representing Germany	Alternate lead member for CI-SCP, lead on 3.5
	Ian Fenn	Consumers International	Task force member
	Claire Kneller / Keith James	WRAP	Task force member
SFS	Michael Mulet	WWF	Lead task force member for SFSP, lead on 3.4 and 3.7
	Patrick Mink	FOAG, Government of Switzerland	Alternate lead member for SFSP
SLE	Ryu Koide	IGES	Lead task force member for SLE, lead on 2.3
	Patricia Vilchis Tella	SEI	Alternate lead member for SLE, lead on 3.3
SPP	Farid Yaker	UNEP	Lead task force member for SPP, lead on 1.3
	Hyunju Lee	KEITI	Alternate lead member for SPP
	Laura Skoet	UNEP	Task force member
STP	Virginia Trapa	UNWTO	Lead task force member for STP, lead on 2.1 and 3.2
	Blanka Belosevic	MoT, Government of Croatia	Task force member
	Rochelle Turner	WTTC	Task force member
	Anna Spenceley/ Luca Santarossa	TAPAS	Task force member
	Svitlana Mikhalyeva	UNEP, representing France	Task force member
Regional / national perspective	Janet Salem	UNEP, regional office Asia Pacific	Task force member, regional perspective
	Fabienne Pierre	UNEP, 10YFP Secretariat	Task force member, regional/national perspective, lead on 3.1 and 3.6
secretariat	Sophie Bonnard	UNEP, 10YFP Secretariat	Task force member and secretariat
	Cecilia Lopez y Royo	UNEP, 10YFP Secretariat	Task force member and secretariat
	Sofie Clausen	UNEP, 10YFP Secretariat	Task force member and secretariat
	Charles Arden-Clarke	UNEP, 10YFP Secretariat	Task force member and secretariat

Table 4: 10YFP M&E Task Force composition

ANNEX 2: INDICATOR METHODOLOGY

a) General methodology considerations

The considerations below apply across all indicator metadata sheets for the reporting process.

General definition of SCP

The working definition of Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) used in the context of this framework is:

“The use of services and related products, which respond to basic needs and bring a better quality of life while minimising the use of natural resources and toxic materials as well as the emissions of waste and pollutants over the life cycle of the service or product so as not to jeopardise the needs of future generation.”¹⁴

The key elements of the SCP definition are also reflected under the impact indicators selected within the Framework.

When reporting under an indicator, Programmes, Secretariat and other reporting streams are encouraged to base themselves on this definition to determine what can be considered as “supporting the shift to SCP”, “integrating SCP considerations”, “focusing on SCP”, “Covering SCP issues”, “SCP topics”, etc.

Scope of reporting

10YFP actors are expected to report on results of activities contributing to the objectives of the 10YFP, this includes results directly supported by the 10YFP and activities contributing to the shift to SCP and the objectives of the 10YFP. For 10YFP programmes reference is made to the 10YFP programme portfolios, and their associated key principles, approaches¹³ and criteria (see also attribution paragraph below). Reporting on progress achieved beyond those activities but which are relevant to their work is also encouraged when information is available. Reporting should cover the period 2013-year-to-date, with the year of achievement specified for each progress reported.

Attribution¹⁵

Agreed relevant categories for attribution under this framework are: 1) core initiatives, 2) affiliated initiatives; 3) other. (N.B. Other is used *ad interim*, while programme portfolios are being developed by those programmes who have only recently initiated them)

- 1) **Core initiatives: are the principal initiatives of the programme** and are activities initiated, developed or implemented collaboratively under the programme.
Core initiatives are characterised by the fact that they: address a core problem/issue; are developed and implemented jointly by two or more programme actors (co-lead, MAC, partner) and/or funded by the programme; Include innovations and/or elements of scaling up and replication; directly support countries in shifting to SCP (e.g. supporting implementation national SCP action plans); should build upon existing experience and/or start-up (co-)funding. Examples include: working groups or projects developed/established by the programme, collaborations on or scaling-up of existing initiatives facilitated by the programme, activities developed and implemented by the co-leads of the programme, Trust Fund projects, etc.
- 2) **Affiliated initiatives: activities of the programme actors** (co-leads, MAC or partners) which contribute to the objectives of the programmes and its work areas. Affiliated initiatives are characterised by the fact that they: are relevant projects, activities and tools of programme

¹⁴ UNEP (2010). ABC of SCP: Clarifying Concepts on Sustainable Consumption and Production.

¹⁵ As per 10YFP Programme Portfolios: Key Principles and Approaches

actors; are implemented by at least one programme actor; are promising practices with high replication and scaling-up potential; are relevant to national efforts on the shift to SCP; should only be initiatives that are already being implemented or have secured full (or at least partial) funding and which are already under implementation.

- 3) **Other:** Other is used *ad interim*, while programme portfolios are being developed by those programmes who have only recently initiated them

Methodological rigor and quality assurance

Reporting on the indicators should be done in accordance with the methodology presented in this and the following sections. Partners, Programmes, Secretariat and other reporting streams are responsible for relevance, accuracy and methodological rigor of information they report on. In case of any methodological issue encountered while reporting, please inform the 10YFP Secretariat.

Programme coordination desk review the data submitted by the programme actors and ensure any necessary quality checks of data reported under their Programme. Any concerns regarding the quality of reported data should be discussed directly with the reporting entity and necessary edits to the reported data made.

The Secretariat reviews the overall data across the 10YFP and when inconsistency or gaps may arise, the secretariat will discuss directly with the programme coordination desk or other entity as applicable.

Aggregation

Information reported by 10YFP programmes and other reporting streams might be aggregated at different levels, over different reporting periods, and may also be broken down in various ways using the recommended disaggregation categories detailed in the metadata sheets.

In support to sound aggregation operations, all quantitative data provided under this framework should be put into context by a short narrative covering activity objective and main achievements, as well as relevant attachments and hyperlink.

When aggregating data, the Secretariat, programmes and other reporting streams will be mindful of double counting and other methodological issues as specified in the metadata sheets associated to each indicator.

Cross cutting disaggregation categories and alignment with the SCP Clearinghouse taxonomy

The following disaggregation categories are used across indicators:

- **10YFP role:** Lead/Co-lead/Coordination Desk; MAC member; Partner; Secretariat
- **Reporting stream:** SPP; STP; CI-SCP; SFS; SLE; SBC; SCP General (for Secretariat activities only)
- **Attribution:** Core activity; Affiliated activity; other
- **Activity part of a 10YFP Trust Fund project:** Yes; No
- **Reporting year**
- **Type of organisations involved:** National government; Local authority; Civil society; Scientific and technical organisation; United Nations/Intergovernmental organisation; Business
- **Type of financial source:** Public; Private
- **Sectors of activity:** Agriculture and fishery; Buildings and construction; Consumer goods; Culture and recreation; Financial sector; Education; Energy; Food & Beverage; Forestry; Environmental services; Government and Civil Society; Industrial sector; Scientific research, development and innovation; Tourism; Transport; Waste, incl. chemicals; Water
- **Country:** as per the official SDG list
- **Region:** Global/all regions; Africa; Asia/Pacific; Europe and Central Asia; Latin America /Caribbean; Middle East; North America; Online activity
- **Scope:** 1) local; 2) national; 3) regional; 4) global
- **Impact:** as per SCP impact indicators

The SCP Clearinghouse taxonomy is being updated to reflect above categories.

Stocktaking exercise on baselines and targets

Baselines and targets are key elements to enable assessment of progress under this framework. Programmes and other reporting streams are encouraged to establish one or a small set of harmonized baselines and targets for each indicator. In accordance with the 10YFP and SDGs timelines, recommended time horizons for targets are 2018, 2022 and 2030. Recommended baseline reference dates are 2012 (start of 10YFP), start of relevant activity or programme. The first reporting year can also be used as a baseline. If not possible to establish a baseline and target, direction of change may be indicated in the narrative (e.g. higher is better).

The Mid-term Review will serve as a stocktaking exercise to assess feasibility of and further refine methodology on baselines and target setting at relevant levels (programme, sector, 10YFP, global levels, etc.)

ANNEX 3: TEMPLATE FOR THE METADATA OF THE 10YFP INDICATORS¹⁶

Indicator title, level and general definition
<i>Short name that constitutes a summary of the indicator and is easy to reference, level of the indicator (output, outcome or impact)¹⁷, and clear, brief description of the indicator.</i>
Goals and Targets addressed
<i>Relation to the 10YFP objectives and 13 Functions and linkages with other international processes, and associated indicators, especially SDG indicators.</i>
Definition and method of computation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Definition: Precise definition of the indicator, including references to standards and classifications, preferably relying on international agreed definitions. The indicator definition should be unambiguous and expressed in universally applicable terms. It must clearly express the unit of measurement (proportion, dollars, number of people, etc.).</i> - <i>Concepts: Precise definition of all different concepts and terms associated with the indicator, also including reference to any associated classifications.</i> - <i>Method of computation: Explanation of how the indicator is calculated, including any mathematical formulas and descriptive information of computations made on the source data to produce the indicator (including adjustments and weighting). This explanation should also highlight cases in which mixed sources are used or where the calculation has changed over the time (i.e., discontinuities in the series).</i>
Rational and interpretation
<i>Description of the purpose and rational behind the indicator, as well as examples and guidance on its correct interpretation and meaning.</i>
Disaggregation
<i>Specification of the dimensions and levels used for disaggregation of the indicator (e.g., income, sex, age group, geographic location, disability status, etc.)</i>
Baseline(s) and target(s)
<i>Baseline and target associated to the indicator if any, including associated timelines.</i>
Sources and data collection
<i>Description of all actual and recommended sources of data, as well of the methods used for data collection.</i>
Comments and limitations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Comments on the feasibility, suitability, relevance and limitations of the indicator.</i> - <i>The concept of comments and limitations also includes data comparability issues, presence of wide confidence intervals (such as for maternal mortality ratios); provides further details on additional non-official indicators commonly used together with the indicator.</i>
References
<i>A non-exhaustive list of useful references including on methodology and related data sources.</i>
Examples of sub indicators
<i>Non-exhaustive list of examples of sub indicators from the programmes.</i>

¹⁶ This template is based on the draft template for SDG indicators metadata as presented in [3rd-IAEG-SDGs-Draft-template-for-metadata](#).

¹⁷ As per [UNEP Programme Manual](#) (May 2013) these are defined as follows: **Output:** products and services which result from the completion of activities within an intervention. **Outcome:** intended or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs, usually requiring the collective effort of partners. Outcomes represent changes which occur between the completion of outputs and the achievement of impact. Outcomes could be a change in capacity (immediate outcome) or behaviour (medium-term outcome). **Impact:** positive and negative, primary and secondary, lasting and significant effects contributed to by an intervention. In UNEP, these effects usually concern the environment, and how it affects human life and livelihood.

ANNEX 4: METADATA SHEETS FOR THE 10YFP INDICATORS

1.1. SCP projects

Indicator title, level and general definition

1.1. SCP Projects – output - # of projects supporting the shift to SCP

Goals and Targets addressed

10YFP Objective

Objective 1 (output level): Support capacity building and facilitate access to financial and technical assistance.

Main associated SDG indicators

11.c.1 Proportion of financial support to the least developed countries that is allocated to the construction and retrofitting of sustainable, resilient and resource-efficient buildings utilizing local materials (tier III UN-Habitat)

12.a.1 Amount of support to developing countries on research and development for sustainable consumption and production and environmentally sound technologies (tier III UNEP/UNESCO/WB)

17.7.1 Total amount of approved funding for developing countries to promote the development, transfer, dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies (Tier III, UNEP/OECD)

7.b.1 Investments in energy efficiency as a percentage of GDP and the amount of foreign direct investment in financial transfer for infrastructure and technology to sustainable development services (Tier III, IEA)

Metadata: <http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/iaeg-sdgs/metadata-compilation/>

Definition and method of computation

Definition and concepts

- This indicator focuses on the number of projects initiated and completed under the 10YFP and beyond which are supporting the shift to SCP.
- A project is here defined as a “temporary endeavour undertaken to create a unique product, service or result”¹⁸. It should be composed of a “planned set of interrelated tasks to be executed over a fixed period and within certain cost and other limitations”¹⁹.
- Although projects vary depending on the nature of the resulting product, service or result supporting the shift to SCP, they should involve the implementation of more than one activity and have defined objectives, scope, client, budget, duration, deliverables and target group.
- An initiated project is defined as a project which has started (implementation is ongoing) and a completed project is defined as any finalized project.

Method of computation

- This indicator is calculated at relevant aggregation levels based on the information collected from the different reporting streams. In aggregating number reported, the Secretariat will be mindful of double counting similar projects reported under different reporting streams.
- Standalone activities such as the production of a communication brochure or the organisation of a meeting cannot be reported under this indicator. However, budget associated to such activities can be reported under indicator 1.2 on financing.
- Co-funding should be included in reported project budgets.
- Each project reported should in principle be filled as a separate entry. Umbrella projects can be reported as one single entry associated to the number of projects under the umbrella with supporting narrative providing detailed list of projects included.
- Reporting under this indicator is linked to reporting under indicator 1.2. on financing the shift to SCP

¹⁸ Project Management Institute: <https://www.pmi.org/about/learn-about-pmi/what-is-project-management>

¹⁹ Business Dictionary: <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/project.html>

- Outputs, outcomes and impacts of projects reported under this indicator should be reported under other relevant indicators of this framework.

Rational and interpretation

- This indicator allows monitoring of the number of projects supporting the shift to SCP. This provides an indication of the evolution of the scale of efforts to accelerate the shift towards SCP in both developed and developing countries.
- This can help to assess the success and relevance of the 10YFP in enhancing international cooperation and bringing together existing and new initiatives on SCP. It will provide insights in the evolution of interest and uptake of SCP issues.
- This indicator links to many other indicators in this framework. For instance, a project can be the outcome of some communication and outreach activity and can result in a policy instrument, a change in practice, etc. It can be associated to impacts such as energy efficiency gains, emissions reduction, reduction in material use, etc.

Disaggregation

projects supporting the shift to SCP and projects overall budget [US\$] (to be used in Indicator 1.2) disaggregated by:

- Title of project
- Stage of implementation: 1) on-going; 2) completed
- Project duration (start date/end date)
- Cross-cutting disaggregation categories outlined in Annex 2a.

Note: programmes and other reporting streams are encouraged to report as many outputs, outcomes and impacts of their activities and beyond as possible. The disaggregation categories above are indicative and some can be left empty when reporting on measures for which such data elements are not available.

Baseline(s) and target(s)

Proposed parameters for baselines and targets are defined in Annex 2a.

Sources and data collection

Data collection will be done in accordance with the 10 YFP M&E Process as described in section on “The reporting and monitoring Process: requirements, roles and timelines” of this framework.

Comments and limitations

- This indicator only measure the number of implemented projects supporting the shift to SCP. As such it does not provide any indication of the significance, size, quality, relevance, impacts and success of the project. Neither does it provide insights on equity, transparency, geographical and gender balance issues associated to the reported projects.
- In order to avoid the multiplication of projects without due consideration being given to usefulness, quality and relevance, appropriate consideration will be given to trends as well as narrative reporting and documentation submitted.
- Main issues regarding precision, reliability, attribution and double counting are addressed above. If you come across additional issues, please inform the Secretariat.

References

See general references in “indicator methodology introduction” section.

Examples of sub indicators

<u>SBC</u>	<u>SPP</u>	<u>STP</u>
2.5. # of demonstration projects	# of projects supported by partners	# of Trust Fund and Flagship projects
4.14. # of pilot interventions reducing GHG and other pollutants and strengthening resilience	# of projects (10YFP and 10YFP partners) supporting SPP policy development at national and regional levels	# of Branded initiatives contributing to STP objectives.
	# of SPP supporting projects implemented by partners	

1.2. Financing the shift to SCP

Indicator title, level and general definition

1.2. Financing the shift to SCP - Amount of financial resources (US\$) made available in support to the shift to SCP

Goals and Targets addressed

10YFP Objectives

Objective 1 (output level): Support capacity building and facilitate access to financial and technical assistance.

