Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente
Oficina Regional para América Latina y el Caribe

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME
PROGRAMME DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT

Seventeenth Meeting of the Forum of Ministers of Environment of Latin America and the Caribbean

Panama City, Panama
26-30 April 2010
A. PREPARATORY MEETING OF HIGH LEVEL EXPERTS
26 to 28 April 2010

Distribution:
Limited
UNEP/LAC-IGWG.XVII/Ref.5
Tuesday 20th October, 2009

Original: Spanish

Meeting of the Environmental Indicators Working Group

Heredia, Costa Rica

26 to 28 August, 2009

Table of Contents

⌘ ⌘ ⌘ ⌘

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The EIWG workshop was held in Heredia, Costa Rica, from August 26 to 28, 2009. It was attended by twenty-five persons representing thirteen member countries of the Working Group, one representative from ECLAC and two international specialists on indicators.

Objectives of the meeting

The objectives of the meeting were to review the set of ILAC indicators, ratify the ILAC methodology sheets that have been agreed on, correct any inconsistencies in those that have not been agreed on and arrive at an agreement on them.

Methodology of work

The meeting was organized in two main parts:

1. Expository section. The following presentations were made by representatives of UNEP, ECLAC, Costa Rica as the country coordinating the EIWG, experts in indicators and representatives of the EIWG.
    - Progress of the TAC and the ILAC.
    - International statistical standards, discrepancies in environmental indicators between national, regional y global sources.
    - Working Group on Environmental Statistics of the ECLAC Statistical Conference of the Americas.
    - General Overview of ILAC indicators.
    - Methodology of work – Expected results.
    - Agreed indicators.
2. Work sessions: In the second part, the work focused on reviewing the Methodology Sheet of the indicators not agreed on. The country representatives were divided into working groups which directly analyzed the contents of the Methodology Sheets; the results were presented in plenary and discussed.

Results of the working sessions

During the general presentations, the results expected at the end of the working sessions were highlighted and the methodology for engaging in productive discussions was defined.

Three categories were identified for classifying the indicators, in keeping with the level of progress and consolidation of the Methodology Sheets: Agreed indicators, developing indicators and emerging indicators. The agreed criteria for classifying the indicators were relevance, statistical viability and the possibility of procuring the information necessary for constructing the Methodological Sheet.

During the course of the meeting, the Methodological Sheets were discussed for twenty-three indicators that had not been agreed upon. Of that number, seventeen were placed in the category of agreed indicators, four were eliminated and two remained as developing indicators. The results of the discussions relating to each indicator are summarized in the table at the end of this document.

Conclusions

The group of ILAC indicators comprised fifty-three indicators distributed as follows:

ILAC INDICATORS

Thematic Area	TOTAL	Agreed	Developing	Emerging
1.Biological Diversity	**5**	3	0	2
2. Management of Water Resources	**12**	4	1	7
3.Vulnerability, Human Settlements and Sustainable cities	**11**	10	0	1
4.Social Themes including Health, Inequity and Poverty	**11**	6	1	4
5. Economic Aspects including commerce and patterns of production and consumption	**7**	5	0	2
6. Institutional Aspects	**7**	4	0	3

The recommendations made at the end of the meeting referred mainly to:

- The need to review the formulation of some goals and the relevance of some indicators relating to these goals, such as:
    - Goal 1.1: Increase in forest areas. Indicative Objective 1.1.1: Ensure the sustainable management of forestry resources in the region, significantly reducing the current rates of deforestation. Indicator 1.1.1.1 Proportion of surface area covered by forests.
    - Goal 1.4: Marine Diversity. Indicative Objective 1.4.1: Ensure the protection and adequate use of marine resources in the countries of the Caribbean Basin, in particular the marine and coastal ecosystems. Indicator 1.2.1.1 Proportion of protected terrestrial and marine areas.
    - Goal 3.1: Territorial management. Indicative Objective 3.1.2: Include instruments for risk management in the national management plans. Indicator 3.1.2.1 Annual change in the different uses of land.

- The absence of a national system of statistics in the countries, making development of ILAC indicators difficult.
- The need to strengthen the national statistical entities through an increase in budgets and capacity-building.

LIST OF INDICATORS DISCUSSED BY THE EIWG IN AUGUST 2009

Previous No.	INDICATOR	STATUS	OBSERVATIONS	RELATIONSHIP TO MDG
1.1	**1.1.1.1** Proportion of land area covered by forest	AGREED ON	Previous name: Proportion of wooded area. Harmonize with MDG. The updating of data is done approximately every 5 to 8 years.	MDG 7.1 Proportion of land area covered by forest
1.2	**1.2.1.1** Proportion of terrestrial and marine areas protected	AGREED ON	The same indicator in two goals: 1.2 and 1.4. Harmonize with MDG. This indicator does not reflect the quality of the protection of biodiversity in protected areas.	MDG 7.6 Proportion of terrestrial and marine areas protected
New	**1.2.1.2** Proportion of species threatened with extinction	EMERGING	Indicator proposed by EIWG in Costa Rica. Working Group: Panama	
1.3	**1.3.1.1** Existence of laws and/or national regulations related to access to genetic resources and the distribution of benefits.	AGREED ON	Previous name: Existence of national laws concerning access to genetic resources and sharing of benefits. Binary indicator that does not allow for seasonal monitoring. Discussion about the relevance with regard to thematic area, due to its relationship with institutional aspects.	
New	**1.3.1.2** To be determined (Indicator that incorporates management: process)	EMERGING	Indicator proposed by EIWG in Costa Rica. Working Group: Peru, Colombia, Costa Rica	

LIST OF INDICATORS DISCUSSED BY THE EIWG IN AUGUST 2009

Previous No.	INDICATOR	STATUS	OBSERVATIONS	RELATIONSHIP TO MDG
1.4	**1.2.1.1** Amount of terrestrial and marine areas protected	AGREED ON	The same indicator in two goals 1.2 y 1.4. Harmonized with MDG. This indicator does not reflect the quality of the protection of biodiversity in protected areas. Revision of the goal and making the indicator more relevant to the region is recommended, it should not be limited to the countries of the Caribbean.	MDG 7.6 Proportion of terrestrial and marine areas protected
•				
2.1.a	**2.1.1.1** Proportion of total water resources used	AGREED ON	Previous name: Proportion of total renewable water resources used. Relevant indicator, insufficient statistical information.	MDG 7.5 Proportion of total water resources used
New	**2.1.1.2** To be determined	EMERGING	Indicator proposed at the EIWG in Costa Rica. Working Group: Dominican Republic, Panama. Consult with CONAMA (National Environment Commission)	
2.1.b	**2.1.1.3** Domestic water consumption per household or dwelling	UNDER DEVELOPMENT	Working Group: Colombia, Panama, Mexico. This indicator is not viable due to the fact that there is no record of water consumption. Difficulty in approving regionally, existing data at the national level.	

2.2	**2.2.1.1** Proportion of watersheds that have management committees	AGREED ON	Previous name: Number of watersheds that have committees. The watershed committees that exist do not have management.
New	**2.2.1.2** Proportion of land area managed under the watershed criterion	EMERGING	Indicator proposed at the EIWG in Costa Rica. Working group: Peru, Dominican Republic, Colombia, Cuba, Costa Rica.
New	**2.2.1.3** Efficiency in the management of watersheds	EMERGING	Indicator under development. Proposed at EIWG in Costa Rica. Working Group: Colombia.
3.1.a	**3.1.1.1** Proportion of national land with land-use planning	AGREED ON	Previous name: management plans at the sub-national level. Indicator statistically viable.
3.1.b	**3.1.2.1** Annual change in land use	AGREED ON	Argentina had changes with respect to the goal. Previous name: Average annual variation in land use.
3.3.a	Change in the density of the motor vehicle fleet	ELIMINATED	The quantity of vehicles is not directly related to emissions since difference by vehicle types is not made. Difficulty in the interpretation and collection of data.
3.5.a	**3.5.1.1** Population with access to garbage collection	AGREED ON	
3.5. b	Generation of solid wastes in main capitals	ELIMINATED	Indicator is not statistically viable. Difficulty in obtaining data and calculation of the indicator.
3.5.c	**3.5.2.1** Garbage collected and properly disposed of	AGREED ON	An indicator on recycling and another on the number of sanitary landfills per country. No working group.

