




GREEN economy

A GUIDANCE MANUAL FOR GREEN ECONOMY INDICATORS





Copyright © United Nations Environment Programme, 2014

This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part and in any form for educational or non-profit purposes without special permission from the copyright holder, provided acknowledgement of the source is made. UNEP would appreciate receiving a copy of any publication that uses this publication as a source.

No use of this publication may be made for resale or for any other commercial purpose whatsoever without prior permission in writing from the United Nations Environment Programme.

Citation

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

Disclaimer

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the United Nations Environment Programme concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. Moreover, the views expressed do not necessarily represent the decision or the stated policy of the United Nations Environment Programme, nor does citing of trade names or commercial processes constitute endorsement.

UNEP promotes environmentally sound practices globally and in its own activities. This publication is printed on 100% recycled paper, using vegetable inks and other eco-friendly practices. Our distribution policy aims to reduce UNEP's carbon footprint.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

iv	List of acronyms
iv	List of boxes
iv	List of figures
iv	List of tables
1	Acknowledgements
2	Executive summary
4	1 Introduction
10	2 Indicators for issue identification
10	2.1 Introduction
10	2.2 Methodology
12	2.3 Step 1: Identify potentially worrying trends
14	2.4 Step 2: Assess the issue and its relation to the natural environment
15	2.5 Step 3: Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue of concern
17	2.6 Step 4: Analyse more fully how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment
22	3 Indicators for policy formulation
22	3.1 Introduction
22	3.2 Methodology
23	3.3 Step 1: Identify desired outcomes: define policy objectives
26	3.4 Step 2: Identify intervention options and output indicators
30	4 Indicators for policy assessment
30	4.1 Introduction
30	4.2 Methodology
31	4.3 Step 1: Estimate policy impacts across sectors
32	4.4 Step 2: Analyse impacts on the overall well-being of the population
34	4.5 Step 3: Analyse advantages and disadvantages and inform decision-making
40	5 Indicators for policy monitoring and evaluation
40	5.1 Introduction
41	5.2 Methodology
	5.3 Measuring policy performance: effectiveness, investment and well-being
60	6 Looking ahead
62	Notes
63	References

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1 Overview of the Integrated Policymaking process.
- Figure 2 Example of the multiple benefits generated by green economy policy interventions.
- Figure 3 A schematic representation of the DPSIR Framework.
- Figure 4 Simplified (and partial) causal tree diagram for the issue of nutrition and possible key drivers, where indicators are linked to each other representing the causal chain leading to the problem.
- Figure 5 Diagramme illustrating the impacts of business as usual (left) and green economy scenarios (right).
- Figure 6 Simplified Causal Loop Diagram representing the main causal relations existing among the economy and the environment (forest cover) in Borneo.

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1 Overview of the structure of the manual and main steps proposed to support the policymaking process.
- Table 2 Indicators for production, consumption and decoupling (intensity and productivity). Selected examples for climate change and water stress.
- Table 3 Summary of key steps and related indicators for issue identification: Examples for deforestation, nutrition and CO₂ emissions.
- Table 4 Summary of key steps and related indicators for policy formulation: Examples for deforestation, nutrition and CO₂ emissions.
- Table 5 Key steps and related indicators for policy impact evaluation: Examples for deforestation, nutrition and CO₂ emissions.
- Table 6 Land-locked dry- and sub-humid country with dominant agriculture and in early phases of demographic transition and urbanisation. Key steps and sample indicators for policymaking to address the problem of decreasing agricultural production.
- Table 7 Tropical or sub-tropical small island developing state with dominant industries being tourism and fisheries. Key steps and sample indicators for policymaking to address the problem of decreasing fish catch.
- Table 8 Low-lying coastal middle income country with rapid industrialisation and urbanisation, and relatively advanced demographic transition. Key steps and sample indicators for policymaking to address the problem of increasing pollution and growing cost of living.
- Table 9 Mountainous coastal country with mining, agriculture, and fisheries. Key steps and sample indicators for policymaking to address the problem of increasing frequency of floods.
- Table 10 Developed country with limited natural resources but high potential (and financial resources) for efficiency improvement. Key steps and sample indicators for policymaking to address the problem of rising energy costs, with negative impacts on investments and competitiveness.
- Table 11 Key steps and sample indicators for issue identification and green economy policy formulation, assessment and evaluation

LIST OF BOXES

- Box 1 What is an indicator? What are its basic characteristics?
- Box 2 Key steps: indicators for issue identification
- Box 3 Summary of Step 1: Identify potential worrying trends
- Box 4 Summary of Step 2: Assess the issue and its relation to the natural environment
- Box 5 Summary of Step 3: Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue
- Box 6 Mapping the system with Causal Loop Diagrams
- Box 7 Summary of Step 4: Analyse how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment
- Box 8 Key steps: indicators for policy formulation
- Box 9 Analysing the effect of interventions as outputs, outcomes and impacts
- Box 10 Summary of Step 1: Identify desired outcomes and define policy objectives
- Box 11 Summary of Step 2: Identify intervention options and output indicators
- Box 13 Summary of Step 1: Estimate policy impacts across sectors
- Box 14 Summary of Step 2: Analyse impacts on the overall well-being of the population
- Box 15 Summary of Step 3: Analyse advantages and disadvantages, and inform decision-making
- Box 16 Ex ante and ex post modelling in support of policy formulation and evaluation
- Box 17 Key steps: indicators for policy monitoring and evaluation
- Box 18 Summary: Measure policy performance
- Box 19 Land-locked dry and sub-humid country, with dominant agriculture and in early phases of demographic transition and urbanisation.
- Box 20 Tropical or sub-tropical small island developing state with dominant sectors being tourism and fisheries.
- Box 21 Low-lying coastal middle income with rapid industrialisation and urbanisation, and relatively advanced demographic transition.
- Box 22: Mountainous coastal country with mining, agriculture and fisheries
- Box 23: Developed country with limited natural resources but high potential (and financial resources) for efficiency improvement.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

- CAPP Chemical Accident Prevention and Preparedness
- CBD Convention on Biological Diversity
- CLD Causal Loop Diagram
- CPUE Catch per Unit of Fishing Effort
- DPSIR Driving force – Pressure – State – Impact – Response
- EE Energy Efficiency
- EGSS Environmental Goods and Services Sector
- GDI Gender-related Development Index
- GDP Gross Domestic Product
- GE Green Economy
- GEF Global Environment Facility
- GGGI Global Green Growth Institute
- GGKP Green Growth Knowledge Platform
- GHG Greenhouse Gas
- GII Gender Inequality Index
- GPI Genuine Progress Indicator
- HDI Human Development Index
- IEA International Energy Agency
- IP Integrated Policymaking
- ISEW Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare
- IWI Inclusive Wealth Index
- M&E Monitoring and Evaluation
- MDG Millennium Development Goals
- MPI Multidimensional Poverty Index
- O&M Operation and Management
- OECD Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
- PES Payments for Ecosystem Services
- PME Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation
- R&D Research and Development
- RES Renewable Energy Standards
- RIA Regulatory Impact Analysis
- ROI Return on Investments
- SCP Sustainable Consumption and Production
- SD System Dynamics
- SEEA System of Environmental-Economic Accounting
- SIDS Small Island Developing States
- SMART Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound
- SNBI Sustainable Net Benefit Index
- STAMP SusTainability Assessment and Measurement Principles
- UNEP United Nations Environment Programme
- WAVES Wealth Accounting and the Valuation of Ecosystem Services
- WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre
- WWF Worldwide Fund for Nature

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper was written by Andrea M. Bassi, with substantive input from Sheng Fulai and Markus Lehman, and with contributions from the following UNEP staff: Claudia Assmann, Alice Dauriach, Joy Kim, Alex Leshchynskyy, Richard Scotney and Steven Stone, as well as Cleopus Wang'ombe and Germán Benitez, who helped to review it. Diwata Hunziker, Leigh-Ann Hurt, Stephanie Mansourias and Tan Ding Yong provided editorial assistance. The design and layout was done by Thomas Gianinazzi.

Special thanks to the participants of the International Symposium on Green Economy and Environmental Competitiveness Indicators jointly organised by UNEP and Fujian Normal University in Fuzhou, China from 26 to 27 March 2013, in particular: Anna Chenery Mokshanand Dowarkasing, Hoseok Kim, László Pintér, Novrizal Tahar, Zhou Xin, and Zhang Xuehua for their precious comments.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

For UNEP, the green economy is one: “that results in improved human well-being and social equity, while significantly reducing environmental risks and ecological scarcities” (UNEP, 2011a). The transition to a green economy can occur successfully by investing in areas that decouple economic growth from resource use and environmental impacts. The broad nature of green economy challenges and opportunities requires the use of effective methods and tools to support countries in the formulation of targeted policies for the transition towards a more sustainable future.

This manual provides guidance to users at the country level on the selection of indicators and their use as a tool for identifying priority issues, formulating and assessing green economy policy options, and evaluating the performance of policy implementation. In particular, a series of steps are suggested for the identification and use of indicators throughout the integrated policymaking (IP) cycle. More specifically, emphasis is put on three IP stages in which the use of indicators is particularly relevant, namely (1) issue identification and agenda setting; (2) policy formulation and assessment, and (3) monitoring and evaluation (M&E). Stage 2 (policy formulation and assessment) is further sub-divided into two for the purposes of this manual.

INDICATORS FOR ISSUE IDENTIFICATION

Indicators for issue identification are instruments that help decision makers identify and prioritise problems that might undermine the path towards sustainable development.

Four steps are proposed for the use of indicators in the issue identification phase, namely:

1. Identify potentially worrying trends;

2. Assess the issue and its relation to the natural environment;
3. Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue of concern;
4. Analyse more fully how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment.

The combination of different indicators for the analysis of simultaneous environmental, social and economic trends is essential to identify potential issues (present and/or upcoming), and clearly determine their causes and effects within and across sectors.

INDICATORS FOR POLICY FORMULATION

The second stage of the integrated policymaking cycle consists in the definition of policy goals, to then proceed with policy formulation. While indicators for issue identification help to frame the problem, indicators for policy formulation help to design solutions.

Two key steps are described in this manual for the formulation of sound green economy policies with the help of indicators:

1. Identify policy objectives; and
2. Identify intervention options.

The identification of policy objectives and targets is based on the results of the issue identification phase. Policy objectives should be stated in a manner that is specific or targeted, measurable, ambitious while achievable or realistic, and time-bound (SMART). Once policy objectives and targets are established, various intervention options (including investments, provision of incentives or disincentives, public targets mandated by law and social interventions) need to be analysed with the

help of indicators. Moreover, a multi-stakeholder approach is required to ensure that different perspectives are considered and incorporated in the definition of policy objectives and targeted interventions.

INDICATORS FOR POLICY ASSESSMENT

In the policy assessment phase, expected economic, social and environmental effects of different policy options need to be measured with the help of impact indicators. Also, an analysis of advantages and disadvantages of each policy option needs to be carried out in order to provide solid evidence in support of decision-making.

Three steps are suggested for this phase, namely:

1. Estimate policy impacts across sectors;
2. Analyse impacts on the overall well-being of the population;
3. Analyse advantages and disadvantages, and inform decision-making.

While indicators for problem identification help to frame the issue, and indicators for policy formulation help to design solutions, impact indicators support the assessment of the cross-sectoral impact of the interventions chosen. The analysis should include an estimation of co-benefits and ancillary benefits for the economy as a whole, as well as the improvement of well-being of the entire population. Finally, the use of monetary and financial indicators enables the assessment of the feasibility of each intervention, comparing investment and avoided costs, or added benefits, depending on the issue to be solved.

INDICATORS FOR POLICY MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The last stage of the integrated policymaking cycle consists in the monitoring and evaluation of policy impacts during and after implementation. Indicators for policy monitoring and evaluation support the assessment of the performance of the intervention implemented, and allow decision makers to design timely corrective measures, when needed.

Three key steps are proposed for this phase:

1. Measure policy impacts in relation to the environmental issue (using indicators for issue identification);
2. Measure the investment leveraged (using indicators for policy formulation);
3. Measure impacts across sectors and on the overall well-being of the population (using indicators for policy assessment).

In this phase, indicators for issue identification should be analysed to test the actual effect of the interventions on the problem identified at the beginning of the policy cycle. Further, indicators for issue identification should be compared to target indicators to evaluate whether the situation is improving and matching desired goals. Finally, actual policy impacts on the economy and overall well-being of the population should be carefully monitored and compared to the expectations defined in the policy assessment phase.

With the steps presented above, this manual provides guidance on how to use indicators in designing and implementing green economy policies at the national level. The goal of the manual is neither to propose new indicators, nor to identify a catch-all list of indicators to be used in the policymaking process. Instead, it acknowledges the unique geographical and socio-cultural contexts in which issues arise, and provides a step-by-step guide, with examples, on how to identify and use relevant indicators in designing and implementing green economy responses.

1 INTRODUCTION

This manual provides guidance on how to use indicators in designing and implementing green economy policies at the national level. It seeks to support interested countries to use indicators as a tool for identifying priority issues, formulating and assessing green economy policy options, and evaluating the performance of policy implementation. Emphasis is placed on those policy options with “multiple dividends” across the environmental, social and economic dimensions of sustainable development.

At the 2012 UN Conference on Sustainable Development (“Rio+20”), the Heads of State and Government, and high-level representatives recognised indicators as being necessary to assess progress towards the achievement of the millennium development goals (and in the future, of the sustainable development goals) while taking into account different national circumstances, capacities and levels of development. The green economy has been proposed as a means of catalysing renewed national policy development and international cooperation and support for sustainable development. This manual responds to the call of the Rio+20 Conference addressed to the UN system to support countries interested in pursuing green economy policies by providing methodologies for their evaluation. The primary audience is core teams of policy analysts and advisers involved in developing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating green economy policies at the country level. Other stakeholders may also find this manual useful to guide their substantive involvement in related consultative processes.

The goal of the manual is neither to propose new indicators, nor to identify a catch-all list of indicators to be used in the policymaking process. Instead, it acknowledges the unique geographical and socio-cultural contexts in which issues arise, and provides a step-by-step guide on how to identify and use

relevant indicators in designing and implementing green economy responses. In a similar vein, the manual does not identify and prioritise global issues to be addressed, but rather provides examples to illustrate what could potentially be considered a challenge in a given context and how to address it. Given the cross-sectoral nature of the analysis and implementation steps proposed, the use of existing indicators across various data sources is encouraged, as well as the involvement of a broad set of stakeholders, to support the design and implementation of a coherent and inclusive green economy strategy.

The structure of the manual follows a stylized policymaking process with the following stages:

- Issue identification and agenda setting;
- Policy formulation and assessment;
- Decision-making;
- Implementation; and
- Monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

The emphasis of the manual is on stages 1 and 2, and to some extent on stage 5. Given the importance of policy formulation and assessments, and while acknowledging that feedback loops exist between these tasks, a specific chapter is dedicated to each of them. Decision-making under stage 3 is just a point in time when a particular policy recommendation is adopted. This decision will be based on a comparison of different policy options that were developed under stage 2. The role of indicators in policy implementation, under stage 4, is mainly exercised through monitoring and evaluation (stage 5).

For UNEP, which leads on global environmental issues, the primary motivation for promoting green economy policies is necessarily environmental (UNEP, 2011a). However, the green economy approach is to a large extent socioeconomic: it seeks to redirect economic investments while taking into account the

UNEP defines green economy as “an economy that results in improved human well-being and social equity, while significantly reducing environmental risks and ecological scarcities”.


social implications of both the environmental issues identified by governments and the possible policy responses, and harnessing double or triple wins whenever achievable. The manual recognises that all three dimensions of sustainable development (economic, environmental and social) are relevant. As an illustrative example (hence concise and partial), consider a government programme that aims to restore degraded forest ecosystems in key watersheds:

- The programme will respond to deforestation and forest degradation both to restore forest ecosystems and to address climate change, thus contributing to the environmental dimension of sustainable development.

- However, it will also enhance the provision of safe drinking water as a key service of forest ecosystems in watersheds, thus improving the health of the local population and directly contributing to poverty eradication and social equity objectives – the social dimension of sustainable development.
- In so doing, the programme will leverage financial cost savings in other policy domains, ranging from lower health-related (curative) expenditures, to a lower investment need for water purification plants, thus contributing to the economic dimension of sustainable development.

Importantly, all three dimensions can serve as entry points for identifying issues and developing green economy policies. This approach is reflected in the way this manual is organised. In line with UNEP’s primary mandate, it uses predominantly environmental issues as illustrative entry points for a green economy policymaking process. More specifically, the tables at the end of this manual use examples from the four major thematic areas in UNEP’s medium term strategy: climate change; ecosystem management; resource efficiency; and chemicals and waste. The manual will show how

Figure 1. Overview of the integrated policymaking process



these broad themes can be brought down to a level that is amenable to further prioritisation and the development of policy responses. For instance, one can consider simplifying climate change issues by breaking them down into carbon sequestration, energy efficiency and adaptive measures; and equally simplifying ecosystem management by breaking it down into patterns of land use and land use change. In bringing broad environmental issues to a manageable level, there will be a need for baseline indicators against relevant thresholds or targets (IISD, 2005). Furthermore, in order to capture the attention of mainstream policymakers who face competing demands at any given time, it may also be necessary to express environmental issues in socio-economic terms, such as the cost of inaction.

Prospective users of this manual are not confined to those in the environmental community. It is important, therefore, to consider that this manual is equally applicable to the use of non-environmental issues as entry points. In some cases, the issue of concern may not appear to be environmental at first glance; for instance – taking up again the example above – the increased prevalence of water-borne diseases among rural farmers will initially be perceived as a social issue, with implications primarily for health policies. It is only upon further analysis – by undertaking more detailed assessments – that the strong connection to environmental problems may be revealed.

At the policy formulation and assessment stage, what makes the green economy approach different from other similar approaches is its strong emphasis on the role of redirecting investment at the societal

level to address the issues of concern. The rationale for this approach is that misallocations of capital frequently lead to unsustainable development – that is, too many financial resources are spent on for example, the use of fossil fuels, unsustainable fishing and unsustainable water use, while too little is spent on public transport, renewable energy, ecosystem conservation and waste treatment (GGKP, 2013). Such misallocations prevail whenever externalities are present: policy interventions will be required in order to redirect investment flows towards more sustainable alternatives (UNEP, 2011a). Indicators are needed to define the direction and extent of possible policy responses, and for assessing and comparing the environmental, social and economic implications of different policy options (UNEP, 2012a; OECD, 2011). It is on the basis of such assessments that specific policies can be recommended to policymakers for adoption.

Once policymakers decide on a particular policy option, monitoring and enforcement against a pre-selected set of indicators is essential in the ensuing implementation stage. These indicators can be drawn from the ones used in the agenda setting and policy formulation stages, and applied to assess whether the interventions are effectively addressing the issue, by leveraging the needed investments, and whether green economy policies are generating synergies across sectors, improving the overall well-being of the population (Stiglitz et al., 2009).

The manual recognises that policymaking is never a linear process. It is therefore designed to be easily adaptable to different policymaking situations, including by having feedback loops as needed between the relevant stages.



Starting from a problem or an opportunity, identified with the help of agenda-setting indicators, policies are identified and defined through the use of policy formulation indicators. Policy assessment indicators are then used to forecast policy impacts, and all three categories of indicators are used to support monitoring and evaluation.

