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WHY GREEN ECONOMY INDICATORS?

• Effective GE policymaking requires indicators
  • Identify worrying trends
  • Identify suitable policies to address concerns
  • Assess and evaluate policy impacts

• Indicators also support GE policymaking
  • Capture the nexus among economic performance, environmental status and social dynamics
  • Act as a “report card” for decision making and monitoring
BACKGROUND

• UNEP, 2012. *Measuring Progress towards an Inclusive Green Economy*
• GGKP, 2013. *Moving towards a Common Approach on Green Growth Indicators*
• UNEP, 2014. *Using Indicators For Green Economy Policymaking*
  • Link between indicators framework and integrated policymaking process

• Integrated policymaking process:
  • Issue identification and agenda setting;
  • Policy formulation and assessment;
  • Decision-making;
  • Implementation; and
  • Monitoring and evaluation.
BACKGROUND

  • Application of indicators framework in priority sectors at country level

  • Ghana
    • Agriculture; forestry; water, waste management and sanitation; energy and extractive industries
  • Mauritius
    • Agriculture, energy, transport, manufacturing, tourism, waste and water sectors
  • Uruguay
    • Agriculture, industries, livestock and transport sectors
WHY GREEN ECONOMY FOR MAURITIUS?

• Launch an ambitious project “Maurice ile Durable”
• Indigenous action plan to move the sustainability agenda of the country
• Laying the foundation for the transformation of the country
• Developed the NCA and VRP index- pioneers
• The GE concept fits well in our plan
HOW ? THE GREEN ECONOMY ROADMAP

• Greening the existing sectors – 6 entry points- Agriculture, Tourism, Manufacturing, Waste, Transport and Water
• Create new pillar of the economy – (RE sector, Waste re-cycling etc..)- Green jobs creation
• Re-direct investment to be aligned to the SD concept i.e. bearing in mind the Social and Environmental impacts. (carrying capacity/impacts on water & electricity and waste)
4 STEPS APPROACH - POLICY CANNOT STAND IN A VACUUM

1. Assessing the existing policies – Deep dive into policies that were put in place for the last 10 years – what worked and what didn’t? - lessons learned.
2. Assessing the regulatory frame work – Whether the existing laws/regulations were adequate for the policy implementation
3. Assessing the delivery mechanism and the implementation process
4. Resources evaluation
WHY THE 4 STEPS APPROACH?

• Despite a lot of good policies endorsed by Ministries – no tangible change was visible.
• Try to find out the root causes of the failed policies.
• Map out the syndrome – “Enacting new policies to correct the failed ones”
• Try to find out if the objectives and outcomes of the policies in place/ degree of success.
• Help to understand the flaws and the gaps
GREEN ECONOMY ACTION PLAN

• Agriculture, energy, transport, manufacturing, tourism, waste and water sectors were identified during stakeholder consultations as having significant potential for greening the economy.

• Contribution to GDP

• Employment creation

• Global competitiveness and environmental impact.

• These sectors are not only inter-related, but also reflect the country’s challenges as they relate to food and water security, dependence on imported energy with high energy costs, traffic congestion, impacts related to waste management and the vulnerability and fragility of the tourism sector.
HOW THE KEY SECTORIAL GREEN INDICATORS WERE CHOSEN?

• **Policy relevance**: the indicator needs to address issues that are of (actual or potential) public concern relevant to policy-making. 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 assure 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 cyclicality of others. Definitions and data need to allow meaningful comparison both across time and countries.

• **Usefulness in communication**: the ability to provide understandable, easily interpretable signals for the intended audience.
AGRICULTURAL SECTOR
THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR AS AN EXAMPLE

1. Problem - Conversion of Agricultural land to other uses

i. Indicator of issue

Area of land under agriculture (ha)
Area of land under sugar cane (ha)
Area of land under food crops (ha)
Volume of agricultural production (tons/year)
No of farmers in food crops
Average age of farmers in food crops (yr)
Population
Average price of land for real estate development (Rs/ha).
ii. Indicator of policy formulation

- Food security targets for strategic commodities (%)
- Incentives/Subsidies for agriculture (Rs/year)
- Taxes for land conversion (Rs/ha)

iii. Indicator of policy evaluation

- Volume of agricultural production (tons/year)
- Food Security for strategic commodities (%)
- Share of agriculture in GDP (%)
- Area of land under sugar cane (ha)
- Area of land under food crops (ha)
- Area of forest land (ha)
- Employment in the Agricultural sector (jobs/year)
THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR AS AN EXAMPLE

2. Problem - Misuse of Agro-chemicals in agriculture

i. Indicator of issue

- Amount of fertilizer/pesticides used (tons/year)
- Consumption of fertilizers per ha of arable land (kg/ha)
- Agricultural yields (tons/ha)
- Amount of organic fertilizers used (tons/year)
- No of plants disease outbreaks per year
- Water use for irrigation of food crops (m3/year)
- Average nitrate and pesticide concentration in groundwater (mg/l)
ii. Indicator of policy formulation