3.7.b	**3.7.1.2** Occurrences of natural disasters	AGREED ON	Previous name: Victims or persons affected by natural disasters. Include calculations on number of events, persons affected and deaths. UNEP review	MDG 7 Complementary: Occurrences of natural disasters
3.7.c	**3.7.2.1** National plans which incorporated vulnerability to risks and include indicators for monitoring	ELIMINATED	Indicator eliminated in Costa Rica. The indicator does not have any relevance or link to the goal. There are other indicators which better measure vulnerability.	
4.1.b	**4.1.2.1**. Morbidity rate attributable to acute respiratory diseases	AGREED ON	This indicator should be linked to air quality data.	
4.1.c	**4.1.2.2** Morbidity rate attributable to water-borne illnesses	AGREED ON	Not all cases are reported medically.	
4.1.d	**4.1.3.1** Hectares of urban green spaces in relation to urban population	UNDER DEVELOPMENT	Follow-up by the TAC is requested. Working group: Colombia, Cuba. Possibility of inviting Chile.	MDG 7 Complementary: Green areas (per capita) in the main cities of Latin America and the Caribbean
4.3.a	**4.3.1.1**.Proportion of homes in precarious settlements	AGREED ON	Harmonize with MDG 7.10. The term 'slum' is not acceptable. An emergent indicator on ownership was proposed. No working group.	MDG 7.10 Proportion of urban population living in slums
4.3.b	**4.3.1.2** Proportion of population earning less than $1 purchasing power parity (PPP) per day	AGREED ON	Indicator agreed to during the EIWG meeting. Discussion on the effectiveness of this indicator. It was proposed that it should harmonize with the MDG. It was proposed to include the Gini Index as a new indicator.	

4.3.d	**4.3.3.1** Social expenditure as a percentage of gross domestic product	AGREED ON	Previous name: Social expenditure as a percentage of total public expenditure; it was proposed that this theme be kept as emerging.	
New	**4.3.3.2** Environmental expenditure as a percentage of the total public expenditure	EMERGING	Indicator proposed at the EIWG in Costa Rica. Working group: Argentina, Cuba, Venezuela and Peru.	
5.1.b	**5.1.1.2** Renewable nature of energy supply	AGREED ON	Previous name: Supply of renewable energy as a percentage of the total energy supplied. Studies are required on the use of bio-combustible fuels.	MDG 7 Complementary renewability of energy supply
5.3	**5.3.1.1** Economic instruments that are applied to the country	AGREED ON	Indicator agreed to as binary due to the difficulty it presents in reflecting the goal. The relevance, clarity and use of the indicator are discussed.	
New	**5.3.1.2** To be determined. Indicator that refers to the goal.	EMERGING	Indicator proposed at the EIWG in Costa Rica. Working group: Colombia and Costa Rica	
6.2.a	**6.2.1.1** Net rate of enrolment in primary education	AGREED ON		

BACKGROUND

As a result of various environmental concerns expressed by all the countries in Latin America, the Latin American and Caribbean Initiative for Sustainable Development (ILAC) was approved on the 31st of August, 2002 during the First Extraordinary Meeting of the Forum of Ministers of the Environment in Latin America and the Caribbean. The ILAC forms part of the Implementation Plan adopted at the World Summit on Environment and Sustainable Development in Johannesburg. It was ratified at the XIV and XV Meetings (2003 and 2005) of the Forum of Ministers as the main instrument for promoting sustainable development in the region.

In order to outline the challenges inherent in meeting the ILAC goals, it was agreed that a follow-up and evaluation of ILAC goals be done, from their very formulation. In August 2003, a "core set of statistics and environmental indicators to facilitate monitoring of the progress towards established goals" was agreed upon. This was done in a participatory way by the Environmental Indicators Working Group (EIWG). In addition to this effort, it was recommended that an evaluation of ILAC be done, five years after its adoption, during a meeting in Caracas, Venezuela, in 2007.

This meeting was convened pursuant to Decision 6 of the XVI Meeting of the Forum of Ministers, at which it was stated that in order to advance towards the presentation of a report on the state of the environment and development in the region, based on reports from the countries, an urgent conclusion of the review of the ILAC indicators was necessary.

The meeting was organized and coordinated by UNEP/ROLAC, along with the Environmental Policy Institute (IPA) with headquarters in Costa Rica, and Messrs. Alvaro Aguilar and Fabio Herrera, representatives of Costa Rica, the country coordinating the EIWG.

DAY ONE: WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 26, 2009

INAUGURAL SESSION – WELCOME

The session was opened by Mrs. Graciela Metternicht, Regional Coordinator, Division of Evaluation and Early Warning (DEAT), United Nations Environment Programme/Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (UNEP/ROLAC). She welcomed the participants and underscored the importance of this meeting as well as the review of the Methodology Sheets in order to present a detailed and concrete proposal to the Forum of Ministers to be held in February 2010.

Next, it was the turn of Mrs. Mara Murillo, Deputy Regional Director of UNEP/ROLAC to welcome the participants and provide details on the ITC and the next Forum of

Ministers. She underscored the importance of participation by all those present as well as the institutions they represent.

The next speaker was Mr. Álvaro Aguilar, representing the National Environmental Information Centre, MINAET, Costa Rica, the country coordinating the EIWG of ILAC. Mr. Aguilar welcomed the participants and stated MINAET's commitment to supporting the ILAC initiative. He also commented on the work carried out by Costa Rica up to that point. He emphasized the challenge of successfully monitoring all the objectives in order to contribute to fulfilling the established goals and objectives.

The participants then introduced themselves and voiced their expectations of the Meeting, placing emphasis on the current situation regarding indicators in their respective countries. The complete list of participants and their contact details are contained in Annex II.

The day began with introductory presentations on the work of the meeting. Mrs. Graciela Metternicht, Regional Coordinator of DEAT – UNEP/ROLAC, made a presentation on the progress of previous meetings of the Forum of Ministers of the Environment, the importance of Decision 6 on Environmental Indicators, the organic structure established around the Latin American and Caribbean Initiative (ILAC) – the Environmental Indicators Working Group (EIWG), the Technical Advisory Committee (CTA), the Forum of Ministers of the Environment as well as the collaboration between UNEP and other bodies such as ECLAC for development of indicators. She also referred to the progress of the working group on indicators, the progress that has been made via the EIWG virtual forum and the sessions with Elluminate. She concluded by mentioning other work related to the theme such as Urban Profiles, the Atlas "Our Changing World" and GEO Reports, of which more than 100 have been produced in the region.

Mrs. Rayén Quiroga from ECLAC made a presentation on the topic "International statistical standards, discrepancies and statistical compatibility in environmental indicators between national, regional and global sources (MDG7)". She pointed out the collaboration between ECLAC and UNEP so that countries of the region can join forces at the inter-institutional level to strengthen the quality of the results of the statistical processes, as well as the efforts towards statistical compatibility. She underscored the challenge to overcome the lack of information that exists in some countries.

Mr Jesús Romo and García, INEGI (Mexico) referred to the Working Group on Environmental Statistics of the ECLAC Statistical Conference of the Americas, the objective of which was to develop relevant environmental statistics and their integration into the national statistical systems of the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean. The current members of the Group are Mexico as coordinator, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Panama, and the Dominican Republic. He invited other countries to strengthen the group with their participation.

Mr. Mario Orlando López Castro, DANE (Colombia), presented the contribution of the entities that generate indicators in Colombia and which have participated in different activities which have developed outside of the Forum of Ministers.

Mrs Cristina Sabalaín (Argentina), consultant attached to UNEP/ROLAC gave a general overview of the ILAC indicators. She revealed that, to date, there were 6 thematic areas, 25 goals, and 50 indicators broken down as follows: 15 agreed on, 23 not yet agreed on and 13 emerging. There is also a standardized methodological sheet. Each indicator has its own methodological sheet constructed through a process of participation and consultation. At this meeting of the EIWG, only those indicators that have not been agreed on will be reviewed, based on criteria of relevance with respect to the goal and statistical viability. She reminded participants that there were still some aspects to be reviewed or completed with respect to the methodological sheets of the indicators already agreed on. She proposed that those indicators referred to as "no data" be described henceforth as "emerging".

The EIWG agreed to refer to those indicators previously described as "no data", as "emerging" indicators.

Mrs. Johanna Granados, of EWA/UNEP/ROLAC, outlined the results expected from the meeting and explained the scope of the work to be done: ratification of the Methodological Sheets for the indicators agreed on, definition of the Methodological Sheets for the indicators that have not been agreed on, and review of the Methodological Sheets for emerging indicators.

Finally, Mr. Álvaro Aguilar of MINAET (Costa Rica) outlined the final adjustments made to the Methodological Sheets of the 14 agreed indicators. He also suggested a change to the list of indicators by adding an extra number to the proposed indicators, so that each indicator would be expressed in four digits instead of two. He recalled that the Meeting of Ministers had established the goals and objectives of the ILAC and that these could not be modified. The work of the EIWG would therefore have to be confined to a review of the methodology sheets, and on reaching agreement on them or not. He brought several documents and explained how they were to be used to facilitate the work of the meeting.

SESSION I: THEMATIC AREA 1. BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

At this first working session on methodological sheets, the indicators to be reviewed are:

1.1 Surface area covered by forests

1.2 Protected areas

1.3 Existence of national legislation relating to access to genetic resources and sharing of benefits

1.4 Coastal areas – protected marine areas with respect to total marine and coastal areas

Methodology:

The main group was divided into four groups to review and apply the observations to the Methodological Sheets of each of the four indicators. Below is a summary of the proposal presented by the group in charge of the review, the plenary discussion on each of the indicators as well as the decisions agreed and adopted by the EIWG.