Table 1. Overview of the structure

Agenda setting	Indicators for issue identification	Policy formulation (Chapter 2)	Indicators for policy formulation (Chapter 3)	Indicators for policy assessment (Chapter 4)	Decision-making – Implementation	Indicators for monitoring and evaluation (Chapter 5)
	<p>Identify potentially worrying trends</p> <p>Assess the issue and its relation to the natural environment</p> <p>Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue of concern</p> <p>Analyse more fully how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment</p>		<p>Identify desired outcomes: define policy objectives</p> <p>Identify intervention options and output indicators</p>	<p>Measure policy impacts across sectors</p> <p>Analyse impacts on the overall well-being of the population</p> <p>Analyse advantages and disadvantages and inform decision-making</p>		<p>Measure policy impacts in relation to the environmental issue</p> <p>Measure the investment leveraged</p> <p>Measure impacts across sectors and on the overall well-being of the population</p>





BOX 1. WHAT IS AN INDICATOR? WHAT ARE ITS BASIC CHARACTERISTICS?

As the word suggests, an indicator is an instrument that provides an indication, generally used to describe and/or give an order of magnitude to a given condition. Indicators provide information on the historical and current state of a given system, and are particularly useful to highlight trends that can shed light on causal relations among the elements composing the system.

Both quantitative and qualitative information can be used to define an indicator, depending on the issue that needs to be analysed, as well as on the availability and quality of data. Quantitative indicators provide a standardised and measurable description of a given phenomenon, thereby allowing for more consistent and universal comparison across time and space (GGKP, 2013). In order to facilitate trend identification and comparison, qualitative indicators are often expressed in a quantitative manner (e.g., ranks, percentages).

A combination of different indicators might be necessary to describe complex phenomena, where different concurring causes and effects have to be measured and compared. For example, the causes of a decrease in agricultural productivity, reflected by agricultural yield trends, might have to be explored through a variety of indicators, e.g., soil erosion level, rainfall, workers' productivity etc. Also, there are certain conditions that cannot be directly and universally measured. In these cases, proxy indicators can be used in order to get as close as possible to a reliable description of the phenomenon (e.g., life expectancy as a proxy indicator of the quality of life). As a general rule, the choice and combination of indicators should be based on available data, the information needed by policy-makers, and policy priorities (Pintér et al., 2001).

Before being used for the analysis of trends and phenomena, indicators should be assessed against a number of basic features, including (OECD, 2011):

- **Policy relevance:** the indicator needs to address issues that are of (actual or potential) public concern relevant to policymaking. In fact, the ultimate test of any single indicator's relevance is whether it contributes to the policy process.
- **Analytical soundness:** ensuring that the indicator is based on the best available science is a key feature to ensure that the indicator can be trusted.
- **Measurability:** the need to reflect reality on a timely and accurate basis, and be measurable at a reasonable cost, balancing the long-term nature of some environmental, economic and social effects and the cyclicity of others. Definitions and data need to allow meaningful comparison both across time and countries or regions.

2 INDICATORS FOR ISSUE IDENTIFICATION

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The initial stage of the integrated policymaking cycle consists in identifying the key issues that pose a challenge to sustainable development and that need to be addressed by green economy policies.

In the introductory chapter, the four cross-cutting thematic priorities of UNEP's medium-term strategy were introduced in order to highlight the main environmental challenges presently identified by UNEP at the global level. However, decision makers face social, economic and environmental issues simultaneously, all of which have an impact, to varying degrees, on sustainable development.

This chapter provides guidance on how to identify possible issues of concern with respect to sustainable development and how to evaluate whether they are driven (or impacted by)


environmental degradation. This approach is therefore systemic, promotes multi-stakeholder participation, and aims at fully incorporating the environment in planning exercises, for the formulation of green economy policies that would effectively contribute to sustainable development.

2.2 METHODOLOGY

Indicators for issue identification are instruments that help decision makers to identify and prioritise problems, present and/or upcoming, and to set the agenda for policy interventions (UNEP, 2009). In this respect, these indicators can be related to the set of diagnostic indicators included in the work of the Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI) (GGKP, 2013).

As mentioned in the introduction, problems like climate change and ecosystem management are

Figure 2. Example of the multiple benefits generated by green economy policy interventions. Several stakeholders may benefit from a single intervention, formulated, assessed, monitored and evaluated with a variety of indicators across sectors.




BOX 2 – KEY STEPS: INDICATORS FOR ISSUE IDENTIFICATION

1. Identify potentially worrying trends;
2. Assess the issue and its relation to the natural environment;
3. Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue of concern; and
4. Analyse more fully how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment.

Illustrative issues and related indicators:

UNEP cross-cutting thematic priorities	Possible issues of concern	Indicators
Climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country contribution to anthropogenic climate change Increased frequency/intensity of storm surges 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greenhouse gas emissions (Kt of CO₂ equivalent/year) Rainfall (mm/year) and evaporation Storm-related damages (US\$/year)
Ecosystem management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deforestation Loss of critical ecosystem services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forest cover (ha) Extent of land and marine conservation areas (ha)
Resource efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Falling groundwater tables Low efficiency of non-renewable energy sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water intensity or productivity (m³/US\$) Coal consumption intensity (tonnes/GDP)
Chemicals and waste management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air pollution Soil contamination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sulphur oxide (SO_x) emissions (Kg/yWr) Waste recycling and reuse (%) Toxic heavy metal concentration, e.g., Hg, Cd, Pb, Cr. (mg/kg)

Policy formulation analysis focuses on issues and opportunities




already high on the agenda of decision makers, for a variety of reasons.

For example, climate change, through rising temperatures and increased variability in precipitation, may have negative impacts on, among others, land use (accelerating desertification and lowering the yield of agriculture production), energy (reducing the generation of hydropower) and infrastructure (increasing damage to roads and ports).

As a result, addressing climate change requires a coherent policy mix consisting of several, possibly sectoral, interventions, which are ideally designed to

work in synergy in order to maximise their collective effectiveness (UNEP, 2011a). In fact, climate change is often being addressed simultaneously by several ministries, which rely on a variety of thematic indicators (e.g., related to agriculture, energy and infrastructure), to support policymaking in their respective sectors of responsibility. However, these ministries typically do not have “climate change” as an explicit and exclusive part of their mission and portfolio. Instead, their respective core missions normally consist (and have consisted for years) in ensuring sufficient agriculture production, reliable and affordable energy sources, and providing road infrastructure – all of which affect and are affected by climate change.

Figure 3: A schematic representation of the DPSIR Framework



Hence, in order to elaborate effective policies to address the issues above, they have to be correctly identified and described across all relevant sectors, through a careful analysis of their causes and effects:

- Only with the correct identification of the causes of the issue can policies be designed to have a lasting positive impact.
- Only with the correct identification of the effects of the issue can policies be designed that maximise synergies and avoid the emergence of negative side effects, in particular in other sectors.

The methodology proposed here provides four main steps in issue identification:

1. Identify potentially worrying trends;
2. Assess the issue and how it relates to the natural environment;
3. Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue; and
4. Analyse more fully how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment.

This approach is consistent with the use of the DPSIR framework (UNEP, 2008) through the identification of Drivers (D), Pressures (P), State (S), Impacts (I) and Responses (R) (see Figure 3).

The four proposed steps are described in this chapter. As regards to policy responses, this will be taken up in Chapter 3 addressing indicators for policy formulation.

If the problem to be analysed is essentially environmental (rather than social or economic), steps 1 and 2 could be merged to move directly to the full analysis of causes and impacts (steps 3 and 4).

2.3 STEP 1: IDENTIFY POTENTIALLY WORRYING TRENDS

An initial step to determine whether an issue might constitute a threat to sustainable development is to analyse its historical trend. This can be done using historical quantitative data or, in case reliable statistics are not available, qualitative information. Such a task should be accompanied and complemented by an assessment of political commitment and an analysis of national visions and goals, as well as development plans and sectoral policies (World Bank, 2012b). Mapping the institutional landscape and policy framework, coupled with trend and patterns analyses, are likely to facilitate the identification of potential challenges that need to be placed high on the national agenda.

An example is UNEP's "Flexible Framework" methodology, which includes in its approach the mapping of the institutional landscape and policy framework of countries on chemical accident prevention and preparedness (CAPP) through the development of 'country situation reports' (UNEP, 2010b; UNEP, 2012b).

Depending on the sector, and topic analysed, various types of trends (not only declining trajectories) should be considered.

For example, in the case of some issues, such as forest cover, fish landings or fossil fuel reserves, a declining trend is of concern; in other cases the problem emerges when the trend is on the rise, such as for water pollution or energy prices. Some issues may also appear when no change takes place, especially those that relate to a target, such as in the case of emission reductions, nutrition or access to clean energy.

Moreover, indicators may be interconnected, with varying patterns of interactions. The cause-effect relations between indicators need to be carefully analysed in this phase, and should be grounded in solid evidence, existing theories and empirical studies.

For example, a decline in fossil fuel reserves may lead to an increase in prices (showing opposite trends), and a decline in fish landings may lead to reductions in nutrition (showing similar trends).

Certain historical trends may not appear to be worrisome when analysed in isolation, but may become so when compared to an existing policy target, or national vision.

For example, an unchanged nutrition level represents an issue of concern for decision makers if a national target is available and is above the observed values.

In some circumstances, in particular when indicators and data generation methodologies are adequately standardised, international comparisons ('benchmarking') can be very informative (World Bank, 2012a). Certain historical trends may not appear to be worrisome when analysed in isolation,

but may become so when comparable countries show a significantly better performance.

For example, even an increasing nutrition level may represent an issue of concern for decision makers if a neighbouring country with very similar conditions and priorities performs significantly better.

Some trends may also be worrisome because they point to untapped opportunities. Opportunities are notoriously difficult to measure, but international comparisons may again be very helpful.

For example, even a slightly increasing share of renewable energy sources in the national energy mix may be of concern for decision makers if renewable sources represent a much higher share of total energy in countries with very similar potential in solar, wind or hydropower.

In certain cases, indicators may only highlight a troubling trend when compared with trends in other indicators, such as GDP or population growth.

For example, an average gross domestic product (GDP) growth of 4 per cent over the last 10 years may be considered satisfactory when viewed in isolation, but less so if compared to an average 3 per cent population growth during the same period. Similarly, a 2 per cent increase in annual greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions may be considered negatively unless compared to a 4 per cent GDP growth and 3 per cent population growth.

The examples above highlight the need to evaluate jointly the trend of indicators of production, consumption, and of decoupling economic growth from resource use and environmental degradation (resource intensity and productivity indicators) in order to better identify and prioritise issues of relevance.

Table 2 illustrates this joint assessment of indicator trends using sample indicators for climate change (GHG emissions) and water stress. Indicators of intensity and productivity are also useful and intuitive to carry out benchmarking exercises across countries and regions, and may highlight the presence of untapped opportunities.

Table 2: Indicators for production, consumption and decoupling (intensity and productivity). Selected examples for climate change and water stress.

Topic	Indicator (different perspectives)			
	Production	Consumption	Decoupling	
			Intensity	Productivity
Climate change (particularly relevant for fossil energy carriers)	GHG emissions due to national production	Carbon footprint as global warming potential	GHG emissions per GDP (tonnes/US\$)	GDP per GHG emissions (US\$/tonne)
Water stress	Water abundance and water use for national production	Water footprint for domestic consumption	Water use per GDP	GDP per water use

The indicators selected in this step can also be considered baseline indicators to be used throughout the integrated policymaking process, and against which the effectiveness of various policy interventions will be evaluated.

2.4 STEP 2: ASSESS THE ISSUE AND ITS RELATION TO THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Once a trend has been identified and defined as potentially worrisome, indicators need to be selected to evaluate in more detail whether and how a link exists between the prospective issue of concern and the environment.

The underlying question is whether the issue under consideration is caused, or more generally affected, by existing environmental trends, in particular when this issue has primarily social or economic dimensions.

The objective of this step is to reveal any existing link between the issue and the environment, so that any 'real' or underlying cause can be properly identified and addressed in the next step. In other words, the aim is to carefully evaluate the symptoms in order to be able to properly address the cause, rather than designing policies to fix the symptoms while neglecting the cause.

For example, data on fish production can provide useful information on the performance of the

fisheries sector over the years, and on its relation to the environment. A declining fish capture could be attributed to a reduction in the harvesting effort (i.e. reduced number of fishermen and/or fishing boats, perhaps due to emerging alternative livelihood or income opportunities), or of the fish stock itself, possibly being driven by coral reef degradation, water pollution, an increase in water temperature, or overfishing in earlier years. Apart from the possible reduction in effort (with underlying socio-economic causes) all other factors are environmental.

Taking a multi-stakeholder approach will frequently be useful. Various datasets (both qualitative and quantitative) provided by the stakeholders involved in the process could be used and compared to confirm the existence and relevance of environmental factors influencing the problem. Triangulation techniques, to compare the coherence of data across sectors and data sources, can be used to gauge the relative strengths and the interplay of the various effects, some of which may be social or economic, and others, environmental. This is also useful to evaluate a variety of cross-sectoral indicators, which are often not available in a single, integrated database.

For example, forest degradation or outright deforestation may be caused by environmental trends, for instance associated with diseases, as well as human activity, especially the collection of fuelwood, or the conversion of land to agriculture, or timber production.

It is worth considering that some problems may only, or primarily, have social and/or economic drivers, or may erroneously be perceived as such. In this respect, it is important to identify indicators that can highlight relevant trends in order to be able to design effective policies.

For example, an increase in CO² emissions can be caused by the use of fossil fuels (a source of emissions), but also by deforestation (with forests, and biomass more generally, emitting CO² when burnt). Other more indirect indicators showing the linkages between the source of emissions and the environment are the extraction and use of fossil fuels, as well as their stock level (simultaneously influenced by discovery and extraction). On the other hand,

population and economic growth are often identified as other critical causes of rising CO² emissions (in absolute terms); however such indicators, for several reasons, are much harder, and perhaps less preferable, to influence with policy interventions than targeting energy efficiency, reducing forest loss, reforestation, and adaption measures.

2.5 STEP 3: ANALYSE MORE FULLY THE UNDERLYING CAUSES OF THE ISSUE OF CONCERN

Once a prospective issue has been detected by analysing and comparing indicators of economic,

BOX 3 – SUMMARY OF STEP 1: IDENTIFY POTENTIAL WORRYING TRENDS

Tasks:

1. Identify indicators of sectoral performance related to the problem.
2. Collect relevant data.
3. Identify national trends and compare them with existing national, regional and global targets.
4. Compare trends with the performance of comparable countries and/or regions.

Key questions:

- Has the trend worsened in recent years?
- Is the trend in line with national, regional or global targets?
- Is the trend in line with the performance of similar countries?

BOX 4 - SUMMARY OF STEP 2: ASSESS THE ISSUE AND ITS RELATION TO THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Tasks:

1. Identify indicators of environmental performance related to the problem.
2. Collect data relevant to the issue.
3. Identify national trends and compare them with existing national, regional and global targets.
4. Compare trends with comparable countries and regions.

Key question:

- Is the issue influenced by the environment? For instance, is the issue influenced by natural resource depletion or degradation, erosion of ecosystem services, or the reduced provision of ecosystem services? Is the trend in line with the performance of similar countries?

social and environmental performance, and some light has been shed on the relation between the issue and the natural environment, the underlying causes for the underperforming trend need to be analysed more fully.

In Step 3, the pressures and driving forces (underlying causes) are clearly isolated from the symptoms (impacts and the state of the environment). This is achieved by focusing on the identification of causes (environmental, but also social and economic) underlying the environmental effects identified in Step 2, which are affecting the issue identified in Step 1.

A number of indicators can be used to detect causal relations and to map them systematically, especially if identified through the support of various stakeholders with specific sectoral expertise. In the same way that the value chain for instance in agricultural production can be broken down into several stages from farming, to transport, distribution and customer sales, a causal chain of influence can be defined for indicators.

For example, in the case of nutrition, decreasing agricultural production may be identified as an issue of concern, defined by relevant indicators such as the land used and its productivity (crop yield). Underlying causes may be socio-economic (e.g., rising prices of fertiliser) or environmental, such as water availability (through irrigation, rainfall


and evaporation), or both (e.g., poor agricultural practices leading to erosion or salinisation).

As indicated by the example above, several causes may simultaneously affect - directly or indirectly - the issue of concern or problem. Taking a systemic view helps to map these relationships in order to better understand how the various effects and their indicators interact in creating (but potentially also addressing) the issue.

The use of indicators in Step 3 is essential for policymakers to be able to disaggregate or 'break down' the system and understand the role played by the various variables, including cross-sectoral ones, as well as in determining sectoral trends and patterns. The identification of these different causes, and the understanding of how they interact and impact on the issue at hand, will ultimately support the design of a more targeted and effective policy package.

For example, if the reduced availability of water is the issue to be addressed, very different – and potentially alternative – policies could be designed and implemented, including: to reduce pollution from industrial waste (addressing water quality), to curb the deterioration of forest ecosystems and their water-related services (again addressing water supply), or to increase water productivity in agriculture by introducing more efficient irrigation technologies or more adapted crops (addressing water consumption). The choice of the

Figure 4: Simplified (and partial) causal tree diagram for the issue of nutrition and possible key drivers, where indicators are linked to each other representing the causal chain leading to the problem.



BOX 5 – SUMMARY OF STEP 3: ANALYSE MORE FULLY THE UNDERLYING CAUSES OF THE ISSUE

Tasks:

1. Identify causal relations and map them systemically.
2. Evaluate whether multiple causes act simultaneously and are also causally linked with each other.
3. Evaluate their respective strength.

Key questions:

- Is there a causal relation between the trend observed and economic, social or environmental variables?
- What are the key drivers and pressures?
- Are there multiple and simultaneous causes?

appropriate policy mix would then depend on the specific causes identified, the strength or relative importance of their individual impacts, and the analysis of their interplay.

While silver bullets are rare, in some cases, there are examples in which the implementation of a single policy helps to address several causes simultaneously. In setting the policy agenda, and depending on the local context, interventions that could generate double and triple dividends and co-benefits could be prioritised for implementation.

For example, localised deforestation in many cases is caused by the need to increase agriculture production, in light of a growing population and a reduction in soil productivity. An intervention aiming at improving agricultural yields would allow an increase in production without the need to expand agricultural land at the expense of forests. Safeguarding the provision of forest-related ecosystem services would be an important additional benefit.

2.6 STEP 4: ANALYSE MORE FULLY HOW THE ISSUE IMPACTS SOCIETY, THE ECONOMY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Given that budgetary resources are often scarce, and that there is competition for budget allocation across sectors, great care must be taken in


identifying which issues are important enough to be eventually included in the government agenda.

In the first three steps we have analysed trends, and identified the underlying causes of the issue in order to ensure that it is properly addressed and that targeted information is provided to decision makers in the policy formulation stage.

Step 4 extends the analysis to the impacts that the underperforming trend may have on other social, economic and environmental indicators. By so doing, we can identify additional issues that can also be addressed, thus realising synergies, and further prioritising the issues and the need for intervention. We may also use this step to identify any negative secondary effects arising from the envisaged policy response (such as for example weight-based targets in recycling policies hindering rather than promoting recycling of many critical elements in complex products which are usually present in very low concentrations; UNEP, 2013), as well as possible ways and means to mitigate or otherwise address such effects as they emerge. As a result, the indicators identified in this step could be used to raise awareness about any ramification of the issue, and make the case for policy interventions to address it.

For example, harmful chemical substances and hazardous waste can produce a number of negative effects on several sectors. If access to potable water is the issue to be addressed, and water pollution is

Figure 5: Diagramme illustrating the impacts of business as usual (left) and green economy scenarios (right).




the main problem, additional simultaneous impacts may include food contamination, ecosystem degradation, and various consequences on human health (e.g., acute poisoning, cancer and birth defects) and certainly higher costs for purification and/or for increasing freshwater supply.