Main associated SDGs indicators

12.a.1 Amount of support to developing countries on research and development for sustainable consumption and production and environmentally sound technologies (tier III UNEP/UNESCO/WB)

17.7.1 Total amount of approved funding for developing countries to promote the development, transfer, dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies (tier III, UNEP/OECD)

7.b.1 Investments in energy efficiency as a percentage of GDP and the amount of foreign direct investment in financial transfer for infrastructure and technology to sustainable development services (Tier III, IEA)

11.c.1 Proportion of financial support to the least developed countries that is allocated to the construction and retrofitting of sustainable, resilient and resource-efficient buildings utilizing local materials (tier III UN-Habitat)

Definition and method of computation

Definition and concepts

- This indicator focuses on the amount of financial resources (in US\$) made available in support to the shift to SCP.
- Are considered financial resources supporting the shift to SCP, monetary or in-kind contribution of any amount spent on specific activities addressing SCP issues.
- Monetary contributions are amount of money that are not repayable. They mostly consist of grants of any amount and are measured in US\$ at the average annual exchange rate and in ratio.
- In-kind contributions refer to the provision of non-repayable goods, services and facilities, in the form of staff time, provision of or access to equipment, special material or other commodities. In-kind contributions are also measured in are measured in US\$ at the average annual exchange rate and in ratio based on average commercial prices of services provided applicable in a country or a region. E.g. In-kind staff is valued by the number of worked days or hours X market value of the man-day for such staff.
- financial resources sources can be governments, development cooperation agencies, international, regional or national financial institutions and any other giving entity.
- Only monetary contributions which have been spent Or already made in-kind contributions can be reported under this indicator.
- A financial resource or in-kind contribution is considered as spent once it has been fully used to produce the final outputs for which it was allocated.

Method of computation

- Amounts reported under this indicator can be lumped and reported at any appropriate level (overall programme budget, total donor grant, co-financing, country project level, etc.), but should be disaggregated following the categories presented above.
- Co-funding to trust fund projects and activities should be included under this indicator as well as any funding to programmes' portfolio beyond 10YFP trust fund resources.
- Reporting for this indicator is linked with reporting under indicator 1.1 as budgets of **completed** project should be included under this indicator.
- This indicator is calculated at relevant aggregation levels based on the information collected from the different reporting streams. When aggregating amounts, the Secretariat will be mindful of potential double counting issues. As reporting on this indicator is derived from reporting on budgets within all other indicators in the framework, to avoid double-counting the full project budget amounts captured under indicator 1.1 and budget expenditure as reported under other indicators will be analysed separately.

- Outputs, outcomes and impacts of financial resources reported under this indicator should be reported under other relevant indicators of this framework.

Rational and interpretation

- The shift to SCP requires the upscaling of dedicated resources. This indicator supports the monitoring of financial flows going to individual countries and more generally aims at capturing the evolution of the volume of funding made available to support the shift to SCP including through global activities. Monitoring financial resources to SCP shift can also help tracking progress of the donors’ level of interest and involvement in the SCP projects.
- This indicator links to many other indicators in this framework. For instance, a financial contribution can be the outcome of some communication and outreach activity and can result in a policy instrument, a change in practice, etc. It can be associated to impacts such as energy efficiency gains, emissions reduction, reduction in material use, etc.

Disaggregation

Value of in kind or monetary resources budgeted/spent in US dollars(US\$) disaggregated by:

- Cross-cutting disaggregation categories outlined in Annex 2a.

Note: programmes and other reporting streams are encouraged to report as many outputs, outcomes and impacts of their activities and beyond as possible. The disaggregation categories above are indicative and some can be left empty when reporting on measures for which such data elements are not available.

Baseline(s) and target(s)

Proposed parameters for baselines and targets are defined in Annex 2a.

On financial resources: During the 10YFP mid-term review and associated report session, establishing harmonised baselines and targets may help estimating the appropriate level of financial support for the objectives of the 10YFP programme to be fully met at the following given timeline (2021).

Sources and data collection

Data collection will be done in accordance with the 10 YFP M&E Process as described in section on “The reporting and monitoring Process: requirements, roles and timelines” of this framework.

Comments and limitations

- This indicator only measure the amount of financial resources made available in support to the shift to SCP. As such it does not provide any indication of the usefulness, quality, relevance, impacts and success of the activities funded. Neither does it provide insights on equity, transparency, geographical and gender balance issues associated to the resource allocation.
- In order to avoid reporting on non-relevant funds appropriate consideration will be given to trends as well as narrative reporting and documentation submitted.
- Main issues regarding precision, reliability, attribution and double counting are addressed above. If you come across additional issues, please inform the Secretariat.

References

See general references in “indicator methodology introduction” section.

Examples of sub indicators

<u>STP</u>	<u>SPP</u>
Amount of funds(US\$) made available through TF projects, Flagship projects, Branded initiatives	Total budget of SPP supporting projects implemented by partners
	Average budget of projects per partner

1.3. Training for SCP

Indicator title, level and general definition

1.3. Training for SCP - # person-days of training on SCP.

Goals and Targets addressed

10YFP objectives

Objective 1 (output level) of the 10YFP: Support capacity building and facilitate access to financial and technical assistance.

Main associated SDG indicators

It contributes to SDG 12: “Ensure sustainable consumption and productions patterns”

Definition and method of computation

Definition and concepts

- This indicator focuses on number of person-day of training for SCP.
- Training is defined as a learning activity for any number of participants involving: (1) a setting intended for transferring knowledge and skills that relate to specific competencies that will enable participants to contribute to the shift to SCP; (2) formally designated instructors, lead persons or dedicated networks for peer-to-peer learning; and (3) a defined/documentated curriculum, learning objectives and outcomes. Training can take the form of sponsored seminars, workshops, conferences, on-the-job learning experiences, observational study tours, or distance learning through webinars and online training courses, as well as other events or settings, of any duration, as long as they involve the three elements above.
- Meetings, such as consultations, decision making workshops, awareness raising events, that have educational value but do not have a defined curriculum or objectives are not considered to be training but rather fall under the definition of an outreach and communication activity (2.2.)

Method of computation

- One same meeting cannot be reported under both this indicator and indicator 2.2. related to outreach and communication.
- Only people who have completed the entire training course are counted for this indicator.
- Organizers should not be counted as attending the training.
- Outcomes of training related to another indicator (e.g., if training has resulted in a change in practices) should be reported under such other indicator.

Person day of training for each single event is calculated following this equation:

$$\text{Person day of training for event A} = (\text{number of participants who completed the training}) \times (\text{number of days of the specific training event})$$

One day of training = 6 hours of training

Total person days of training delivered under an activity should be calculated as follows:

$$\text{Person days of training for event A} + \text{Person days of training supported for event B} + \dots$$

- Counting procedures should be consistent throughout the life of the activity.
- This indicator is calculated at relevant aggregation levels based on the information collected from the different reporting streams. Secretariat, programmes and other users of this framework should be mindful of double counting one same training when aggregating reporting across different reporting streams or different reporting years.

Rational and interpretation

This indicator allows quantification of training activities across 10YFP activity streams and is used to gain insight on the number of people who may have increased competencies regarding SCP as a result of training activities.

Training is an important element in the 10YFP theory of change, because it can help raise awareness, generate knowledge and increase institutional ability for SCP action. Training may relate to development and implementation of policies, regulations and strategies, to practices and technologies that supports the shift toward SCP, or also to development of and application for finance.

Disaggregation

person-days of training and associated budget expenditure (in USD) if available disaggregated by:

- Title of training
- Days of training
- Number of participants
- Composition of participants (male/female)
- Audience of training: as per list of type of organisations in Annex 2a.
- Cross-cutting disaggregation categories outlined in Annex 2a.

Note: programmes and other reporting streams are encouraged to report as many outputs, outcomes and impacts of their activities and beyond as possible. The disaggregation categories above are indicative and some can be left empty when reporting on measures for which such data elements are not available.

Baseline(s) and target(s)

Proposed parameters for baselines and targets are defined in Annex 2a.

Sources and data collection

Data collection will be done in accordance with the 10 YFP M&E Process as described in section on “The reporting and monitoring Process: requirements, roles and timelines” of this framework.

Examples of data sources for this indicator include:

- Attendance sheets, training event agenda or curriculum with stated objective or expected competencies lists
- Evaluation (at the end of the training session)
- Follow up questionnaires (6 months - 1 year after training) to document impact of training

Comments and limitations

- This indicator addresses only the completion of training related to SCP. As such it does not provide any information on:
 - Whether training has led to action or changes in institutional or organizational capacity.
 - Effectiveness, quality, diversity or impact of the training and the depth of skills and knowledge conveyed and acquired.
- This indicator also groups together the training of persons across many different functional roles that vary in terms of their power/influence, and could mask gender and other disparities.
- Geographical and gender balance of training organizers.
- In order to avoid the multiplication of training hours and participants without due consideration being given to usefulness, quality and relevance, or at the expense of other activities, appropriate consideration will be given to trends as well as narrative reporting and documentation submitted.
- Main issues regarding precision, reliability, attribution and double counting are addressed above. If you come across additional issues, please inform the Secretariat.

References

See general references in “indicator methodology introduction” section.

Examples of sub indicators

<u>STP</u>	<u>CI-SCP</u>	<u>SPP</u>
# of participants to STP trainings	# of participants to capacity building activities and degree of increased understanding of consumer information for SCP issues	# of SPP trainings organized by 10YFP on SPP Partners; # of trainees trained

2.1. SCP network

Indicator title, level and general definition

2.1. SCP network - # of governments and other organisations engaged in the 10YFP and its programmes

Goals and Targets addressed

10 YFP objectives

Objective 2 (output level): Enable all stakeholders to share information and knowledge on SCP

Definition and method of computation

Definition and concepts

- This SCP network indicator allows quantification of the number of stakeholders, i.e. governments and organisations, engaged in the 10YFP and its programmes. Governments and organisations can be engaged in the 10YFP in different capacities including as:
 - 1) Programme Lead(s) and Co-Leads: they are governments and organisations that support the overall coordination, implementation, fundraising activities, and monitoring of the programme, and will provide the resources needed to create and sustain its “Coordination Desk”.
 - 2) Coordination Desk members: these governments and organisations act as the interface between the programme and the 10YFP Secretariat, the Lead and Co-Leads, MAC members and Partners. The Coordination Desk implements the decisions of the Lead and Co-Leads and MAC members and ensures the coordinated promotion, implementation and expansion of the programme.
 - 3) MAC members: they are governments and organisations which act together as a forum for consultation, advice and support to the Lead, Co-Leads and Coordination Desk for the implementation of the programme.
 - 4) Official Partners: they are government and organisations committed to the objectives of the programme and to be part of an implementing “community of practice”. In general, any stakeholder supporting implementation and/or benefiting from the activities of the programme could be a partner of a programme.
 - 5) Contributors: they are governments and organisations which, for administrative or other reasons, cannot follow the official process to get partner status but are committed to the objectives of the programme and to be part of an implementing “community of practice” in a remarkable way. They also include committed institutions which are involved in specific programme activities, e.g. in project implementation, but do not wish to follow partner affiliation process or extend support to programme activities beyond the specific activity in which they are involved. This type of contributors are identified at discretion of the Coordination Desk.
- A government refers to any of the national or sub-national governing institutions of a country.
- An organisation is defined as any intergovernmental, non-governmental, academic, media, civil society, private sector entity.

Method of computation:

- Each governing institution from one same country involved in the 10YFP should be accounted for separately.
- One same governmental organisation or organisation, even if involved in different capacities or in different activities under the 10YFP, should only be counted once under each reporting stream and when aggregating across reporting streams or reporting periods. Type of engagement of an institution can be updated on a yearly basis as needed.
- This indicator is calculated at relevant aggregation levels based on the information collected from the different reporting streams –i.e. this indicator is captured at 10YFP organisational group level: at programme level, National focal point level, interagency level, etc. Secretariat, programmes and other users of this framework should be mindful of double counting one same organisation when aggregating reporting across different reporting streams or different reporting years.

Rational and interpretation

The 10YFP is a global framework of action to enhance international cooperation to accelerate the shift towards SCP in both developed and developing countries. The more governments and organisation involved in the 10YFP the more important

networking possibilities among countries and all stakeholders on SCP. As such, this indicator aims at measuring the evolution of the volume of organisations engaged in the 10YFP both at programme level and at focal point level.

Disaggregation

of entities engaged in the 10YFP and its programmes disaggregated by:

- Organisations names
- Type of organisation: cf. Annex 2a
- Country: cf. Annex 2a
- Region: cf. Annex 2a
- Reporting stream: cf. Annex 2a

Note: programmes and other reporting streams are encouraged to report as many outputs, outcomes and impacts of their activities and beyond as possible. The disaggregation categories above are indicative and some can be left empty when reporting on organisations for which such data elements are not available.

Baseline(s) and target(s)

Proposed parameters for baselines and targets are defined in Annex 2a.

For the SCP network: baselines can be established at zero at the start of the implementation of the 10YFP and of each programme. As a defined number of organisations might not make sense to establish as a target, an upward trend in rate of increase could be used as indication of progress under this indicator.

Sources and data collection

The programmes will report on the programme level and the 10YFP Secretariat on the focal point level since the focal points are common to all programmes. Other details on data collection can be found in section on “The reporting and monitoring Process: requirements, roles and timelines” of this framework

Examples of data sources for this indicator include:

- Application forms to become member of the network as Lead, Co-Lead, MAC and Partners.
- Registry and other documentation of Contributors at the discretion of the coordination desks.
- Directory of NFP, SFP and IACG members.

Comments and limitations

The SCP networks does not measure the level of activity of the network actors but only their formal engagement as members of the network. Therefore, in order to come to conclusions on the “dynamism” of the network, the information would have to be looked in combination to the other output indicators that capture activities undertaken and participants as well as with the narratives.

References

UNEP (2010). *ABC of SCP: Clarifying Concepts on Sustainable Consumption and Production*.

UNEP (2015). *Sustainable Consumption and Production Indicators for the Future SDGs*.

UNEP (2014). *Guidance document on programme development and implementation for the Ten-Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production (10YFP): Criteria, structure and steps to develop and operationalize them*.

UNWTO (2015). *10YFP Sustainable Tourism Programme (STP): Operational Terms of Reference*.

See other general references in “indicator methodology introduction” section.

Examples of sub indicators

2.2. Outreach and communication for SCP

Indicator title, level and general definition
2.2. Outreach and communication for SCP - # of outreach and communication activities focusing on SCP issues and # of recipients
Goals and Targets addressed
<u>10 YFP objectives</u>
<u>Objective 2</u> (output level): Enable all stakeholders to share information and knowledge on SCP
Definition and method of computation
<p><u>Definition and concepts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This indicator focuses on the number of outreach and communication activities having for main focus SCP issues and the number of recipients of these activities. - An outreach and communication activity having for main focus SCP is defined as any activity with a communication or outreach purpose, directed to a specific audience, and addressing SCP relevant topics. Such activity can be associated to different objectives from sharing, collecting, disseminating information to supporting decision making. - Such activity can take the form of an event or formal interaction such as: a high level sponsored event, committee's meeting, regional / national forum, conference, consultation, presentation, briefing, press conference, site visit etc. - It can also take the form of spreading a message through printing /electronic media (magazine, newsletter, radio), and social media including blog. - Outreach and communication activities are different from knowledge and technical tools production. - Outreach and communication activities for SCP are related, but are not the same. Outreach activities are meant to engage a large audience and to bring knowledge and expertise on a particular topic to the general public. Outreach activities can take several forms, such as school presentations, workshops, public talks, conferences, social media, etc. The objective of outreach is to explain and promote the benefits of tools, studies, research, and other knowledge of SCP to a larger public. Outreach implies an interaction between the sender and the receiver of the message, there is an engagement and a two-way communication between the researcher and the public. Communication, on the other hand, only goes in one direction from the sender to the receiver. Communication refers to pieces of information or documents through articles in mainstream newspapers and magazines, or on TV and radio channels. <p><u>Method of computation:</u></p> <p>Knowledge products and tools reported under indicator 2.3. cannot be reported under this indicator.</p> <p>This indicator is calculated at relevant aggregation levels based on the information collected from the different reporting streams. Secretariat, programmes and other users of this framework should be mindful of double counting one same outreach and communication activity when aggregating reporting across different reporting streams or different reporting years.</p>
Rational and interpretation
<p>This indicator focuses on activities with communication or outreach objectives and aims at capturing the evolution in the number of such activities and in the volume of associated recipients, with justification of the relevance of the targeted public provided in the narrative. An increase in the number of activities and of recipients can be interpreted as an increase in SCP information dissemination and can help monitor the evolution of the levels of awareness on SCP issues.</p> <p>While outreach and communication for SCP is an output, outcomes of this indicator can be captured under indicators (3.1.) SCP in policy instruments, (3.3.) Education on SCP, (3.4.) SCP changes in practices, (3.5.) SCP Commitments, (3.6.) Coordination on SCP, (3.7.) Use of SCP knowledge and technical tools.</p>
Disaggregation

of outreach and communication activities having for main focus SCP issues and # of recipients and associated budget expenditure (in USD) if available, disaggregated by:

- Title of outreach and communication activity
- Type of outreach and communication activity: 10YFP conference; Communication campaign; Communication event (side event, press conference, etc.); Communication material (brochure, film, etc.); Decision making/policy consultation meeting; Newsletter; Social media activity
- Target audience: 10YFP partners; business and industry; civil society (including NGOs); consumers, donors; government; internal (own colleagues); international and regional organizations; local authorities; scientific and technological community.
- Number of recipients
- Cross-cutting disaggregation categories outlined in Annex 2a.