Indicator 1.1 Surface area covered by forests

Members of the working group were: Mrs. Patricia Maccagno – Argentina, Mrs. Ana Graciela Batres – El Salvador, Mr. Arturo Flores – Mexico, Mrs. Beyra Torres – Panama, Mrs. Rayen Quiroga – Chile (rapporteur).

The proposal of the group centered on the following aspects:

a. Minor changes were made to the Methodological Sheet and the MDG proposal was maintained.

b. The unit of measurement, which reads as a percentage of the land area, was changed to “percentage” alone.

c. Time period: most of the countries update their forestry information every five or eight years.

d. The methodology was maintained as in the MDG, bearing in mind that the countries are not going to be able to construct their indicator in this way.

e. The following sentence was added: “the surface area of masses of internal waters”.

f. As for interpretation, maintaining the proportion of forestry surface area would be interpreted as a greater conservation of its biodiversity and a reduction of its rate of deforestation. With respect to limitations, the indicator provides information on the quality of the forests.

g. With respect to this indicator, for the topic biological diversity, only information on forestry biodiversity is given.

h. The indicator considers only bodies of internal waters as ecosystems without the potential for maintaining forests.

i. Many countries do not share the definition of forest as presented in the Methodological Sheet.

j. The indicator partially reflects the proposed goal which is to ensure the sustainable management of forestry resources.

k. It is recommended that an additional indicator be generated which describes the forest area managed in order to respond to the intention of the goal.

l. A new Emerging Indicator is proposed: National surface area under forestry management programmes.

Comments from the plenary:

Mr. Wadih Joao Scandar Neto (Brazil) is in agreement with most of the changes proposed by the group, but he has reservations about the new emerging indicator proposed and considers that this will be an arduous task, due to the possible definitions of what are managed forest areas. To generate this information for this indicator in Brazil would be a difficult and exhausting task. Mrs. Neyra Herrera (Panama) and other participants shared his opinion.

Other participants intervened to support the other proposals from the group and also make additional inputs.

1.1 Proportion of surface area covered by forests

The EIWG agreed to place this indicator among those agreed and modify its name. The methodological sheet relating to the changes made and agreed to can be examined in Annex IV.

Indicator 1.2 Protected areas

The working group was made up of: Mrs. Marly Santos – Brazil, Mrs. Nelly García – El Salvador, Mr. César Rodríguez – Mexico, Mrs. Cirila Gutiérrez – Peru, Mr. Álvaro Aguilar, Costa Rica (rapporteur).

The group raised the following points as part of their proposal:

a. Limitations: This indicator does not reflect the quality of protection for the biodiversity in the protected areas.

b. With regard to Aim or Purpose: the indicator represents the degree to which the areas that are important in terms of conservation of the biodiversity, cultural heritage, scientific research (including monitoring of natural resources and other values, are protected with respect to incompatible uses. It shows how much each main ecosystem is dedicated to maintaining its diversity and integrity. It is suggested that this indicator be re-written considering the ILAC goal linked to this indicator.

c. Owing to the similarity between the indicator that appears in the MDG and the ILAC, close adherence to the indicator that appears in the MDG is suggested. The group proposed that the file be transferred from MDG to ILAC, and that the limitations of the indicator be added, since nothing has been said of the quality in which the ecosystems are protected.

d. An initial problem is identified which is that many Latin American countries do not use the categorization created by the IUCN to classify Protected Areas. The point of view of the group is that this categorization is not taken into consideration. Each country recognizes a total protected area that can be

used as the indicator. It is even better if each country reported the protected area in keeping with its particular system without limiting it.

e. The following name is proposed: “Proportion of protected land and sea areas”.

Comments from the plenary:

The discussion of this particular indicator should be seen as linked to that of indicator 1.4., since it was agreed by the group that both indicators should be merged.

1.2 Proportion of land and marine protected areas

The EIWG agreed to consider this indicator as agreed and change its name. The respective methodological sheet with the changes introduced and accepted can be found in Annex IV.

Indicator 1.3. Existence of national legislation relating to access to genetic resources and sharing of benefits

The members of the working group were: Mr. Dorian Muñoz – Colombia, Mrs. Jania Sierra – Honduras, Mr. Jesús Romo and García – Mexico, Mrs. Cristina Sabalaín, Argentina (rapporteur). The proposal from the group is summarized in the following points:

a. A new name is proposed: “1.3 Existence of laws and/or national decrees relating to access to genetic resources and sharing of benefits”.

b. It is an indicator which reflects the country’s interest in regularizing access to genetic resources. This is the justification. Its Aim or Purpose is: Indicate the national effort to optimize the administration of access to genetic resources and share fairly and equitably the benefits derived with a view to achieving sustainable use as a source of development in the country.

c. The indicator fulfils three criteria for eligibility. It is therefore a core priority.

Comments from the plenary:

Mrs. Neyra Herrera (Panama) commented that this seemed to be an indicator of institutionality and not biological diversity. She therefore mentioned that the name of the indicator should be “Existence of legal instruments...” since there are countries that consider and draft resolutions, as against only laws and decrees. On the basis of this comment, different suggestions were sought with respect to the naming of the indicator.

Mrs. Patricia Maccagno (Argentina) opined that this was a very strong main indicator and that it should be developed a bit further since, with respect to the likelihood of drafting the goal, there did not seem to be enough data in most of the countries to do this. This comment was supported by Mr. Adrián Sánchez (Peru), who declared that the indicator could not be removed and replaced with another; he therefore suggested that the indicator remain as is. He added that another indicator could be proposed to complement this one with respect to application of standards. Some participants felt that this proposal could be included as an emerging indicator.

Mr. Arturo Flores (Mexico) was of the opinion that the indicator did not properly reflect the protection and management of the resources. He did not agree with the idea that "the amount of information available does not translate into an equivalent amount of work" He felt that it would be better for the indicator to be listed as "in development". Mr. Dorian Muñoz (Colombia) did not share this opinion, since, even though the indicators relating to existence do not show processes or management, this does not mean that they are in development, they could be "agreed". Mr. Álvaro Aguilar (Costa Rica) commented further on this idea, underlining the importance of developing other qualitative indicators or separating/removing the indicator in question in order to measure the management terms, but based on the indicator under discussion. With respect to the subject of licences, access permits and intellectual property rights, there were some doubts which were clarified by Mrs. Eugenia Wo Ching (Costa Rica) who highlighted the importance of the indicators in terms of their direct relationship with Article 15 of the Convention on Biological Diversity, although this deals with only one basic indicator.

1.3 Existence of laws, decrees and/or national legislation relating to access to genetic resources and sharing of benefits.

The EIWG agreed to place this indicator among those agreed on and to change its name. The respective methodological sheet with changes introduced and agreed appears in Annex IV.

Peru, Colombia and Cuba will work on the proposal for an emerging indicator, which will be complementary to this.

Indicator 1.4 Protected Marine and Coastal Areas in relation to total marine and coastal area

Members of the working group were: Mr. Mario Orlando López – Colombia, Mr. Rafael Muñoz – Honduras, Mrs. Neyra Herrera – Panama, Mr. José Actis – Dominican Republic, Mr. Wadih Joao Scandar Neto – Brazil (rapporteur). The proposal from the group included the following points:

a. The indicator was considered statistically relevant and viable. However, when the coastal areas are included, these would be difficult to calculate.

b. In order to correct this weakness, it was proposed that it be merged with indicator 1.2.1.1, in anticipation that this will remove the surface area values between the terrestrial protected areas and the marine protected areas, and ensure that the summation between these two areas is the total protected area of the country.

c. The denominator in the case of the marine areas would be the territorial waters of the country (the one referring to 12 nautical miles). If a given country believes that from the point of view of sovereignty it needs to make the indicator correspond to the exclusive economic zone, it can do it, but in relation to this question, it is better to use the 12 nautical miles.

d. It was proposed that the name be changed to "Proportion of terrestrial and marine protected areas" as presented in the MDG (7.6), seventh objective, Goal 7B.

e. Additionally, a new indicator has been proposed entitled "Number of species in danger of extinction".

Comments from the plenary:

Mrs. Neyra Herrera (Panama) proposed that there be only one indicator including protected areas and marine protected areas and that the percentage of terrestrial protected areas and marine protected areas be calculated. The first is divided by the total land area of the country and the second by the nautical miles. Some countries commented on the difficulty of delimiting marine territory.

Mrs. Rayén Quiroga, ECLAC, pointed out that the MDGs originally had only one indicator for protected land areas, and that for this reason, ILAC proposed one for marine areas. With the reform of the MDGs, it can be assumed that the new indicator should also include marine areas. The proposal from the group is that the total indicator be separated into marine and terrestrial areas. The format for calculation would be the following: the numerator would contain the surface area of marine and terrestrial protected areas and the denominator would contain the total surface area of the country, including the marine portion (12 nautical miles from the entire coastline of the country.