It is noteworthy that such cascading effects may also characterise the problem analysed. In fact, the impacts of a certain environmental issue can in turn be the causes of other problems in other sectors, further worsening the overall performance of the system. For this reason, both causes and impacts need to be carefully examined adopting a system-wide perspective, ahead of the definition of the policy package. For example, ecosystem degradation can have damaging impacts across sectors as a result of the loss of ecosystem services (UNEP-WCMC, 2011).

For example, deforestation in Borneo is causing the loss of biodiversity, erosion and the disruption of the hydrological cycle, leading to more frequent and acute floods and droughts, in turn causing soil degradation and lowering agriculture production, and reducing the potential for fish catch and tourism revenue (Van Paddenburg et al., 2012).

As indicated in the example above, the use of indicators across several sectors is necessary to correctly identify and assess issues, as well as their impacts. In this respect, it is useful to organise key impacts (and their respective indicators) by sector of pertinence and add them to the causal map developed in Step 3, to fully appreciate the ramifications of the problem. Indicators for issue identification can serve to highlight the linkage between environmental degradation and sustainable development.

Figure 6: Simplified Causal Loop Diagramme representing the main causal relations existing among the economy and the environment (forest cover) in Borneo.



BOX 6 – MAPPING THE SYSTEM WITH CAUSAL LOOP DIAGRAMMES

In general terms, a Causal Loop Diagram (CLD) is a map of the system analysed: a way to explore and represent the interconnections among the key indicators in the sector, or system analysed.

More specifically, a CLD is an integrated map (because it represents different dimensions of the system) of the dynamic interplay (because it explores circular relations, or feedbacks) existing between the key elements (main indicators) that constitute a given system.

By highlighting drivers and impacts of the issue to be addressed, and by mapping the causal relations existing among key indicators, CLDs support a systemic decision-making process aiming at designing solutions that last over time. By explicitly representing feedback loops, CLDs shed light on possible future trajectories generated, from within or as a reaction to external events, by any given decision. As a result, CLDs enable the identification and use of synergies emerging within and across the key elements of the system, as well as avoiding possible unintended consequences.

Figure 6 represents a causal loop diagram for the deforestation example above, and shows how indicators are linked to each other using arrows that depict the causal relation (positive or negative) between them, and includes the problem (deforestation), its causes and cross-sectoral direct and indirect effects. The diagram illustrates that, from a short-term economic perspective, palm oil plantations and timber production contribute to economic growth. However, in the medium- and longer-term, an increase in deforestation would reduce forest cover, increasing climate variability and vulnerability (e.g., to floods and droughts),

thus negatively impacting biodiversity as well as economic growth because of the need to increase government expenditure to mitigate damage and adapt to higher vulnerability. Box 6 provides a brief explanation of causal loop diagrams and systems mapping more generally.

Table 3 summarises the four main steps in this phase, using sample indicators to illustrate each step.

BOX 7 – SUMMARY OF STEP 4: ANALYSE HOW THE ISSUE IMPACTS SOCIETY, THE ECONOMY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Tasks:

1. Identify impacts of the issue on society, the economy and the environment.
2. Identify indicators relevant to the issue analysed, considering its social, economic and environmental impacts.
3. Relate causes to cross-sectoral impacts using the causal relations identified in Step 3.

Key questions:

- How is the problem affecting the system and its socio-economic and environmental performance?
- Are the impacts of the problem immediate or emerging slowly, and do they last for a long time?



Table 3: Summary of key steps and related indicators for issue identification: Examples for deforestation, nutrition and CO₂ emissions.

Steps	Description	Indicator typology and tasks	Indicator samples
1. Identify potentially worrying trends	Analyse data and detect worrying trends. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the trend worsened in recent years? Is the trend in line with national, regional or global targets, and with the performance of similar countries? 	a. Identify indicators of sectoral performance related to the problem. b. Collect data relevant to the issue under consideration. c. Identify national trends and compare them with existing national, regional and global targets. d. Compare trends with the performance of comparable countries and/or regions.	Deforestation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value of timber products (US\$/year) Deforestation (ha/year) Annual harvest of wood products (m³/year) Nutrition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dietary energy supply (Kcal/day per person) Crop yield (tonnes/ha) % of newborns with low birth weight (<2500g) CO₂ emissions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CO₂ emissions (Kt of CO₂ equivalent) Temperature variability (% annual increase in °C) CO₂ emissions (Kt of CO₂ equivalent per US\$1 GDP - PPP)
2. Assess the issue and its relation to the natural environment	Identify environmental trends that could contribute to the problem considered. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the issue influenced by the environment, for instance by natural resource depletion or degradation, erosion of ecosystem services, or the reduced provision of ecosystem services? 	a. Identify indicators of environmental performance related to the problem. b. Collect data relevant to the issue under consideration. c. Identify national trends and compare them with existing national, regional and/or global targets. d. Compare trends with comparable countries and regions.	Deforestation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forest land cover (ha) Annual desertification of forest area (ha or % of forest land) Degraded forest land (ha or % of forest land) Nutrition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rainfall (mm/year) Droughts (n. of droughts/year) Fish landing (tonnes/year) CO₂ emissions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Production of fossil fuels (Btu/year) Fossil fuel reserves (Btu) Forest cover (ha)
3. Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue of concern	Investigate more fully the causes for the underperforming trends. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a causal relation between the trend observed and economic, social or environmental variables? What are the key drivers and pressures? Are there multiple, and simultaneous causes? 	a. Identify causal relations and map them systemically. b. Evaluate whether multiple causes act simultaneously and are also causally interlinked. c. Evaluate their respective strength.	Deforestation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agriculture land (ha) Fuelwood consumption (kg/year) Population (people) Nutrition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population (people) Fish stocks (tonnes) Water consumption (L/year) CO₂ emissions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population (people) Energy consumption from fossil fuels (KWh; % of total) GDP growth (US\$/year)
4. Analyse more fully how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment	Analyse impacts of the identified worrying trends on the system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the problem affecting the system and its socio-economic and environmental performance? Are the impacts of the problem immediate or emerging slowly, and do they last for a long time? 	a. Identify impacts of the issue on society, the economy and the environment. b. Identify indicators relevant to the issue analysed, considering its social, economic and environmental impacts. c. Relate causes to cross-sectoral impacts using the causal relations identified in step 3.	Deforestation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Income of forest communities (US\$/year per capita) Freshwater supply (L/year) Ecotourism (n. of visits/year; US\$/year; % of GDP) Nutrition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Life expectancy (years) Agriculture GDP (US\$/year) Primary sector employment (people) CO₂ emissions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in average temperature (°C) Diseases from air pollution (n. of respiratory diseases/year) Crop yield (tonnes/ha)

3 INDICATORS FOR POLICY FORMULATION

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The second stage of the integrated policymaking cycle consists in the definition of policy goals, to then proceed with policy formulation. While indicators for problem identification help to frame the issue, indicators for policy formulation help to design solutions.

This chapter provides guidance on how to identify indicators that support policy formulation and analyse the strengths and weaknesses of various possible intervention options, using a systemic approach. Focus is given to the use of indicators that help to assess the adequacy of the interventions analysed, taking into account their repercussions on the key actors in the economy and impacts across sectors.

While the policy options analysed in this manual are designed to be implemented at the national level in response to issues highlighted in the problem identification phase, additional interventions may be considered. These include policies that would ensure compliance with international standards, or with regional and global goals, addressing problems such as the leakage of greenhouse gas emissions. Indicators can be identified and used to support policy formulation and assessment, regardless of the national boundaries of the impact of the intervention.

3.2. METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses how to utilise the information gathered on the issue to: (1) set policy objectives, and (2) identify the possible policy options and set associated targets.

While this process would ideally require the use of several methodologies and instruments, analysing

historical qualitative and quantitative information as well as the projections of economic and biophysical simulation models, this manual focuses on the specific contribution of indicators during the two main steps for policy formulation (with additional steps being included in the policy impact assessment stage):

1. Identify policy objectives;
2. Identify intervention options.


These steps are described more fully in the following sections. Considerations on indicators for policy impact assessment are presented separately in Chapter 4.

A differentiation is made in this report between the effects of interventions on (i) outputs; (ii) outcomes; and (iii) impacts. This terminology is commonly used when assessing or evaluating the effectiveness of measures (see Box 9 for further explanations and definitions). As a result, the effectiveness of policy interventions needs to be assessed at three different levels:

1. The effectiveness of the intervention in terms of desired outcome needs to be addressed against the specific, stated policy objective or objectives. Step 1 addresses the role of indicators with respect to outcomes.
2. The quality or effectiveness of the intervention in terms of output needs to be measured against agreed specifications. Step 2 addresses the role of indicators with respect to outputs.
3. The effectiveness of the intervention in terms of impact needs to be addressed against the overarching, strategic objectives enshrined in the concept of sustainable development. Chapter 4 reviews the role of indicators with respect to impacts.

BOX 8 – KEY STEPS: INDICATORS FOR POLICY FORMULATION

1. Identify potentially worrying trends;
2. Assess the issue and its relation to the natural environment;
3. Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue of concern; and
4. Analyse more fully how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment.



Illustrative issues and related indicators:

UNEP cross-cutting thematic priorities	Possible issues of concern	Indicators
Climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country contribution to anthropogenic climate change Increased frequency/intensity of storm surges 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greenhouse gas emissions (Kt of CO₂ equivalent/year) Rainfall (mm/year) and evaporation Storm-related damages (US\$/year)
Ecosystem management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deforestation Loss of critical ecosystem services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forest cover (ha) Extent of land and marine conservation areas (ha)
Resource efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Falling groundwater tables Low efficiency of non-renewable energy sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water intensity or productivity (m³/US\$) Coal consumption intensity (tonnes/GDP)
Chemicals and waste management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air pollution Soil contamination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sulphur oxide (SO_x) emissions (Kg/yr) Waste recycling and reuse (%) Toxic heavy metal concentration, e.g., Hg, Cd, Pb, Cr. (mg/kg)

In order to gauge the cost-efficiency of alternative policy interventions, policy inputs also need to be measured – typically in the form of public expenditures. It is noteworthy that, in some circumstances, input indicators are also used as proxies for measuring output, in particular when output is difficult to measure directly or when the policy intervention relates closely to financial flows.

An example of the former would be expenditures for public education serving as a proxy for the state of the public education system. An example of the latter would be the implementation of a public payment scheme for ecosystem services, where the amount of funds distributed (output) could be approximated by overall expenditures (input) minus the estimated administrative overhead. Clearly, such

indirect methods of measuring success need to be applied with due caution, as they are inherently unable to capture the effectiveness of the policy intervention itself.

3.3 STEP 1: IDENTIFY DESIRED OUTCOMES: DEFINE POLICY OBJECTIVES

The identification of policy objectives is based on the results of the issue identification phase and precedes the definition and choice of policy interventions. It is therefore a crucial step for decision makers, as policy objectives will frame the specific steps taken in order to address the issue. The definition of associated policy targets will also

BOX 9 – ANALYSING THE EFFECT OF INTERVENTIONS AS OUTPUTS, OUTCOMES AND IMPACTS

While conceptual nuances exist, in accordance with the mandates and missions of organisations, existing methodologies for evaluation and results-based management commonly distinguish (i) outputs from (ii) outcomes and (iii) impacts. For the purposes of the present manual, these terms are defined as follows:

- **Output:** is the immediate result of the policy intervention, in terms of the product, process, good or service that it delivers.
- **Outcome:** is the observable positive or negative change in the actions of social actors that have been influenced, directly or indirectly, partially or totally, intentionally or not, by the output.
- **Impact:** is the long-term, sustainable change in the conditions of people and the state of the environment that structurally reduces poverty, improves human well-being and protects and conserves natural resources – in a nutshell, that achieves sustainable development.

The key to distinguishing these terms is that policymaking and implementation controls its outputs, influences outcomes, and contributes to impacts.

Source: Wilson-Grau 2008

ensure effective monitoring and evaluation during and after implementation.

Given its primary importance in the policy cycle, the definition of policy objectives should be carried out carefully, ensuring that a systemic, cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder approach is followed throughout the process. An example of this process is represented by the Bellagio STAMP (SusTainability Assessment and Measurement Principles), which suggests eight general principles that could be adopted globally (Pintér et al., 2012; IISD, 2013).

More precisely, objectives should be formulated and phrased according to a shared understanding of the steps needed to solve the specific issue, in accordance with the national vision, if available. High-level government officials should be involved in this process to guide the decision-making process, aligning policy objectives with existing strategies and plans. Moreover, all relevant stakeholders should be engaged and consulted to take into account different points of view and expertise, and to set goals that do not conflict with key social values, norms and beliefs. Finally, scientific evidence needs to inform the formulation of policy objectives, so as to ensure that objectives are appropriate and achievable.

Defining the policy objective or objectives relates to the desired outcome of the policy intervention. Ideally, policy objectives are stated in a manner that is specific or targeted, measurable, ambitious while achievable or realistic, and time-bound (SMART) (Doran, 1981).

Indicators play a role in defining policy targets as the explicit statement of desired results over a specified period of time. Expressing targets in a quantified manner will simplify the measure of progress towards their achievement (IISD, 2005). However, not in every case may it be desirable or possible to further specify policy objectives by defining quantifiable targets. For example, the Government of Indonesia set the following targets in 2011: 7 per cent GDP growth per year by 2014, and 41 per cent carbon emission reductions by 2020 - of which 15 per cent with international support. Additional objectives include improved food security and poverty alleviation (to ensure more inclusive growth) and wise use of natural resources (to support future economic growth but also to provide means of subsistence for rural communities); these objectives are however not quantified.

Several social, economic and environmental objectives and thresholds exist at national, regional

and global level, and can be used to formulate national policy objectives and targets. Examples of the latter are:

- the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and their respective targets, agreed globally and used to improve national performance (e.g., halving the proportion of the population without sustainable access to safe drinking water and sanitation by 2015);
- the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, adopted in 2010 by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, contains twenty global policy targets (the 'Aichi Biodiversity Targets') under five strategic objectives, some of which are quantified. For instance, target 11 calls for at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, to be conserved through effectively and equitably managed protected areas by 2020;
- At the regional level, among many examples, the EU has established a CO₂ emission target for new passenger vehicles, not to exceed 130 grams of carbon dioxide per kilometre (g CO₂/km) by 2015.

When not explicitly or formally stated, possibly due to the emerging nature of the issues to be addressed, the objectives set at the national level should be aligned, or consistent with, agreed regional and international objectives.

The EU Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe, which includes a series of milestones to be reached by 2020, is an example of regional targets. Among these milestones one refers to resource efficient production: "Milestone: By 2020, market and policy incentives that reward business investments in efficiency are in place. These incentives have stimulated new innovations in resource efficient production methods that are widely used. All companies, and their investors, can measure and benchmark their lifecycle resource efficiency. Economic growth and well-being are decoupled from resource inputs and come primarily from increases in the value of products and associated services."

Targets could focus on: (1) a specific issue, (2) the causes of the issue or, more generally, (3) the performance of the sector, or the economy as a whole.

In order to define specific targets, the choice of indicators at the adequate scale and level of disaggregation is critical. For instance, consider the example of defining policy targets for addressing deforestation:

1. Setting a target on forest area alone, while helping decision makers to gauge the effectiveness of policies against the desired outcome, in itself would not provide focus on the key drivers of forest degradation or deforestation.
2. Setting additional targets on the causes of deforestation would help to support the design and effective implementation of policies that would directly and specifically address these underlying causes, and may also bring about double and triple dividends (see Chapter 2), as the causes of deforestation may also contribute to other problems.
3. Setting a target on the performance of the sector, or the economy as a whole, would allow decision makers to consider several additional interventions, some of which may actually be more effective than reduced deforestation. Given the high competition for budgetary expenditure across sectors, setting a high level goal may be detrimental to solving very specific issues, despite the fact that these issues have an impact on the overall performance of the system. As in the case of (1) above, decision makers may overlook the key drivers of deforestation, leading to the persistence of the problem and the possible creation of additional unexpected side effects. For instance, if the main issue to be addressed is the reduction in GDP in the forestry sector, the allocation of subsidies to lower costs would make timber production more attractive, stimulating investment in activities that would further push deforestation in the short term, and further undermine the potential growth and sustainability of the sector in the future.

BOX 10 – SUMMARY OF STEP 1: IDENTIFY DESIRED OUTCOMES AND DEFINE POLICY OBJECTIVES

Tasks:

1. Analyse indicators of sectoral and environmental issues.
2. Select target indicators tailored to the national context, with the help of existing global and regional targets:
 - Set specific targets to address the causes of the problem.
 - Set specific targets to reduce the impacts of the problem.

Key questions

- What is the desired outcome that can be reached through policy interventions?
- What is the key target to be reached?

More specific targets support more focused policy formulation. A more targeted policy formulation exercise, carried out within specific boundaries, would also reduce the risks related to policy implementation, increasing effectiveness and reducing the emergence of elements of policy resistance.

The above being said, macro targets (such as those on GDP growth) remain important, as, in the end, the combination of all policies implemented to reach specific targets should lead to an improvement of the overall performance of the system. Macro indicators, in fact, may be useful to measure impact along key dimensions. In this respect, a more specific analysis of the impact of policy implementation from a macro and cross-sectoral perspective will be presented in Chapter 4.

3.4 STEP 2: IDENTIFY INTERVENTION OPTIONS AND OUTPUT INDICATORS

After policy objectives and targets are established, various intervention options can be considered to achieve them, and various indicators can be identified to evaluate the effectiveness of these options once implemented. These indicators address the output of the policy intervention. For example, should private motor vehicles represent a rapidly increasing share of the transportation network of a major city, this could

lead to an increase in detrimental effects on public health and quality of life more generally, as well as an increase in economic costs associated with ever-longer travel times. In such a case, city administration, identifying this as a worrying trend, could decide to reduce the modal share of private motor vehicles (outcome: policy objectives). More specifically, it could seek to reduce its modal share from 80 per cent in 2010 to 55 per cent in 2020 (outcome: policy target and indicator). As part of its adopted policy package, and in co-operation with the federal government, it could launch a massive investment programme into public transportation, with a view to expand its metro system by 50 km, its public bus system by 150 km, and to implement 30 per cent of bus lines on dedicated lanes (output: targets and indicators).

There are four main ways for governments to influence behaviour and shape future trends in order to reach stated objectives: investments, provision of incentives or disincentives, public targets mandated by law (regulation) and social interventions. Current and past policies adopted for solving similar issues (i.e. address similar causes) should be analysed to evaluate their efficiency and effectiveness in the specific context of implementation, also to identify the emergence of potential side effects. The analysis of the adequacy of these options, as well as their impacts (as presented later on) will certainly benefit from the adoption of a multi-stakeholder approach (UNDP, 2012).

INVESTMENT

Investment by the government is a direct intervention, originating from budgetary allocation, aimed at creating new or improved green infrastructure, or restructuring existing public services. These investments can be implemented for several purposes, including upgrading public infrastructure (e.g., climate resilient transport infrastructure) and modernising other services (e.g., expansion of the power transmission network, or investment in renewable energy supply, such as wind power).

For example, investments in public transport, if well designed, support the reduction of liquid fuel consumption and CO₂ emissions, while at the same time reducing traffic congestion and accidents, possibly also lowering transport and health costs for households.

Public capital investment can also contribute to the abatement of costs for green activities, thus potentially influencing future private expenditure and investment.