- Investment in efficient Irrigation techniques (Rs/year)
- Target % of crop area under sustainable agriculture (%).
- Amount of tax exemptions on the import of efficient irrigation systems
- Incentives for compost making (subsidies on price for compost) (Rs/year)
- Target for no of farmers trained in sustainable agriculture
- Expenditure on R&D in Agriculture (Rs/year)
iii. Indicator of policy evaluation

- No of farmers that subscribe to sustainable agriculture
- No of green certification schemes established
- Area under sustainable farming (ha)
- Volume of compost/organic fertilizers used (tons/year)
- Volume of certified green agricultural products on the market (tons/year)
- Avoided costs for fertilizer/pesticides imports (Rs/year)
- Average concentration of nitrate and pesticide in groundwater (mg/l)
- Market price of sustainable agriculture products (Rs/ton)
- Total volume of business (revenues) for sustainable products (Rs/year)
WASTE SECTOR
THE WASTE SECTOR AS AN EXAMPLE

1. Problem - Increasing volume of waste to be collected and treated

i. Indicator of issue

- Total MSW collected and disposed (tons/year)
- Per Capita MSW Generation (tons/person/year)
- % of Food and Green Waste, Paper and Plastics
- Total MSW Landfilled (tons/year)
- Total MSW Composted (tons/year)
- Total MSW recycled (tons/year)
- Total MSW combusted (tons/year)
- Total Landfill area (ha)
ii. Indicator of policy formulation

- Target % reduction in MSW landfilled
- Target % of MSW composted
- Target % of MSW recycled and reused
- Investment in waste collection and disposal (Rs/year)
- Incentives for waste reduction and recycling (Rs/year)

iii. Indicator of policy evaluation

- % reduction in MSW landfilled
- % of MSW composted
- % of MSW recycled and reused
- Surface and Groundwater Quality near landfills/composting plants/combustion facilities
- Employment in waste sector
- Economic value of wastes exported (Rs/year)
THE WASTE SECTOR AS AN EXAMPLE

2. Problem - Inadequate Infrastructure for waste collection, recycling, treatment and disposal

i. Indicator of issue

• LFG production (m³/year)
• Landfill capacity (tons/year)
• Composting plants capacity (tons/year)
• Anaerobic Digestion capacity (tons/year)
• Combustion capacity (tons/year)
• Hazardous waste generated, collected and treated (tons/year)
• E-Waste Generated, collected and reused/recycled (tons/year)
THE TOURISM SECTOR AS AN EXAMPLE

i. Indicator of issue

- Total MSW collected and disposed (tons/year)
- Per Capita MSW Generation (tons/person/year)
- % of Food and Green Waste, Paper and Plastics
- Total MSW Landfilled (tons/year)
- Total MSW Composted (tons/year)
- Total MSW recycled (tons/year)
- Total MSW combusted (tons/year)
- Total Landfill area (ha)
ii. Indicator of policy formulation

- Target % of households with compost bins
- Target % of E-Waste reused/recycled
- Target % of hazardous waste collected and treated
- Public Expenditure in waste collection and disposal (Rs/year)
- Public Expenditure in waste landfill construction and maintenance and operation (Rs/year)
- Target Expenditure in Ecopoints (Rs/year)
iii. Indicator of policy evaluation

- Energy produced from waste (toe/yr)
- Amount of hazardous wastes collected and disposed (tons/yr)
- Amount of E wastes collected and recycled (tons/yr)
- Amount of Waste collected at EcoPoints to be recycled (tons/year)
- Private Investment in Recycling (Rs/year)
- Revenue from waste taxes (Rs/year)
- Average wage of waste collection and disposal workers (Rs/month)
- % of households
TOURISM SECTOR
THE TOURISM SECTOR

1. Problem- 1. Coastal Ecosystem degradation.
   • Indicator of issue
   • Indicator of policy formulation
   • Indicator of policy evaluation

2. Poor Resource Efficiency
   • Indicator of issue
   • Indicator of policy formulation
   • Indicator of policy evaluation
THANK YOU
MAIN LESSONS FROM COUNTRY STUDIES

• Consultative process in policymaking is critical
  • Selection of sectors and identification of policies and areas of action were done in a series of workshops with relevant stakeholders, including representatives of key ministries
  • Time consuming and imposes some challenges, but ensure greater validity as well as the cooperation on data building in the future

• Packaging indicators covering broader aspects of GE generate important benefits
  • Show multiple overlapping benefits in terms of economic growth, poverty reduction and environmental outcomes
  • Facilitates analysis of potential causal loops and interrelations among different dimensions of GE
GEP MEASUREMENT FRAMEWORK: OBJECTIVES

At the international level

1. Develop a framework that provides a useful tool for countries to measure their progress towards an IGE;

2. Measure progress in green economy areas, many related to the SDGs, and compare efforts across countries and over time to identify gaps and opportunities;

At the national level

3. Measure progress in achieving national priorities
   - Framework accommodates to countries’ level of development
   - Can be complemented with country-specific indicators
A famous sentence, attributed to Albert Einstein, says: “not everything that can be counted counts, and not everything that counts can be counted.”