After several interventions from participants regarding the limits of marine territory of the countries, it was suggested that, depending on the way in which each country designated a marine area, it would be calculated as such or it would be calculated in keeping with how it considered its limits. If the country's concept was different from what appears in the Methodological Sheet, then it must be reported as such.

1.4 Coastal and marine protected areas with respect to total marine and coastal area

The EIWG agrees to:

- merge this indicator with indicator 1.2, creating a single indicator which reports on the totality of the protected marine and terrestrial areas, adding the proposals accepted by the plenary to Methodological Sheet 1.2.

- make a recommendation to the Forum of Ministers for the expression "exclusive to the Caribbean" be eliminated and be replaced by "Latin America and the Caribbean".

- propose a new emerging indicator entitled: "**Proportion of known species in danger of extinction**".

DAY TWO: THURSDAY, AUGUST 27, 2009

SESSION II: THEMATIC AREA 2. MANAGEMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

During the second session of work on the methodological sheets, the indicators to be reviewed were:

2.1a index of surface water shortage

2.1b Domestic consumption of water per household or dwelling

2.2 Number of basins with committees

Methodology:

The main group was divided into 3 smaller groups to review and apply the observations of the Methodological Sheets of each of the three indicators. Each group later presented its proposals, which were discussed in plenary.

Below is a summary including the proposal presented by the group in charge of the review, the discussion in plenary on each of the indicators as well as the decisions agreed to and adopted by the EIWG.

Indicator 2.1a: Index of surface water shortage

The group, made up of Mrs. Patricia Maccagno - Argentina, Mr. Patricio Devers – Dominican Republic, Mrs. Beira Torres - Panama, Mr. Arturo Flores - Mexico, Mr. Adrián Sánchez - Peru, Mr. Mario López - Colombia, Mrs. Ana Graciela Batres – El Salvador and Mr. Wadih Joao Scandar Neto – Brazil, proposes:

a. To recommend to the Forum of Ministers that they support the collection of data in order to strengthen this indicator.

b. To eliminate the word "renewable" from the entire sheet, in keeping with the terminology used in the MDGs.

Comments from the plenary:

Mrs. Rayén Quiroga (ECLAC) stated that there were adequate statistical bases in the region for calculating water, since between 12 and 14 countries had water balances with calculation of the flow, although there is no sectorial breakdown – agriculture, industry households. In the latter phase, they can be removed and linked closer to the goal, to the theme of efficiency and technology, which is another concern expressed by some of the participants such as Mr. Jesús Romo and García (Mexico), Mssers. José Actis and Patricio Devers (Dominican Republic), who proposed that members think about additional indicators which refer directly to the goal. Mrs Quiroga also suggested that the word "renewable" be eliminated to bring it more in line with the MDG.

Other participants such as Mrs. Patricia Maccagno (Argentina) pointed out the relevance of the indicator and emphasized the problem of insufficient statistical data or the lack of current and systematized data. There are currently seven countries: Mexico, Guatemala, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Brazil, Panama (in process) and Honduras (in process), which have the current standard required by the UN on this topic.

Mr. Fabio Herrera (Costa Rica) commented that as a working group, they needed to exhort the Ministers to allocate sufficient economic and human resources to generate the necessary information into the accounts relating to water. The statement was supported by Mr. Mario López (Colombia) and Mrs. Neyra Herrera (Panama).

2.1a Proportion of total renewable water resources used

The EIWG agreed to place this indicator among those agreed on and change its name. The respective methodological sheet with the changes included and agreed can be found in Annex IV. A group made up of Dominican Republic and Panama, with the collaboration of Mexico, will analyze the possibility of creating an emerging indicator.

Additionally, they agreed to urge the Ministers to allocate more resources to the countries that do not yet have the necessary information for the indicator, reminding them that it was a priority indicator and is also an MDG indicator.

Indicator 2.1b Domestic consumption of water per household or dwelling

The group comprising Mr. César Rodríguez - Mexico, Mrs. Marly Santos - Brazil, Mrs. Jania Sierra - Honduras, Mr. Álvaro Aguilar – Costa Rica, Mrs. Ileana Saborit - Cuba, Mrs. Cirila Gutiérrez - Peru, Mr. Rafael Muñoz – Honduras and Mrs. Nelly García – El Salvador, made the following proposal:

a. Consumption by the population is not being taken into account. In order to calculate the indicator, the numerator and denominator in data must be used

b. This indicator is not viable; this would only be possible where the entire consumption of water is registered.

c. The group felt that this indicator did not qualify to do the calculation since the member countries do not have the necessary information. Another suitable indicator will have to be sought to replace it.

d. Significant differences can exist between countries in the way they measure water volume. It may be different from one country to another.

Comments from the plenary:

Some participants, like Mr. César Rodríguez (Mexico) expressed strong doubts about the relevance of the indicator. Others pointed out that the problem was due to a source of primary information, since the region's countries did not have complete data on the volume of water, as pointed out by Mrs. Cirila Gutiérrez (Peru) and Mrs. Cristina Sabalaín, consultant at UNEP/ROLAC.

Other participants, such as Mr. Patricio Devers (Dominican Republic) argued that it was possible to estimate the indicator from certain formal reliable sources, creating a coefficient for determining the population to study.

Mr. Fabio Herrera (Costa Rica) recalls that the original indicator was the consumption of water in relation to GDP, as an original intention to measure the effectiveness of domestic, industrial use etc., in order to take them into account when formulating the new proposal

2.1b Domestic consumption of water per household or dwelling

The EIWG agrees to place this indicator in the category "under development" and to change its name.

A group comprising Colombia, Panama and Mexico will propose options for this emerging indicator.

Indicator 2.2 Number of basins that have management committees

This indicator was dealt with by: Mr. José Actis – Dominican Public, Mrs. Cristina Sabalaín – Argentina, Mrs. Donnalyn Charles – Saint Lucia, Mr. Dorian Muñoz – Colombia, Mrs. Neyra Herrera – Panama, and Mr. José Capote – Venezuela. This group presented the following recommendations:

a. A proposal with a new name: **2.2 Number of basins that have management committees.**

b. The definition of watershed from the methodological sheet has been maintained.

c. The definition of management committees for basins has been added, taking into account that some countries might not have this structure.

d. This is considered to be a relevant indicator, it should be approved as agreed and a new improved indicator was proposed that should be reviewed and its measurement determined: “efficiency in the management of watersheds”.

Comments from the plenary:

Mrs. Patricia Maccagno (Argentina) explained that the fact that a watershed committee exists does not imply that there is management. She stated that she shared the view of Mr. Patricio Devers (Dominican Republic) that an additional indicator should be established showing that the management committees for watersheds are a reality. In spite of this, other participants were of the opinion that watershed committees be established. They felt that the indicator was relevant and statistically viable.

Mrs. Ileana Saborit (Cuba) proposed that based on her country’s experience a proposal for an additional indicator could be circulated and that the other countries could contribute comments relating to its application, etc. The proposal was supported by Mr. Dorian Muñoz (Colombia) and Mr. Fabio Herrera (Costa Rica), with the latter adding that perhaps it would be convenient to change the name of the indicator since it was aimed at management plans and not committees. It was suggested that the proposal for an additional indicator be drawn up within 2 months.

2.2 Number of watersheds that have committees

The EIWG agreed that this indicator should be placed among those agreed.

A group comprising Peru, Dominican Republic, Colombia, Cuba and Costa Rica will present a proposal of complementary indicators on the proportion of land area managed under the topic of watershed.

SESSION III: THEMATIC AREA 3. VULNERABILITY, SETTLEMENTS AND SUSTAINABLE CITIES (I)

Following the same methodology as in the previous sessions, the EIWG proceeded to review the following groups of indicators:

3.1a Land-use planning at the sub-national level

3.1b Average anual variation In land use

3.7b Victims or persons affected by natural disasters

3.7c National plans that incorporate or take into account vulnerability by risks and include indicators for its monitoring

Indicator 3.1a Land-use Planning at the sub-national level

Mr. Adrián Sánchez – Peru, Mrs. Patricia Maccagno – Argentina, Mrs. Ana Graciela Batres – El Salvador, Mr. Arturo Flores – Mexico, Mrs. Beira Torres – Panama, and Mr. Wadih Joao Scandar Neto – Brazil, worked together and proposed the following:

a. It is an indicator with statistical viability since it has information.

b. It should be an indicator that was agreed on.

c. A new name was proposed for the indicator: "**Percentage of national land with land-use planning**"

d. With respect to the definition, this relates to the land area of the country that corresponds to the total land area of the country.

e. Limitations: the existence of plans does not mean that these plans are being successfully implemented.

Comments from the plenary:

Several participants highlighted the importance of this indicator and the need for all the countries to have the tools for its implementation.