For example, in the case of decreasing agricultural production, investments in pilot projects for the adoption of micro irrigation systems would show the benefits of the technology in saving water and increasing land productivity, thus potentially triggering private investment.

Indicators relevant for the analysis and use of capital investments are monetary flows, such as R&D investment (% of GDP), EGSS investment (US\$/year) and specific sectoral investments, such as renewable energy expansion (MW/year and US\$/year).

INCENTIVE MEASURES

Incentives and disincentives can be used to stimulate or dissuade private investments. They are powerful instruments to guide the market through price signals, towards more sustainable production and consumption. Incentives and disincentives can come in several forms, including taxation and subsidies.

For example, investments in renewable energy can be stimulated by the introduction of feed-in tariffs, an incentive that allows households to sell the excess energy produced and increase their return on investment. Providing payments for ecosystem services can redirect the incentives of land holders, in particular farmers, towards undertaking activities that are beneficial (or, at least, less harmful) for ecosystem conservation.

Indicators can be used to target, monitor and evaluate the adequacy and performance of incentives. This analysis requires a cross-sectoral approach, as the impacts of these interventions typically have social, economic and environmental ramifications even beyond the targeted sector. From a green economy perspective, particular emphasis is put on the removal or phasing out of harmful subsidies and the introduction of taxes or fees that reflect the full opportunity cost of nature's goods and services. Full-cost pricing means that prices are corrected for the external costs of transactions, and ensures that consumers and producers face a price that restores socially-efficient decision-making.

For example, the removal, phasing out or reform of environmentally-harmful subsidies, such as those that subsidise the use of fossil fuels would lead to higher prices thus lowering demand and consumption, implying energy savings or substitution of fossil fuel use with less carbon-intensive energy sources. In identifying subsidy programmes for reform or removal, the effectiveness of the programme (or lack thereof) against stated social or development policy objectives is an important factor, and identifying appropriate indicators would be very useful; for instance the share of subsidy beneficiaries along income brackets. Moreover, removing harmful subsidies would also leverage scarce public resources that can be put to better use (also an important indicator).

PUBLIC TARGETS MANDATED BY LAW

The establishment of laws and standards can be seen as the formal enactment of a target, to ensure that it is reached. In fact, unless mandated by law,

BOX 11 – SUMMARY OF STEP 2: IDENTIFY INTERVENTION OPTIONS AND OUTPUT INDICATORS

Tasks:

1. Identify indicators representing and measuring the main policy instruments considered.
2. Identify indicators representing and measuring the sectoral effectiveness of the intervention considered.

Key questions:

- What are the policy instruments available to address the negative environmental trends?
- What are current and past policies adopted for the same objective?
- What should be changed?

targets remain well-specified objectives that will be attained only if policy interventions are effective in stimulating the investment required.

For example, several countries adopted Renewable Energy Standards (RES). These standards require utilities to generate a certain percentage of their supply from renewable energy, usually to be attained by a specific year. Without these targets, utilities would presumably rather invest in expanding the cheapest option for power generation capacity, regardless of its carbon intensity.

Similarly, as mentioned above, fuel efficiency standards exist in the EU and USA that mandate yearly improvements in the efficiency of engines, with the aim to modernise the car fleet and reduce energy consumption and costs.

A sound regulatory framework is essential for a successful green economy transition, and, as presented in the following sections, public targets mandated by law are typically coupled with other interventions to share the economic burden among the private and public sectors.

SOCIAL INTERVENTIONS

All the policy options mentioned above aim at stimulating behavioural change (both for producers and consumers). Other types of interventions, also requiring investment, aim primarily at informing the public with a view to stimulate voluntary changes in behaviour, without relying on economic incentives.

Such interventions include, among others, capacity building (personal and institutional) and awareness-raising activities (IISD, 2013).

Voluntary behavioural change is a major driver for the shift to sustainable development. Individuals, communities and private companies can change their behaviour in response to an increased awareness of the consequences of unsustainable production and consumption.

For example, in the case of decreasing agricultural production and the planned adoption of micro irrigation systems, training could be carried out to inform farmers of the advantages of using this technology. Such capacity building may be particularly effective as farmers will already be aware that action is needed to reverse the trend of declining incomes. Noticing that water has an impact on their production, and its availability is more and more limited, they might decide to use water more effectively and invest in micro irrigation.

Indicators can be used to monitor changes in consumption patterns, and should be compared to the effort the government is making to change these patterns.

For example, in the case above, relevant indicators include the expenditure in awareness-raising and training activities (input), the number of farmers adopting micro-irrigation (output), the productivity of water use (outcome) and the effect on agricultural production and income (outcome).

The policy instruments mentioned above will be analysed in the following chapter, taking into consideration their strengths and weaknesses in solving the problems identified in Chapter 2, as well as the potential synergies that can be created by

designing a policy package that combines several intervention options.

Table 4 summarises the two main steps in this phase, using sample indicators to illustrate each step.

Table 4. Summary of key steps and related indicators for policy formulation: Examples for deforestation, nutrition and CO₂ emissions.

Steps	Description	Indicator typology and tasks	Indicator samples
1. Identify desired outcomes: define policy objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the worrying trend and its environmental causes, define policy objectives and set targets for their achievement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the desired outcome that can be reached through policy interventions? What is the key 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Analyse indicators of sectoral and environmental issues. Select target indicators tailored to the national context, with the help of existing global and regional targets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set specific targets to address the causes of the problem. Set specific targets to reduce the impacts 	<p>Deforestation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced deforestation (e.g. 50% reduction by 2030) Increase in protected area (ha) Certified timber production (\$/year; ha) <p>Nutrition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased nutrition levels (e.g. 2000 kcal/day per person) Increased production of agricultural products (tonne/year) Higher water productivity in agriculture (L/tonne) <p>CO₂ emissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decreased CO₂ emissions (Kt of CO₂ equivalent) Increased renewable energy production (KWh) Lower electricity losses (% of electricity generation)
2. Identify intervention options and output	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish an initial list of potential policy instruments. Carry out an analysis of past interventions adopted to address the same issue, and their outcomes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the policy instruments available to address the negative environmental trends? What are current and past policies adopted for the same objective? What should be changed? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Identify indicators representing and measuring the main policy instruments considered. Identify indicators representing and measuring the sectoral effectiveness of the intervention considered. 	<p>Deforestation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PES (payment for ecosystem services): funding transferred (US\$/year and/or US\$/ha) Agroforestry development: investment per ha (US\$/ha/year) Timber certification: activities certified (#/year and output) <p>Nutrition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecological fertilisers: investment and productivity (US\$/ha/year, tonnes/ha) Water efficiency: investment and productivity (US\$/ha/year, tonnes/L) Improved fishing practices: public subsidy (US\$/person/year) <p>CO₂ emissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renewable energy: feed-in tariffs (US\$/MWh) Energy efficiency: national standards (CO₂ emission % reduction)

4 INDICATORS FOR POLICY ASSESSMENT

4.1 INTRODUCTION

A green economy is one that results in improved human well-being and social equity while significantly reducing environmental risks and ecological scarcities (UNEP, 2011a). Therefore, the final objective of green policy interventions is to protect the environment while ensuring the well-being of the population in a sustainable way. Impact indicators are thus needed to highlight the linkage between green economy and sustainable development.

Once objectives and targets are defined, and intervention options identified, a policy assessment needs to be carried out to estimate the ultimate, long-term impacts of implementation, to evaluate the effectiveness of each option in supporting sustainable development, and to inform decision-making. While indicators for problem identification help to frame the issue, and indicators for policy formulation help to design solutions, impact indicators support the estimation of the cross-sectoral impacts of the interventions chosen. Guidance provided in this chapter focuses on the use of indicators already identified in Chapter 2 (issue identification), and Chapter 3 (policy formulation), with a more marked focus on indicators for socio-economic impacts and well-being. Complementary to these indicators, there are several impact assessment methods that support a systemic analysis across sectors and actors.

4.2 METHODOLOGY

Once a policy is designed, its expected impacts have to be estimated to inform decision-making and implementation. In this phase, clear understanding needs to be developed of the time needed to progress from policy formulation to decision-making and consequently implementation. The use

of a multi-stakeholder approach is encouraged, and roles, responsibilities and procedures should be clearly defined and agreed upon (UNDP, 2009). In addition, policy assessment should take into account the time needed to implement the policy and for its impacts to emerge. While being equally effective in the longer term, certain policies may generate positive results already in the short term, while others may require more time to show any meaningful impact.

For example, the expansion of forest protected areas is a policy intervention that may require the engagement of a number of relevant stakeholders, including, when applicable, forest dwellers, logging companies, government representatives from different ministries, enforcement agencies, civil society organisations, research institutions, etc. The time needed to consult different actors and reach an agreement on general objectives and principles, as well as respective roles and responsibilities for implementation (e.g., who is responsible for monitoring the area; what is the procedure in case of violations; what are the exceptions, if any, for local dwellers). Moreover, the assessment should include estimations of the time and costs needed to implement and enforce new regulations, including relocating companies and communities, creating the capacity to control the area, and an assessment of when results of policy implementation would be visible (e.g., employment may be generated in the short term, but impacts on biodiversity may take longer).

Finally, the evaluation of policy effectiveness should account for possible “rebound effects”, where part of the policy-induced gain is offset by system responses. These can be feedbacks involving the price, income and/or the economy-wide rebound effect. A rebound effect could limit the desired impact of the policy, thereby influencing the time required to achieve policy objectives.

For example, in the case of a policy targeting a 10 per cent improvement in energy efficiency, energy consumption may only be reduced by 6 per cent. This is due to a reduction in energy consumption and expenditure (policy impact) possibly leading to a re-allocation of resources which ultimately lead to higher expenditure and consumption (system response).

Economic, social and environmental impacts have to be forecasted and evaluated to support the creation of a policy package that would lead to double or triple dividends. The results of these assessments will feed back into the further development and fine-tuning of the policy options. The iterative 'back-and-forth' expressed in such feedback loops are typical for the policy cycle.

Policy impact indicators are also fundamental for the evaluation of the performance of policies during and after implementation, and also contribute to the next policymaking round (starting, again, with issue identification).

The approach used for the identification of policy impact indicators covers a broader set of consequences of a social, economic and environmental nature, and thus requires a multi-stakeholder approach. These indicators include information on the state of the environment, directly related to the environmental issues and target indicators, as well as indicators of sectoral performance and socio-economic progress, such as employment and well-being.

For example, the adoption of standards and regulations for the exploitation of fisheries should have positive effects on the preservation of fish stocks, and thus the long-term profitability of fishing activities. At the community level, policy impacts could be measured through the development of small-scale fisheries, which are directly linked to food security and employment generation.

Moreover, the restoration of damaged marine ecosystems should help to prevent future floods and coastal erosion, thus protecting coastal communities and their livelihoods, as well as crucial industries and infrastructure. Finally, revenues of

marine ecotourism activities (i.e. accommodation and entertainment services) could be analysed to quantify benefits deriving from healthier coasts.

Also, as an example from the waste sector, the adoption of the 3R approach (reduce, reuse, recycle) is mainly aimed at reducing pollution and contamination derived from inappropriate waste disposal and management. Together with positive impacts on the environment, the success of innovative policies for industrial and municipal waste management might be reflected in improved health conditions (e.g., reduced pollution), water quality (e.g., reduced water contamination), energy supply (e.g., energy generation from waste), increased fish stocks (e.g., reduced contamination of ocean and inland water resources). Moreover, economic and employment opportunities could be created by collecting, sorting and reusing waste.

Impacts are notoriously more difficult to identify and assess. In the absence of more definite impact indicators, early pointers of impact may be used during implementation to indicate progress toward achieving policy objectives. For example, in many cases, output indicators and indicators of risk factors can serve as suitable intermediate or leading indicators of impact.

The methodology proposed focuses on three main steps to identify indicators for policy monitoring and evaluation:

- Analyse policy impacts across sectors;
- Analyse impacts on the overall well-being of the population;
- Analyse advantages and disadvantages, and inform decision-making.

These steps are described in the following sections.

4.3 STEP 1: ESTIMATE POLICY IMPACTS ACROSS SECTORS

After having measured the effectiveness of the policy intervention in addressing the issue at hand, cross-sectoral impacts should also be measured to evaluate whether the policy is effectively

contributing to sustainable development. In fact, given the high degree of interdependence of social, economic and environmental indicators, every green policy implemented in one sector is also likely to produce impacts (either positive or negative) on other sectors.

For this reason, an integrated, cross-sectoral impact analysis of green policies should be carried out in order to provide a coherent evaluation of synergies, side effects and ancillary benefits.

For example, greening the agriculture sector is expected to improve soil quality and increase yields and production, and consequently farmers' incomes. Additional positive effects and synergies are improvements in nutrition (social), reductions in food imports (economic), and reductions in the rate of deforestation (environmental), among others.

A policy example includes energy subsidies, which are effective instruments to support economic growth in the short term, by lowering the cost of energy to consumers. On the other hand, economic growth leads to higher energy demand, and higher demand - in an open market - leads to higher energy prices, offsetting the initial advantage gained by introducing subsidies. This side effect indicates that subsidies should be phased out over time to maintain competitiveness, not only for fossil fuels, but also for renewable energy.

For instance, subsidies on solar capacity reduce market prices, pushing demand higher. On the other hand, when demand increases, the price of the raw materials used to produce solar panels also increases (mostly due to the fact that demand grows faster than the increase in supply), making such panels more expensive. This is a case that has particularly affected production in China, and, as a consequence, global markets as well. Additional interventions could be designed to mitigate the strength of the side effect, by introducing incentives for energy efficiency while removing fossil fuel subsidies and by introducing incentives for a less material-intensive production process for solar panels while also, in this case, phasing out consumer subsidies.

4.4. STEP 2: ANALYSE IMPACTS ON THE OVERALL WELL-BEING OF THE POPULATION

The green economy is a vehicle to reach sustainable development. For this reason, economic, social and environmental impact indicators need to be identified in the policy assessment phase and monitored, focusing on how green economy interventions contribute to the improvement of well-being. In particular, potential co-benefits and ancillary benefits of green policies should be measured in order to assess the impacts on the quality of life of communities, and to identify additional opportunities to create positive synergies between green growth and sustainable development (OECD, 2011; UNEP, 2012a).

Several indicators can be used to estimate the impact of green economy policies on well-being, including, among others, employment and income generation (ILO, 2013), total wealth (e.g., value of natural resource stocks), access to resources (e.g., energy, water, sanitation) and health (e.g., harmful chemicals in water, people hospitalised due to air pollution).

The impact of green interventions on well-being can be both direct and indirect:

- Direct benefits include employment generation (e.g., new jobs for installing and maintaining renewable energy infrastructure), improved access to energy and water, increased food security (e.g., as result of ecological agriculture practices), among others.
- Indirect benefits include health (e.g., reduced occurrence of diseases linked to air or water pollution, adoption of healthy lifestyle), education (e.g., higher quality education and business skills resulting from capacity-building activities on innovative green techniques and technologies).

For example, a number of well-being indicators could be considered when evaluating policies on green agricultural practices. Improvements include health conditions (e.g., cases of malnutrition or intoxication due to water pollution), employment (e.g., new jobs in agriculture and related sectors),

BOX 13 – SUMMARY OF STEP 1: ESTIMATE POLICY IMPACTS ACROSS SECTORS

Tasks

- Select and analyse indicators of policy impacts on other sectors.

Key questions

- Is the policy having positive/negative impacts on other sectors?

BOX 14 – SUMMARY OF STEP 2: ANALYSE IMPACTS ON THE OVERALL WELL-BEING OF THE POPULATION

Tasks:

- Select and analyse indicators of policy impacts on:
 - Employment, total wealth, access to resources, etc.
- Select and analyse composite indicators of well-being, such as:
 - Human Development Index (HDI), Gender-related Development Index (GDI), Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI).

Key questions:

- What is the impact of the policy on the overall well-being of the population?

food security (e.g., share of food insecure people, MDG hunger target). Further, education would improve (with technical knowledge on improved management practices, but also due to higher household income), and the risk of floods might be reduced with better management of land and water upstream.

From a bird's eye perspective, the impact of green policy interventions can also be estimated through compound indicators (aggregated indicators, composite indicators and indices) of well-being, which measure the advancement towards sustainable development through the combination of several variables (IISD, 2005). Examples of these aggregate indicators include:

- Human Development Index (HDI)
- Gender-related Development Index (GDI)
- Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)
- Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI)
- Gender Inequality Index (GII)

- Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI)
- Inclusive Wealth Index (IWI)
- Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW)
- Sustainable Net Benefit Index (SNBI)

Compound indicators are the result of a compilation of single indicators on the basis of an underlying model (Nardo et al., 2005; Hak, 2011). They are designed to be more accessible to policymakers, since they condense vast amounts of data into one single value. However, they are particularly prone to subjectivity, since value systems may influence the theoretical framework for the selection and combination of individual indicators, and in particular with regard to the relative weights given to the individual components. As suggested in previous studies (UNEP, 2012a), methodological pluralism coupled with stakeholder participation and open and informed debate could reduce subjectivity and increase the value of compound indicators for measuring policy impacts on well-being.

Evaluating compound indicators of well-being can help to evaluate the aggregated impacts of green policies on quality of life and human development, with particular attention to vulnerable groups. Synergies between green economy strategies and sustainable development become more evident in this phase of the policy cycle, with an integrated evaluation that touches upon direct and indirect impacts of green interventions on the economy, society and the environment.

For example, higher quality education and business-related skills would contribute to an improved Human Development Index (HDI) and in many cases potentially to a better Gender-related Development Index (GDI) as well. Further, access to energy and water would improve the overall MDG performance, and natural resource conservation would increase adjusted net savings.

4.5 STEP 3: ANALYSE ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES, AND INFORM DECISION-MAKING

The goal of policy formulation, including the assessment of the likely impact of the interventions chosen, is to design a policy package that can effectively solve the problem and equitably allocate the economic burden, as well as the benefits, across the key actors in the economy.

An analysis of advantages and disadvantages is necessary to identify the winners and losers, concerning both required investments and benefits. Simply put, this analysis would generally compare investment and avoided costs, or added benefits, depending on the issue.

For example, the adoption of energy efficient technology requires upfront investments (capital expenditure), but will reduce energy consumption and expenditure (avoided cost), while possibly creating new jobs and income (added benefit).

Added benefits and avoided costs may change depending on the problem analysed, and can be compared with indicators of the historical

and current performance of the sector to assess whether the investment can be sustained, and how the economic burden can be allocated across the main actors impacted by the intervention (e.g., public versus private investment).

For example, in the case of deforestation, avoided costs include the replacement of deteriorating ecosystem services with built infrastructure (e.g., roads), and the lowered production and income from ecosystem goods (e.g., rubber and other non-timber forest products). In fact, aggressive deforestation may cause siltation, or the accumulation of sediments in rivers, negatively impacting on navigation, water supply, fishing communities, hydropower infrastructure, among others. As a consequence, companies involved in mining, for example, can either build roads to offset the loss of river use for transport, plant trees, compensate communities or contribute to the clean-up of river beds.

The following steps could be followed to carry out an analysis of advantages and disadvantages:

1. Establish the baseline and estimate the cost of inaction

This includes an analysis of trends, especially of baseline indicators (see Chapter 2) and the estimation of economic, biophysical, social and cultural damage resulting from inaction. These include, for instance, costs of biodiversity loss (expressed as lost ecotourism GDP); crop losses due to extreme weather events (expressed as income and production loss, increased imports, as well as nutrition and relative health impacts); costs of health treatment for respiratory diseases (expressed as the number of people hospitalised, the cost of treatment and the impact on GDP through reductions in labour productivity).