- Remind us that measuring complex phenomena

Not everything that counts and can be counted can be reasonably aggregated into a single number.

- This implies that any measure of IGE will only provide a partial estimate of the performance to be evaluated.
- Complementing that single number with a dashboard of indicators might be most useful.
THE GEP MEASUREMENT FRAMEWORK

• **GEP index**: track progress in green economy indicators, relative to the desired changes, impacting current well-being
  - Reflects weighted progress achieved by countries with respect to targets set within relevant thresholds across several indicators
  - The score of the GEP index gives a country an indication of its overall progress towards an IGE

• **Dashboard of progress on sustainability indicators**: monitors the sustainability of well-being (well-being of future generations).
  - Keeps track of some of the main forms of natural capital as well as other key stocks of capital which affect long term sustainability.

• **GEP+ ranking** of progress is done by comparing progress on indicators in the dashboard with progress measured by the GEP index.
INDICATORS

- GEP index: 13 indicators
- Dashboard: 6 indicators

Selection criteria

- Mapping with IGE narrative (multidimensionality)
- Data coverage (country and time)
- Transparency and comparability (Data accessibility)
- Linkages with SDGs’ headline indicators
The GEP Measurement Framework has strong linkages with many of the SGD's (it has direct 14 direct links to 10 of the 17 SDGs)
GEP INDEX

• Intended to measure the progress in achieving the transition towards an IGE based on three main ideas:

1. Identifying key dimensions to be associated with an inclusive green economy, each approximated by one or several variables;

2. Focusing on the progress, i.e. changes rather than levels;

3. Measuring progress relative to targets and thresholds. **Targets** refer to desired changes, whereas **thresholds** define some critical levels.
METHODOLOGY: PROGRESS

• Let \( y^* \) be the value of the indicator that we target to have in \( t+1 \)

\[
\frac{dy}{dy^*} = \frac{y^1-y^0}{y^*-y^0} \text{ for goods}
\]

\[
\frac{d(-y)}{d(-y^*)} = \frac{y^0-y^1}{y^0-y^*} \text{ for bads}
\]

• \( \text{Progress} \): ratio of actual versus desired (or targeted) increment.

• Target \( y^* \) is set so as to include the threshold (\( t \)).

• For a good: Progress will have a greater valuation if it happens or lead us to be above the threshold.

\[
y^* = \max\{t, \lambda y^0\}, \lambda > 1
\]

• For a good: Progress will have a greater valuation if it happens or lead us to be above the threshold.

\[
y^* = \min\{t, \beta y^0\}, \beta < 1
\]
METHODOLOGY: GEP INDEX

• Let \( J = G \cup B \) be the set of indicators, consisting of goods, \( G \), and bads, \( B \) (in the understanding that \( G \cap B = \emptyset \)). Let \( \pi_j \) denote the weight attached to indicator \( j \) into the aggregate composite index, with \( \sum_{j \in J} \pi_j = 1 \).

• Applying now the former model for the case of different weights for different indicators, we get:

\[ \text{GEP} = \sum_{j \in G} \pi_j \frac{dy_j}{dy^*_j} + \sum_{j \in B} \pi_j \frac{d(-y_j)}{d(-y^*_j)}, \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{\pi}_j = \begin{cases} \frac{t_j}{y^*_j}, & \text{if } j \in G \\ \frac{y^*_j}{t_j}, & \text{if } j \in B \end{cases} \]

• Normalising the weights: \( \pi_j = \frac{\hat{\pi}_j}{\sum_{j \in J} \hat{\pi}_j} \)

• Green Economy Progress (GEP) index:

\[ \text{GEP} = \frac{1}{\sum_{j \in G} \frac{t_j}{y^*_j} + \sum_{j \in B} \frac{y^*_j}{t_j}} \times \left[ \sum_{j \in G} \frac{t_j}{y^*_j} \frac{dy_j}{dy^*_j} + \sum_{j \in B} \frac{y^*_j}{t_j} \frac{d(-y_j)}{d(-y^*_j)} \right] \]
OVERALL RANKING:
AGGREGATING INFORMATION IN GEP INDEX AND DASHBOARD

• Rank all index-dashboard profiles but do not combine their information into a synthetic index.

• When comparing progress based on the GEP index and the dashboard, countries are ranked according to their least-performing progress.