Mrs. Rayén Quiroga pointed that the name of the indicator does not contain the unit of measurement, and the word "percentage" could be changed to "proportion".

3.1a Proportion of national land area with land-use plans

The EIWG agreed to place this indicator in the agreed category and change its name. The respective methodological sheet with the changes introduced and agreed can be found in Annex IV.

Indicator 3.1b Average annual variation in land use

This indicator was reviewed by: Mrs. Marly Santos – Brasil, Mrs. Nelly García – Panama, Mr. César Rodríguez – Mexico, Mr. Cirila Gutiérrez – Peru, Mrs. Ileana Saborit – Cuba, and Mr. Álvaro Aguilar – Costa Rica. This group observes the following:

a. It is advisable that the name of the indicator be changed to the following: "Annual rate of change in the various coverages".

b. A problem has been identified with the unit of measurement since not all the countries are using the same categories.

c. The FAO's categories were missing.

d. In terms of interpretation, variations in the categories of annual land use and vegetation in the country were pointed out.

There was consensus within the group for it to be approved as agreed. Mrs. Patricia Maccagno (Argentina) proposed the following name for the indicator: "Annual change in land use" and to reposition it in respect to the goal. The proposal was accepted.

3.1b Annual change in land use

The EIWG agreed to place this indicator in the category "agreed" and change its name. The methodological sheet with respect to the changes introduced and agreed on can be found in Annex IV.

Indicator 3.7b Victims or persons affected by natural disasters

The members of the group reviewing this indicator were as follows: Mr. Patricio Devers – Dominican Republic, Mr. Dorian Muñoz – Colombia, Mr. Jesús Romo and García – Mexico, Mr. José Capote – Venezuela, Mrs. Jannia Sierra – Honduras and Mr. José Actis – Dominican Republic. They made the following remarks:

a. In the proposed file, the goal of this indicator is vulnerability, although its name deals with the occurrence of disasters measured in numbers. The description speaks of four (4) more indicators: those affected, victims, number of disasters and material losses.

b. It was proposed that the four (4) indicators identified are important to be developed.

Comments from the plenary:

Mrs. Patricia Maccagno (Argentina) stated that she was not convinced that there were four (4) indicators even though the decision was valid because topics cannot be mixed. She felt that the most complete was the last one relating to the value of monetary losses in order to calculate and compare data among countries. She noted that there was a network of social studies on disaster prevention with the same methodology, outlining statistics by variables, which would be available for these indicators. On the other hand, Mrs. Neyra Herrera (Panama) felt that the four (4) indicators were not relevant but should be merged in a single methodological sheet where the information would be presented separately. The name of the indicator could be "natural disaster" and each one could be defined by separating them and applying the formula to them.

The participants were in favour of one proposal or the other. For example, Mrs. Rayén Quiroga, of ECLAC, pointed out that work has been done in Mexico on monetary evaluation of natural disasters and that this has yielded good results. She was therefore suggesting that material losses be included in the indicator; since most of the countries could not quantify it this would be a good opportunity for them to do so.

3.7b Occurrence of Natural disasters

The EIWG agreed to place this indicator in the category "agreed" and change its name.

The respective methodological sheet will be reviewed by UNEP with regard to its content, to include the four indicators.

Indicator 3.7c National plans that incorporate or take into account vulnerability to risks and include indicators for its monitoring

The members of this group, Mrs. Donnalyn Charles – Saint Lucia, Mrs. Jeanne Louis – Saint Lucia, Mr. Mario López – Colombia and Mr. Rafael Muñoz – Honduras, discussed whether or not this indicator reflected the intent of the topic. The group thought that it was consistent, given that the other indicators dealt with other aspects, and this aspect was not measured in the other indicators.

In addition, Mr. Mario López (Colombia) proposed the formulation of an indicator which quantifies the proportion of land that has vulnerability plans for natural disasters and that its calculation be done annually.

Comments from the plenary:

Several participants stated that the indicator had no real relevance or connection and suggested that it be deleted; this was unanimously agreed.

With respect to the goal of vulnerability, the other participants felt that there was a significant quantity of indicators that cover the topic, therefore they were unsure about approving an emerging indicator.

Mrs. Eugenia Wo Ching mentioned that indicator 3.6 which was previously agreed to by the meeting, included what was proposed by the group, therefore it would not be necessary to prepare a specific indicator for this topic.

3.7c National plans that incorporate or take into account vulnerability to risks and include indicators for its monitoring

The EIWG agreed to eliminate this indicator.

DAY THREE: FRIDAY, AUGUST 28, 2009

SESSION IV: THEMATIC AREA 3. VULNERABILITY, SETTLEMENTS AND SUSTAINABLE CITIES (II)

The following indicators were reviewed during this session:

3.3a Change in the density of the fleet of motor vehicles

3.5a Garbage collection

3.5b Generation of solid wastes in the main cities

3.5c Waste collected and appropriately disposed of

Mr. Álvaro Aguilar (Costa Rica) presented the group's comments on the indicators and suggested that all the groups put forward their comments first on indicators 3.5a, 3.5b, 3.5c and then hold a single plenary to make final decisions on each one.

Indicator 3.3a Change in the density of the fleet of motor vehicles

Members of the group: Mr. Adrián Sánchez – Peru, Mrs. Patricia Maccagno – Argentina, Mrs. Ana Graciela Batres – El Salvador, Mr. Arturo Flores – Mexico, Mrs. Beira Torres – Panama, and Mr. Wadih Joao Scandar Neto – Brazil, comented as follows:

a. The indicator was not agreed to because the interpretation, as proposed, could be confused with respect to what it wanted to measure.
b. The indicator needed improvement but there was not sufficient data. All the information that was lacking was required, which posed a problem for interpretation.
c. The interpretation of the indicator was restricted to inhabitants, and this was not correct.
d. Another limitation was that, by itself, the amount of vehicles was not directly related to emissions, depending on the type of vehicle, type of transport.
e. Its elimination was proposed.

All the participants supported the proposal made by the group to eliminate this indicator.

3.3a Change in the density of the fleet of motor vehicles

The EIWG agreed to eliminate this indicator.

Indicator 3.5a Garbage collection

The members of the group: Mrs. Marly Santos – Brazil, Mrs. Nelly García – El Salvador, Mr. César Rodríguez – Mexico, Mrs. Cirila Gutiérrez – Peru, Mrs. Ileana Saborit – Cuba, and Mr. Álvaro Aguilar – Costa Rica, declared that:

a. There are different stages in garbage generation and collection.

b. It would be a good indicator but the reality of the other countries was not known.

c. The unit of measurement should be tonnes per inhabitant.

Indicator 3.5b Generation of solid wastes in main cities

The members of the group: Mr. Patricio Devers – Dominican Republic, Mr. Dorian Muñoz – Colombia, Mr. Jesús Romo and García - Mexico, Mr. José Capote – Venezuela, Mrs. Jannia Sierra – Honduras, Mr. José Actis – Dominican Republic, and Mr. Fabio Herrera – Costa Rica, thought that the indicator was relevant but that it had no statistical viability. It was therefore proposed that indicator 3.5c be restructured and the word “collection” added.

Indicator 3.5c Garbage collected and properly disposed of

This indicator was reviewed by: Mrs. Donnalyn Charles – Saint Lucia, Mrs. Jeanne Louis – Saint Lucia, Mr. Mario López – Colombia, Mr. Rafael Muñoz – Honduras, Mrs. Neyra Herrera – Panama, and Mr. Agustín Gómez – Costa Rica. The group suggested the following:

a. Change the word “garbage” to “waste” and relate it only to urban, commercial and industrial waste within urban areas.

b. Develop another indicator on material that is recovered and recycled, or domestic wastes that go to sanitary land-fill.

Comments from the plenary:

Mr. Wadih Joao Scandar Neto (Brazil) indicated that the equation on the final destination of garbage should be limited to urban garbage. In Brazil, for example, there is information on companies that provide garbage collection services within the country and there are categories for the final destination of the residue, open-air incineration, etc. A category on “proper and improper” disposal of residue could be prepared.

Mr. Fabio Herrera (Costa Rica) explained that in most countries, the percentage of the population that has access to garbage collection service is determined in the yearly home survey. It was later proposed to measure the percentage of the population that has garbage collection service. The garbage collection companies, of course, keep an account of how much they collect from the residents, and give an account of the percentage of solid waste that is properly disposed of. If the number of kilos of solid waste that is properly disposed of increases, proper disposal of it will also increase. Mr. Arturo Flores of Mexico commented that he was concerned about the possible interpretation of the indicator if it is isolated, because if the quantity of waste that is disposed of in controlled sites decreases, this could mean that less waste is being produced and that better recycling and materials reuse options are being used, or it could simply mean that waste is not being properly disposed of.

Mrs. Patricia Maccagno (Argentina) stated that with respect to the type of disposal, it was necessary to carry it out based on the sanitary land-fills available, but that other forms of disposal should also be considered. She indicated that only urban solid wastes should be considered, but that if data were available, the opportunity to classify them by disposal type should be seized.