In all these examples, a variety of indicators should be monitored simultaneously in order to properly establish cause-effect relations, and assess the actual impact of interventions. In the case of tourism, for instance, biodiversity loss does not necessarily lead to a decline in revenues. In fact, while this could be true for ecotourism services, it may not be the same for traditional tourism business. In this case, considerable

short-term growth could be achieved by expanding hotel capacity at the expense of forest cover and biodiversity.

2. Quantify the costs of policy intervention

Each policy instrument may imply several typologies of costs, for various stakeholders (e.g., planning, capacity-building, research, operation and management), and some of these costs may be prolonged or even become regular (e.g., operation and management).

These include, for instance, salaries for park rangers, training, management and operational costs for the establishment of forest protected areas; investments in research for the identification of locally-adapted varieties, training and awareness-raising activities for the introduction of climate-resistant crop seeds; project and capital upfront costs, and maintenance and capacity building expenditure for investments in renewable energy infrastructure.

3. Quantify the advantages or benefits of policy intervention

Benefits to all stakeholders include avoided damages, direct and indirect economic and/or biophysical positive impacts, qualitative and/or quantitative social improvements (e.g., well-being) and cultural impacts, and more. Specific methodologies for this quantification can be found in several sectors. For biodiversity these include, among others, market and non-market valuation techniques (UNSD, 2003; EC et al., 2012). In the case of policies that involve the private sector, (e.g., incentives to EGSS), expected returns on investments (ROI) and more conventional cost-benefit and multi-criteria analyses could be carried out. Further, reputational benefits deriving from enhanced corporate social responsibility could also be estimated.

It is important to underline that such advantages will not just include benefits in a narrow sense, such as monetary or financial benefits. Examples of financial benefits include, for instance, revenues from forest products; avoided costs for

the replacement of watershed management and other ecosystem services; increased revenues from ecotourism activities and from the sustainable management of forests; increased agricultural production and value; increased food exports (or decreased imports); avoided costs of health treatments for nutrition-related diseases or intoxication from polluted water caused by the use of climate-resilient crop-seeds; reduced fossil fuel costs; avoided cost of health treatments for respiratory diseases caused by polluted air; increased employment; and lowered volatility of electricity prices from investments in renewable energy.

4. Compare advantages and disadvantages (qualitative and quantitative, monetary and biophysical, social and cultural, across sectors and key actors, and over time)

Several methods can be used to estimate advantages and disadvantages of the policy options, depending on the information available. These methods include the use of simulation models for ex ante analysis (see Box 16) which can facilitate the analysis of forecasted impacts of policy implementation across sectors. Further, if an exclusively economic analysis, such as a cost-benefit analysis or a cost-effectiveness analysis, is not deemed adequate or appropriate in the specific situation, multi-criteria analyses could be applied whereby policy options are ranked against a variety of criteria, including social and cultural ones, chosen ad hoc, as well as analyses of distributional impacts, as applicable.

Given the need to consider the many ramifications of the impacts of policies in the context of a green economy analysis, the comparison of costs and benefits is likely to require cross-sectoral expertise. In fact, this activity should be carried out using a multi-stakeholder approach in order to ensure that assessments are objective (UNDP, 2009).

For instance, since the removal of harmful subsidies has several measurable impacts, a variety of indicators should be utilised to evaluate the performance of the intervention. These



include indicators on government accounts (for the foreseen reduction in public expenditure), production costs and market prices of certain goods and services (kept artificially low and potentially increasing) and their consumption (potentially decreasing if prices increase). These three main direct consequences have several indirect ramifications that require the utilisation of an even broader set of indicators:

- Reduced public expenditure frees up resources for other interventions that could potentially reduce the burden on households;
- Reduced consumption of natural resources, often being traded as commodities, would reduce upward price pressure, partially offsetting the impact that subsidy removal would have on prices and, as a consequence, on household costs;
- Reduced consumption would allow a reversal of current downward trends of some natural resource stocks (such as forests and fisheries) due to overexploitation;
- The higher prices of unsustainable goods and services would immediately increase the profitability of green economy interventions, triggering further investments;
- Last but not least, higher prices could also have adverse distributional consequences, which would need to be identified accurately and, if judged significant, mitigated by additional measures.

5. Inform decision-making with the results of the analysis and formulate related policy interventions.

Once the various policy options available to address the issue and attain the policy targets have been further analysed with the help of indicators on advantages and disadvantages, as explained above, and further fine-tuned based on the results of the assessment, the best combination of interventions needs to be chosen by policy-makers considering the distribution of advantages and disadvantages across key actors in the economy.

The selection of policy options should be based on three criteria, also supported by quantitative modelling exercises (see Box 16): (i) the equitable sharing of costs; (ii) the effectiveness in addressing the issue; (iii) the promotion of cross-sectoral double and triple dividend opportunities (OECD, 2011; World Bank, 2012b). More specifically:

Indicators should be analysed to evaluate and select the options that would not put an onerous burden on vulnerable groups or the poor.

For instance, regulations (e.g., mandates), in the absence of incentives, imply that individuals and the private sector would be required to bear all the costs needed to comply with the law (e.g., such as in the case of a mandate for energy efficiency) (World Bank, 2012b). A multi-stakeholder approach

BOX 15 – SUMMARY OF STEP 3: ANALYSE ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES, AND INFORM DECISION-MAKING

Tasks:

1. Identify indicators to estimate the costs of reaching selected targets through various policy interventions (e.g., including capital and O&M costs, training expenditure, etc.).
2. Identify indicators to evaluate expected benefits and avoided costs of the investment and interventions considered.
3. Identify and analyse indicators that highlight the presence of possible synergies and/or side effects.

Key questions:

- What is the economic cost of the targets and intervention(s) proposed?
- How does it compare to the cost of inaction?
- What are the economic and cross-sectoral benefits of policy options in the short, medium and long-term?
- Which options are expected to generate the maximum cross-sectoral benefit at the least cost?

is necessary to identify and evaluate inconsistencies in the cost allocation as well as impacts across stakeholders, and to determine the indicators necessary to evaluate the expected impacts of policy interventions. In fact, indicators of household investment as well as disposable income could be used to evaluate whether the new policy would require a considerable reallocation of resources (possibly reducing consumption and savings) that could lead to negative economic impacts. In such a case, the gradual phasing in of the regulation, possibly coupled with additional incentives, could be considered. In the case of additional incentives, their impact on government accounts – using indicators associated with the annual deficit and debt – should be carefully monitored.

Indicators should be analysed to evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions available.

As an example, investments in setting up a public system for the collection and sorting of waste may be very effective in creating employment, but may prove to be very expensive and ineffective in supplying the required quantity of waste to recycling facilities. Investments in public awareness instead, and the installation of waste disposal units

in several parts of the city may not generate jobs, but may reduce implementation costs and increase the flow of waste reaching recycling facilities, all thanks to voluntary action.

Indicators should be used to design policy packages that make use of synergies and create double and triple dividends.

For example, while an investment in renewable energy may be perceived to be very effective in reducing fuel consumption (import and cost), the impacts of the various policy options available to reach a renewable energy target can be many and varied. Importing manufactured capacity from abroad, through a direct capital investment, while minimising costs, will not create local employment and capacity. On the other hand, incentives for the expansion of capacity will stimulate local operators to learn about the technology and either import it or create it locally, generating knowledge and employment.

Table 5 summarises the three main steps in this phase, using sample indicators to illustrate each step.

BOX 16 – EX ANTE AND EX POST MODELLING IN SUPPORT OF POLICY FORMULATION AND EVALUATION

Due to the cross-sectoral impacts of green policy interventions, an integrated approach is needed to design an effective policy package.

As indicated in Chapters 2, 3 and 4, policymakers should use multiple indicators in order to better understand the functioning of the system, maximise synergies across sectors and avoid unintended consequences. Indeed, policies can have very positive impacts for certain sectors and create issues for others. Furthermore, successful policies in the longer term may have negative short-term impacts, for which mitigating actions may be designed and implemented.

Integrated policymaking requires a holistic perspective and constant monitoring of multiple, simultaneous changes in the drivers of the system. Integrated simulation models that address social, economic and environmental factors within a single analytical framework can support decision makers in identifying upcoming problems, estimating and evaluating the prospective impacts of policy implementation. More specifically, simulation models can be used *ex ante* - in the problem identification and policy formulation phases - and *ex post* - when policies are under implementation and their performance needs to be monitored and evaluated.

Ex ante modelling can generate “what if” projections on the expected (and unexpected) trends, as well as on the impacts of proposed policy options on a variety of key indicators across sectors. In addition, well-designed models that integrate various economic and biophysical variables and sectors can assist in the analysis of advantages and disadvantages and the prioritisation of policy options. The use of structural models that explicitly link policy interventions to their impacts can generate projections on how a certain target could be reached, and when.

Ex post modelling can support impact evaluation by improving the understanding of the relations existing among key variables in the system. Comparing actual with projected performance under given initial conditions and historical data enables improvements in the model and understanding of the system, and ultimately supports the refinement of objectives, targets, and policies.

The System Dynamics (SD) methodology, coupled with econometrics and optimisation in the sectors of relevance, has been successfully used to develop and test green economy principles at the global level, and to design several national green economy strategies in collaboration with the respective governments. One of the main advantages of SD - a methodology that emphasises causal relations and highlights the complexity of the system - is its transparency, and also its capacity to explicitly account for feedback loops, delays and non-linearity.

Table 5: Key steps and related indicators for policy impact evaluation: Examples for deforestation, nutrition and CO₂ emissions.

Steps	Description	Indicator typology and tasks	Indicator samples
1. Estimate policy impacts across sectors	<p>Evaluate the direct economic, environmental and social benefits (and potential side effects) of the interventions implemented.</p> <p>Use integrated simulation models to project the future impact of the interventions on key sectors and indicators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the policy having positive/negative impacts on other sectors? 	Evaluate the direct economic, environmental and social benefits (and potential side effects) of the interventions implemented.	<p>Deforestation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased revenues from river transport activities (US\$/year) Increased water supply (L/year) Reduced flood risk (US\$/year; % of GDP) <p>Nutrition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revenue creation for food processing industries (US\$/year) Water savings due to micro-irrigation (L/year) Increased water availability for hydropower (KWh/year) <p>CO₂ emissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced cost of energy imports (US\$/year) Lowered road transport costs (US\$/year) Households consumption and savings (US\$/year)
2. Analyse impacts on the overall well-being of the population	<p>Identify impacts of policy implementation on sustainable development, including poverty alleviation, equity, social inclusiveness, inclusive wealth etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the impact of the policy on the overall well-being of the population? 	<p>a. Select and analyse indicators of policy impacts on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment, total wealth, access to resources, etc. <p>b. Select and analyse composite indicators of well-being, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HDI, GDI, MDGs, GPI. 	<p>Deforestation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment and income generation, e.g., in sustainable forest management (people /year, US\$/year) Deaths from landslides and floods (deaths /year) Revenues from ecotourism (US\$/year) <p>Nutrition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment and income generation, e.g., in agriculture (people/year, US\$/year) Malnutrition (people hospitalised/year) Newborn health (% of newborns with low birthweight) <p>CO₂ emissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to modern forms of energy (%) Employment and income generation (people/year, US\$/year) Respiratory diseases due to smoke inhalation from indoor burning cooking stoves (people hospitalised/year)
3. Analyse advantages and disadvantages and inform decision-making	<p>Analyse short, medium and long-term advantages and disadvantages of the various policy options considered.</p> <p>Compare options based on the analysis of advantages and disadvantages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the economic cost of the targets and intervention(s) proposed? How does it compare to the cost of inaction? What are the economic and cross-sectoral benefits of policy options in the short, medium and long-term? Which options are expected to generate the maximum cross-sectoral benefit at the minor cost? 	<p>a. Identify indicators to estimate the costs of reaching selected targets through various policy interventions (e.g., include, capital and O&M cost, training expenditure, etc.)</p> <p>b. Identify indicators to evaluate expected benefits and avoided costs of the investment and interventions considered.</p> <p>c. Identify and analyse indicators that highlight the presence of possible synergies and/or side effects.</p>	<p>Deforestation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost of reforestation (US\$/ha) GEF benefits index for biodiversity Income creation for rural communities (US\$/year) <p>Nutrition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost of interventions: material inputs and training (US\$/year, % of GDP) Reduction of child malnutrition (% and %/US\$ invested) Avoided food imports (US\$/year or % change) <p>CO₂ emissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investment in renewable energy (US\$/year, % of GDP) Rural access to clean energy (%) Avoided energy costs from savings (US\$/year, % of GDP)

5 INDICATORS FOR POLICY MONITORING AND EVALUATION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The last stage of the integrated policymaking cycle consists in the monitoring and evaluation of policy impacts. While indicators for problem identification help to frame the issue, and indicators for policy formulation help to design solutions, indicators for policy monitoring and evaluation support the assessment of the performance of the intervention implemented.

This approach focuses on the use of indicators already identified in Chapter 2 (issue identification) and Chapters 3 and 4 (policy formulation and assessment).

5.2 METHODOLOGY

Given that the integrated policymaking cycle is continuous, the impact of policies needs to be monitored and evaluated, firstly to support the agenda-setting stage. In fact, if the impacts differ from expectations, unsolved issues will remain high on the agenda of policymakers, and corrective actions will have to be taken and then monitored and evaluated.

For example, the impact of interventions in public transport should be measured in relation to initial expectations, such as the reduction of CO₂ emission, which may have been perceived as a priority issue in the agenda-setting stage. In this case, data monitoring may reveal that emission levels, although declining, are still above desired targets. This could be due to an underestimation of secondary impacts, such as transit-oriented development, resulting from the extension of the public transport infrastructure. In particular, the expansion of railway networks connecting urban and lower density areas might result in increased urbanisation, with the growth of suburbs. As a

result, corrective measures need to be identified and implemented.

Monitoring and evaluation is also crucial to identify and anticipate patterns and trends, through the analysis of emerging and unexpected events. Despite all efforts made during the policy identification and assessment stages described in previous chapters, unforeseen policy responses, in the form of negative side effects or potentially positive synergies, may only be detected during the implementation stage. This may also lead to a redefinition of targets (either lowered or increased) and to the modification of policies already in place.

For example, policy interventions to reduce CO₂ emissions have included incentives for the cultivation of sugar or starch crops - such as corn or sugarcane- to produce energy and reduce fossil fuel exploitation. However, subsequent assessments or monitoring and evaluation during implementation have, in a number of cases, highlighted a trend towards shifting land use from food crops to biofuel crops, with consequent increases in food prices and negative impacts on food security and nutrition. Furthermore, large amounts of water and fertilisers are needed to obtain adequate biofuel crop yields leading to reduced water availability for other uses, as well as soil degradation and groundwater pollution from chemical fertilisers.

These early warning signs may induce policymakers to consider lowering the target for biofuel production, or implementing interventions that mitigate the negative effects of existing production practices (such as more stringent water efficiency standards or land use regulations, or the provision of incentives for ecological agricultural practices).

In order to conduct comprehensive monitoring and evaluation, a broad range of stakeholders need to be engaged in the process to provide feedback on

BOX 17 – KEY STEPS: INDICATORS FOR POLICY MONITORING AND EVALUATION

1. Measure policy impacts in relation to the environmental issue indicators for issue identification);
2. Measure the investment leveraged (indicators for policy formulation);
3. Measure impacts across sectors and on the overall well-being of the population (indicators for policy assessment).

the perceived performance of implemented policies. Stakeholder participation could be enhanced through the organisation of public hearings, the establishment of special consultative committees and task forces (UNEP, 2009). Different perspectives on policy impacts are particularly relevant in this phase, when political biases can compromise the transparency and efficacy of the evaluation process. Based on stakeholder consultations, policies can be reformulated and adjusted according to evolving needs and observed synergies or unintended consequences. In particular, new target indicators can be designed that are more in line with the system's response, and acknowledge possible delays in transitioning towards new behavioural patterns.

The methodology proposed focuses on three main steps to identify indicators for policy monitoring and evaluation:

- Measure policy impacts in relation to the environmental issue (using indicators for issue identification);
- Measure policy performance (using indicators for policy formulation);
- Analyse impacts across sectors and on the overall well-being of the population (using indicators for policy assessment).

5.3 MEASURING POLICY PERFORMANCE: EFFECTIVENESS, INVESTMENT AND WELL-BEING

Monitoring implementation of the policy is a fundamental step of the policymaking cycle. It allows decision makers to verify whether the policy is generating expected results, and will eventually

lead to the formulation and implementation of corrective measures (UNDP, 2009). In addition to policy impacts, the effectiveness of the implementation process can be evaluated. Indeed, the implementation of a policy often requires that different actors take simultaneous or sequential actions in different sectors or administrative divisions. The actual responsiveness of different stakeholders involved in the execution of policy measures, the effectiveness of their actions as well as the suitability of the implementation and enforcement procedures established, can be measured with the help of qualitative and quantitative indicators. In this context, monitoring and evaluation becomes a powerful process to strengthen stakeholder coordination, enhance accountability and reinforce the understanding of the integrated nature of the system.

An illustrative example at the global level is the monitoring of the correct implementation of the Kyoto Protocol. A number of indicators are constantly monitored to assess compliance of Parties with the rules established by the Protocol. Moreover, the quality of measurements taken to calculate emission levels is evaluated periodically. The annual greenhouse gas inventories, as well as national communications, are mandatory outputs that Parties have to produce in order to allow the monitoring of key compliance indicators.

Simultaneously with monitoring the policy implementation process, the effectiveness of the policy itself needs to be carefully assessed from the very beginning of its implementation. In order to ensure that a consistent approach is adopted throughout the entire policy process, the same indicators that were designed for each step of the policymaking cycle should inform the

monitoring phase. Therefore, when monitoring and evaluating impacts of green policy interventions, the indicators for issue identification (see Chapter 2) should be analysed to test the actual effect of the interventions implemented. Further, indicators for issue identification should be compared to target indicators (see Chapter 3) to evaluate whether the situation is improving and matching desired targets.

For example, if deforestation has been identified as a worrying trend, and the establishment of new protected areas has been selected as a green policy option to protect forests and reverse the trend, the first indicators to monitor are deforestation and its causes. Further, if a target is available for the reduction of deforestation, a comparison should be made, to evaluate whether the trend is improving enough to reach the stated target on time.

If the analysis indicates that the problem has not been effectively addressed, the emphasis should be put on the causes of the problem to evaluate whether the inertia of the system (i.e. delay times in the implementation of the policy and in it having an impact) is preventing sudden and measurable changes.

For example, in the case of fisheries, despite the introduction of natural reserves to reduce catch and support the natural growth of the fish stock, it may take months or years for the fish stock to reach desired levels due to the biology of fish reproduction and other natural processes (e.g., natural predation, or growth of corals) affecting the system.

If no change is visible in the causes of the problem, a more specific policy analysis should be carried out, to evaluate the impacts of the intervention on the causal chain and to identify weak links, including side effects and unintended consequences.

For example, in the case of energy efficiency, despite the success of incentives for energy efficient light bulbs and appliances, household energy consumption may not decline as much as expected because of the rebound effect, whereby the avoided energy costs resulting from the energy saved, may be spent on purchasing more energy intensive appliances (e.g., a larger TV or

refrigerator) or simply using them more (e.g., light bulbs being left on for a longer period of time).

The performance of the policy in addressing the problem should be evaluated in relation to the resources it has mobilised. For this reason, to assess the effectiveness of the policy instrument chosen, the investment disbursed should be measured, either directly (e.g., in the form of capital investment and/or incentives) or indirectly (e.g., private investment triggered by the allocation of incentives, laws and regulations, or by the pricing of externalities).