Note: programmes and other reporting streams are encouraged to report as many outputs, outcomes and impacts of their activities and beyond as possible. The disaggregation categories above are indicative and some can be left empty when reporting on measures for which such data elements are not available.

Baseline(s) and target(s)

Proposed parameters for baselines and targets are defined in Annex 2a.

Sources and data collection

Data collection will be done in accordance with the 10 YFP M&E Process as described in section on “The reporting and monitoring Process: requirements, roles and timelines” of this framework.

Examples of data sources for this indicator include: Participants lists, agendas, and any other relevant associated documents.

Comments and limitations

This indicator only provides as indication of the number of outreach and communication activities and number of recipients of those activities. It does not provide any information on the quality and success of the activity, or on the relevance of the balance. Neither does it provide any insight on social dimension (geographical, gender balance, etc.)

To avoid the multiplication of outreach activities without due consideration being given to usefulness, quality and relevance or at the expense of other activities, appropriate consideration will be given to trends as well as narrative reporting and documentation submitted.

Main issues regarding precision, reliability, attribution and double counting are addressed above. If you come across additional issues, please inform the Secretariat.

References

See general references in “indicator methodology introduction” section.

Examples of sub indicators

<u>CI-SCP</u>	<u>SLE</u>	<u>SFS</u>	<u>STP</u>	<u>SPP</u>
# of events on promoting the Guidelines # of stakeholders brought together for reviewing the Guidelines	# of events on SLE	# of multi-stakeholder roundtables on sustainable food systems # of SFS collaborations and stakeholders brought together	# of events on STP; # of participants at events	# of events promoting the SPP Programme work and results # of events (including in-person and virtual) organized by the 10YFP SPP or its partners

2.3. Production of SCP knowledge and technical tools

Indicator title, level and general definition

2.3. Production of SCP knowledge and technical tools - # SCP knowledge resources and technical tools produced

Goals and Targets addressed

10YFP objectives

Objective 2 (output level): Enable all stakeholders to share information and knowledge on SCP

Main associated SDG indicators

In addition to SDGs 12, this indicator reflects the following cross-cutting goals of SDGs 17;

17.6 Enhance North-South, South-South and triangular regional and international cooperation on and access to science, technology and innovation and enhance knowledge sharing on mutually agreed terms, including through improved coordination among existing mechanisms, in particular at the United Nations level, and through a global technology facilitation mechanism;

17.16 Enhance the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development, complemented by multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals in all countries, in particular developing countries;

Definition and method of computation

Definition and concepts

- This indicator focuses on SCP knowledge resources and technical tools developed, supported or validated by the co-leads, MAC member or partners of the 10YFP, or developed by any other parties outside of the 10YFP. Unit of measurement is number of documents/tools.
- “SCP knowledge and technical tools” refers to resources that provide insights, scientific conclusions, frameworks, guidance; or resources that can foster or facilitate decision-making and that are scoped to promote the shift towards SCP, based on scientific research and/or empirical evidence. This may include scientific articles, policy briefs, reports, guidelines, manuals, media products, software, tools and educational materials, and may include any format whether digital or physical.

Method of computation:

- Any knowledge resource or technical tool reported under this indicator, cannot be reported under indicator 2.2., 3.4. or 3.5. related to communication and outreach, changes in practices and commitments. To illustrate, a science report is counted as one product under this indicator, while an associated press article is counted as one “outreach and communication activities.”
- An executive summary or annexes which consist of a part of full document should not be counted separately.
- Reporting under this indicator is linked to reporting on indicator 3.7. on use of SCP knowledge and technical tools.
- This indicator is calculated at relevant aggregation levels based on the information collected from the different reporting streams. Secretariat, programmes and other users of this framework should be mindful of double counting one same resource or tool when aggregating reporting across different reporting streams or different reporting years.

Rationale and interpretation

- This indicator focuses on activities with knowledge and technical tools production objectives and aims at capturing the evolution of the effort to advance SCP relevant science and knowledge. Production of scientific and policy knowledge and technical tools based on scientific research and empirical evidences will be necessary to support the countries and other stakeholders for the shift towards SCP.
- The production of knowledge and tools has synergies with other outputs including 1.1 SCP Projects, 1.3 Training for SCP and 2.2 Outreach and communication for SCP, through the use of products for project implementation, training and dissemination, as well as feedback from implementation of concrete projects and trainings to the knowledge products.
- The documents and tools monitored with this indicator will demonstrate quantity and quality of concrete knowledge products from the 10YFP and other activities related to SCP. The produced knowledge and tools will contribute to all the outcomes (3.1 to 3.7) by providing innovative ideas, best practices, recommendations, guidelines and evidences to the

relevant stakeholders. Particularly, the use of SCP knowledge and technical tools will be measured by indicator 3.7 “Use of SCP knowledge and technical tools.”

Disaggregation

of knowledge resources and tools and associated budget expenditure (in USD) if available, disaggregated by:

- Title of resource
- Type of resource: Educational material; Fact sheet/brief/commentary; Guidelines; Journal article; Manual; Policy brief; Report; Technical tool
- Quantification of use: number of users; methodology; occasions of use; number of downloads in the SCP Clearinghouse
- Cross-cutting disaggregation categories outlined in Annex 2a.

Note: programmes and other reporting streams are encouraged to report as many outputs, outcomes and impacts of their activities and beyond as possible. The disaggregation categories above are indicative and some can be left empty when reporting on measures for which such data elements are not available.

Baseline(s) and target(s)

Proposed parameters for baselines and targets are defined in Annex 2a.

Sources and data collection

Data collection will be done in accordance with the 10 YFP M&E Process as described in section on “The reporting and monitoring Process: requirements, roles and timelines” of this framework.

Comments and limitations

- This indicator addresses only the production of knowledge and technical tools related to SCP. It does not:
 - allow insight on their quality and credibility, including methodological rigor, or accuracy, relevance, comprehensiveness and usefulness of content.
 - address whether the knowledge/tool was produced in a transparent and impartial manner or the independency of its authors.
 - capture gender and geographical balance among authors and institutions involved or the engagement of all relevant stakeholder in its production.
 - enable an estimate of its impact and/or dissemination and whether the new knowledge/tool reached the right audience and translated into action.
- To avoid the multiplication of knowledge resources and tools without due consideration being given to usefulness, quality and relevance, or at the expense of other activities, appropriate consideration will be given to trends as well as narrative reporting and documentation submitted.
- Main issues regarding precision, reliability, attribution and double counting are addressed above. If you come across additional issues, please inform the Secretariat.

References

See general references in “indicator methodology introduction” section.

Examples of sub indicators

<u>SPP</u>	<u>SBC</u>	<u>STP</u>	<u>SFS</u>
# of reports produced by the 10YFP on SPP and its partners or in the framework of the 10YFP on SPP	2.6. # of tools and methodologies for sustainable housing projects identified and shared	# of knowledge resources produced on STP	# of SFS publications and media-related articles published
# of SPP-related case studies developed/collected			
# of reports proposing solutions to overcome barriers to SPP and # of downloads of these reports			

3.1. Policy instruments for SCP

Indicator title, level and general definition

3.1. Policy instruments for SCP- # of governments and other organisations developing, adopting, or implementing (or in process of) policy instruments aimed at supporting the shift to SCP.

Goals and Targets addressed

10YFP Objectives

Objective 3 of the 10YFP (outcome level): Accelerate the shift towards SCP, supporting regional and national policies and initiatives.

Main Associated SDG indicators

12.1.1 # of countries with sustainable consumption and production (SCP) national action plans or SCP mainstreamed as a priority or a target into national policies (Tier III, UNEP DTIE)

12.7.1 # of countries implementing sustainable public procurement policies and action plans (Tier III UNEP DTIE)

12.b.1 # of sustainable tourism strategies or policies and implemented action plans with agreed monitoring and evaluation tools (Tier III UNWTO UNEP)

12.8.1 # Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development (including climate change education) are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies; (b) curricula; (c) teacher education; and (d) student Assessment (Tier III, UNESCO)

13.2.1 # Number of countries that have communicated the establishment or operationalization of an integrated policy/strategy/plan which increases their ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change, and foster climate resilience and low greenhouse gas emissions development in a manner that does not threaten food production (including a national adaptation plan, nationally determined contribution, national communication, biennial update report or other) (Tier III, UNFCCC)

14.c.1 # Number of countries making progress in ratifying, accepting and implementing through legal, policy and institutional frameworks, ocean-related instruments that implement international law, as reflected in the United Nation Convention on the Law of the Sea, for the conservation and sustainable use of the oceans and their resources (Tier III, UN-DOALOS and others)

14.6.1 # Progress by countries in the degree of implementation of international instruments aiming to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (Tier III, FAO)

15.8.1 # Proportion of countries adopting relevant national legislation and adequately resourcing the prevention or control of invasive alien species (Tier III, IUCN)

Considering that the development, adoption and implementation of policy instruments integrating SCP are creating the enabling environment for sustainable development, there are potentially many more associated SDGs, targets and indicators.

Definition and method of computation

Definition and concepts

- This indicator allows for the quantification (#) and monitoring of governments and organisations making progress along the policy cycle of binding and non-binding policy instruments aimed at supporting SCP.
- “Policy”: Although quite flexible and contexts specific, a policy is usually defined as a course of action that has been officially agreed by an entity or an organization (governmental or non-governmental) and is effectively implemented to achieve specific objectives.
- “Policy instruments for SCP”: Policy instruments refer to the means – methodologies, measures or interventions – that are used to achieve those objectives. In the case of SCP, such instruments are designed and implemented to reduce the environmental impacts of consumption and production patterns, with a view of generating economic and/or social benefits.
- Policy instruments are distinguished in legally binding policies and non-legally binding ones.
- Legally binding: a legally binding policy instrument refers to a system of rules, procedures and/or principles which are prescribed and enforced by a governing authority with the aim of requiring or preventing specific actions or providing

incentives that lead to change in actions or preferences. It includes: laws, regulations, standards, by-laws, codes, etc. They can relate to different types of jurisdictions such as a ministry, state, municipality, or group of states.

- Non-binding: a non-binding policy instrument refers to a coherent set of decisions associated to a common vision, objective and/or direction, and to a proposed course of action to achieve these. It includes, for instance: action plans, policies, strategies, programmes, and projects. They can fall under the responsibility of different types of organisation (ministry, company, international organisation, NGO, etc.) and have different scopes of application (international, national, local, etc.).
- Different categories of policies can be distinguished:
 - o Macro policies (e.g. national strategies/action plans, new institutions/entities)
 - o Regulatory and legal policies (e.g. laws, standards, enforcement measures)
 - o Economic and fiscal policies (taxes and tax incentives, grants, preferential loans, etc.)
 - o Voluntary and self-regulation schemes (e.g. sectoral partnerships, codes of conduct, CSR initiatives)
- “Policy cycle”: this political science concept is widely used to analyse and inform public policy-making processes, but can be transposed to any recurrent pattern leading to the implementation of a policy or policy instrument, either led by governmental or non-governmental entities. The following approach with regards to the various stages of the policy cycle is adopted:
 - o **Policy development**, including Agenda setting (e.g. the problem identified is high enough on the public agenda that action becomes likely) and Policy design (e.g. setting objectives, identifying costs-benefits of potential policy instruments and selecting);
 - o **Policy adopted or officially launched** (e.g. adopting or authorizing the preferred policy options through the legislative process and refined through the bureaucratic process);
 - o **Policy under implementation through specific actions** (e.g. translating policy into concrete action and policy instruments); results and impacts are being monitored;
 - o **Policy and related action plan has reached its end date and has been evaluated.**
- Entities making progress in developing, adopting, or implementing policy instruments aimed at supporting the shift to SCP can be of different types, e.g. ministry, company, international organization, NGO, etc. and have different geographical scopes (international, national, local)

Method of computation

- To be reported under this indicator, a government or organisation should have moved through one or more new stage(s) of the “Policy cycle” on one or more policy instrument(s) during the current reporting period.
- As per definition above, and although they can be linked, a policy instrument is not the same thing as a change in practice (indicator 3.4.), a commitment (3.5.), a coordination (3.6.), monitoring and reporting mechanism (3.2.), or a knowledge resource or tool (2.3.). For instance, monitoring frameworks do not have the status of policy instruments but are rather used to monitor implementation of these. New monitoring or assessment of a policy can be considered as progress along the policy cycle and be reported as such. This indicator is calculated at relevant aggregation levels based on the information collected from the different reporting streams. Secretariat, programmes and other users of this framework should be mindful of double counting one same organisation when aggregating reporting across different reporting streams or different reporting years.

Rational and interpretation

- Mainstreaming SCP in decision-making at all levels is a core function of the 10YFP. As per the mandate of the 10YFP, it should also “support the integration of sustainable consumption and production into sustainable development policies, programmes and strategies, as appropriate, including, where applicable, into poverty reduction strategies”. The purpose of the indicator is to help assess the volume and geographical repartition of organisations progressing on SCP, including those supported by 10YFP, and to monitor the evolution of such volume over time. This should support evaluation of how much / how fast governments and non-state actors progress in the development and application of policies integrating SCP, at cross-cutting and sectoral levels, under the influence of the 10YFP and, to the extent that is possible, beyond.
- Binding policies (laws and regulations) are essential to the shift towards SCP across and within sectors, as they provide the legal ground for SCP and can be used for enforcement or to provide incentives. The ability to develop, pass and

implement legislation is an indication of jurisdictions’ engagement in the shift towards SCP. This indicator can also help monitor the evolution of the global SCP legislative landscape.

- Non-binding policies are essential in ensuring institutional engagement, commitment and ownership. In some cases, such non-binding policies can lead to the creation of new legal ones. The development and implementation of non-binding policies across sectors also provides information on engagement of partners and other stakeholders in SCP and can help monitor the evolution of the global SCP policy landscape.
- Progress of organisation on policies supporting the shift to SCP can be the outcome of many other outputs reported under other indicators of this framework such as trainings, knowledge resources and tools, etc.

Disaggregation

of governments and other organisations developing, adopting, or implementing policy instruments to support the shift to SCP and associated budget expenditure (in US\$) if available, disaggregated by:

- Title of policy
- Type of policy: Macro-policy; regulatory and legal; economic and fiscal; voluntary and self-regulation schemes
- System of rules: legally binding; non-legally binding
- Policy cycle: Under development (initial stage); just adopted; under implementation through specific actions; has reached its end date and has been evaluated.
- Year of adoption
- Cross-cutting disaggregation categories outlined in Annex 2a.

Note: programmes and other reporting streams are encouraged to report as many outputs, outcomes and impacts of their activities and beyond as possible. The disaggregation categories above are indicative and some can be left empty when reporting on measures for which such data elements are not available.

Baseline(s) and target(s)

Proposed parameters for baselines and targets are defined in Annex 2a.

For government and organisation progress on SCP policy: There is to date no global baseline available on number of governments and organisations working on SCP policies developed and implemented by governments. The first Global Report on National SCP Policies and Initiatives, currently under development, could serve as a baseline, although it won’t be exhaustive. Scoping studies have also been conducted at regional and national levels (e.g. SWITCH projects in Asia / Pacific; EEA survey on resource efficiency policies) and could support baseline setting exercises. The baseline of reference could be based on the status of SCP policies before the 10YFP was adopted (prior to 2012), which would allow for a first assessment of how much progress has been made since then and under the influence of the 10YFP.