Mr. Agustín Gómez (Costa Rica) summarized as follows: three indicators cover the topic of disposal by monitoring the percentage of solid waste coverage, measuring what goes to the sanitary land-fills and recording the number of structured, standardized, sanitary land-fills and unstructured dumps that the country has. In other words, how much is collected, how much is being disposed of in appropriate places as well as the number of appropriate places it has or does not have.

Following the intervention of several participants, Mr. José Actis (Dominican Republic) commented that it would seem that there was consensus in that generation was important but that it could not be measured economically. There would therefore have to be 2 indicators, one on the number of homes or dwellings covered by the collection system and another on the physical volume, tonnes collected. With these practical indicators, the topic would be covered.

3.5a Population with Access to garbage collection services

The EIWG agreed to place this indicator in the category “agreed” and change its name. The respective methodological sheet with the changes introduced and agreed on can be found in Annex IV.

3.5b Generation of solid wastes in main cities

The EIWG agreed to eliminate this indicator.

3.5c Waste collected and properly disposed of

The EIWG agreed to place this indicator in the "agreed" category. The respective methodological sheet with the changes introduced and agreed on can be found in Annex IV.

They also agreed to prepare an emerging indicator on recycling and recording of the quantity of sanitary land-fills by country.

SESSION V: THEMATIC AREA 4: SOCIAL THEMES INCLUDING HEALTH, INEQUALITY AND POVERTY

In this session, using the same methodology, the following group of indicators was reviewed:

4.1b Morbidity rate attributable to acute respiratory illnesses

4.1c Morbidity rate attributable to water-borne illnesses

4.1d Hectares of urban green spaces in relation to urban population

4.3a Proportion of homes with access to secure tenancy

4.3d Social expenditure as a percentage of total public expenditure

Indicator 4.1b Morbidity rate attributable to acute respiratory illnesses

The following were addressed:

a. Interpretation: a high level of morbidity by ARI would indicate a high level of air pollution.

b. Given the multiple causes of illnesses, there is no direct relationship between this indicator and pollution.

c. A sub-data base can exist.

d. This indicator must be interpreted jointly with data on air quality.

e. If a country has information on the hospitalized or confirmed cases, this would be separated.

Following some brief comments from plenary, the importance of the indicator was recognized and it was approved as "agreed" without further changes.

4.1b Morbidity rate attributable to acute respiratory illnesses

The EIWG agreed to place this indicator as consented. The relevant methodology sheet with changes introduced and agreed is available in Annex IV.

Indicator 4.1c Morbidity rate for water-borne illnesses

The reviewing group, comprising Mrs. Marly Santos – Brazil, Mrs. Nelly Garcia – El Salvador, Mr. Cesar Rodriguez – Mexico, Mrs. Cirila Gutierrez – Panama, Mrs. Ileana Saborit – Cuba, and Mr. Alvaro Aguilar – Costa Rica, reported that:

a. This indicator needs to be developed.

b. The illness must be placed in the correct statistical category.

c. There is no statistical viability, most countries do not have sufficient statistical data to respond to this indicator.

Comments from the plenary

Mrs. Patricia Maccagno (Argentina) disagreed with leaving this indicator as "developing". This would be a good indicator for linking health with environment.

Mr. Cesar Rodriguez (Mexico) commented that perhaps the bigger question could be the viability of the data; most countries would not be able to document the indicator. He recommended resorting to the CIE-10 list for all illnesses. Mrs. Cirila Gutierrez (Peru) commented that for this type of indicator the sources are water records. Many persons do not report their illnesses to medical centres. This indicator includes other factors that are not mentioned in the indicator. The closest indicator would be drought, since this variable is included in surveys in most countries. However, Mr. Wadih Joao Scandar Neto (Brasil) commented that specialists in health information records who were consulted recommended that hospitalization records, though not in their entirety, are used because the quality of the records can affect the data. Mr. Mario Lopez (Colombia) commented that the information that would be in the indicator of diarrhea and respiratory illnesses should be based on three homogenous data sources that are: external consultation, emergency consultations and hospitalization.

4.1c Morbidity rate for water-borne illnesses

The GTIA agreed by consensus to include this indicator. The relevant methodology sheet with changes introduced and agreed appears in Annex IV.

Indicator 4.1d: Hectares of urban green areas in relation to urban population

The group that revised this indicator comprised: Mr. Patricio Devers – Dominican Republic, Mr. Dorian Munoz – Colombia, Mr. Jesus Romo and Garcia – Mexico, Mr. Jose Leonardo Capote – Venezuela, Mrs. Jannia Sierra – Honduras, Mr. Jose Actis – Dominican Republic and Mr. Fabio Herrera – Costa Rica, who concluded the following:

a. The indicator is relevant and international standards now exist.

b. However, it does not fulfil the requirement for statistical viability because currently this methodology is not used in the countries. A regional recommendation cannot be made with this statistical base.

c. Work is needed in the conceptual area, in definitions, and adopting a classification on what is a green area, how it is measured, etc. Adopting measures used at the international level is recommended.

d. Suggestion: leave this indicator in the "emerging" group as relevant but without statistical viability.

e. Place on the agenda the need to measure this and stick to a remote measurement -- remote satellite perception, etc.

Comments from the plenary:

Mr. Dorian Muñoz (Colombia) commented that in some planning activities, the large cities included this indicator in their information but it is necessary to consult with various entities to verify how to consolidate the information. On this theme, Mr. Fabio Herrera (Costa Rica) added that the WHO had the reference rule for the desirable range of metres per inhabitant. Mexico and Chile collected this type of statistics for large cities.

Mr. Wadih Joao Scandar Neto (Brazil) was in agreement with the group's conclusions that this indicator was emerging. However, he recommended having a period of observation to construct this indicator.

Finally, Mrs. Neyra Herrera (Panama) stated that the evaluation committee for detection was charged with supporting the committee with data on the urban green spaces, in the meeting that took place in Panama last year.

4.1d Hectares of urban green spaces in relation to the uban population

The GTIA agreed to consider this indicator as emerging. This is necessary coming out of the TAC. The group which will work on this indicator will comprise: Colombia and Cuba; Chile will also be invited.

Indicator 4.3a Proportion of homes with access to secure tenancy

The group comprised: Mrs. Donnalyn Charles – St. Lucia, Mrs. Jeanne Louis – St. Lucia, Mr. Mario López – Colombia, Mr. Rafael Muñoz – Honduras and Mr. Agustín Gómez – Costa Rica. The points expressed by the group are:

a. This indicator is different from that of the MDG. The indicator for the Millennium Development Goals is based on four main areas: water security, sanitation, state of housing materials and crowding. The ability to classify a dwelling as being poor or not is insufficient or not applicable to the reality of many countries.

b. The group has differences of opinion as to whether this indicator will actually help to measure the levels of poverty, or not.

c. The title is not ideal, it could be called "homes that lack satisfactory basic necessities", in the same spirit as that of the millenium goals.

d. The idea is to bring this indicator in line with millenium goals MDG 7.10, and create an emerging indicator about secure land tenancy or property rights and develop it in this sense. They recommended caution at the time of constructing said indicator, whether or not it reflects the condition referred to as a poor home, and bearing in mind the limitations with regard to the conditions of Caribbean countries.

Comments from the plenary:

Mrs. Rayén Quiroga from ECLAC clarified that the indicator MDG 7.10 refers to the "Proportion of the urban population living in shacks", which emphasizes the urban aspect of the indicator.

Various participants indicated that they were not in agreement with the word "shacks" since it does not apply directly to the reality of their countries, there is doubt concerning its definition, in addition to it not being used by many countries in the institutions that measure this type of goal. A discussion arose around the name that the indicator would carry. It was proposed to use the alternative name of "precarious settlement", but with the same definitions and names for classifying a home.

4.3a Proportion of homes in precarious settlements

The EIWG agreed to use this indicator and modify its name. It was proposed to bring this indicator in line with MDG 7.10 and draft an emerging indicator with respect to land tenancy, bearing in mind the experiences in Caribbean countries.

Indicator 4.3b Population with daily earnings below the parity of the purchasing power (PPP) of a dollar

This concerned an indicator that is now "agreed" and which was not included in the agenda but there is a proposal by some participants to modify it, and consequently the discussion is opened.

Mrs. Rayen Quiroga explains that it would be important_to bring this agreed indicator in line with that of the MDG, instead of using the World Bank poverty indicator. This indicator has a methodology sheet and data in a data base; it deals with poverty in terms of earnings and the Gini Index is used also from the same source and shows the income inequalities; it is accepted by the 19 countries of the region. It proposes to measure poverty with income plus the Gini Index.