For example, the monitoring and evaluation of renewable energy incentives may reveal that progress towards reaching a desired renewable energy growth target is below expectations. In light of this result, possible direct and indirect causes of failure should be analysed. These include the possibility that government incentives are not adequate (or sufficiently attractive) to trigger the required private sector investments. In this case, the incentive package could be revised. Another possible explanation may be that the target set was too ambitious compared to the private financial resources available (e.g., with low access to credit, even an attractive incentive may prove unsuccessful).

Finally, with the green economy being a vehicle for sustainable development the monitoring and evaluation of policy impacts should also be extended to effects across sectors and on well-being. Since a green economy is expected to favour inclusive growth, the distribution of costs and benefits across actors also needs to be carefully evaluated. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) is strongly recommended as an effective approach to understand multiple perceptions of policy impacts on well-being (UNEP, 2009).

For example, when evaluating the effects of a stimulus package for ecotourism, co-benefits should be measured also in other sectors, such as the provision of local services and the manufacturing of tourism-related goods (e.g., beds, souvenirs, equipment etc.). These, and other activities, impact on the well-being of the population through job creation, income, but also through the creation of

knowledge and skills. All these factors contribute to poverty reduction and well-being, as a result of the participation of the poor in income-generating activities linked to the ecotourism industry.

Another example can be taken from the waste sector, where the success or failure of integrated waste management policies should also be evaluated in terms of health impacts and access to clean water and sanitation, resulting from reduced pollution. In particular, groundwater pollution due to open dumps and illegal landfills could be monitored in conjunction with the incidence of diseases from water contamination in the areas close to the landfills. Similarly, data on air pollution and related respiratory diseases caused by emissions from municipal solid waste landfills should be analysed to assess additional health impacts of waste management policies.

Monitoring and evaluation is an action-oriented phase of the policy cycle. Indeed, the purpose of the evaluation is to take prompt decisions with regard to the continuation or modification of the policy. If indicators of policy outcomes reflect expectations, the behaviour of the system needs to be continuously monitored to ensure that potential delayed negative effects do not emerge.

On the other hand, if the evaluation shows that results are not being properly achieved, an in-depth analysis has to be conducted, including a study of the evolution of key indicators, in order to detect the main causes of failure, and design effective corrective measures in the next policymaking cycle. In particular, the breadth and depth of policy failure need to be measured and understood, and different solutions should be found accordingly.

BOX 18 – SUMMARY: MEASURE POLICY PERFORMANCE

Tasks:

- Measure policy impacts in relation to the environmental issue
 - Use target indicators selected in the policy formulation phase.
 - Use indicators of sectoral performance identified in the issue identification phase.
- Measure the investment leveraged o Use indicators for policy formulation.
- Measure impacts across sectors and on the overall well-being of the population
 - Use indicators for policy assessment.

Key questions:

- Is the policy implemented contributing to solving the problem?
 - Are the costs estimated in line with actual implementation expenditure?
 - Is implementation progressing as planned, with coordinated actions across key stakeholder?
 - Is investment (from public or private sources) being effectively leveraged by the policy implemented?
 - Is there any cross-sectoral impact being observed as a result of policy implementation?
 - Is the policy contributing to inclusiveness and well-being?

BOX 19 – LAND-LOCKED DRY AND SUB-HUMID COUNTRY, WITH DOMINANT AGRICULTURE AND IN EARLY PHASES OF DEMOGRAPHIC TRANSITION AND URBANISATION.

Given their socio-economic and environmental context, land-locked, dry and sub-humid countries relying heavily on agriculture might face a number of direct or indirect environmental challenges. Examples include:

- A reduction in soil quality, possibly due to climate change impacts and unsustainable agricultural practices, leading to a decrease in food production.
- Increasing water stress, due to growing demand for municipal and agricultural uses, and to variability in precipitation.
- High demographic growth, leading to urbanisation and creating pressures on the provision of basic services, such as access to sanitation and health care.

Sample indicators are presented for each step of the policymaking process to address the problem of decreasing agricultural production in this specific country context.

2. Issue identification

Step 1: Identify potentially worrying trends. In the first step of the issue identification phase, past and current trends are monitored in order to identify potential issues that might compromise national development.

The problem can be identified by analysing production (tonnes/year) and productivity (tonnes/ha), or indirectly, with the help of indicators related to food availability, such as food security, average nutrition level (Kcal/day/person) and health (% of newborns with birth weights inferior to 2500g).

Step 2: Assess the issue and its relation to the natural environment. Once the issue has been identified as potentially harmful for national development, indicators are used to clarify the relation (if any) between the problem and the environment.

In the case of decreasing agricultural production, a number of cause-effect relations might be explored between soil fertility, agricultural practices and environmental quality. On the one hand, the adoption

of unsustainable cultivation and irrigation practices is likely to put pressure on natural resources, thereby impacting the overall performance of the sector. On the other hand, the sector can also be affected by environmental trends (such as increased climate variability, leading to water scarcity). Key indicators that can support this type of analysis include, among others, water use (L/year), rainfall (mm/year), irrigated land area (ha), water intensity in agriculture (L/tonne), use of fertilisers and pesticides (tonnes/ha), drought occurrence (n. of droughts/year).

Step 3: Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue of concern. After a general analysis has been conducted on the key elements having an influence on agricultural production, a more in-depth study is carried out to clearly identify causes and effects. For example, lower yields might be caused by soil erosion, in turn determined by a number of unsustainable practices, such as intensive use of chemical fertilisers (tonnes/ha), limited crop rotation, deep tillage etc. Another concurring cause could be the lack of water, attributable to low water productivity (m³/US\$), reduced or highly variable rainfall (mm/year) and temperatures as a result of climate change.

Step 4: Analyse more fully how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment. Once the key causes of the problem have been detected with the help of indicators and causal maps, the effects of decreased agricultural production on national socio-economic and environmental performance need to be measured.

For example, economic impacts could be evaluated by analysing trends in agriculture value added (US\$/year); social impacts may include reduced employment (people/year), as well as increasing malnutrition (n. of malnutrition-related diseases/year); environmental impacts might derive from unsustainable practices to increase production at the expense of ecosystems; these may include deforestation (ha/year), more intensive use of fertilisers (tonnes/ha) leading to further soil degradation (% of agriculture land) and groundwater pollution (BOD mg/L, etc).

3. Policy formulation

Step 1: Identify desired outcomes: define policy objectives. The information provided by indicators of problem causes and effects is used to define the desired outcomes of policy interventions. The main goal of the policy could be the improvement of agricultural practices for the achievement of adequate and sustainable production. Time-bound targets could be defined with the help of relevant indicators in order to track progress towards desired outcomes. These may include crop yield (% increase), reduced use of chemical inputs (% decrease in use, measured in tonnes/ha), water efficiency (% reduction of irrigation water losses).

Step 2: Identify intervention options and output indicators. Once broad policy goals and related specific targets have been set, an initial list of potential policy interventions is designed. Examples of potential green policies for this specific country context are incentives and training on sustainable agricultural practices and investment in efficient irrigation technology. Output indicators are used in this phase to measure the suitability of each policy option with respect to the identified goals and targets. Indicators may include, for example: investment in and productivity of organic fertilisers (US\$/ha/year; tonnes/ha), investment in water efficient technology and avoided water losses (US\$/year; % of GDP; L/year), investment in and outreach of training activities (US\$/year; n. of farmers involved).

4. Policy assessment

Step 1: Measure policy impacts across sectors. The impact of each policy option is measured with respect to the main sector addressed (i.e. agriculture) as well as to other key sectors. First of all, expected impacts are evaluated using indicators of agricultural production (tonnes/year). In addition, cross-sectoral impacts can be measured, such as revenue creation for food processing industries (US\$/year), increased water availability for hydropower (KWh/year).

Step 2: Analyse impacts on the overall well-being of the population. Relevant indicators should be used to assess the impact of different green policy interventions on well-being. For example, an increase in agriculture production through the adoption of more sustainable practices is expected to bring health benefits (e.g., number of people hospitalised due to malnutrition or diseases related to water pollution), improve access to potable water and sanitation,

and generate employment (number of new jobs in agriculture and related sectors).

Step 3: Analyse advantages and disadvantages, and inform decision-making. A comparative analysis of costs and benefits is essential to evaluate the feasibility of the policy. The overall investment needs to be estimated (US\$/year), including training of farmers, storage facility construction and maintenance, incentives for organic fertilisers etc. Investments are then compared with benefits, such as additional value added (US\$/year), avoided chemical fertiliser and water use, as well as food imports (US\$/year or % change), additional income generated through employment (US\$/year), reduced mortality (%), etc.

5. Monitoring and evaluation

Step 1: Measure policy impacts in relation to the environmental issue. Once the policy is under implementation, progress towards the stated targets has to be measured. Target indicators, such as % increase in crop yield, % decrease in the use of chemical inputs, % reduction of water losses, are compared with actual results in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the selected interventions.

Step 2: Measure the investment leveraged. Similarly, the indicators of expected costs and benefits identified in the policy formulation and assessment phases are monitored to evaluate the actual response of the system.

Step 3: Measure impacts across sectors and on the overall well-being of the population. Finally, actual policy impacts on well-being indicators are evaluated, using the same indicators identified in the assessment stage.

BOX 20 –TROPICAL OR SUB-TROPICAL SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATE WITH DOMINANT SECTORS BEING TOURISM AND FISHERIES.

Small island developing states (SIDS) are exposed to various environmental challenges, especially due to their high vulnerability to climate change impacts. Moreover, the performance of key sectors such as tourism and fisheries is strongly dependent on the environment and climate.

Examples of problems that may affect SIDS are:

- Increased risk of floods and storm surges due to climate change.
- Lowered and erratic fisheries production and productivity, possibly due to overfishing and marine ecosystem deterioration.
- Decreasing tourism arrivals and profitability due to the deterioration of marine and coastal ecosystems and the depletion of key natural resources, among others.

Sample indicators are provided below for each step of the policymaking process to address the problem of decreasing fish catch in this specific country context.

2. Issue identification

Step 1: Identify potentially worrying trends. Decreasing fish catch is a problem that can be identified with the help of various indicators. In particular, worrying trends can be detected through the monitoring of fish landings (tonnes/year) and, possibly, fish stocks (tonnes), but also through indirect indicators such as food security (number of food insecure people) or average household income (US\$/year), especially when a large part of the population depends on fishing activities for nutrition and livelihoods.

Step 2: Assess the issue and its relation to the natural environment. The relation between fish catch and environmental trends can be assessed through the health of marine ecosystems, measured through coral reef degradation (% of live, bleached, broken coral), water pollution (BOD mg/L), number of fish species threatened with extinction, among others. Also, indicators of climate change impacts on marine ecosystems can be analysed, including average ocean temperature (°C), sea level rise (mm/year), etc.

Step 3: Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue of concern. The underlying causes of declining fish production can be further explored with the help of causal maps, which would include climate change impacts on ocean water temperature (°C) and possible relative changes in migratory patterns, intensive fishing practices (e.g., leading to overfishing and destruction of marine habitats), impacts of tourism activities on water pollution from waste (BOD mg/L) and coral reef deterioration (% of damaged coral cover), and limited extension of marine protected areas (ha).

Step 4: Analyse more fully how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment. Once key environmental and other causes of the observed problem have been analysed, the multiple impacts of reduced fish catch can be measured. In particular, the depletion of fish stocks is likely to have negative impacts on the national economy, which can be quantified through fisheries value added (US\$/year); social impacts include a reduction of direct and indirect employment (number of jobs/year), as well as reduced food security (% of food insecure people); finally, the progressive decline of fish stocks might encourage companies to further increase their fishing effort (Catch per Unit of Fishing Effort, CPUE), in turn leading to water pollution and further overfishing.

3. Policy formulation

Step 1: Identify desired outcomes: define policy objectives. The overall objective of the policy intervention would be to achieve sustainable levels of catch in order to allow fish stocks to regenerate. Specific targets could be set to facilitate the monitoring of policy results. The same indicators used in the issue identification phase can be used to quantify the expected outcomes of the policy intervention within a given time frame. Targets in this specific context could refer directly to the observed problem (e.g., % increase in fish catch, % increase in fisheries GDP, stock value, average weight of fish caught) or to the causes of the problem itself (e.g., % expansion of marine protected areas, % regeneration of damaged coral reef).

Step 2: Identify intervention options and output indicators. A variety of policy instruments can be identified and assessed, depending on the specific national context. Public investments could be redirected to strengthen fisheries management and lower fishing capacity to facilitate fish stock regeneration, including through de-commissioning of vessels and relocation of employment in the short term. Moreover, harmful subsidies that encourage overfishing could be redirected to green activities, such as incentives for sustainable tourism along the coast. Regulatory measures could also be introduced, such as the expansion of marine protected areas. Key indicators could be used to measure the costs and benefits of investments, e.g., investment in re-training of fishermen to find alternative employment (US\$/year) and expected income generated (US\$/year); expected short-term reduction in fisheries revenue (US\$/year) compared to long-term profitability after fish stock is regenerated (US\$/year), as related to the value of fish stocks, among others.

4. Policy assessment

Step 1: Measure policy impacts across sectors. The different policy options identified need to be carefully assessed before a final decision is made. In particular, the expected cross-sectoral impacts of interventions can be measured. For example, the protection of marine ecosystems is likely to strengthen ecosystem services, such as the prevention of floods and coastal erosion, with positive impacts for tourism activities, measurable as damage avoided (US\$/year) and additional tourism value added (US\$/year). Also, the availability of marine resources is likely to increase revenues of local fish processing industries (US\$/year). Finally, healthier coasts could encourage ecotourism development and related business opportunities such as hotel and entertainment services (e.g., diving) (number of ecotourism enterprises; US\$/year).

Step 2: Analyse impacts on the overall well-being of the population. In addition to impacts across key sectors, green policy interventions should be evaluated based on their capacity to improve well-being in an inclusive way. For example, the long-term availability of marine resources could facilitate the development of small-scale fisheries at the community level, possibly improving food security (% of food insecure people) and generating direct and indirect employment (number of new jobs in fisheries). Moreover, the restoration of damaged marine ecosystems would help preventing future floods and coastal erosion,

thus protecting livelihoods (avoided damage cost, US\$/household per year) and health (number of flood victims/year) of coastal communities.

Step 3: Analyse advantages and disadvantages, and inform decision-making. Once costs and benefits of the identified policies have been estimated, a comparative analysis is needed to identify those measures that would maximise benefits at the minimum costs. Investments are calculated (US\$), including costs of capacity building, subsidies and incentives, operation and management (O&M) etc. The costs are then compared with expected benefits, e.g., improved food security (% of food insecure people) and potential increase in consumption (US\$/year), fish stock regeneration (%/year) and its economic value (US\$), avoided damage costs (US\$/year), additional fisheries value added (US\$/year), employment and income (new jobs/year, US\$/year), etc.

5. Monitoring and evaluation

Step 1: Measure policy impacts in relation to the environmental issue. Monitoring policy performance during implementation includes an evaluation of current impacts on the environmental causes of declining fish catch. In particular, the health of marine ecosystems is evaluated through the same indicators selected in the issue identification phase, such as fisheries production (US\$/year) and landings (tonnes/year), coral reef degradation (% of live, bleached, broken coral), water pollution (BOD mg/L), number of fish species threatened with extinction, etc.

Step 2: Measure the investment leveraged. The actual effectiveness of investments is then evaluated using indicators of expected costs and benefits identified in the policy formulation and assessment phases.

Step 3: Measure impacts across sectors and on the overall well-being of the population. Improvements in the overall well-being of the population, as well as the inclusiveness of implemented policies, are monitored and evaluated through the same indicators identified in the assessment stage.

BOX 21 – LOW-LYING COASTAL MIDDLE INCOME COUNTRY WITH RAPID INDUSTRIALISATION AND URBANISATION, AND RELATIVELY ADVANCED DEMOGRAPHIC TRANSITION.

Middle-income countries that are rapidly transitioning to an industrialised and service economy can experience various environmental challenges that could undermine their development. In particular, if the industrialisation process is achieved at the expense of the environment, side effects are likely to emerge. Examples include:

- Increasing pollution from industrial processes could lead to public health problems, in turn requiring higher public expenditure (e.g., for water purification, sanitary assistance).
- Unplanned urbanisation, coupled with rapid industrial growth, could lead to an increase in the average price of basic services in urban settings, and consequently to an increase in the number of low-income families in urban areas.
- Intensive exploitation of natural resources for industrial purposes might result in a rapid degradation of ecosystems, leading to an increase in public expenditure to cover replacement costs of environmental goods and ecosystem services.

Sample indicators are provided below for each step of the policymaking process to address the problem of increasing pollution and growing cost of living.

2. Issue identification

Step 1. Identify potentially worrying trends. Different indicators can

be monitored to identify worrying trends related to unsustainable industrial expansion. Key indicators include, among others, the cost of basic services, e.g., water price (US\$/L), electricity price (US\$/Kwh), air pollution (ppm), water pollution (BOD mg/L), public expenditure for water purification (US\$/year), CO₂ emission levels (Kt of CO₂ equivalent), diseases from air and water pollution (number of respiratory diseases/year; number of diseases related to water pollution/year), urban poor (% of urban poor population), etc.

Step 2: Assess the issue and its relation to the natural environment.

A more in-depth analysis should focus on the relation between the problem and environmental trends. For example, indicators of pollution can be compared with the number of hospitalised people due to water and air pollution diseases. Also, indicators of availability and use of natural resources could be analysed in order to understand the level of environmental stress, e.g., fossil fuel consumption (Btu/year), forest land cover (ha).

Step 3: Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue of concern.

Increasing pollution and growing costs of living might be determined by, among others, fossil fuel consumption (KWh/year), resource intensive industrial production processes (e.g., Btu/US\$, and the use of chemicals), as well as demographic pressure (% of urban population). Industrial

and municipal pollution, if not treated can also be an important cause of water contamination among others.

Step 4. Analyse more fully how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment.

Once the main causes of the problem, and their respective weightings, have been identified and analysed with the help of the causal map, attention should be paid to economic, social and environmental impacts of pollution and increasing costs of basic services. Relevant indicators include, among others: contribution of the manufacturing sector to GDP (US\$/year), access to basic services in urban settings (%), subsidies to the urban poor (US\$/year), incidence of pollution-related diseases (number of hospitalised people/year).

3. Policy formulation

Step 1: Identify desired outcomes: define policy objectives.

The main objective of green economy policy interventions is to ensure long-term economic development while minimising social and environmental impacts of industrialisation and urbanisation. Specific targets can be set to measure progress towards the achievement of policy objectives within a given time frame. These may include, for example: emission reduction targets (% reduction in CO₂ emissions), energy efficiency targets for industries and buildings

(% increase in energy efficiency), waste collection, potential recycle and reuse targets, increase in access to basic social services, etc.

Step 2: Identify intervention options and output indicators.

Decision makers can assess a number of different instruments that can create the enabling conditions for a shift to more sustainable industrial and urban development. These include, among others, incentives for life-cycle approaches that enable dematerialisation and expanded service systems; incentives for the purchase of energy efficient technology and the adoption of less resource-intensive industrial processes; investments in public transport infrastructure; investments in monitoring and metering devices that provide real time information on resource use; and introduction of stricter industrial pollution regulations and standards. Output indicators can be used to measure the adequacy of policy options with respect to expected outcomes. Indicators may include, for example: investment and avoided costs deriving from energy efficiency incentives (US\$/year), investment and reduced emissions deriving from public transport infrastructure (US\$/year; % CO₂ equivalent) etc.