• Carries a double signal for countries:
  • Learn about their relative green economy progress with the GEP index and dashboard indicators.
  • Learn how their least-performing progress compares with the achievements of other countries.
## RESULTS GEP INDEX: BY INDICATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>material footprint</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>-52.53</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>air pollution</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-5.70</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protected areas</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energy use</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>green trade</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>green technology innovation</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>renewable energy source</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palma ratio</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-2.04</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender inequality index</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to basic services</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean years of schooling</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pension coverage</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-4.55</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life expectancy</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS GEP INDEX : BY COUNTRY

Progress on an IGE by country – full sample
RESULTS GEP INDEX : BY COUNTRY

Progress on an IGE by country – full sample
RESULTS GEP INDEX: REGIONS AND HDI GROUPS

GEP and components by HDI regions and groups

## RESULTS DASHBOARD: BY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Obs.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater withdrawal</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-10.93</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-3.74</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions of nitrogen</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-5.07</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-4.24</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Footprint</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-4.95</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Wealth Index</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Wealth Index (Natural Capital)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-5.84</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>-26.41</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RESULTS GEP+ (TOP 4 COUNTRIES PER HDI GROUP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Progress Greenhouse gas emissions</th>
<th>Progress Nitrogen emissions</th>
<th>Progress Land use</th>
<th>GEP Index</th>
<th>Protective criterion</th>
<th>HDI group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>0.5566</td>
<td>0.5971</td>
<td>0.1800</td>
<td>0.5862</td>
<td>0.1800</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0.9080</td>
<td>0.7315</td>
<td>0.1120</td>
<td>0.0999</td>
<td>0.0999</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1.3180</td>
<td>1.7082</td>
<td>0.0873</td>
<td>0.2118</td>
<td>0.0873</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.9423</td>
<td>1.9024</td>
<td>0.0664</td>
<td>0.2598</td>
<td>0.0664</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>1.1022</td>
<td>0.4906</td>
<td>0.1682</td>
<td>0.1256</td>
<td>0.1256</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>-0.1942</td>
<td>0.0018</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>0.2512</td>
<td>-0.1942</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>-0.2369</td>
<td>2.1228</td>
<td>0.0080</td>
<td>0.1523</td>
<td>-0.2369</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Venezuela, RB</td>
<td>-0.3027</td>
<td>0.3700</td>
<td>0.0227</td>
<td>-0.0497</td>
<td>-0.3027</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>-0.2539</td>
<td>-0.2341</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.2801</td>
<td>-0.2539</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>-0.3429</td>
<td>0.6564</td>
<td>-0.0059</td>
<td>-0.1977</td>
<td>-0.3429</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>0.1430</td>
<td>0.3621</td>
<td>-0.3572</td>
<td>0.1978</td>
<td>-0.3572</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>-0.3793</td>
<td>0.6753</td>
<td>-0.1613</td>
<td>0.1329</td>
<td>-0.3793</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>0.9104</td>
<td>0.2037</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0530</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>0.2000</td>
<td>0.0080</td>
<td>-0.0052</td>
<td>0.1607</td>
<td>-0.0052</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>0.8613</td>
<td>0.0657</td>
<td>-0.1058</td>
<td>0.2448</td>
<td>-0.1058</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>-0.1776</td>
<td>1.7463</td>
<td>-0.0061</td>
<td>0.1931</td>
<td>-0.1776</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TAKE AWAY MESSAGES

• The GEP Index shows that 2014, 83 out of 105 countries (79 per cent) managed to achieve progress in their transition towards an Inclusive Green Economy, as compared to the year 2004
  • However, there are important challenges in areas such as increasing material footprint and overstepped planetary boundaries

• Progress on green economy, as measured by the GEP index, shows important differences in results across geographical regions and development groups

• Results from the dashboard show that on average countries are making regress in the sustainability indicators

• The overall ranking (applying the Protective Criterion) shows that only 17 out of 100 countries were able to make progress in the dashboard and in the GEP index.

• Methodology is flexible for country application (specific indicators, sub-national measurement)
GREEN ECONOMY PROGRESS MEASUREMENT FRAMEWORK

• The Green Economy Progress Measurement Framework – Methodology and Application are available on:

  • GGKP’s website: http://www.greengrowthknowledge.org/resource/green-economy-progress-measurement-framework

  • PAGE’s website: http://un-page.org/learning-resources/technical-guidance/green-economy-progress-measurement-framework
Andrea Bassi
Founder and CEO,
KnowlEdge Srl
Panel Discussion
Closing Remarks
Thank you for attending this webinar on

Introducing the Green Economy Progress (GEP) Measurement Framework

• This webinar was recorded and will be uploaded to the GGKP website: www.ggkp.org

• If you have any further questions about the webinar please email: contact@ggkp.org

• The GGKP asks you to complete a survey which will be sent out after this webinar.