Mrs. Patricia Maccagno (Argentina) accepted the motion, since the ODM indicator is an accurate reflection of what is happening in the countries of the region. Previously, Mr. José Actis (Dominican Republic) and Mr. Dorian Muñoz (Colombia) agreed that this would be like an emerging indicator, to make it as compatible as possible with the methodologies of the countries. Mr. Actis added that the technical discussion on these measures was not finalized; there were discrepancies between what is done at the regional level and what is done nationally, and also in respect of the methodology of the World Bank and ECLAC.

Other participants viewed the indicator as primary and expected that it would be agreed.

4.3b People with daily incomes below the purchasing power of a dollar

The EIWG agreed to continue the discussion on the two indicators proposed, to decide on the harmonization with the ODM indicator and the emerging Gini Coefficient indicator, through an Enlightenment session scheduled in the short-term with prior circulation of the corresponding methodology, bearing in mind the comments made.

Indicator 4.3e Social Expenditure as a percentage of total public expenditure

The group which revised the indicator comprised: Mr. Patricio Devers – Dominican Republic, Mr. Dorian Muñoz – Colombia, Mr. Jesús Romo y Garcia – Mexico, Mr. José Leonardo Capote – Venezuela, Mrs. Jannia Sierra – Honduras, Mr. José Actis – República Dominicana, and Mr. Fabio Herrera – Costa Rica.

a. Change the name of the indicator to the following: "social public expenditure in the gross domestic product".
b. Treat the indicator as agreed.
c. Create an emerging indicator for social public expenditure as a percentage of the total public expenditure.
d. Create another emerging indicator for "Environmental expenditure as a percentage of total public expenditure", which would be considered as developing, due to the difficulty of its measurement.

Comments from the plenary:

Mrs. Patricia Maccagno (Argentina) and Mrs. Cirila Gutiérrez (Perú) were in favor of the indicator on the "proportion of public social expenditure in relation to the total public expenditure" since this format better displayed the country's efforts on these social themes. Mrs. Maccagno seconded the proposal on the emerging indicator on the public environmental expenditure in relation to the total public expenditure.

Other participants expressed doubt about the different proposals, and the way in which a decision was reached.

4.3d Proportion representing the Gross Domestic Product

The EIWG agreed to place this indicator in the category "agreed" and to modify its name. The relevant methodology sheet is available in Annex IV.

A group comprising Argentina, Peru, Venezuela and Cuba will present a proposal of the developing emerging indicator on environmental public expenditure.

SESSION VI: THEMATIC AREA 5. ECONOMIC ASPECTS INCLUDING TRADE AND PATTERNS OF PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION. THEMATIC AREA 6. INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS

This session deals with the last three indicators proposed in the agenda:

5.1b Supply of renewable energy as a percentage of total energy supplied

5.3 Economic instruments that apply to the country

6.2a Net rate of enrolment in primary education

Indicator 5.1b Supply of renewable energy as a percentage of total energy supplied

The revision was carried out by: Mr. Adrián Sánchez – Perú, Mrs. Patricia Maccagno – Argentina, Mrs. Ana Graciela Batres – El Salvador, Mr. Arturo Flores – Mexico, Mrs. Beira Torres – Panama, and Mr. Wadih Joao Scandar Neto – Brasil. This group reported the following:

a. It suggested the name be changed to "Proportion of renewable energies", which is shorter and more concise than that utilized in the MDG.

b. The group suggested that it be considered the main "agreed" indicator.

c. More in-depth economic studies are necessary on the development of the use of bio-fuels, which lead to the use of renewable energy, but it is necessary to bear in mind the food problems of each country that could cause a change in land use.

Comments from the plenary:

Mr. Wadih Joao Scandar Neto (Brazil) was of the view that the comments regarding biocombustibles ought to be eliminated from the methodology sheet. Mr. Fabio Herrera (Costa Rica) suggested that if the comment was politically sensitive and there was no consensus, it should be eliminated. Other participants expressed the same view.

5.1b Porportion of renewable energies

The Environmental Indicators Working Group placed this indicator as the most agreed on and modified its name. The relevant methodology sheet with changes introduced and agreed on can be seen in Annex IV.

Indicator 5.3 Economic instruments that apply to the country

The reviewing group comprised: Mrs. Marly Santos – Brazil, Mrs. Nelly García – El Salvador, Mr. César Rodríguez – Mexico, Mra. Cirila Gutiérrez – Panama, Mrs. Ileana Saborit – Cuba, Mr. Fabio Herrera – Costa Rica and Mr. Alvaro Aguilar, Costa Rica. The group proposed the following to the plenary:

a. Widen the definition of the indicator making reference to incentives in three categories: financial, fiscal and market.

b. It should be a main agreed indicator.

c. Add to the limitations, that each country should do the description of its elements.

Comments from the plenary:

Several participants expressed their concerns and doubts regarding the relevance of the indicator, the clarity and utility of same, the category to which it should be assigned and the proposed methodology.

Mr. Agustin Gómez (Costa Rica) was of the opinion that the discussion should be oriented slightly more towards the types of renewable energy. He proposed the elimination of this indicator since it appears that other phenomena were expressed in the goal, in order to formulate a more harmonious indicator.

5.3 Economic instruments applicable to the country

The Environmental Indicators Working Group agreed to place this indicator as agreed but to change it to a binary one. The methodology sheet with the changes, as introduced and agreed, can be seen in Annex IV.

A working group convened by Costa Rica and Colombia will present a proposal of an emerging indicator more directed towards the goal in question.

Indicator 6.2a Net Enrolment Rate for Primary Education

Mrs. Donnalyn Charles – St. Lucia, Mrs. Jeanne Louis – Santa Lucía, Mr. Mario López – Colombia, Mr. Rafael Muñoz – Honduras, and Mr. Agustín Gómez – Costa Rica, worked in a group to revise the indicator and proposed that:

a. The name should remain the same since it was well known in educational circles.

b. The definition was not clearly understood; perhaps the draft could be improved.

c. The information was correct, fulfilled the criteria and was relevant.

d. Regarding the limitations, it is necessary to include limitations that had been considered in a previous version of the methodology sheet that was in English, and which referred to the different levels that each country considered to be primary education.

Comments from the plenary:

Mr. José Actis (Dominican Republic) indicates that he was in agreement with the remainder of the group with regard to the importance of the indicator. However, he thought that this indicator had a degree of complexity that was not necessary. The formula should be simplified since what was being measured was net rate; there was no need to calculate this indicator degree-by-degree or level by level, since in each country there are different rules with regard to the age and degree, or level in which the child should be and that is where the net education rate is achieved. He explained that there was no denominator for calculating this indicator. Mr. Mario López (Colombia) commented that, in his country, the calculations were done in exactly the way mentioned by Mr. Actis: the population enrolled at all levels is added.

Mrs. Cirila Gutiérrez (Peru) commented that almost all the countries worked with an indicator like the one being proposed; however, she saw a problem regarding the age group for measuring the indicator; each country has a different normative age, moreover, she suggested that the SINE classification be used.

Mrs. Patricia Maccagno (Argentina) commented that the way of calculating this indicator, as shown in the Methodology Sheet, was correct and simple.

The discussion continued on the way to calculate the indicator, since if the formula was simplified, students who were not in their correct grades would not be counted, which would happen if it is disaggregated by course or grade and scholastic level of the child. In the end the EIWG chose the simplest formula.

6.2a Net enrollment rate for primary education

The EIWG agreed to place this indicator among those agreed on. The relevant methodology sheet with changes introduced and agreed can be seen in Annex IV.

SESSION VII: CONCLUSIONS

At the start of this session there was a recap of the different agreements reached, which are available in Annex III. Also revised is the current state of the ILAC indicators, summarized in Annex II. The group appeared pleased with the progress made at the meeting, on the 23 revised indicators and the agreed emergent indicators.

Mr. Álvaro Aguilar (Costa Rica) proposed taking it to the national level and evaluating the final results of this meeting to feed them back to the countries. To this proposal, other participants such as Mrs. Ileana Saborit (Cuba) gave ideas on possible ways for increased involvement of persons in each country who manage the relevant information on the ILAC.

Mr. Jesús Romo and Garcia (Mexico) proposed that the group recommend to the Forum of Ministers that they complement this effort of the Environmental Indicators Working Group by strengthening the national statistical efforts that they support, a proposal that was supported by Mr. Fabio Herrera (Costa Rica).

Mr. José Actis (Dominican Republic) proposed that the news brief to be sent to the Ministers shows the agreed on indicators and those for which information is available, to draw attention to those indicators which countries cannot address due to a lack of data, so that more resources can be allocated. In this connection, Mr. Fabio Herrera (Cosa Rica) indicated that interesting opportunities for horizontal cooperation existed, and not only with multilateral organizations, for example.

Other participants emphasized the importance of scheduling the completion of all the agreements reached and the development of news briefs to present to the Ministers' Forum. Likewise, emphasis was placed on the utility of the Virtual Forum for the progress that could be made using this and other electronic media. Highlighted is the importance of not duplicating efforts and the progress that could be achieved through close collaboration between UNEP and ECLAC, in particular on the indicators which have been homogenized. In addition, suggestions were given

on the format of presenting the EIWG report to the Forum of Ministers on the construction of indicators using direct information from countries.