4. Policy assessment

Step 1: Measure policy impacts across sectors. Greening the manufacturing sector and investing in more sustainable cities is likely to have positive impacts across key sectors. For example, water and energy savings in industrial processes would increase resource availability for the development of other sectors, e.g.,

allowing an increase in irrigated agriculture land (ha), or potentially lowering prices for municipal water consumption. In general, efficient energy use in industrial production might reduce the vulnerability of the sector to external (and internal) shocks, and its reliance on volatile energy sources. Also, reduced pollution and improved environmental quality are factors that could positively impact on the tourism attractiveness of the country, thereby improving annual revenues from tourism activities (US\$/year).

Step 2: Analyse impacts on the overall well-being of the population.

Indicators can be used to evaluate the expected impact of green policies on well-being. In particular, measures to reduce pollution are expected to positively impact on health (number of water and air pollution related diseases/year). Moreover, incentives and investments in resource efficient industrial production are likely to increase resource availability and reduce the price of basic services, with a possible reduction in the number of urban poor (% of urban poor). Also, increased productivity of the industrial sector would likely generate employment (number of new jobs in green manufacturing).

Step 3: Analyse advantages and disadvantages, and inform decision-making.

A final comparison between costs and benefits of different policy options can guide policymakers towards the most effective solutions to the problem identified. Total investments (US\$) would include incentives, subsidies, capital investments, capacity building, research and development etc. The benefits of

different policy options should include avoided water purification expenditure, lowered energy imports, expected income generation (US\$/year) also through a reduction in work days lost due to illness, increase in GDP (US\$/year), and also environmental and social benefits, such as reduced emissions (Kt of CO₂ equivalent) and related health problems (number of pollution-related diseases), reduced price of basic services (%) etc.

5. Monitoring and evaluation

Step 1: Measure policy impacts in relation to the environmental issue.

The actual impact of the policy should be monitored after implementation. Indicators of environmental trends, such as carbon emissions (Kt of CO₂ equivalent), pollution indices, availability of natural resources, should be monitored to measure policy effects on sustainable growth.

Step 2: Measure the investment leveraged.

Expected costs and benefits, identified in the policy formulation and assessment phases, should be compared with the actual results obtained during implementation.

Step 3: Measure impacts across sectors and on the overall well-being of the population.

The actual positive effects on the performance of key sectors need to be evaluated using the same indicators of the policy assessment phase. Similarly, the advancements in well-being and the level of inclusiveness of green policies should be constantly monitored, using the indicators selected during policy assessment.

BOX 22 – MOUNTAINOUS COASTAL COUNTRY WITH MINING, AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES

The preservation of ecosystems is an essential priority in this country context, since two of the driving sectors of national development - i.e. agriculture and fisheries - depend on the availability and quality of ecosystem services. A number of issues can threaten sustainable development, including, among others:

- Deforestation, driven by mining, agriculture expansion and timber production, can cause the disruption of the hydrological cycle, with negative consequences across sectors. These include for example, an increase in the occurrence of floods, whose impacts are often devastating for livelihoods, as well as for agriculture and infrastructure.
- Unsustainable agricultural practices, such as intensive use of chemical fertilisers and pesticides, can have an impact on soil quality and agricultural productivity, as well as on water pollution and fisheries.

Sample indicators are provided for each step of the policymaking process to address the problem of increasing frequency of floods.

2. Issue identification

Step 1: Identify potentially worrying trends. Indicators of issue identification are used in the initial phase of the policy cycle in order to detect worrying trends linked to the frequency of floods. Indicators for this purpose include the frequency of floods (number of floods/year) and flood damage (US\$/year; % of GDP). In addition, the deforestation rate (ha/year), soil erosion (% of total land area), annual harvest of wood products (m³/year) and rainfall (mm/month or year) could be used to identify key trends.

Step 2: Assess the issue and its relation to the natural environment. The link between increased floods and environmental trends could be measured through the analysis of the deforestation rate (ha/year) and rainfall (mm/year). Other indicators include forest area (ha), as well as siltation and sedimentation.

Step 3: Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue of concern. A more in-depth analysis of the underlying causes of floods can focus on causal relations between key economic, social and environmental indicators. For example, the size of the mining area (ha) could provide additional information on current and expected deforestation trends. Another underlying cause could be the increase in population (people) leading to higher exploitation of wood resources for cooking and heating purposes, and to the expansion of agriculture land.

Step 4: Analyse more fully how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment. High deforestation rates and increased floods have negative impacts across sectors and actors. For example, the income of forest communities (US\$/year/person) is likely to be affected by uncontrolled deforestation. Similarly, the attractiveness of the country for ecotourism activities would be reduced due to the loss of biodiversity, with a consequent decrease in ecotourism revenues (US\$/year). In addition, the disruption of the hydrological cycle might lessen the availability of freshwater (L/year), thereby reducing access to safe drinking water (% of population). Floods might also have economic impacts on agricultural production and revenues (tonnes/year; US\$/year), and cause damage to housing, transport and other infrastructure (US\$/year).

3. Policy formulation

Step 1: Identify desired outcomes: define policy objectives. The main objective of green economy policies in this specific case could be to reduce deforestation resulting from mining and agriculture activities, thereby preserving key ecosystem services, and improving resilience to floods. Specific targets could be set for a given time frame, including deforestation (% reduction), forest protected areas (% increase) and certified timber production activities (% increase in certified activities, and reduction of illegal logging), etc.

Step 2: Identify intervention options and output indicators. A variety of policy interventions can be analysed and combined to tackle the problem of unsustainable deforestation and increasing floods. Examples of possible options are, among others: investments and regulations for the expansion of forest protected areas in order to limit harmful land-use practices; improved forest management certification; payments for ecosystem services (PES) schemes; investments in planted forests, primary forests, natural modified forests; incentives for the development of agroforestry. Output indicators could be used to measure the expected costs and benefits of interventions, such as payments for ecosystem services (US\$/year and/or US\$/ha), investments in afforestation and reforestation initiatives (US\$/ha/year), incentives for agroforestry development (US\$/ha/year).

4. Policy assessment

Step 1: Measure policy impacts across sectors. Impacts of reduced deforestation can be measured in terms of improved ecosystem services and reduced frequency of floods, but also in relation to other key sectors. For example, reduced sedimentation might improve the navigability of rivers, thereby increasing revenues from river transport activities (US\$/year). Agricultural revenues (US\$/year) might, in general, benefit from reduced deforestation (i.e. due to reduced soil erosion and floods), and also from the expansion of agroforestry activities. In addition, the improvement of environmental quality and biodiversity in forest ecosystems might lead to an increase in forest ecotourism revenues (US\$/year). Furthermore, there is potential for revenues derived from the carbon market (US\$/year) which could be used to support the green economy transition of other sectors, on top of providing incentives for natural resource conservation.

Step 2: Analyse impacts on the overall well-being of the population. Reduced frequency of floods is likely to have a direct impact on the well-being of the local population, both in terms of avoided re-building, or relief costs (US\$/year) and reduced deaths and injuries (number of deaths attributed to floods/year). Also, the possible loss of employment in the mining and logging sectors (if constrained in its development) might be more than compensated by new employment (number of new jobs /year) in other expanding sectors, such as ecotourism and agroforestry.

Step 3: Analyse advantages and disadvantages, and inform decision-making. An evaluation of advantages and disadvantages of the selected policy options would imply the comparison of investment (US\$) - including subsidies, capacity building, operation and management costs - and expected benefits, in the form of income generation for forest and rural communities (US\$/year), avoided flood damage costs (US\$/year), as well as the value of natural resource stocks.

5. Monitoring and evaluation

Step 1: Measure policy impacts in relation to the environmental issue. Once the strategy has been drafted and implemented, the expected effects of policy interventions on deforestation rates and ecosystem preservation need to be monitored and evaluated. Indicators of issue identification, in particular target indicators, can be used to verify the effectiveness of policy instruments.

Step 2: Measure the investment leveraged. The actual benefits deriving from targeted investments need to be verified by comparing expected and current results through indicators of policy formulation and assessment.

Step 3: Measure impacts across sectors and on the overall well-being of the population. The well-being of the population is expected to improve thanks to reduced negative impacts on health and income from uncontrolled deforestation and increased floods. In the monitoring and evaluation phase, the actual impacts need to be confronted with ex ante assessments, in order to detect potential early warning signs and gaps in policy implementation.

BOX 23 – DEVELOPED COUNTRY WITH LIMITED NATURAL RESOURCES BUT HIGH POTENTIAL (AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES) FOR EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT.

Developed countries make use of capital, advanced technology and knowledge to foster economic growth. In this specific country context, the limited availability of natural resources requires investments in resource efficiency to maximise the productivity of key economic sectors. Examples of problems that might arise in relation to resource constraints include, among others:

- Excessive dependency on fossil fuel imports, possibly sustained by harmful subsidies, can limit the exploitation of renewable energy sources, thereby increasing the vulnerability to fossil fuel price variability.
- Intensive use of fossil fuels in key sectors, such as transport and manufacturing, leads to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, in turn contributing to global warming and pollution, with consequences for health and environmental quality.

Sample indicators are suggested for each step of the policymaking process to address the problem of rising energy costs, with negative impacts on competitiveness.

2. Issue identification

Step 1: Identify potentially worrying trends. Indicators of issue identification include, among others, energy demand and supply (Mtoe/year), energy productivity (Btu/US\$) and energy price and cost (US\$/Btu).

Step 2: Assess the issue and its relation to the natural environment. There is a strong relationship between the intensity in fossil fuel use and impacts on environmental quality. These can be analysed through air pollution (ppm), CO₂ emissions (Kt of CO₂ equivalent), , all being related to unsustainable production and consumption.

Step 3: Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue of concern. A reduction in the competitiveness of national industries due to increasing energy costs

can be traced back to several concurring causes, which should be mapped and carefully analysed. These include, among others, energy prices (US\$/Btu), energy intensity (Btu/tonne, or Btu/US\$) as well as the existence of fossil fuel subsidies and taxation (US\$ or % of GDP) and the reliance on imports, or fossil fuel dependency (%).

Step 4: Analyse more fully how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment.

High energy prices can have a negative influence on economic, social and environmental indicators. Indeed, the performance of key economic sectors is highly dependent on energy prices (their absolute value and relative change over time). This relation can be assessed, for example, by comparing the energy bill (US\$/year) of selected sectors and their contribution to GDP (US\$/year). Energy prices also have a direct impact on households through an increase in the price of basic services and inflation, e.g., electricity (US\$/Kwh), as well as food prices, which will affect consumption and private investment (US\$/year). Finally, environmental impacts can be measured by analysing, for example, pollution indices and CO₂ emission (Kt of CO₂ equivalent).

3. Policy formulation

Step 1: Identify desired outcomes: define policy objectives. One major goal of green economy policy interventions is to maximise energy efficiency in production processes, while stimulating the growth of the renewable energy sector, and progressively loosening the dependence on carbon-intensive energy resources. Specific targets could be set to foster the achievement of stated objectives within a given time frame, including targets for renewable energy power generation (% of power generation), energy efficiency (% efficiency increase), CO₂ emission reduction (% decrease in Kt of CO₂ equivalent).

Step 2: Identify intervention options and output indicators. A successful combination of energy

policies can be explored, with the help of relevant output indicators to estimate the feasibility of each option. Examples of interventions are: upfront investments in renewable energy infrastructure, phasing out of fossil fuel subsidies and introduction of carbon taxes; incentives for the purchase of energy efficient technologies in households and industrial processes; feed-in tariffs, direct subsidies and tax credits for private companies interested in renewable energy investments; investments in public transport infrastructure. Relevant indicators that can be used in this phase are, for example, renewable energy feed-in tariffs (US\$/MWh); investments in renewable energy infrastructure (US\$ or % of GDP); avoided costs of fossil fuel subsidies (US\$/year); avoided costs from energy consumption and losses (US\$/year); expected increase in energy supply (Btu/year; %); cost of capacity building, institutional capacity, research and development (US\$ or % of GDP).

4. Policy assessment

Step 1: Measure policy impacts across sectors.

Reductions in the energy bill and improvements in efficiency are likely to influence the performance of key economic sectors, possibly leading to higher productivity and competitiveness, leading to higher revenues (US\$/year) and lower costs, thus improving profitability and GDP (US\$/year), among others.

Step 2: Analyse impacts on the overall well-being of the population.

Energy efficiency and renewable energy policies could reduce production costs in key sectors, with positive impacts on prices and overall cost of living. Moreover, since the renewable energy sector is labour intensive, impacts can be measured on employment generation (number of new jobs in renewable energy), taking into account possible negative effects in fossil fuel-related sectors. In addition, impacts of reduced use of fossil fuels on health can be assessed through indicators of air pollution-related diseases (number of people hospitalised due to respiratory diseases). Finally, the reduction in CO₂ emissions would more generally contribute to mitigate the negative effects of climate change on livelihoods, resource availability and health.

Step 3: Analyse advantages and disadvantages, and inform decision-making.

Costs and benefits

of green energy policies could be measured through the analysis of investments (US\$), taking into account incentives, upfront capital expenditure on infrastructure, capacity building, operation and management as well as research and development. These can be then compared with expected benefits for the economy, society and the environment. Indicators would include reduced energy costs (US\$/year), increased competitiveness (GDP growth), income generated from new employment opportunities (US\$/year) as well as avoided health costs (US\$/year).

4. Monitoring and evaluation

Step 1: Measure policy impacts in relation to the environmental issue.

The monitoring and evaluation phase should start immediately after the implementation of the policy package. First of all, the environmental impact of the interventions should be measured, focusing in particular on energy consumption and CO₂ emissions and pollution.

Step 2: Measure the investment leveraged.

At the same time, the effectiveness of implemented policies needs to be evaluated by comparing indicators of expected costs and benefits (i.e. policy formulation and policy assessment indicators) with actual results.

Step 3: Measure impacts across sectors and on the overall well-being of the population.

The actual improvement of the overall well-being of the population is measured using indicators of policy assessments, with particular consideration for the distributional and inclusive character of the implemented policies.

Table 6. Land-locked dry- and sub-humid country with dominant agriculture and in early phases of demographic transition and urbanisation. Key steps and sample indicators for policymaking to address the problem of decreasing agricultural production

Stages	Steps	Indicator samples
Issue identification	1. Identify potentially worrying trends	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture production (tonnes/year) • Dietary energy supply (Kcal/day per person) • Crop yield (tonnes/ha)
	2. Assess the issue and its relation to the natural environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rainfall (mm/year) • Droughts (n. of droughts/year) • Soil erosion (% of total agriculture land)
	3. Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue of concern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population (people) • Use of chemical fertilisers and pesticides (tonnes/ha) • Water consumption (L/year)
	4. Analyse more fully how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture GDP (US\$/year) • Employment (people) • Access to potable water and sanitation (%)
Policy formulation	1. Identify desired outcomes: define policy objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased nutrition levels (e.g. 2000 kcal/day per person) • Increased agriculture production and productivity (tonnes/year, tonnes/ha) • Higher water productivity in agriculture (L/tonne)
	2. Identify intervention options and output indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organic fertilisers: incentive and use (US\$/year, ha) • Water efficiency: investment and productivity (US\$/ha/year, tonnes/L) • Training: support to public outreach (people, US\$/person/year)
Policy assessment	1. Estimate policy impacts across sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue creation for food processing industries (US\$/year) • Water savings due to micro-irrigation (L/year) • Increased water availability for hydropower (KWh/year)
	2. Analyse impacts on the overall well-being of the population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment and income generation (people/year, US\$/year) • Malnutrition (people hospitalised/year) • Newborn health (% of newborns with low birth weight)
	3. Analyse advantages and disadvantages and inform decision-making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost of interventions: material inputs and training (US\$/year, % of GDP) • Additional GDP and income created (US\$/year) • Avoided food imports (US\$/year or % change)
Policy monitoring and evaluation	1. Measure policy impacts in relation to the environmental issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water intensity in agriculture (L/tonne) • Use of chemical fertilisers and pesticides (tonnes/ha) • Soil erosion (% of agriculture land)
	2. Measure the investment leveraged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost of interventions: material inputs and training (US\$/year, % of GDP) • Training: support to public outreach (people, US\$/person/year) • Organic fertilisers: investment and productivity (US\$/ha/year, tonnes/ha)
	3. Measure impacts across sectors and on the overall well-being of the population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment and income generation (people/year, US\$/year) • Malnutrition (people hospitalised/year) • Newborn health (% of newborns with low birth weight)

Table 7. Tropical or sub-tropical small island developing state with dominant industries being tourism and fisheries. Key steps and sample indicators for policymaking to address the problem of decreasing fish catch

Stages	Steps	Indicator samples
Issue identification	1. Identify potentially worrying trends	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fish production (tonnes/year) Fish stock (tonnes) Average nutrition level (Kcal/day per person)
	2. Assess the issue and its relation to the natural environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coral reef degradation (% of total reef) Average ocean temperature (°C) Sea level rise (mm/year)
	3. Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue of concern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fishing effort (vessels) Water pollution (BOD mg/L) Marine conservation areas (ha)
	4. Analyse more fully how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fisheries GDP (US\$/year) Food security (% of food insecure population) Depletion of fish stock (%)
Policy formulation	1. Identify desired outcomes: define policy objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fish catch (% increase) Marine conservation areas (% increase) Coral reef regeneration (% of regenerated reef)
	2. Identify intervention options and output indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investment in re-training of fishers (US\$/year) Establishment of marine protected areas (enforcement cost per ha) Reduction in vessel stock (US\$/year)
Policy assessment	1. Estimate policy impacts across sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecotourism revenues (US\$/year) Revenues of fish processing industries (US\$/year) Avoided costs of flood damage to infrastructure (US\$/year)
	2. Analyse impacts on the overall well-being of the population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food security (% of food insecure population) Employment (people/year) Income generation (US\$/year)
	3. Analyse advantages and disadvantages and inform decision-making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total costs of interventions (US\$/year) Fish stock regeneration (% of previous year's stock, US\$) Income generation for fishing communities (US\$/year per capita)
Policy monitoring and evaluation	1. Measure policy impacts in relation to the environmental issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coral reef degradation (% of degraded reef) Fish stock regeneration (% of previous year's stock) Water pollution (BOD mg/L)
	2. Measure the investment leveraged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total costs of interventions (US\$/year) Fisheries GDP (US\$/year) Fish catch (tonnes/year)
	3. Measure impacts across sectors and on the overall well-being of the population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food security (% of food insecure population) Revenues of fish processing industries (US\$/year) Employment and income generation, e.g. in fisheries (people/year, US\$/year)

Table 8. Low-lying coastal middle income country with rapid industrialisation and urbanisation, and relatively advanced demographic transition. Key steps and sample indicators for policymaking to address the problem of increasing pollution and growing cost of living