Sources and data collection

Data collection will be done in accordance with the 10 YFP M&E Process as described in section on “The reporting and monitoring Process: requirements, roles and timelines” of this framework.

Examples of data sources for this indicator include:

- Reports of the 10YFP programmes. For instance, based on a survey sent to all the actors of the programmes (leads, MAC members and partners). The reports of the 10YFP programmes could list the number of policies integrating SCP, led by either governmental or non-governmental entities, developed, adapted or implemented by or with the financial / technical support of their actors (direct and indirect).
- The 10YFP Global Survey on National SCP Policies and Initiatives and official country reporting on SDG 12.1, conducted by the 10YFP Secretariat with the 10YFP National Focal Points

Comments and limitations

The indicator does not provide any information on instruments’ usefulness and quality (including from a social perspective) and whether they were well-designed or effective and if a proper background analysis had been conducted, the quality of implementation, level of enforcement, and its effects. These aspects will have to be looked at through narrative reports / qualitative analysis.

Establishing baselines and targets can be time and resource intensive and depends on the willingness of partners and actors – including the 10YFP National Focal Points - to communicate necessary information.

Main issues regarding precision, reliability, attribution and double counting are addressed above. If you come across additional issues, please inform the Secretariat.

References

- 10YFP Secretariat’s inventory of SCP National Action Plans and other strategies integrating SCP
- Methodological note and questionnaire of the 10YFP Global Survey on National SCP Policies and Initiatives
- Metadata sheet on SDG 12.1
- UNEP Live (Natural Resources: DMC, Energy, GHG, Water Footprint) <http://uneplive.unep.org>
- Global Outlook on SCP, UNEP, 2011
- Capacity-building and policy needs assessment for SCP developed by SWITCH Asia <http://www.switch-asia.eu/policy-support-components/rpsc/policy-assessment>
- See general references in “indicator methodology introduction” section.

Examples of sub indicators

<u>SPP</u>	<u>SBC</u>	<u>CI-SCP</u>	<u>SFS</u>	<u>SLE</u>
<p># of national and local public institutions, partners of the SPP 10YFP or working with partners of the SPP 10YFP, which have or are engaged in designing a policy and legal frameworks favouring SPP implementation</p> <p># of national and local public institutions, partners of the SPP 10YFP or working with partners of the SPP 10YFP, which are progressing in embedding SPP in their operations (existing SPP procedures, training, tools and guidelines, monitoring of SPP, etc.)</p>	<p># of governments adopting and applying policies promoting SBC</p>	<p># of [...] with adopted plans or strategies on consumer information tools</p>	<p># of [...] have included sustainability considerations in their national dietary guidelines</p>	<p># of [...] developing, adopting, or implementing policy instruments integrating sustainable lifestyle considerations</p> <p>integrating SLE considerations</p> <p># of [...] developing, adopting, or implementing policy instruments integrating education for sustainable lifestyle considerations</p>

3.2. SCP monitoring and reporting

Indicator title, level and general definition

3.2. SCP monitoring and reporting - # of governments and other organisations officially establishing monitoring and reporting on SCP.

Goals and Targets addressed

10YFP Objective

Objective 3 (outcome level): Accelerate the shift towards SCP, supporting regional and national policies and initiatives.

Main associated SDG indicators

12.4.1 # of parties to international multilateral environmental agreements on hazardous waste, and other chemicals that meet their commitments and obligations in transmitting information as required by each relevant agreement (Tier I, UNEP)

12.6.1 # of companies publishing sustainability reports (Tier III, UNEP/GRI)

12.b.1 # of sustainable tourism strategies or policies and implemented action plans with agreed monitoring and evaluation tools (Tier III UNWTO UNEP)

17.16.1 # of countries reporting progress in multi-stakeholder development of effectiveness monitoring frameworks that support the achievement of the sustainable development goals (Tier II, OECD)

Definition and method of computation

Definition and concepts

This indicator focuses on the number of governments and other organisations officially establishing or improving monitoring and reporting instruments to track progress on SCP.

Monitoring and reporting instruments for SCP refer here to any voluntary or mandatory monitoring and reporting scheme that is being used by a government or organisation to regularly measure and assess performance, results and impacts of defined activities against an agreed set of criteria in support to SCP objectives.

These schemes can take various forms from annual sustainability reports published by companies, to certification systems, to full accounting systems used by governments (composed of frameworks of indicators and associated targets, monitoring and reporting guidelines, principles, etc.). For the last decade, a large range of monitoring and reporting instruments has been developed from distinct fields of applications which can be exclusive to specific reporting (e.g. by sector, by product, by company, by issue, etc.), to multiple fields application which target corporate or government uses at a global level (see Source and data collection below).

Method of computation

To be reported under this indicator, a government or organisation should have established a new monitoring and reporting instrument (or amended an existing one) supporting the tracking of progress toward the shift to SCP within the current reporting period.

Monitoring and reporting instruments do not have the status of policy or coordination instruments but are rather used to monitor implementation of these. Hence, although they can be linked, progress reported under this indicator cannot be similar to those reported under indicators (3.1.) on SCP in policy instruments and (3.6.) on coordination on SCP.

This indicator is calculated at relevant aggregation levels based on the information collected from the different reporting streams. Secretariat, programmes and other users of this framework should be mindful of double counting one same organisation when aggregating reporting across different reporting streams or different reporting years.

Rationale and interpretation

This indicator enables measurement of the number of organisation having made progress on SCP monitoring and reporting over the past year, over multiple years, as well as comparison of such numbers across different years and identification of associated trends, including regarding on those coordination mechanisms supported by 10YFP.

This can help monitor trends in the utilisation of monitoring and reporting frameworks integrating SCP. It can also help the identification of gaps and needs as well as best practices in SCP monitoring and reporting standards that would encourage governments and organisations to integrate sustainability information into their reporting cycle.

Progress of a government or organisation in monitoring and reporting on SCP can be an outcome of training (1.1.) communication and outreach activities (2.2.) as well as other outputs under this framework and can result in improved monitoring of impact indicators.

Disaggregation

of governments and other organisations officially establishing monitoring and reporting on SCP and associated budget expenditure (US\$) if available, disaggregated by:

- Title of monitoring and reporting instrument
- Type of monitoring and reporting instruments: Single indicator; Existing monitoring and reporting framework; ad hoc frameworks; sustainability reports; other
- Cross-cutting disaggregation categories outlined in Annex 2a.

Note: programmes and other reporting streams are encouraged to report as many outputs, outcomes and impacts of their activities and beyond as possible. The disaggregation categories above are indicative and some can be left empty when reporting on measures for which such data elements are not available.

Baseline(s) and target(s)

Proposed parameters for baselines and targets are defined in Annex 2a.

Sources and data collection

Data collection will be done in accordance with the 10 YFP M&E Process as described in section on “The reporting and monitoring Process: requirements, roles and timelines” of this framework.

On monitoring and reporting instruments: Well established frameworks and standards have been developed across the world: 400 (383) sustainability reporting instruments exist today in 64 countries²⁰. The GRI guidelines²¹ are currently seen as best practice for governments and organisations voluntary reporting. To date, GRI guidelines have been used by thousand organisations from 90 countries, the majority of which are large companies. Other voluntary initiatives exist nationally or internationally, which include the International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC), the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB), the Accountability 1000 (A1000); the Balanced Scorecard; the ISO 26000 CSR standard, etc.; and more specific tools such as the Greenhouse Gas protocol Initiative of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development or the ISO 14001 for example.

So far, governments are the “most common issuers of sustainability reporting instruments” and the majority of the governmental initiatives have been undertaken by departments for the environment. Companies are the “second most active issuers of sustainability reporting instruments”²². An area of concern is the slow uptake of sustainability reporting amongst small and medium sized enterprise due to internal and external barriers to change, such as the lack of human and financial resources and the lack of pressure from customers.

Increasing numbers of NGOs and charities are voluntarily deciding to report their own social and environmental information because they have become aware of how important it is to be “practising what [they] preach” (WWF, UK environmental Report, 2003-2004) and to demonstrate it publicly. However, little data exists in relation to the number of reporting organisations from this area of industry.

Comments and limitations

This indicator only measures the number of government and organisation making progress on monitoring and reporting in support to SCP. As such it does not enable assessment of the quality, usability or relevant of the monitoring and reporting instruments and of progress made on these. Hence appropriate considerations will be given to trends as well as narrative reporting and documentation submitted.

Today, many drivers motivate governments and organisations to increase their transparency to the public. This increasing trend of information availability can be a result of community rights to information, cost effectiveness, legal obligations, pressures from stakeholders and donors, etc. According to Global Reporting Initiative (GRI, 2012), “stock exchanges,

²⁰ Carrots Sticks Global trends in sustainability reporting regulation and policy. UNEP/GRI/KPMG. 2016

²¹ The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) is a large multi-stakeholder network created in 1997 whose aim is to develop globally applicable sustainability reporting guidelines

²² idem

governments and other organisations are recognising the value of integrating sustainability into core strategy and business practice, and are adjusting their reporting accordingly”.

Still, monitoring and reporting on sustainable performances is not a common practice. In addition, the structure and content of sustainability information reported can entail different forms and quality. Also the overabundance of guidance can be seen to reduce the credibility of reporting schemes and does not favour the overall comparability of performance of sustainability reporting (European Commission, 2001).

Main issues regarding precision, reliability, attribution and double counting are addressed above. If you come across additional issues, please inform the Secretariat.

References

- Sustainable Consumption and Production Indicators for the Future SDGs. March 2015. UNEP Discussion paper.
- ABC of SCP. Clarifying Concepts on Sustainable Consumption and Production. 2012.
- Demonstrating Impacts of Activities Process, Framework and Methodology. December 2015. CCAC
- Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals. Report of the Secretary-General. July 2015-July 2016. Economic and Social Council
- Public sector sustainability reporting: Remove the clutter, reduce the burden. GRI 2012.
- The Future of Sustainability Reporting. Paul Hohnen. Chatham House. January 2012
- Carrots Sticks Global trends in sustainability reporting regulation and policy. UNEP/GRI/KPMG. 2016
- <http://effectivecooperation.org/monitoring-country-progress/explore-monitoring-data/>
- <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/handbook/me-handbook.pdf>
- <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/>
- <http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/database/>
- www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/wesp/wesp_current/2014wesp_country_classification.pdf
- <http://database.globalreporting.org/>

Examples of sub indicators

<u>SFS</u>	<u>STP</u>	<u>SPP</u>	<u>SLE</u>
# of [...] using indicators measuring food losses and waste (including though use of Food Loss & Waste Protocol and UNEP/FAO/WRAP methodology) (potential external source: national food or agriculture ministries)	# of STP actors using indicators for SCP monitoring	# of countries with systems to monitor SPP implementation/# of countries adopting the monitoring system to be proposed by the SPP programme # of governments, cities, IGOs, large companies and NGOs with an established and functional SPP or SP monitoring framework	# of [...] officially using indicators for sustainable lifestyle monitoring and collecting associated data # of [...] officially using indicators for education for sustainable lifestyle monitoring and collecting associated data

3.3. Education on SCP

Indicator title, level and general definition

3.3. Education on SCP - # of countries integrating SCP topics in education practices

Goals and Targets addressed

10YFP Objective

Objective 3 (outcome level): Accelerate the shift towards SCP, supporting regional and national policies and initiatives

Main associated SDG indicators:

12.8.1/4.7.1. Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development (including climate change education) are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies; (b) curricula; (c) teacher education; and (d) student assessment (Tier III UNESCO/UNEP)

13.3.1 Number of countries that have integrated mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula (Tier III, UNESCO, UNEP)

Definition and method of computation

Definition and concepts

This indicator measures the # of national governments integrating (or further integrating) SCP topics in formal education including into (a) curricula (pre-primary, primary, secondary and tertiary levels including higher education vocational training); and (b) teacher education.

Such integration can be embedded in Education for Sustainable Development.

Formal education is defined as: “the hierarchically structured, chronologically graded ‘education system’, running from primary school through the university and including, in addition to general academic studies, a variety of specialised programmes and institutions for full-time technical and professional training.”²³

It is different from non-formal education defined as: “any organised educational activity outside the established formal system – whether operating separately or as an important feature of some broader activity – that is intended to serve identifiable learning clientele and learning objectives.”²⁴, non-formal education to SCP can be reported under indicator on training for SCP (1.3.).

SDG 4 has two main measurement challenges: learning outcomes and educational equality. Traditional levels of measurement such as reading, comprehension and numeric skills to integrated view of the skills needed in relation to the society and the environment are needed (enhancing educational quality and increasing learning consequences for those that would not ordinarily be able to). United Nations Secretary General’s Synthesis Report (UNSG 2014)²⁵ recommends four levels of monitoring: global, regional, thematic and national. It will include all formal educational institutional from primary, through to secondary and post-secondary.

Education for sustainable development (ESD) aims to help people develop the attitudes, skills and knowledge to make informed development decisions for the benefit of themselves and others, now and in the future, and to act upon these decisions. ESD supports five fundamental types of learning to provide quality education and foster sustainable human development: learning to know, learning to be, learning to live together, learning to do and learning to transform oneself and society. ESD concerns all levels of education and all social contexts (family, school, workplace, community). It allows learners to acquire the skills, capacities, values and knowledge required to ensure sustainable development, and fosters responsible citizens. ESD empowers learners to take informed decisions and responsible actions for environmental integrity, economic viability and a just society, for present and future generations, while respecting cultural diversity. It is about lifelong learning, and is an integral part of quality education. ESD is holistic and transformational education which addresses learning content and outcomes, pedagogy and the learning environment. It achieves its purpose by transforming society.²⁶

²³ Coombs, P. H., Prosser, C. and Ahmed, M. (1973). *New Paths to Learning for Rural Children and Youth*, New York: International Council for Educational Development.

²⁴ Ibid.

Education for Sustainable Consumption (ESC) aims at providing knowledge, values and skills to enable individuals and social groups to become actors of change towards more sustainable ways of living. The objective is to ensure that the basic needs of the global community are met, quality of life for all is improved, inefficient use of resources and environmental degradation are avoided. ESC is therefore about providing citizens with the appropriate information and knowledge on the environmental and social impacts of their daily choices, as well as workable solutions and alternatives. ESC integrates fundamental rights and freedoms including consumers’ rights, and aims at empowering citizens for them to participate in the public debate and economy in an informed and ethical way.²⁷

Method of computation

Further integration of SCP topics in formal education cannot be reported under indicator 3.4. focused on changes in practices related to production processes.

Countries having made progress on national policies for integration of SCP topics into formal education should be reported under indicator 3.1. on SCP policies.

This indicator is calculated at relevant aggregation levels based on the information collected from the different reporting streams. Secretariat, programmes and other users of this framework should be mindful of double counting one same country when aggregating reporting across different reporting streams or different reporting years.

Rational and interpretation

By monitoring on a yearly basis the number of countries making progress on SCP integration into education practices and the nature of these progress, including as supported by the 10YFP and beyond as possible, this indicator supports the assessment of progress on education to SCP.

Countries further integrating SCP topics into education practices can be an outcome of SCP projects, new financing streams (1.1. & 1.2.), national policies for integration of SCP topics into formal education (3.1), or outreach and communication activities to teachers or policy makers (2.2.) and can result in outcomes and impacts captured under other indicators of this framework.

Higher levels of educational attainment have been directly or indirectly associated with individual outcomes such as better livelihoods, healthier behaviors, greater environmental awareness and increased civic participation as well as positive social outcomes, such as economic growth and increased social cohesion (UNESCO-UIS 2016)²⁸.

Education (Goal 4 SDG) aims to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all. Higher levels of education are linked to better livelihoods, greater environmental awareness, healthier behaviors and increased civic participation.

The 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production (10YFP) is a global framework of action to enhance international cooperation to accelerate the shift towards sustainable consumption and production (SCP) in both developed and developing countries. Providing quality education on SCP will provide citizens with appropriate information and knowledge on the environmental and social impacts of their daily choices, and provide alternatives. Education for SCP will provide citizens with the tools to make more sustainable choices and producers with skills and tools to develop workable and innovative solutions to meet the needs of all people while reducing environmental impact.

Disaggregation

of countries integrating SCP topics in education practices disaggregated by:

- Title of activity
- Integration of SCP topics into: learning material, learning methodologies, pedagogic material, lectures, professional seminars, and teaching toolkits.
- Level of education: pre-primary, primary, secondary, tertiary, vocational, teacher education.
- Cross-cutting disaggregation categories outlined in Annex 2a.

Note: programmes and other reporting streams are encouraged to report as many outputs, outcomes and impacts of their activities and beyond as possible. The disaggregation categories above are indicative and some can be left empty when reporting on measures for which such data elements are not available.

Baseline(s) and target(s)

Proposed parameters for baselines and targets are defined in Annex 2a.

Sources and data collection

Data collection will be done in accordance with the 10 YFP M&E Process as described in section on “The reporting and monitoring Process: requirements, roles and timelines” of this framework

Examples of data sources for this indicator include: documentation from the 10YFP SLE Programme on implementation of the Education for Sustainable Lifestyles Action Plan (PERL)

Comments and limitations

Similarly to the challenges faced by SDG 4 this indicator will not reflect on:

- a) Quality of the education
- b) Learning outcomes and impact

References

Combs, P. H., Prosser, C. and Ahmed, M. (1973). *New Paths to Learning for Rural Children and Youth*, New York: International Council for Educational Development.

UNEP (2010) *HERE and NOW! Education for Sustainable Consumption Recommendations and Guidelines*
http://www.unep.org/pdf/Here_and_Now_English.pdf

UNESCO(2014) *UNESCO Roadmap for Implementing the Global Action Programme on Education for Sustainable Development*.
See general references in “indicator methodology introduction” section.

Examples of sub indicators

3.4. SCP changes in practices

Indicator title, level and general definition

3.4. SCP changes in practices - # of changes in practices and production processes supporting the shift to SCP

Goals and Targets addressed

10YFP objectives

Objective 3 (outcome level): Accelerate the shift towards SCP, supporting regional and national policies and initiatives

Main 10YFP associated indicators

It contributes to SDG 12: “Ensure sustainable consumption and productions patterns”

Definition and method of computation

Definition and concepts

This indicator focuses on the number of changes in practices and in production processes supporting the shift to SCP and the nature and scope of these changes.

A change in practices or production process supporting the shift to SCP refers here to the adoption, deployment, implementation of new practices (systems, technologies, processes), or in a modification, or increase in use of SCP relevant practices into supply chains and their governance.

A change in practice or production process supporting the shift to SCP **directly results in concrete, tangible and measurable sustainability impacts** either environmental, social (e.g. changes in living conditions) or (shared prosperity) economic (e.g. changes in redistribution of wealth to the advantage of lower social classes, etc.).

Changes in practices or production processes may take the form of sustainability improvements within chemical, mechanical, physical, biological technologies as well as management and cultural practices.

Method of computation

Although quantitative data is requested, given the broad range of changes, of many different natures, that could be reported under this indicator it is mainly a qualitative indicator under which scale, scope and effects of the changes achieved are described in the narrative, overall budget associated to the change should also be provided as an indication of scope when available. To avoid losing significance, secretariat, programmes and other reporting streams should be mindful of this when attempting to quantitatively aggregate data under this indicator.

It should be noted that in itself, a policy (3.1.), coordination mechanism (3.6.) or a monitoring and reporting scheme (3.2.) is not considered here as a change in practice. However, the concrete and tangible changes associated to their implementation can constitute changes in practices and production processes subject to reporting under this indicator.

Rationale and interpretation

This indicator helps identification of trends in the implementation of technologies/practices as well as, when possible, assessment of the scope and scale of that implementation, including of those changes supported by the 10YFP. It can also help identification of gaps and needs, and support enhanced coordination and collaboration on support for changes in technologies and practices across the 10 YFP activities.

Changes in practices and production processes can be an outcome resulting from many of elements captured under other the output and outcome indicators of this framework (e.g. trainings (1.1.), commitments (3.5.)) and link to relevant impact indicators such as energy efficiency (4.1.), material use reduction (4.3.), etc.

Disaggregation

changes in practices and production processes and indication of associated budget expenditure (in US\$) if available, disaggregated by:

- Title of change in practice
- Number of practices/processes changed
- Type of change in practice: Systems; technologies; practices; labelling schemes/certifications/standards; job creation; market access; other
- Explanation of change in practice

- Cross-cutting disaggregation categories outlined in Annex 2a.

Note: programmes and other reporting streams are encouraged to report as many outputs, outcomes and impacts of their activities and beyond as possible. The disaggregation categories above are indicative and some can be left empty when reporting on measures for which such data elements are not available.

Baseline(s) and target(s)

Proposed parameters for baselines and targets are defined in Annex 2a.

For changes in practices and production process: given the broad range of changes that can be reported under this indicator it might not make sense to establish overall baselines and targets at programme or overall 10YFP level. However, programmes are encouraged to establish such baselines and targets for specific types of change which are of particular relevance to their work.

Sources and data collection

Data collection will be done in accordance with the 10 YFP M&E Process as described in section on “The reporting and monitoring Process: requirements, roles and timelines” of this framework.

Comments and limitations

The indicator will likely not collect more than a small to moderate number of data entries, at least in the first years of monitoring while the Programmes are developing.

The interpretation of influence and, ultimately, attribution to the 10YFP, will remain a difficult effort.

The indicator does not:

- o provide information on the quality of implementation
- o provide information on the credibility of the practice
- o provide information on the likeliness of success in mitigating impacts and improving sustainability
- o be balanced geographically and per sectors/actors.

Data comparability between Programmes and types of practices considered will remain an issue.

Main issues regarding precision, reliability, attribution and double counting are addressed above. If you come across additional issues, please inform the Secretariat.

References

See general references in “indicator methodology introduction” section

Examples of sub indicators

3.5. SCP Commitments

Indicator title, level and general definition

3.5. SCP Commitments - # of high level commitments covering SCP

Goals and Targets addressed

10YFP objectives

Objective 3 (outcome level): Accelerate the shift towards SCP, supporting regional and national policies and initiatives

Main associated SDG indicators

12.4.1 # of parties to international multilateral environmental agreements on hazardous waste, and other chemicals that meet their commitments and obligations in transmitting information as required by each relevant agreement (Tier I, UNEP)
Metadata: <http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/iaeg-sdgs/metadata-compilation/>

Definition and method of computation

Definition and concepts

This indicator allows quantification of the number of official high-level expressions of support related to SCP.

A SCP commitment is defined here as any non-legally binding official high-level expression of support or pledge (e.g. company X commit to reducing its environmental footprint by Y by 2050), which is relevant, at least in part, to SCP. They constitute an official account of facts, views, intentions, and/or plans further engaging a stakeholder in SCP, communicated through formal announcement in written or orally.

They include, but are not limited to, official commitments, declarations, statements, pledges as well as international decisions, recommendations or resolutions.

This indicator only considers commitments that are taken at the highest level of the concerned government or organisation (e.g. ministerial level, CEO level).

Commitments are not legally binding and can fall under the responsibility of different types of organisation (ministry, company, international organisation, NGO, etc.) and apply to different scopes (international, national, local, sectoral, etc.).

Method of computation

Only commitments which have been issued during the current reporting period and which relate to something new (not already announced) can be reported under this indicator.

Under this indicator one commitment is considered as an official expression of support or pledge from one government or organisation. If one same commitment is made by a number of organisations (e.g. an international declaration), the commitment made by each and every organisation should be counted as one. This entails that for instance an international resolution being signed by 20 governments should be reported as 20 commitments.

Commitments being part of elements monitored under other indicators, such as policy instruments, cannot be reported on under this indicator.

This indicator is calculated at relevant aggregation levels based on the information collected from the different reporting streams. Secretariat, programmes and other users of this framework should be mindful of double counting one same commitment when aggregating reporting across different reporting streams or different reporting years.

Rationale and interpretation

An official expression of support (commitment, statement, declaration) by a stakeholder is representative of an increase in engagement toward shift to SCP patterns. Commitments are important in ensuring continuity and scaling up of political and other support and can help in the mobilisation of further resources or further implementation of actions. They demonstrate robust support of the 10YFP objectives and increasing high-level support to collectively work towards the change of production and consumption patterns worldwide. They can help recognize opportunities and benefits of action, and facilitate inclusion or elevation of SCP as institutional priority. Commitments can also help to catalyse collective action, leverage finance at scale, and/or enhance science and knowledge. They can also indicate the start of a policy process aimed at improving the legal and/or institutional environment for SCP. As such, they are indications of success of 10YFP implementation. Policy process as referred to in this indicator does not only relate to government policy, but also covers policies of companies, networks/associations, and others (see: types of organisation under disaggregation).

This indicator is used to provide insights on efforts of the 10YFP and beyond in generating high-level support and engagement in countries, organisations and beyond and identify associated gaps. It can also, more specifically, help to measure effectiveness of SCP related outreach efforts, and, more generally, provide information on the status of SCP in political agendas.

Commitments can be an outcome of activities whose outputs and outcomes are reported under other indicators, and outcomes of commitments may contribute to other indicators.

Disaggregation

of commitments and indication of associated budget expenditure (US\$) if available disaggregated by:

- Title of commitment
- Number of commitments (One commitment is considered as an official expression of support or pledge from one government or organisation)
- Link (URL) to commitment
- Cross-cutting disaggregation categories outlined in Annex 2a.

Note: programmes and other reporting streams are encouraged to report as many outputs, outcomes and impacts of their activities and beyond as possible. The disaggregation categories above are indicative and some can be left empty when reporting on measures for which such data elements are not available.

Baseline(s) and target(s)

Proposed parameters for baselines and targets are defined in Annex 2a.

Sources and data collection

Data collection will be done in accordance with the 10 YFP M&E Process as described in section on “The reporting and monitoring Process: requirements, roles and timelines” of this framework.

Comments and limitations

This indicator only provides an indication of the number of high-level commitments, which are relevant, at least in part, to SCP. As such, it does not provide any information on their usefulness, significance, effectiveness, or quality and these and of their impacts or concretisation.

For attribution, the influence of the 10YFP on these high-level commitments might be difficult to accurately determine. In order to avoid the multiplication of high-level commitments without due consideration being given to their relevance, quality and feasibility for implementation, or at the expense of other efforts, appropriate consideration will be given to trends as well as narrative reporting and documentation submitted.

Main issues regarding precision, reliability, attribution and double counting are addressed above. If you come across additional issues, please inform the Secretariat.

References

See general references in “indicator methodology introduction” section.

Examples of sub indicators

<p><u>SPP</u></p> <p># of high level statements (at government or corporate levels) supporting SPP or SP implementation</p>	<p><u>CI-SCP</u></p> <p># of high level commitments (at government, non-governmental or corporate level) to implement the Guidelines for providing product sustainability information</p>
---	---

3.6. Coordination on SCP

Indicator title, level and general definition

3.6. Coordination on SCP - # inter-sectoral or multi-stakeholder mechanisms for coordination on SCP and # of participating governments and other organisations.

Goals and Targets addressed

10YFP Objectives

Objective 3 (outcome level): Accelerate the shift towards SCP, supporting regional and national policies and initiatives

Main associated SDG indicators

17.14.1 # of countries with mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence of sustainable development (Tier III UNEP)

17.16.1 # Number of countries reporting progress in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks that support the achievement of the sustainable development goals (Tier II, UNDP, OECD)

17.17.1 # Amount of United States dollars committed to public-private and civil society partnerships (Tier III, World Bank to confirm)

Definition and method of computation

Definition and concepts

This indicator allows for the quantification (#) of inter-sectoral or multi-stakeholder mechanisms for coordination on SCP established by governments and other organisations under the influence of the 10YFP and, to the extent that is possible, beyond. It also tracks the number of participating organisations,

An inter-sectoral and/or multi-stakeholder mechanism for coordination on SCP can be defined as an assembly composed of governmental and/or non-governmental entities with various mandates and sectors of interventions, interacting on a regular basis, established with the objective of coordinating action on SCP in a coherent and sustained manner. These mechanisms can be established at various scales, e.g. regional, national or sub-national, at cross-cutting or sectoral level. For instance, in the governmental context, those mechanisms can take the form of inter-ministerial committees on SCP or national multi-stakeholder roundtables. At the regional level, existing Regional Roundtables on SCP could also count as such mechanisms.

This indicator focuses on coordination mechanisms which are either multi-stakeholder or inter-sectoral or both.

The notion of coordination is very broad and could be measured through activities of diverse degrees of integration, from regular dialogues / information sharing sessions to shared plans of action or common policies resulting directly from the action of the mechanism. Hence, monitoring the effectiveness of those mechanisms implies to not only quantify those mechanisms or the entities involved, but also to collect information on their operating conditions (e.g. dedicated budget) as well as on their activities and impacts.

The effectiveness of those coordination mechanisms could be measured through several elements, including:

- 1) Diversity of participating entities (types, sectors of intervention);
- 2) Level of representation in the mechanism (e.g. high-level, technical) or level of influence of the mechanism (e.g. what is the audience of the mechanism – e.g. ministerial, executive, technical, financial, public);
- 3) Prerogatives of the mechanism (e.g. informative, consultative, decision-making, implementing, monitoring);
- 4) Operating budget
- 5) Regularity
- 6) Shared planning and monitoring instruments
- 7) Types of outputs: meetings / dialogues, information sharing, technical reports/tools, specific inter-sectoral or transversal agreements / policies.

Method of computation

Each coordination mechanism should be reported separately together with its associated annual budget if available, and number of participating organisations.

Stand alone outreach or communication meetings do not fall under the definition of a coordination mechanism and cannot be reported under this indicator. They can be reported under indicator 2.2. on communication and outreach activities. There are also differences between a coordination mechanism, a monitoring and reporting scheme (3.2.) and a policy (3.1.) as per their respective definition.

This indicator is calculated at relevant aggregation levels based on the information collected from the different reporting streams. Secretariat, programmes and other users of this framework should be mindful of double counting one same mechanism when aggregating reporting across different reporting streams or different reporting years.

Rationale and interpretation

Because of its holistic and systemic nature, SCP requires a multi-disciplinary approach and the participation of all stakeholders. In this context, inter-sectoral and multi-stakeholder mechanisms are essential to creating the conditions for an integrated, coordinated and coherent approach to SCP.

This indicator helps to monitor the establishment and improvement of SCP coordination mechanisms, including those supported by the 10YFP. It also supports monitoring of the number of participating organisations, as well as this of actual participants and associated gender balance.

Progress on coordination on SCP can be the result of elements captured under other outputs and outcomes indicator of this framework such as SCP network (2.2.), SCP in policy instruments (3.1.), etc. and can in turn lead to achievements relevant to some of these indicators, e.g. improved monitoring and reporting on SCP (3.2.)

Disaggregation

of inter-sectoral or multi-stakeholder mechanisms for coordination on SCP and indication of associated budget expenditure (in US\$) if available, disaggregated by:

- Title of coordination mechanism
- Status of coordination mechanism: Initiated; on-going; closing
- Years active:
- Date of last meeting
- Functions of coordination mechanism: Communicating to the general public on SCP; Coordinated policy implementation; Design of overarching or sectoral policies with SCP objectives; Identification of ad hoc opportunities for synergies and cooperation; Information and knowledge sharing on SCP; Monitoring and evaluation of policies relevant to SCP; Reporting on progress at national and/or international level; Stakeholders consultations and transparency
- Cross-cutting disaggregation categories outlined in Annex 2a.

Note: programmes and other reporting streams are encouraged to report as many outputs, outcomes and impacts of their activities and beyond as possible. The disaggregation categories above are indicative and some can be left empty when reporting on measures for which such data elements are not available.

Baseline(s) and target(s)

Proposed parameters for baselines and targets are defined in Annex 2a.

For SCP coordination mechanism: There is to date no global baseline available for inter-sectoral or multi-stakeholder mechanism for SCP coordination. The first Global Report on National SCP Policies and Initiatives, currently under development, will include a review of existing inter-ministerial and multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism at government level, based on the results of the 10YFP Global Survey on National SCP Policies and Initiatives (about 50 countries). Scoping studies have also been conducted at regional and national levels (e.g. SWITCH projects in Asia / Pacific; EEA survey on resource efficiency policies).

Sources and data collection

Data collection will be done in accordance with the 10 YFP M&E Process as described in section on “The reporting and monitoring Process: requirements, roles and timelines” of this framework.

Comments and limitations

The indicator does not provide any information on the usefulness and quality of the mechanism and whether they were effective in enabling an integrated approach to SCP. These aspects will have to be looked at through narrative reports / qualitative analysis.

Establishing baselines and targets can be time and resource intensive and depends on the willingness of partners and actors – including the 10YFP National Focal Points - to communicate necessary information.