Stages	Steps	Indicator samples
Issue identification	1. Identify potentially worrying trends	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air pollution (ppm) • Water pollution (BOD mg/L) • Electricity price (US\$/KWh)
	2. Assess the issue and its relation to the natural environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fossil fuel reserves (Btu) • Consumption of fossil fuels (Btu/year) • Forest land cover (ha)
	3. Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue of concern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population (people) • Urbanisation (% of urban population) • Energy intensity in manufacturing (Btu/US\$)
	4. Analyse more fully how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manufacturing GDP (US\$/year or %) • Access to basic services in urban settings (%) • Waste generation (tonnes/year)
Policy formulation	1. Identify desired outcomes: define policy objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carbon emissions (% reduction in CO² emissions) • Waste collection, recycle and reuse (tonnes/year, %) • Access to basic services (% increase)
	2. Identify intervention options and output indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subsidies: energy efficiency improvement (US\$/year, %/year) • Investment: public transport infrastructure (US\$/year, % of travel) • Incentive: waste collection, recycle and reuse (US\$/year, tonnes/year)
Policy assessment	1. Estimate policy impacts across sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manufacturing value added (US\$/year) • Avoided cost for fossil fuel and water purification (US\$/year) • Water stress and access to sanitation (%)
	2. Analyse impacts on the overall well-being of the population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health (number of water and air pollution related diseases/year) • Employment (number of new jobs in green manufacturing) • Urban poor (% of population)
	3. Analyse advantages and disadvantages and inform decision-making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total investments, i.e. incentives, infrastructure, capacity building (US\$/year) • Manufacturing GDP (US\$/year or %) • Reduction in water and electricity prices (%)
Policy monitoring and evaluation	1. Measure policy impacts in relation to the environmental issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carbon emissions (% reduction in CO² emissions) • Water pollution (BOD mg/L) • Energy bill (US\$/year)
	2. Measure the investment leveraged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total costs of interventions (US\$/year) • Manufacturing GDP (US\$/year) • Energy and water intensity in manufacturing (Btu/US\$)
	3. Measure impacts across sectors and on the overall well-being of the population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health (number of water and air pollution-related diseases/year) • Employment (number of new jobs in green manufacturing) • Urban poor (% of population)

Table 9. Mountainous coastal country with mining, agriculture, and fisheries. Key steps and sample indicators for policymaking to address the problem of increasing frequency of floods

Stages	Steps	Indicator samples
Issue identification	1. Identify potentially worrying trends	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood frequency (number of floods/year) Deforestation (ha/year) Annual harvest of wood products (m3/year)
	2. Assess the issue and its relation to the natural environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forest land cover (ha) Rainfall (mm/year) Degraded forest land (ha or % of forest land)
	3. Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue of concern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agriculture land (ha) Population (people)
	4. Analyse more fully how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Income of forest communities (US\$/year per capita) Freshwater supply (L/year) Ecotourism (n. of visits/year; US\$/year; % of GDP)
Policy formulation	1. Identify desired outcomes: define policy objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced deforestation (e.g. 50% reduction by 2030) Forest protected area (ha) Certified timber production (US\$/year; ha)
	2. Identify intervention options and output indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PES: funding transferred (US\$/year and/or US\$/ha) Agroforestry development: investment per ha (US\$/ha/year) Timber certification: activities certified (#/year and output)
Policy assessment	1. Estimate policy impacts across sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> River use for transport activities (days/year and US\$/year) Value of natural resource stock and ecosystem services (US\$ and US\$/year) Revenues derived from the carbon market (US\$/year)
	2. Analyse impacts on the overall well-being of the population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment, e.g. in sustainable forest management (number of jobs/year) Deaths from landslides and floods (deaths / year) Income generation from ecotourism (US\$/year)
	3. Analyse advantages and disadvantages and inform decision-making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost of reforestation (US\$/ha) GEF benefits index for biodiversity Income creation for rural communities (US\$/year) Deforestation (ha/year)
Policy monitoring and evaluation	1. Measure policy impacts in relation to the environmental issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forest cover (ha) Flood frequency (number of floods/year)
	2. Measure the investment leveraged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total investment, i.e. capital investments, incentives, O&M etc. (US\$/year) Reduced flood risk (US\$/year; % of GDP) Revenues from ecotourism and river transport (US\$/year)
	3. Measure impacts across sectors and on the overall well-being of the population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment, e.g. in sustainable forest management (number of jobs/year) Deaths from landslides and floods (deaths / year) Income generation from ecotourism and ecosystem goods (US\$/year)

Table 10. Developed country with limited natural resources but high potential (and financial resources) for efficiency improvement. Key steps and sample indicators for policymaking to address the problem of rising energy costs, with negative impacts on investments and competitiveness

Stages	Steps	Indicator samples
Issue identification	1. Identify potentially worrying trends	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CO₂ emissions (Kt of CO₂ equivalent) • Fossil fuel consumption (Mbtu/year, US\$/year or % of GDP) • Energy productivity (Btu/US\$)
	2. Assess the issue and its relation to the natural environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production of fossil fuels (Btu/year) • Fossil fuel resource and reserve (Btu) • Natural resource endowment (e.g., GWh from solar and wind power)
	3. Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue of concern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population (people) • Energy consumption from fossil fuels (Btu/year; % of total) • Fossil fuel subsidies and taxation (US\$/year or % of GDP)
	4. Analyse more fully how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electricity and other energy prices (US\$/Btu) • Diseases from air pollution (n. of respiratory diseases/year) • Increase in average temperature (°C), or climate variability
Policy formulation	1. Identify desired outcomes: define policy objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decreased CO₂ emissions (Kt of CO₂ equivalent) • Increased renewable energy production (KWh) • Lower electricity losses (% of electricity generation)
	2. Identify intervention options and output indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewable energy: feed-in tariffs (US\$/MWh) • Energy efficiency: national standards (CO₂ emission % reduction) • Public transport: ridership for the bus network (%)
Policy assessment	1. Estimate policy impacts across sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced cost of energy imports (US\$/year) • Lowered road transport costs (US\$/year) • Household consumption and savings (US\$/year)
	2. Analyse impacts on the overall well-being of the population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced electricity prices (US\$/KWh or % reduction) • Employment and income generation (people/year, US\$/year) • Respiratory diseases (people hospitalised/year)
	3. Analyse advantages and disadvantages and inform decision-making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investment in renewable energy (US\$/year, % of GDP) • Competitiveness, productivity and GDP (US\$/year) • Avoided energy costs from savings (US\$/year, % of GDP)
Policy monitoring and evaluation	1. Measure policy impacts in relation to the environmental issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CO₂ emissions (Kt of CO₂ equivalent) • Fossil fuel reserves (Btu) • Energy productivity (Btu/US\$)
	2. Measure the investment leveraged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total investment, i.e. capital investments, incentives, O&M etc. (US\$/year) • Avoided energy costs from savings (US\$/year, % of GDP) • Competitiveness, productivity and GDP (US\$/year)
	3. Measure impacts across sectors and on the overall well-being of the population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment and income generation (people/year, US\$/year) • Respiratory diseases (people hospitalised/year) • Transport fatalities (people/year)

Table 11. Key steps and sample indicators for issue identification and green economy policy formulation, assessment and evaluation

Stages	Steps	Indicator samples
Issue identification	1. Identify potentially worrying trends	Value of timber products (US\$/year) – Deforestation (ha/year) – Dietary energy supply (Kcal/day per person) – Crop yield (tonnes/ ha) – CO ₂ emissions (Kt of CO ₂ – equivalent) – Energy consumption (Btu/year)
	2. Assess the issue and its relation to the natural environment	Forest land cover (ha) – Degraded forest land (ha or % of forest land) – Rainfall (mm/year) – Fish landing (tonnes/year) – Fossil fuel reserves (Btu) – Average temperature (°C)
	3. Analyse more fully the underlying causes of the issue of concern	Agriculture land (ha) – Population (people) – Use of chemical fertilisers and pesticides (tonnes/ha) – Fish stocks (tonnes) – Urbanisation (% of urban population) – Fossil fuel subsidies (US\$/year; % of GDP)
	4. Analyse more fully how the issue impacts society, the economy and the environment	Income of forest communities (US\$/year per capita) – Freshwater supply (L/year) – Agriculture GDP (US\$/year) – Primary sector employment (people) – Increase in average temperature (°C) – Diseases from air pollution (n. of respiratory diseases/year)
Policy formulation	1. Identify desired outcomes: define policy objectives	Reduced deforestation (e.g. 50% reduction by 2030) – Certified timber production (US\$/year; ha) – Increased nutrition levels (e.g. 2000 kcal/day per person) – Increased production of agricultural products (tonnes/year) – Decreased CO ₂ emissions (Kt of CO ₂ equivalent) – Increased renewable energy production (KWh)
	2. Identify intervention options and output indicators	PES: funding transferred (US\$/year and/or US\$/ha) – Timber certification: activities certified (#/year and output) – Organic fertilisers: investment and productivity (US\$/ha/year, tonnes/ha) – Improved fishing practices: public subsidy (US\$/person/year) – Renewable energy: feed-in tariffs (US\$/MWh) – Energy efficiency: national standards (CO ₂ emission % reduction)
Policy assessment	1. Estimate policy impacts across sectors	Increased water supply (L/year) – Reduced flood risk (US\$/year; % of GDP) – Revenue creation for food processing industries (US\$/year) – Water savings due to micro-irrigation (L/year) – Reduced cost of energy imports (US\$/year) – Household consumption and savings (US\$/year)
	2. Analyse impacts on the overall well-being of the population	Employment and income generation, e.g. in sustainable forest management (people /year, US\$/year) – Deaths from landslides and floods (deaths /year) – Employment and income generation, e.g. in agriculture (people/year, US\$/year) – Malnutrition (people hospitalised/ year) – Access to modern forms of energy (%) – Respiratory diseases due to smoke inhalation from indoor burning cooking stoves (people hospitalised/year)
	3. Analyse advantages and disadvantages and inform decision-making	Cost of reforestation (US\$/ha) – Income creation for rural communities (US\$/year) – Cost of interventions: material inputs and training (US\$/ year, % of GDP) – Avoided food imports (US\$/year or % change) – Investment in renewable energy (US\$/year, % of GDP) – Avoided energy costs from savings (US\$/year, % of GDP)
Policy monitoring and evaluation	1. Measure policy impacts in relation to the environmental issue	Forest land cover (ha) – Degraded forest land (ha or % of forest land) – Use of chemical fertilisers and pesticides (tonnes/ha) – Soil erosion (% of agriculture land) – CO ₂ emissions (Kt of CO ₂ equivalent) – Fossil fuel reserves (Btu)
	2. Measure the investment leveraged	Total investment, i.e. capital investments, incentives, O&M etc. (US\$/year) – Reduced flood risk (US\$/year; % of GDP) – Cost of interventions: material inputs and training (US\$/year, % of GDP) – Avoided food imports (US\$/year or % change) – Total investment, i.e. capital investments, incentives, O&M etc. (US\$/year) – Avoided energy costs from savings (US\$/year, % of GDP)
	3. Measure impacts across sectors and on the overall well-being of the population	Employment, e.g. in sustainable forest management (number of jobs/ year) – Deaths from landslides and floods (deaths /year) – Employment and income generation, e.g. in agriculture (people/year, US\$/year) – Malnutrition (people hospitalised/year) – Employment and income generation, e.g. in renewable energy (people/year, US\$/year) – Respiratory diseases (people hospitalised/year)

6 LOOKING AHEAD

The preceding sections provided guidance on how to use indicators in designing and implementing green economy policies at the national level, following a basic policymaking framework, namely, on the use of indicators as a tool for: (i) identifying priority issues, (ii) formulating and assessing green economy policy options, and (iii) evaluating the performance of policy implementation. In so doing, the manual explicitly recognised that issues arise in a specific geographical, socio-economic and socio-cultural context, and focused on providing process-oriented guidance, illustrated with concrete examples. Given the cross-sectoral nature of the analysis and implementation steps proposed, the use of existing indicators across various data sources is encouraged, as well as the involvement of a broad set of stakeholders, to support the design and implementation of coherent and inclusive green economy policies.

The last point is important for another reason: by providing guidance that is meant to be applicable to all countries, the manual by necessity takes a somewhat idealised perspective, mapping out an optimal process – and the use of indicators within – devoid of both complications, and the resource and information constraints faced by real-world policymakers. Note though that the manual, to some extent, takes such constraints into consideration by advocating an incremental, issue-driven approach to green economy policies over the design and implementation of comprehensive green economy strategies. This incremental, issue-driven approach calls for a prioritisation exercise during the agenda-setting stage and builds on existing policy priorities. Recall that the initial step suggested by the manual consists of identifying potentially worrying trends, accompanied and complemented by an assessment of existing political commitments enshrined in national visions, goals, development plans and sectoral policies.

Even within this incremental approach, limitations in data availability and quality may limit the use of indicators. For this reason, it is all the more important to put existing data collections to best use, bearing in mind that these are typically scattered across a range of government ministries or agencies, academic and other research institutions, and even private sector and non-governmental organisations. Engaging these stakeholders and forging partnerships and cooperation with these institutions will be an important and integral part of green economy policies, particularly as concerns indicators.

Moreover, improving data availability and quality will frequently be another critical element of green economy policies, in that it will gradually enable their enhanced fine-tuning. Work on implementing or improving environmental accounting, as a complement to the existing system of national accounts, is one concrete example. The recent adoption, by the United Nations Statistical Commission, of the revised System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) as an international standard has generated considerable interest and political momentum among countries towards making progress on this aspect – illustrated by the fact that, at the date of publication of this manual, sixty-six countries had expressed their commitment to advance natural capital accounting by signing the communique of the so-called 50:50 initiative of the World Bank-led partnership on wealth accounting and the valuation of ecosystem services (WAVES).

While the manual, throughout its suggested steps, alludes to a broad range of existing indicators for illustrative purposes, it does not identify a standard, catch-all list of indicators to be used in the policymaking process, nor does it provide a more extensive, in-depth description of those indicators,

including their strengths and limitations. This task is relegated to the companion volume: the Technical Manual for the Construction and Use of Indicators.

Finally, it is important to recall that the present manual, by presenting one particular tool for designing green economies, operates within a specific overall architecture of UNEP guidance materials on the topic. First, it needs to be read and understood in the context provided by the Manual on Green Economy Policy Assessments, which provides the general framework by covering the needs, services and tools offered by UNEP in an introductory and non-technical manner.

Second, the present manual underlined that, due to the cross-sectoral impacts of green policy interventions, an integrated approach is typically needed to design an effective green economy policy package, and briefly pointed to the importance of modelling. This important tool is addressed in further detail in the manual on Using Models for Green Economy Making. Acting as a twin manual to the present one, it also comes in two volumes, where general, non-technical guidance is being complemented by a compendium Technical Manual for the Use of Models in Specific Policy Analysis.



NOTES

- ¹ According to GGGI, diagnostics indicators are designed to assess the overall sustainability of the country and to identify key issues that should be considered in the Green Growth Planning process (GGKP, 2013).
- ² Triangulation consists in the evaluation of the consistence and coherence of data, across sources and sectors. Given the cross sectoral nature of causes and effects in the context of the green economy, the trend of a social variable may be affected by the behaviour of an environmental one, requiring data collection from different sources. Trends for these variables should be evaluated to determine the presence of behavioural patterns that would reflect the presence of causal relations.
- ³ Government of Indonesia, 2011.
- ⁴ Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, The Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and The Committee of the Regions. Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe (European Commission, 2011).

REFERENCES

- Doran, G. T. (1981). "There's a S.M.A.R.T. way to write management's goals and objectives" in *Management Review* 70 (11): 35-36.
- European Commission (2011). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, The Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and The Committee of the Regions. Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe*. Brussels, Belgium.
- European Commission, Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations, International Monetary Fund, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, United Nations and World Bank (2012). *System of Environmental-Economic Accounting. Central Framework*. Brussels, Rome, Washington DC, Paris and New York: EC, FAO, IMF, OECD, UN and World Bank.
- Government of Indonesia, National Development Planning Agency (2011). *Acceleration and Expansion of Indonesia Economic Development Report (MP3EI)*. Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Green Growth Knowledge Platform (GGKP) (2013). *Moving Towards a Common Approach on Green Growth Indicators. A Green Growth Knowledge Platform Scoping Paper*. Seoul, Paris, Nairobi and Washington DC: Global Green Growth Institute, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, United Nations Environment Programme and World Bank.
- Hak, T. (2011). *Status report on composite indices of environmental sustainability*. Prepared for UNEP.
- International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) (2005). *Sustainable Development Indicators: Proposals for the Way Forward*. Winnipeg: IISD.
- International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) (2013). *Measuring Progress Towards Sustainable Development Goals. Working Paper*. Winnipeg: IISD.
- International Labour Organization (ILO) (2013). *Sustainable Development, Decent Work and Green Jobs. Report V*. International Labour Conference, 102nd Session, 2013. Geneva: ILO.
- Nardo, M. and M. Sasiana (2005). *Handbook on Constructing Composite Indicators: Methodology and User Guide*. OECD Statistics Working Papers, 2005/03. Paris: OECD.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2011). *Towards Green Growth: Monitoring Progress*. Paris: OECD.
- Pintér L., P. Hardi, A. Martinuzzi and J. Hall (2012). "Bellagio STAMP: Principles for Sustainability Assessment and Measurement" in *Ecological Indicators* 17: 20-28
- Pintér, L., K. Zahedi and D. Cressman (2001). *Capacity Building for Integrated Environmental Assessment and Reporting. Training Manual*. Second edition. Winnipeg: IISD for UNEP.
- Stiglitz, J.E., A. Sen and J.P. Fitoussi (2009). *Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress*. Paris: Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2009). *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Results*. New York: UNDP.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2012). *Multi-Stakeholder Decision-Making. A Guidebook for Establishing a Multi-Stakeholder Decision-Making Process to Support Green, Low-Emission and Climate-Resilient Development Strategies*. New York: UNDP.
- United Nations Environment Programme - World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) (2011). *Developing Ecosystem Service Indicators: Experiences and Lessons Learned from Sub-global Assessments and other Initiatives*. Technical Series No. 58. Montreal: Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (2008). *SCP Indicators for Developing Countries. A Guidance Framework*. Paris: UNEP.
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (2009). *Integrated Policymaking for Sustainable Development. A reference manual*. Geneva: UNEP.
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (2010b). *A Flexible Framework for addressing Chemical Accident Prevention and Preparedness: A Guidance Document*. Paris: UNEP.
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (2011a). *Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication*. Nairobi: UNEP.
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (2012a). *Measuring Progress Towards an Inclusive Green Economy*. Paris: UNEP.
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (2012b). *A Flexible Framework for Addressing Chemical Accident Prevention and Preparedness: An Implementation Support Package*. Paris: UNEP.
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (2013). *Metal Recycling: Opportunities, Limits, Infrastructure*. Paris: UNEP.
- United Nations Statistics Division (2003). *Handbook of Integrated Environmental and Economic Accounting (SEEA)*. New York: United Nations.
- Van Paddenburg, A., A. Bassi, E. Buter, C. Cosslett and A. Dean (2012). *Heart of Borneo: Investing in Nature for a Green Economy*. Jakarta: WWF Heart of Borneo Global Initiative.
- Wilson-Grau, R. (2008). *Evaluating the effects of international advocacy networks*. Paper presented at the Advocacy Impact Evaluation Workshop, Evans School for Public Affairs, University of Washington, 4-6 December, 2013. Seattle, WA, USA.
- World Bank (2012a). *World Development Indicators 2012*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank (2012b). *Inclusive Green Growth. The Pathway to Sustainable Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- WWF, Global Footprint Network and Zoological Society of London (2012). *Living Planet Report 2012. Biodiversity, Biocapacity and Better Choices*.



Partnership for Action on
GREEN economy **PAGE**



UNITED NATIONS
INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION



unitar

United Nations Institute for Training and Research



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

www.unep.org

United Nations Environment Programme
P.O. Box 30552 Nairobi, 00100 Kenya
Tel: (254 20) 7621234
Fax: (254 20) 7623927
E-mail: unep@unep.org
web: www.unep.org



Job no. DTI/1690/GE