Main issues regarding precision, reliability, attribution and double counting are addressed above. If you come across additional issues, please inform the Secretariat.

References

- Methodological note and questionnaire of the 10YFP Global Survey on National SCP Policies and Initiatives
- See general references in “indicator methodology introduction” section.

Examples of sub indicators

<p><u>STP</u></p> <p># of functioning models for improved participatory coordination, cooperation and joint action on sustainable tourism and SCP at national and local level</p>	<p><u>SPP</u></p> <p># of [...] with inter-sectoral and multi-stakeholder mechanisms supporting the shift to SPP or SP</p>
---	--

3.7. Use of SCP knowledge and technical tools

Indicator title, level and general definition

3.7. Use of SCP knowledge and technical tools - # of downloads on SCP clearing house and any other quantitative representation of use²⁹

Goals and Targets addressed

10YFP objectives

Objective 3 (outcome level): Accelerate the shift towards SCP, supporting regional and national policies and initiatives.

Main associated SDG indicators:

In addition to SDGs 12, this indicator reflects the following cross-cutting goals of SDGs 17;

- 17.6 Enhance North-South, South-South and triangular regional and international cooperation on and access to science, technology and innovation and enhance knowledge sharing on mutually agreed terms, including through improved coordination among existing mechanisms, in particular at the United Nations level, and through a global technology facilitation mechanism;
- 17.16 Enhance the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development, complemented by multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals in all countries, in particular developing countries;

Definition and method of computation

Definition and concepts

- The use of SCP knowledge and technical tools is defined as any usage made of a SCP knowledge or technical tool addressing SCP issues.
- This indicator measures the number of downloads on SCP clearing house of any knowledge resource or technical tool reported under indicator 2.3. as a proxy for estimating the level of use of these resources. In a first phase as this approach is intended to facilitate reporting however, such proxy can be complemented by any other quantification of use (e.g. # of downloads from 10YFP Programme partner websites, Information on # of users of tool provided by sources (such as Programme partners, stakeholders, etc.), number of references or citations, number of licence agreements).
- “SCP knowledge and technical tools” refers to resources that that provide insights, scientific conclusions, frameworks, guidance; or resources that can foster or facilitate decision-making and that are scoped to promote the shift towards SCP, based on scientific research and/or empirical evidence. This may include scientific articles, policy briefs, reports, guidelines, manuals, media products, software, tools and educational materials, and may include any format whether digital or physical. These should be distinguished from “outreach and communication activities” in the indicator 2.2 which are relatively with short materials for disseminating breaking story and awareness raising.

Method of computation

- Number of downloads of a specific resource or tool on the 10YFP clearing house is calculated under the 10YFP clearing house. Other quantification of use are left at the discretion of the relevant reporting entities.
- For each resource or tool, data reported under this indicator is attached to the data and narrative for this same resource or tool as reported under indicator 2.3. on production of knowledge resources and technical tools.

Rationale and interpretation

The broad dissemination and increased use of scientific and policy knowledge and technical tools based on scientific research and empirical evidences will be necessary to support governments and other stakeholders to accelerate the shift towards SCP.

The evolution of the number of downloads on the SCP clearing house year after year can provide insight on the evolution of the level of use of a resources, i.e. the ore a resource is being downloaded the more it is being used.

²⁹ This unit of measure has been chosen for the pilot phase as the easiest to measure. However, is expected to evolve with time toward a more meaningful one for measurement of knowledge and tools use.

The use of knowledge and tools has synergies with other outputs including 1.1 SCP Projects, 1.3 Training for SCP and 2.2 Outreach and communication for SCP, through the use of products for project implementation, training and dissemination, as well as feedbacks from implementation of concrete projects and trainings to the knowledge products. The uptake of knowledge and technical tools monitored with this indicator will demonstrate the influence of the 10YFP and its associated actors and activities towards driving a shift to SCP patterns.

Disaggregation

Data for this indicator is provided together with this for indicator 2.3. for each resource or tool and as such follows the same disaggregation categories.

- # of downloads of the SCP clearing house and any other quantification of use disaggregated by:
 - o Knowledge resources or technical tools (already disaggregated as per indicator 2.3.)
- - **Cross-cutting disaggregation categories outlined in Annex 2a.**

Baseline(s) and target(s)

Proposed parameters for baselines and targets are defined in Annex 2a.

For use of knowledge and tools: the baseline can be established at zero at the date of publication or launch of a resource or tool.

Sources and data collection

Data collection will be done in accordance with the 10 YFP M&E Process as described in section on “The reporting and monitoring Process: requirements, roles and timelines” of this framework.

For this indicator, the Secretariat will work with programmes to produce the required data from the SCP Clearinghouse.

Comments and limitations

- Interpretation of the data should be undertaken with caution, since dissemination remains an insufficient representation of the value and impact that this indicator aims to monitor. The influence achieved by the resource or tool usage should be interpreted by using a number of factors, namely: the type (quality, nature, size, relevance, power), of actor(s) making use of the tool, the context of use, the objective for which the tool has been put to use, etc
- In addition, the number of downloads on the SCP clearinghouse as a measurement unit may not represent actual use of knowledge and technical tools, or may underrepresent actual use.
- The use of a tool may result in acquiring knowledge by a target beneficiary, which may never put the tools’ “purpose” to use or might not belong to the targeted audience. Usefulness of this indicator to gain understanding of the outcomes of the use of tools remain limited.

References

See general references in “indicator methodology introduction” section

Examples of sub indicators

- SPP
- # of downloads of resources, policy recommendations, training material, etc. produced in the work areas of the SPP Programme
- # of shared tools and resources

4. SCP Impact Indicators

4.1 Resource Efficiency

- Material use efficiency
- Waste reduction
- Water use efficiency
- Energy use efficiency

Key projection measurement for impact level: Material footprint (source: IRP)

Material footprint (MF):

Material footprint = the domestic extraction (DE) of materials + the raw material trade balance.³⁰

“The concept of a material footprint offers an additional perspective on a country’s material use by attributing material extraction, wherever it may have occurred globally, along supply chains of different products and services to final domestic demand (Giljum et al. 2015). It is thus a measure of the material requirement of the consumption and infrastructure system of a country (Wiedmann et al. 2015). Indirectly, it also indicates the material flow based environmental pressure of final consumption across the whole supply chain.”³¹

Material footprint example projections³²:

- “Global material resource use is expected to reach nearly 90 billion tonnes in 2017 and may more than double by 2050, with high-income countries currently consuming 10 times more per person than low-income countries and the planetary boundaries being pushed beyond their limits.”
- “Until 2050, ambitious policies for resource efficiency can reduce global resource requirements by about a quarter and deliver global economic growth 3 to 5 per cent above existing trend. This would also have considerable co-benefits for climate mitigation efforts.”
- “Resource efficiency policies and initiatives could: reduce natural resource use globally by 26 per cent until 2050, in combination with ambitious global action on climate change, and stabilize per capita resource use at current levels in high-income countries; reduce greenhouse gas emissions by an additional 15-20 per cent in 2050 (for a given set of greenhouse policies), with global emissions in 2050 falling to 63 per cent below 2010 levels, and emissions in high-income countries in 2050 falling to 74 per cent below 2010 levels; more than offset the economic costs of ambitious climate action, so that income is higher and economic growth is stronger than in the Existing Trends scenario; deliver annual economic benefits of US\$2,000 billion globally in 2050 relative to Existing Trends, including benefits of US\$520 billion in high-income nations, while also helping put the world on track to limit climate change to 2°C or lower.”

³⁰ IRP, 2016: “Global Material Flows and Resource Productivity”, Link [here](#)

³¹ IRP, 2017: “Assessing global resource use: A systems approach to resource efficiency and pollution reduction”, to be published at UNEA3 in December 2017

³² IRP, 2017: “Assessing global resource use: A systems approach to resource efficiency and pollution reduction”, to be published at UNEA3 in December 2017

Impact	Material use efficiency
Proposed question	<i>Was material use efficiency measures, such as alternative, recycled, or remanufactured material and/or decreased material use, integrated into the implementation of this activity or does the activity encourage increased material efficiency?</i>
Indicator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of material used that is remanufactured or recycled
Existing measurements	SDG 12.2.1 (UNEP/International Resource Panel) – Tier III
Relevant SDGs	<p>#8.4 Improve progressively, through 2030, global resource efficiency in consumption and production and endeavour to decouple economic growth from environmental degradation, in accordance with the 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production, with developed countries taking the lead</p> <p>#8.4.1 Material footprint, material footprint per capita, and material footprint per GDP</p> <p>#12.2 By 2030, achieve the sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources</p> <p>#12.2.1 Material footprint, material footprint per capita, and material footprint per GDP</p>
Relevance to Rio+20 “The Future We Want”	<p>III: Green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Sustainable cities and human settlements</p>
Relevance to the Paris Agreement	-
Life cycle perspective	This indicator does not incorporate a life cycle perspective, but points at the need to incorporate more recycled material back into the economy with the implicit assumption that this reduces overall impacts with respect to bringing in new virgin material.
IRP projection	“A resource efficient scenario applying a mix of resource efficiency policies globally could cut the use of natural resources by up to 28 per cent by 2050.” ³³
Limitations	<p>While increasing the share of material that is used for a second or more time within the economy is in principle positive, a relative indicator like this (%) does not inform about the absolute reduction that is needed (the % of recycled content may keep increasing while the total material consumption still increases).</p> <p>A review of the proposed indicators will be done on the basis of data received through the pilot testing of impact indicators, and should take into account the above limitations.</p>
Scientific sources	<p>IRP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Global Data Set of Resource Efficiency Data (1970-2017) ▪ IRP report on Global Material Flows and Resource Productivity ▪ IRP report on Resource Efficiency (resource efficient scenario)

³³ IRP, 2017: “Resource Efficiency: Potential and Economic Implications.”, Link [here](#)

Impact	Waste reduction
Proposed question	<i>Have measures been taken in the implementation of this activity to reduce or to encourage the reduction waste generation through prevention, reduction, recycling and reuse?</i>
Indicator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % recycle rate (tons of material recycled) (3Rs – reduce, reuse, recycle)
Existing measurements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SDG 12.5.1 (3Rs) (UNSD/UNEP) – Tier III <i>Methodology still in development</i> ▪ Global Waste Management Outlook indicators (International Environmental Technology Centre)
Relevant SDGs	<p>#11.6.1 Proportion of urban solid waste regularly collected and with adequate final discharge out of total urban solid waste generated, by cities</p> <p>#12.3 By 2030, halve per capita global food waste at the retail and consumer levels and reduce food losses along production and supply chains, including post-harvest losses</p> <p>#12.4 By 2020, achieve the environmentally sound management of chemicals and all wastes throughout their life cycle, in accordance with agreed international frameworks, and significantly reduce their release to air, water and soil in order to minimize their adverse impacts on human health and the environment</p> <p>#12.5 By 2030, substantially reduce waste generation through prevention, reduction, recycling and reuse</p>
Relevance to Rio+20 “The Future We Want”	<p>III: Green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication</p> <p>IV.C: Environmental pillar in the context of sustainable development</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Sustainable cities and human settlements</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Chemicals and waste</p>
Relevance to the Paris Agreement	-
Life cycle perspective	This indicator does not incorporate the life cycle perspective, and focuses only on the waste management stage. Strategies to increase the recycling rate may indeed be incorporated in other stages of the life cycle such as design.
IETC projection	<p>The IRP does not have projections in this area, instead potential projections have been suggested by the IETC <i>Global Waste Management Outlook</i>³⁴ and are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Using a lifecycle approach, it has been estimated that a 10 to 15% reduction in global greenhouse gas emissions could be achieved through landfill mitigation and diversion, energy from waste, recycling, and other types of improved solid waste management. Including waste prevention could potentially increase this contribution to 15 to 20%.” ▪ “The major priority in low- and middle-income countries is to ensure universal access to waste collection services, to eliminate uncontrolled disposal and burning and to move towards environmentally sound management facilities for all waste. Achieving this challenge is made even more difficult by forecasts that amounts of waste in major cities in the lowest-income countries are likely to double in the next 20 years.”
Limitations	<p>The % of recycling may increase while the total waste generated still continues to grow. Thus, the indicator tells us about the measures in place to minimise the impacts of waste, but not about the reduction of waste itself.</p> <p>A review of the proposed indicators will be done on the basis of data received through the pilot testing of impact indicators, and should take into account the above limitations.</p>
Scientific sources	<p>UNEP IETC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Global Waste Management Outlook

³⁴ UNEP IETC, 2015: “*Global Waste Management Outlook*”, Link [here](#)

Impact	Water use efficiency
Proposed question	<i>Was water use efficiency measures integrated into the implementation of this activity or does the activity encourage improved water use efficiency?</i>
Indicator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % reduction in water use ▪ Change in water-use efficiency over time
Existing measurements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ISO 14046: 2014 (International Organization for Standardization) ▪ SDG 6.4.1 (FAO) – “change in water-use efficiency over time”. <i>Methodology still in development</i>
Relevant SDGs	<p>#6.3 By 2030, improve water quality by reducing pollution, eliminating dumping and minimizing release of hazardous chemicals and materials, halving the proportion of untreated wastewater and substantially increasing recycling and safe reuse globally</p> <p>#6.4 By 2030, substantially increase water-use efficiency across all sectors and ensure sustainable withdrawals and supply of freshwater to address water scarcity and substantially reduce the number of people suffering from water scarcity</p> <p>#12.2 By 2030, achieve the sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources</p>
Relevance to Rio+20 “The Future We Want”	<p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Food security and nutrition and sustainable agriculture</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Water and sanitation</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Sustainable cities and human settlements</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Desertification, land degradation and drought</p>
Relevance to the Paris Agreement	-
Life cycle perspective	Efficiency indicators are not per se considering the life cycle perspective, but only the amount (of water) consumed per unit of output. By focusing on some of the key drivers for water consumption (particularly water use in agriculture and industry), the indicator may help in bringing about reduction of impact, but the indicator does not tell us about the impacts related to water consumption. A water footprint indicator based on ISO 14046 would on the other hand focus the attention on the key drivers of impact.
IRP projection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The landmark study “Charting Our Water Future” by the 2030 Water Resources Group (2009)³⁵ argues that if ecosystem water uses are taken into account, a 40% gap exists between projected water supplies and demands in 2030. The projection assumes a so-called “business-as-usual” scenario in which current approaches to water supply development and water management continue. Continuing with the current demand and supply-side efficiency measures such as desalination, irrigation scheduling, reduced waste in the mining sector, and other typical groundwater supply. ▪ “Technically possible and commercially viable technologies can improve water and energy efficiency by 60 to 80 per cent in construction, agriculture, food, industry, transport and other sectors, all the while delivering economic cost savings between USD 2.9 to 3.7 trillion each year by 2030 (UNEP 2014, UNEP 2017).”³⁶
Limitations	A review of the proposed indicators will be done on the basis of data received through the pilot testing of impact indicators, and should take into account the any limitations identified.

³⁵ 2030 Water Resources Group, 2009: “Charting our Water Future”. Link [here](#).

³⁶ IRP, 2017: “Assessing global resource use: A systems approach to resource efficiency and pollution reduction”, to be published at UNEA3 in December 2017

Scientific sources	IRP: IRP report on Water Decoupling	Water Footprint Network: Water footprint	LCI/WULCA: Water footprint in assessments Water use in assessments (AWARE)
--------------------	---	--	---

Impact	Energy use efficiency
Proposed question	<i>Does the activity aim to influence energy use efficiency either directly through its implementation and/or indirectly as a result of increased awareness and capacities?</i>
Indicator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of energy consumption from renewable resources
Existing measurements	SDG 7.2.1 (International Energy Agency (IEA), United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD), United Nations’ Inter-agency Mechanism on Energy (UN Energy), SE4ALL Global Tracking Framework Consortium) – Tier I
Relevant SDGs	<p>#7.1 By 2030, enhance international cooperation to facilitate access to clean energy research and technology, including renewable energy, energy efficiency and advanced and cleaner fossil-fuel technology, and promote investment in energy infrastructure and clean energy technology</p> <p>#7.2.1 Renewable energy share in the total final energy consumption</p> <p>#7.3 By 2030, double the global rate of improvement in energy efficiency</p>
Relevance to Rio+20 “The Future We Want”	<p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Energy</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Sustainable cities and human settlements</p>
Relevance to the Paris Agreement	<p>Article 2: on reducing adapting to the adverse impacts of climate change</p> <p>Article 4: on national GHG emissions</p> <p>Article 6: on approaches to mitigation and reduction of GHG emissions</p>
Life cycle perspective	See comments for water efficiency. In addition, increasing the share of renewables is good, but reducing overall energy use per unit of output is possibly as important (and is actually what we call efficiency). By looking at indicators of total energy use per unit of output (similar to an “energy footprint”), then the life cycle perspective is considered and action can be focused on the key drivers for impact.
IRP projection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “The IPCC states that “efficiency enhancements and behavioural changes, in order to reduce energy demand compared to baseline scenarios without compromising development, are a key mitigation strategy in scenarios reaching atmospheric CO2 eq concentrations of about 450 to about 500 ppm by 2100 (robust evidence, high agreement)” (IPCC, 2014a). Among such scenarios, the median level of demand reduction relative to baselines in the transport, buildings and industry sectors is between 20 and 30 percent in each case. Some of the scenarios analysed show even higher sectoral demand reductions of up to 60 percent (IPCC, 2014d). Increasing resource efficiency is critical to achieving such necessary demand reductions, without negatively affecting human development and well-being.”³⁷ “Technically possible and commercially viable technologies can improve water and energy efficiency by 60 to 80 per cent in construction, agriculture, food, industry, transport and other sectors, all the while delivering economic cost savings between USD 2.9 to 3.7 trillion each year by 2030 (UNEP 2014, UNEP 2017).”³⁸

³⁷ IRP, 2017: “Resource Efficiency: Potential and Economic Implications.”, Link [here](#)

³⁸ IRP, 2017: “Assessing global resource use: A systems approach to resource efficiency and pollution reduction”, to be published at UNEA3 in December 2017

<p>Limitations</p>	<p>A review of the proposed indicators will be done on the basis of data received through the pilot testing of impact indicators, and should take into account the any limitations identified.</p>	
<p>Scientific sources</p>	<p>SE4ALL: Global Tracking Framework: progress toward sustainable energy</p>	<p>IRP: IRP report on Resource Efficiency (resource efficient scenario)</p>

4.2 Environmental Impact

- GHG emissions reduction
- Reduction of air, soil and water pollutants
- Biodiversity conservation and sustainable land-use

Key projection measurement for impact level: Global warming potential (GWP100) and Global Temperature Change Potential (GTP100) (source: IPCC)

GWP100:

“The Global Warming Potential (GWP) is defined *as the time-integrated RF [Radiative Forcing] due to a pulse emission of a given component, relative to a pulse emission of an equal mass of CO₂*. The GWP was presented in the First IPCC Assessment (Houghton et al., 1990), stating ‘It must be stressed that there is no universally accepted methodology for combining all the relevant factors into a single global warming potential for greenhouse gas emissions. (...)’

A direct interpretation is that the GWP is an index of the total energy added to the climate system by a component in question relative to that added by CO₂. (...) The GWP has become the default metric for transferring emissions of different gases to a common scale; often called ‘CO₂ equivalent emissions’ (e.g., Shine, 2009). It has usually been integrated over 20, 100 or 500 years consistent with Houghton et al. (1990). (...) **The GWP for a time horizon of 100 years was later adopted as a metric to implement the multi-gas approach embedded in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and made operational in the 1997 Kyoto Protocol.** The choice of time horizon has a strong effect on the GWP values — and thus also on the calculated contributions of CO₂ equivalent emissions by component, sector or nation.”³⁹

GTP100:


“Compared to the GWP, the Global Temperature change Potential (GTP; Shine et al., 2005a) goes one step further down the cause–effect chain, and is defined as the *change in global mean surface temperature at a chosen point in time in response to an emission pulse*—relative to that of CO₂. Whereas GWP is integrated in time, GTP is an end-point metric that is based on temperature change for a selected year (...).

Like GWP, the GTP values can be used for weighting the emissions to obtain ‘CO₂ equivalents’. This gives the temperature effects of emissions relative to that of CO₂ for the chosen time horizon. As for GWP, the choice of time horizon has a strong effect on the metric values and the calculated contributions to warming. (...) By accounting for the climate sensitivity and the exchange of heat between the atmosphere and the ocean, the GTP includes physical processes that the GWP does not. The GTP accounts for the slow response of the (deep) ocean, thereby prolonging the response to emissions beyond what is controlled by the decay time of the atmospheric concentration. Thus the GTP includes both the atmospheric adjustment time scale of the component considered and the response time scale of the climate system”⁴⁰

³⁹ [IPCC Assessment Report 5, Chapter 8, page 710-712](#). Myhre, G., D. Shindell, F.-M. Bréon, W. Collins, J. Fuglestedt, J. Huang, D. Koch, J.-F. Lamarque, D. Lee, B. Mendoza, T. Nakajima, A. Robock, G. Stephens, T. Takemura and H. Zhang, 2013: Anthropogenic and Natural Radiative Forcing. In: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

⁴⁰ [IPCC Assessment Report 5, Chapter 8, page 712](#). Myhre, G., D. Shindell, F.-M. Bréon, W. Collins, J. Fuglestedt, J. Huang, D. Koch, J.-F. Lamarque, D. Lee, B. Mendoza, T. Nakajima, A. Robock, G. Stephens, T.

GWP and GTP example projection⁴¹:



Takemura and H. Zhang, 2013: Anthropogenic and Natural Radiative Forcing. In: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

⁴¹ IPCC, 2014: [Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](#) [Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Meyer (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland.

Impact	GHG emissions reduction		
Proposed question	<i>Have measures been taken in the implementation of this activity to directly reduce the emissions of GHG, including CO₂, or to encourage such reductions?</i>		
Indicator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kg/ton CO₂ emissions ▪ Kg/ton non-CO₂ GHG emissions (as CO₂ equivalent) 		
Existing measurements	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (IPCC, produced at the invitation of the UNFCCC)		
Relevant SDGs	<p>#9.4 By 2030, upgrade infrastructure and retrofit industries to make them sustainable, with increased resource-use efficiency and greater adoption of clean and environmentally sound technologies and industrial processes, with all countries taking action in accordance with their respective capabilities</p> <p>#9.4.1 CO₂ emission per unit of value added</p> <p>#13.2.1 Number of countries that have communicated the establishment or operationalization of an integrated policy/strategy/plan which increases their ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change, and foster climate resilience and low greenhouse gas emissions development in a manner that does not threaten food production (including a national adaptation plan, nationally determined contribution, national communication, biennial update report or other)</p>		
Relevance to Rio+20 “The Future We Want”	<p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Energy</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Sustainable transport</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Climate Change</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Sustainable consumption and production</p>		
Relevance to the Paris Agreement	<p>Article 2: on reducing adapting to the adverse impacts of climate change</p> <p>Article 4: on national GHG emissions</p> <p>Article 6: on approaches to mitigation and reduction of GHG emissions</p>		
Life cycle perspective	GHG emissions are commonly measured/calculated with a “footprint” perspective: i.e. they can include all the emissions generated upstream of a specific assessment point. It is essential that the “GHG footprint” (or carbon footprint; or GHG Protocol Scope 3) approach be considered for this indicator, in order to avoid trade-off/leakage of emissions to other life cycle stages (e.g. if the measures taken do reduce GHG emissions in the actual activity but at the expense of inputs that are more intensive in GHG emissions, or generating a product that generates more GHG in its use phase, downstream...).		
IRP projection	“According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), scenarios in which it is “likely” that the global temperature will rise less than 2°C above pre-industrial levels “are characterized by atmospheric concentrations in 2100 of about 450 ppm CO ₂ eq”. Such scenarios require global GHG emissions in 2050 to be 40–70 percent lower than in 2010, and for GHG emissions to be “near zero Gt CO ₂ eq or below in 2100” (IPCC, 2014d).” ⁴²		
Limitations	<p>Relative emissions reductions (in kg GHG/tonne of output or kg / \$ value added) may be achieved, but if overall consumption grows faster, then absolute emissions are not.</p> <p>A review of the proposed indicators will be done on the basis of data received through the pilot testing of impact indicators, and should take into account the above limitations</p>		
Scientific sources	<p>IPCC: IPCC 5th Assessment Report (AR5)</p>	<p>IRP: IRP report on Resource Efficiency (resource efficient scenario)</p>	<p>LCI: Global Guidance for Life Cycle Impact Assessment Indicators Volume 1</p>

⁴² IRP, 2017: “Resource Efficiency: Potential and Economic Implications.”, Link [here](#)

Impact	Reduction of air, soil and water pollutants
Proposed question	<i>Was reduction of pollutants in relation to air, soil and water quality integrated in the implementation of this activity or does the activity encourage a decrease of such pollutants (e.g. nitrogen concentrations, SLCP emissions, particulate matter, agricultural inputs)?</i>
Indicator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) – as ratio of fertilizer removed to fertilizer applied (nitrogen per hectare) ▪ % decrease of SLCP emissions/fine particulate matter
Existing measurements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nitrogen Use Efficiency as an Agro-Environmental Indicator (OECD) ▪ Supporting National Planning for Action on Short-Lived Climate Pollutants (SNAP): SLCP National Planning Guidance Document (Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), CCAC) ▪ Data requirements: SNAP toolkit on short-lived climate pollutants (LEAP-IBC) (Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI))
Relevant SDGs	<p>#3.9 By 2030, substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination</p> <p>#6.3 By 2030, improve water quality by reducing pollution, eliminating dumping and minimizing release of hazardous chemicals and materials, halving the proportion of untreated wastewater and substantially increasing recycling and safe reuse globally</p> <p>#11.6.2 Annual mean levels of fine particulate matter (e.g. PM2.5 and PM10) in cities (population weighted)</p> <p>#12.4 By 2020, achieve the environmentally sound management of chemicals and all wastes throughout their life cycle, in accordance with agreed international frameworks, and significantly reduce their release to air, water and soil in order to minimize their adverse impacts on human health and the environment</p>
Relevance to Rio+20 “The Future We Want”	<p>IV.C: Environmental pillar in the context of sustainable development</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Food security and nutrition and sustainable agriculture</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Water and sanitation</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Energy</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Sustainable transport</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Sustainable cities and human settlements</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Health and population</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Oceans and seas</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Desertification, land degradation and drought</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Chemicals and waste</p>
Relevance to the Paris Agreement	-
Life cycle perspective	Current life cycle approaches allow assessing systems’ contributions to air, soil and water pollution impacts caused by a variety of emissions with a life cycle perspective. ⁴³
IRP projection	Potential projection have been suggested by the CCAC and are as follows: “Global action on black carbon and methane can help slow down expected warming in 2050 by up to 0.5 degree Celsius and avoid about 2.4 million annual premature deaths and 52 million tonnes of annual crop loss by 2030.” ⁴⁴

⁴³ LCI: “Global Guidance for Life Cycle Impact Assessment Indicators Volume 1”, Link [here](#)

⁴⁴ CCAC: “Supporting National Action and Planning on SLCPs (SNAP)”, Link [here](#)

Limitations	A review of the proposed indicators will be done on the basis of data received through the pilot testing of impact indicators, and should take into account the any limitations identified.		
Scientific sources	CCAC: Short-Lived Climate Pollutants Time to act to reduce short-lived climate pollutants	OECD: Nitrogen Use Efficiency	LCI: Global Guidance for Life Cycle Impact Assessment Indicators Volume 1

Impact	Biodiversity conservation and sustainable land-use
Proposed question	<i>Does the activity encourage biodiversity conservation and/or increase sustainable land-use, or does the activity directly affect biodiversity and land-use towards more sustainable practices?</i>
Indicator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proportion of land that is degraded over total land area ▪ % of terrestrial/coastal/marine area under protection/certification schemes
Existing measurements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SDG 2.4.1 (FAO) – “Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture”. – Tier III, <i>Methodology still in development</i> ▪ SDG 11.3.1 (UN-Habitat) – “Ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate”. - Tier II, <i>Methodology still in development</i> ▪ SDG 15.1.1 (FAO) – “Forest area as a proportion of total land area”. – Tier I ▪ SDG 15.1.2 (UNEP-WCMC, BLI, IUCN) – “Proportion of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity that are covered by protected areas, by ecosystem type” – Tier I ▪ SDG 15.3.1 (UNCCD) – “Proportion of land that is degraded over total land area” – Tier III, <i>Methodology still in development</i>
Relevant SDGs	<p>#2.4 By 2030, ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production, that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters and that progressively improve land and soil quality</p> <p>#6.6 By 2020, protect and restore water-related ecosystems, including mountains, forests, wetlands, rivers, aquifers and lakes</p> <p>#11.3.1 Ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate</p> <p>#12.2 By 2030, achieve the sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources</p> <p>#14.5: Conserve at least 10% of coastal and marine areas by 2020 consistent with national and international law and based on best available scientific information</p> <p>#15.1: By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements</p> <p>#15.2 By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally</p> <p>#15.3 By 2030, combat desertification, restore degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought and floods, and strive to achieve a land degradation-neutral world</p> <p>#15.5: Take urgent and significant action to reduce the degradation of natural habitats, halt the loss of biodiversity and, by 2020, protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species</p>

<p>Relevance to Rio+20 “The Future We Want”</p>	<p>III: Green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Food security and nutrition and sustainable agriculture V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Sustainable tourism V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Oceans and seas V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Biodiversity V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Desertification, land degradation and drought V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Forests V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Mountains</p>	
<p>Relevance to the Paris Agreement</p>	<p>“Noting the importance of ensuring the integrity of all ecosystems, including oceans, and the protection of biodiversity, recognized by some cultures as Mother Earth, and noting the importance for some of the concept of "climate justice", when taking action to address climate change”</p> <p>Article 5: on conservation of GHG sinks and reservoirs</p>	
<p>Life cycle perspective</p>	<p>The indicators proposed only cover one potential way of contributing to the question to be addressed. Current life cycle approaches allow assessing systems’ contributions to biodiversity impacts caused by land use with a life cycle perspective.⁴⁵</p>	
<p>IRP projection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Under business-as-usual conditions the <i>net expansion</i> of cropland (rising demand for food and non-food biomass which cannot be compensated by higher yields) will range from around 120 to 500 million hectares between 2005 and 2050. In addition, cropland will be shifted to compensate for the expansion of built-up land and land degradation, leading all in all to a <i>gross expansion</i> of cropland in the range of 320 to 850 million hectares. ▪ The global net cropland area available for supplying demand could safely increase up to 1,640 Mha. This value is taken as a reference for sustainable consumption of agricultural goods. Under the above-described business-as-usual conditions, the expected range of cropland expansion would overshoot the “safe operating space” in all cases by 2050.”⁴⁶ 	
<p>Limitations</p>	<p>A review of the proposed indicators will be done on the basis of data received through the pilot testing of impact indicators, and should take into account the any limitations identified.</p>	
<p>Scientific sources</p>	<p>IRP: Assessing Global Land Use: Balancing Consumption with Sustainable Supply</p>	<p>LCI: Global Guidance for Life Cycle Impact Assessment Indicators Volume 1</p>

⁴⁵ LCI: “Global Guidance for Life Cycle Impact Assessment Indicators Volume 1”, Link [here](#)

⁴⁶ IRP, 2014: “Assessing Global Land Use: Balancing Consumption with Sustainable Supply.”, Link [here](#)


4.3 Human Well-being

- Gender
- Decent work
- Health

Key projection measurement for impact level: Human Development Index (source: UNDP)

Human Development Index:

“The Human Development Index (HDI) is a summary measure of average achievement in key dimensions of human development: a long and healthy life, being knowledgeable and have a decent standard of living. (...) The health dimension is assessed by life expectancy at birth, the education dimension is measured by mean of years of schooling for adults aged 25 years and more and expected years of schooling for children of school entering age. The standard of living dimension is measured by gross national income per capita.”⁴⁷



HDI example projection: “an accelerated progress scenario that set ambitious targets for raising the Human Development Index (HDI) value in all regions by 2050 through a series of public spending initiatives. This scenario assumes about 20% improvement in infrastructure by 2050, universal access to electricity by 2030, elimination of solid fuels as the primary source for heating and cooking in the home by 2030, renewable energy production 50% above the base case by 2050 and universal access to mobile telephone and broadband by 2030. The largest projected increases in HDI value under this scenario are in Sub-Saharan Africa (65%) and South Asia (47%)”⁴⁸

⁴⁷ UNDP, 2016: “Human Development Index (HDI)”, Link [here](#)

⁴⁸ UNDP, 2013: “Human Development Report 2013”, Link [here](#)

Impact	Gender	
Proposed question	<i>Have gender aspects been directly integrated into the implementation of this activity and/or does the activity aim to influence societal issues/conflicts related to gender?</i>	
Indicator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Average hourly earnings of female and male employees ▪ Female and male labour force participation rates 	
Existing measurements	SDG 8.5.1/ILOSTAT (ILO) – Tier II Labour force participation rate (ILO)	
Relevant SDGs	<p>#5.5 Ensure women’s full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life</p> <p>#5.A Undertake reforms to give women equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, financial services, inheritance and natural resources, in accordance with national laws</p> <p>#8.5.1 Average hourly earnings of female and male employees, by occupation, age and persons with disabilities</p>	
Relevance to Rio+20 “The Future We Want”	<p>II.B: Advancing integration, implementation and coherence</p> <p>II.C: Engaging major groups and other stakeholders</p> <p>III: Green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Health and population</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Promoting full and productive employment, decent work for all and social protection</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Education</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Gender equality and women’s empowerment</p>	
Relevance to the Paris Agreement	Article 7: on people affected by climate change and participatory approaches	
Life cycle perspective	It is important to consider a life cycle perspective also for social indicators; e.g. avoid the “fair trade bananas transported in boats with appalling labour conditions”.	
IRP projection	-	
Limitations	<p>The proposed indicators for the pilot testing of impact on gender does not take into account gender aspects related to; education, household structure and dynamic, community engagement, political influence, social activities. Gender in education is covered by the separate outcome indicator 3.3 <i>Education on SCP</i>.</p> <p>A review of the proposed indicators will be done on the basis of data received through the pilot testing of impact indicators, and should take into account the above limitations.</p>	
Scientific sources	ILO: ILO Decent Work Indicators	UNDP: Human Development Index

Impact	Decent work		
Proposed question	<i>Has measures been taken to ensure decent work in the implementation of this activity and/or does the activity help promote/facilitate decent work?</i>		
Indicator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minimum wage as a percentage of the median wage ▪ Total household income/consumption 		
Existing measurements	Decent Work Indicators: guidelines for producers and users of statistical and legal framework indicators, ILO Manual (ILO)		
Relevant SDGs	<p>#8.3 Promote development-oriented policies that support productive activities, decent job creation, entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, and encourage the formalization and growth of micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises, including through access to financial services</p> <p>#8.5 By 2030, achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value</p> <p>#10.1.1 Growth rates of household expenditure or income per capita among the bottom 40 per cent of the population and the total population</p>		
Relevance to Rio+20 “The Future We Want”	<p>II.B: Advancing integration, implementation and coherence</p> <p>II.C: Engaging major groups and other stakeholders</p> <p>III: Green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Sustainable cities and human settlements</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Promoting full and productive employment, decent work for all and social protection</p>		
Relevance to the Paris Agreement	“Taking into account the imperatives of a just transition of the workforce and the creation of decent work and quality jobs in accordance with nationally defined development priorities”		
Life cycle perspective	It is important to consider a life cycle perspective also for social indicators; e.g. avoid the “fair trade bananas transported in boats with appalling labour conditions”.		
IRP projection	-		
Limitations	<p>The proposed indicators for the pilot testing of impact on decent work does not take into account aspects related to; green jobs and workplace safety.</p> <p>A review of the proposed indicators will be done on the basis of data received through the pilot testing of impact indicators, and should take into account the above limitations.</p>		
Scientific sources	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>ILO: ILO Decent Work Indicators</td> <td>UNDP: Human Development Index</td> </tr> </table>	ILO: ILO Decent Work Indicators	UNDP: Human Development Index
ILO: ILO Decent Work Indicators	UNDP: Human Development Index		

Impact	Health
Proposed question	<i>Does the activity influence either directly or indirectly the prevalence of illnesses from pollution and toxicity, such as air, soil and water pollution, or non-communicable diseases/illnesses, such as those related to lifestyles and consumption?</i>
Indicator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % relative reduction in the risk of premature mortality from NCDs, such as cardiovascular diseases, cancer, diabetes or chronic respiratory diseases ▪ Mortality rate attributed to household and ambient air pollution, unsafe water, unintentional poisoning or toxicity
Existing measurements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SDG 3.4.1 (WHO) – Tier II ▪ SDG 3.9.1 (WHO/UNEP) – Tier I ▪ SDG 3.9.2 (WHO/UNEP) – Tier II ▪ SDG 3.9.3 (WHO/UNEP) – Tier II ▪ Disability-Adjusted Life Years: Metrics & National Burden Disease Manual (WHO)

Relevant SDGs	<p>#3.4.1 Mortality rate attributed to cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes or chronic respiratory disease</p> <p>#3.9 By 2030, substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination</p>			
Relevance to Rio+20 “The Future We Want”	<p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Food security and nutrition and sustainable agriculture</p> <p>V.A: Framework for action and follow-up – Health and population</p>			
Relevance to the Paris Agreement	-			
Life cycle perspective	It is important to consider a life cycle perspective also for health indicators; current life cycle impact assessment indicators provide the DALYs generated by different processes across consumption and production systems, thus assessing whether the activity is improving or worsening the impact on human health.			
IRP projection	“Approximately 19 million premature deaths are estimated to occur each year globally due to environmental and infrastructure related risk factors that arise from the way societies use natural resources in production and consumption systems, including essential infrastructure and food provisions (Ramaswami et al. 2016). More than 7 million premature deaths arise from air pollution, a vast majority occurring in cities, related with energy supply and use in homes and industries, and transportation and construction sectors of cities (ibid).” ⁴⁹			
Limitations	<p>The proposed indicators for the pilot testing of impact on health currently takes into account both mortality rate in relation to NDCs and to pollution. The lack of distinction between the two at the indicator level may result in difficulties in comparing reported impacts on health. In the case that such difficulties occur, clear explanation should be given in the disclaimers of the analysis and presentation of results. It is understood that the attribution of these indicators on health may be difficult to determine with certainty and disclaimers should be included on this as well.</p> <p>A review of the proposed indicators will be done on the basis of data received through the pilot testing of impact indicators, and should take into account the above limitations.</p>			
Scientific sources	<p>ILO: ILO Decent Work Indicators</p>	<p>UNDP: Human Development Index</p>	<p>WHO: Disability-Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) definition Disability-Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) by region/country</p>	<p>CCAC: Time to act to reduce short-lived climate pollutants</p>
	<p>LCI: Global Guidance for Life Cycle Impact Assessment Indicators Volume 1</p>			

⁴⁹ IRP, 2017: “Assessing global resource use: A systems approach to resource efficiency and pollution reduction”, to be published at UNEA3 in December 2017

ANNEX 5: GENERAL REFERENCES

Publications

CCAC (2016): *Guidance for national planning to reduce short-lived climate pollutants*. Developed by the Supporting National Planning for Action on SLCPs (SNAP) Initiative of the Climate and Clean Air Coalition. Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), International Union of Air Pollution Prevention and Environmental Protection Associations (IUAPPA), Molina Center for Energy and the Environment (MCE2), Institute for Governance & Sustainable Development (IGSD), UN Environment.

CCAC (2014). *Time to act to reduce short-lived climate pollutants*. Ed. Sophie Bonnard, UNEP-CCAC Secretariat; Nathan Borgford-Parnell, Advisor to the CCAC Secretariat.

GRI (2012). *Public sector sustainability reporting: Remove the clutter, reduce the burden*.

International Energy Agency (IEA) and the World Bank (2017). *Sustainable Energy for All 2017—Progress toward Sustainable Energy* (Summary). World Bank, Washington, DC. License: Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 3.0 IGO

IETC (2015). *Global Waste Management Outlook*. David C. Wilson, Ljiljana Rodic (Senior Researcher, Wageningen University and Research Centre, Wageningen, The Netherlands), Prasad Modak (Executive President of Environmental Management Centre (EMC) LLP, India), Reka Soos (Director of Resources and Waste Advisory Group and Managing Director of Green Partners, Romania), Ainhoa Carpintero Rogero (Associate Programme Officer, UNEP-IETC), Costas Velis (Lecturer in Resource Efficiency Systems, School of Civil Engineering, University of Leeds, UK), Mona Iyer (Associate Professor at Faculty of Planning, CEPT University, Ahmedabad, India), and Otto Simonett (Director and cofounder of Zoi Environment Network, Switzerland).

IPCC (2014a). *Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report*. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Meyer (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland.

IPCC. (2014b). *Summary for policymakers*. In O. Edenhofer, R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K. Seyboth, A. Adler, I. Baum, S. Brunner, p. Eickemeier, B. Kriemann, J. Savolainen, S. Schlömer, C. von Stechow, T. Zwickel, & J. C. Minx (Eds.), *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

IPCC (2013). *Anthropogenic and Natural Radiative Forcing*. In: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Myhre, G., D. Shindell, F.-M. Bréon, W. Collins, J. Fuglestedt, J. Huang, D. Koch, J.-F. Lamarque, D. Lee, B. Mendoza, T. Nakajima, A. Robock, G. Stephens, T. Takemura and H. Zhang. [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

IPCC (2006), *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*, Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, Eggleston H.S., Buendia L., Miwa K., Ngara T. and Tanabe K. (eds). Published: IGES, Japan.

IRP (2017). *Assessing global resource use: A systems approach to resource efficiency and pollution reduction*. Bringezu, S., Ramaswami, A., Schandl, H., O'Brien, M., Pelton, R., Acquatella, J., Ayuk, E., Chiu, A., Flanegin, R., Fry, J., Giljum, S., Hashimoto, S., Hellweg, S., Hosking, K., Hu, Y., Lenzen, M., Lieber, M., Lutter, S., Miatto, A., Singh Nagpure, A., Obersteiner, M., van Oers, L., Pfister, S., Pichler, P., Russell, A., Spini, L., Tanikawa, H., van der Voet, E., Weisz, H., West, J., Wijkman, A., Zhu, B., Zivy, R. A Report of the International Resource Panel. United Nations Environment Programme. Nairobi, Kenya. *(to be published at UNEA3 in December 2017)*

ISO (2014). *ISO 14045:2014 (en) Environmental management – Water footprint – Principles, requirements and guidelines*.

Life Cycle Initiative (2016). *Global Guidance for Life Cycle Impact Assessment Indicators Volume 1.*

Monitoring and Statistics Directorate (SOEs) (2017). *10 Key Indicators for Monitoring the Circular Economy – 2017 Edition.* Ministry of the Environment, Energy and Marine Affairs, Government of France. Published by The Monitoring and Statistics Directorate (SOEs), Acknowledgements: Alain Geldron (Ademe), Pierre Galio (Ademe), Rémi Galin (Meem), Doris Nicklaus (Meem), Murielle Gauvain (AFNOR), Alice Sarran and Pauline Lavoisy (Orée).

PAGE (2017). *The Green Economy Progress Measurement Framework – Methodology.*

UNDP (2002). *Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results.* UNDP Evaluation Office.

UNEP (2017) *Resource Efficiency: Potential and Economic Implications.* A report of the International Resource Panel. Ekins, P., Hughes, N., et al.

UNEP, GRI and KPMG (2016). *Carrots Sticks Global trends in sustainability reporting regulation and policy.*

UNEP (2015a). *Sustainable Consumption and Production Indicators for the Future SDGs.*

UNEP (2015b). *Options for decoupling economic growth from water use and water pollution.* Report of the International Resource Panel Working Group on Sustainable Water Management.

UNEP (2014a). *Guidance document on programme development and implementation for the Ten-Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production (10YFP): Criteria, structure and steps to develop and operationalize them.*

UNEP. (2014b). *Using Indicators for Green Economy Policymaking.*

UNEP (2014c) *Assessing Global Land Use: Balancing Consumption with Sustainable Supply.* A Report of the Working Group on Land and Soils of the International Resource Panel. Bringezu S., Schütz H., Pengue W., O’Brien M., Garcia F., Sims R., Howarth R., Kauppi L., Swilling M., and Herrick J.

UNEP (2011a) *Decoupling natural resource use and environmental impacts from economic growth,* A Report of the Working Group on Decoupling to the International Resource Panel. Fischer-Kowalski, M., Swilling, M., von Weizsäcker, E.U., Ren, Y., Moriguchi, Y., Crane, W., Krausmann, F., Eisenmenger, N., Giljum, S., Hennicke, P., Romero Lankao, P., Siriban Manalang, A., Sewerin, S.

UNEP (2011b). *Global Outlook on SCP.*

UNEP (2010a). *ABC of SCP: Clarifying Concepts on Sustainable Consumption and Production.*

UNEP (2010b). *Assessing the Environmental Impacts of Consumption and Production: Priority Products and Materials,* A Report of the Working Group on the Environmental Impacts of Products and Materials to the International Panel for Sustainable Resource Management. Hertwich, E., van der Voet, E., Suh, S., Tukker, A., Huijbregts M., Kazmierczyk, P., Lenzen, M., McNeely, J., Moriguchi, Y.

World Bank. (2017). *The Little Green Data Book 2017.* World Development Indicators; Washington, DC: World Bank. © World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/27466> License: CC BY 3.0 IGO.

Papers and working documents

10YFP Sustainable Tourism Programme: *Draft “Key environmental impact indicators for tourism private sector”*

10YFP Sustainable Lifestyles and Education Programme: *Draft “Assessment of Systemic Changes and Scalability of SCP Projects”*

CCAC (2015) “Demonstrating Impacts of Activities Process, Framework and Methodology”. December 2015.

Economic and Social Council (2015). *Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals.* Report of the Secretary-General. July 2015-July 2016.

ILO: *Labour Force Participation Rate*. Accessible here: http://www.ilo.org/ilostat-files/Documents/description_LFPR_EN.pdf

OECD: *Nitrogen Use Efficiency as an Agro-Environmental Indicator*. Frank Brentrup, Christian Palliere, Yara International, Research Centre Hanninghof, Duermen, Germany, Fertilizers Europe (Efma), Brussels, Belgium.

Paul Hohnen (2012). “The Future of Sustainability Reporting”. EEDP Programme Paper: 2012/02. Chatham House. January 2012. Accessible here: https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/files/chathamhouse/public/Research/Energy,%20Environment%20and%20Development/0112pp_hohnen.pdf

UN (2014). *Country Classification*. Prepared by the Development Policy and Analysis Division (DPAD) of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat (UN/DESA).

UNEP (2015). Sustainable Consumption and Production Indicators for the Future SDGs. March 2015. UNEP Discussion paper.

UNWTO (2015). “10YFP Sustainable Tourism Programme (STP): Operational Terms of Reference”.

Websites

10YFP SCP Clearinghouse website: <http://www.spcclearinghouse.org/>

Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-Operation Explore Monitoring Data
<http://effectivecooperation.org/monitoring-country-progress/explore-monitoring-data/>

Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Sustainability disclosure database <http://database.globalreporting.org/>

ILO Decent Work Indicators http://www.ilo.org/integration/themes/mdw/WCMS_189392/lang-en/index.htm

ILO Green Jobs Assessment Reports: <http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/green-jobs/publications/assessments/lang-en/index.htm>

IPCC Fifth Assessment Report: <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/>

IRP Global Data Set of Resource Efficiency Data (1970-2017)
https://uneplive.unep.org/material#.WjxRc_KnTVJ

OECD Better Life Index <http://www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org/>

SDG targets and indicators can be found at: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdgs>

SDG indicators methodology can be found at: <http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/iaeg-sdgs/metadata-compilation/>

SDG indicators global database can be found at: <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/database/>

UNDP Gender Inequality Index (GII): <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/gender-inequality-index-gii>

UNDP Human Development Index (HDI): <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-index-hdi>

UNDP Independent Evaluation Office <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/>

UNEP Live (Natural Resources: DMC, Energy, GHG, Water Footprint): <http://uneplive.unep.org>

Water Footprint Network What is water footprint: <http://waterfootprint.org/en/water-footprint/what-is-water-footprint/>

Water Use in LCA (WULCA) Water footprint: <http://www.wulca-waterlca.org/footprinting.html>

WHO Disability-Adjusted Life Years:
http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/metrics_daly/en/



10YFP Secretariat

UN Environment Programme

Email: 10yfp@unep.org

1 rue Miollis

Building VII

www.scpclearinghouse.org



SCP Clearinghouse



@10YFP



@GlobalSCP