ANNEXES

Annex I Meeting Agenda

Annex II – List of Participants

Annex III – Summary Table of ILAC Indicators

ANNEX I – MEETING AGENDA

Meeting of the Environmental Indicators Working Group

Decision 6 of the Forum of Ministers of the Environment of

Latin America and the Caribbean

26, 27 and 28 August 2009, Hotel Bouga nvillea, Heredia, Costa Rica

AGENDA

Day 1

Wednesday, 26 August

8:00 – 8:30	Registration
8:30 – 9:00	***Welcome*** ► Mrs. Graciela Metternicht UNEP/ROLAC ► Mr. Álvaro Aguilar, Representative from Costa Rica, coordinating country of the Environmental Indicators Working Group (EIWG) of the Forum of Ministers of the Environment of Latin America and the Caribbean
9:00 – 9:30	► ***Progress of the TAC, ILAC, Forum of Ministers*** Mrs. Graciela Metternicht UNEP/ROLAC
9:30 – 10:00	► ***International statistical standards, discrepancies and statistical compatibility in environmental indicators from national, regional and global sources.*** (includes the state of MDG 7 indicators*).* Rayen Quiroga, Division of Statistics and Economic Projections, ECLAC
10:00-10:30	► ***General Overview of ILAC Indicators*** Mrs. Cristina Sabalaín
10:30 – 10:45	Coffee break
10:45 – 11:15	► ***Work methodology – Expected outcomes*** Mrs. Johanna Granados UNEP/ROLAC
11:15 – 12:30	► ***Agreed Indicators: (14 HM)*** Presentation of adjustments to the methodology sheets Mr. Álvaro Aguilar / Fabio Herrera
12:30- 13:30	Lunch

13:30- 15:00	► ***Indicators without data (12HM)*** Mrs. Cristina Sabalaín
15:00 – 15:15	Coffee break
Session I: Theme Area 1. Biological Diversity	
	4 indicators *1.1 Wooded areas* *1.2 Protected areas* *1.3 Existence of national laws related to access to genetic resources and sharing of benefits* 1.4 *Coastal areas – protected marine areas in relation to the entire marine and coastal area*
15:15 – 15:30	► Presentation of Combined Comments of the Virtual Work Forum (Costa Rica)
15:30 – 16:30	► Working Session: Working groups of 5 persons
16:30 – 17:00	**Presentation of results in plenary - Discussion** **Combined comments and decisions**

Day 2

Thursday, 27 August

8:00 – 10:30	► Visit to InBio Park
10:30 – 10:45	Coffee break
Session II: Theme Area 2. Management of water resources	
	3 Indicators not agreed on *2.1a Index of surface wáter scarcity* *2.1b Domestic wáter consumption per house and dwelling* *2.2 Number of watersheds with committees*
10:45 – 11:00	► Presentation of Combined Comments of the Virtual Work Forum (Costa Rica)
11:00 – 12:00	► Working Session: Working groups of 5 persons
12:00 – 12:30	**Presentation of results in plenary - Discussion** **Combined comments and decisions**
12:30 – 13:30	Lunch
Session III: Theme Area 3. Vulnerability, Settlements and Sustainable Cities **PART I**	

	4 Indicators not agreed on *3.1a Territorial Training Plans at sub-national level* *3.1b Annual average variation in land use* *3.7b Victims or those affected by natural disasters* *3.7c National plans incorporating or considering the theme of vulnerability to risks including indicators for their monitoring*
13:30 – 13:45	► Presentation of Combined Comments of the Virtual Work Forum (Costa Rica)
13:45 – 14:45	►Working Session: Working groups of 5 persons
14:45 - 15:15	**Presentation of results in plenary - Discussion** **Combined comments and decisions**
15:15 – 15:30	Coffee break
Session IV: Theme Area 3. Vulnerability, Settlements and Sustainable Cities PART II	
	4 Indicators not agreed on *3.3a Change in the fleet of motor vehicles* *3.5a Waste collection* *3.5b Generation of solid waste in main capitals* *3.5c Waste collected and adequate disposal*
15:45 – 16:00	► Presentation of Combined Comments of the Virtual Work Forum (Costa Rica)
16:00 – 17:00	► Working Session: Working groups of 5 persons
17:00 – 17:30	**Presentation of results in plenary - Discussion** **Combined comments and decisions**

Day 3

Friday, August 28

Session V: Theme Area 4. Social themes, including health, inequality and poverty

	5 Indicators not agreed on *4.1b Morbidity rate atributable to acute respiratory illnesses* *4.1c Morbidity rate for wáter-borne illnesses* *4.1d Hectares of urban green spaces in relation to urban population* *4.3a Proportion of homes with access to secure tenancy* *4.3d Social expenditure as a percentage of total public expenditure*
8:00 – 8:15	► Presentation of Combined Comments of the Virtual Work Forum (Costa Rica)
8:15 – 9:30	► Working Session: Working groups of 5 persons
9:30 – 10:00	**Presentation of results in plenary - Discussion** **Combined comments and decisions**
10:00 – 10:30	Coffee break
Session VI: Theme Area 5. Economic aspects, including trade and the patterns of production and consumption **Theme Area 6. Institutional Aspects**	
	3 Indicators not agreed on *5.1b Supply of renewable energy as a percentage of total energy supplied* *5.3 Economic instruments applicable to the country* *6.2a Net enrolment rate for primary education*
10:30 – 10:45	► Presentation of Combined Comments of the Virtual Work Forum (Costa Rica)
10:45 – 11:45	► Working Session: Working groups of 5 persons
11:45 – 12:15	**Presentation of results in plenary - Discussion** **Combined comments and decisions**
12:15 – 13:30	Lunch
Session VIII. Conclusions	
13.30 – 15.30	► *Work in plenary* ***Definition of phases of indicators*** ► **Combined comments and decisions**
15.30 – 15.45	Coffee break
15:45 – 17:00	► Recommendations and conclusions ► Closing

ANNEX II- LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Country	Name	Job Title	Institution	Telephone	E-mail
Argentina	Patricia Maccagno	Director – Environmental and Social Impact	Secretariat of the Environment and Sustainable Development of Argentina	00-54-11-4348-8525	pmaccagno@ambiente.gov.ar, patricia_maccagno@yahoo.com.ar
Argentina	Cristina Sabalaín	Consultant			kika@fibertel.com.ar
Brazil	Marly Santos Da Silva	Expert in Public Policy	SINAMA/MMA	00 55 21-33-17-17-68	marly.silva@mma.gov.br
Brazil	Wadih Joao Scandar Neto	Assistant to the Director of Geosciences	DGC-IBGE	00-55-21-2142-4666	wadih.neto@ibge.gov.br
Colombia	Dorian Alberto Muñoz Rodas		Division of Planning and Information and Coordination - Regional Ministry of the Environment and Territorial Development	00-571-332-3434 ext.1263 00-571-323400	dmunoz@minambiente.gov.co
Colombia	Mario Orlando López Castro	Coordinator – Research on Environmental Indicators	Environmental Programme - Division of Synthesis and National (DANE)		molopezc@dane.gov.co
Costa Rica	Álvaro Aguilar		National Information Centre. Ministry of the Environment, Energy and Telecommunications	00-506-2221-1839	aguilar@mail.geologos.or.cr
Costa Rica	Edgar Gutiérrez Espeleta	Director – School of Statistics - UCR President of the IPA	ILAC	00 506 2511-4335/2511-4034/2511-4504	edgar.gutierrez@ucr.ac.cr, edgar.gutierrez@ipa.co.cr

Country	Name	Job Title	Institution	Telephone	E-mail
Costa Rica	Fabio Herrera Ocampo	Chief of Environmental Statistics	National Institute of Statistics and Census	00 506 2280-9280/8860-0528	fabio.herrera@inec.go.cr
Costa Rica	Agustín Gómez		Development Observatory	00 506 2511-4878	agomezodd@gmail.com
Costa Rica	Eugenia Wo Ching	Executive Director	Instituto de Política Ambiental (IPA)	00 506 2272-2420 Fax: 2272-2283	eugeniaws@ipa.co.cr
Cuba	Ileana Saborit Izaguirre	Environmental Specialist/ Coordinator of the Group of National Environmental Indicators	Division of the Environment. Ministry of Science, Technology and the Environment (CITMA)	00 537 8670598	saborit@citma.cu
Chile	Rayen Quiroga	Regional Advisor	Statistical Division / ECLAC	00 562-2102665	rayen.QUIROGA@cepal.org
Dominican Republic	Patricio Devers		Secretaría de Estado de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales	00-809-567-4300 ext.363	patriciodevers@yahoo.es
Dominican Republic	José Actis	Manager of Economic Statistics	Oficina Nacional de Estadística	00-809-682-7777 ext.248	jose.actis@one.gov.do
El Salvador	Ana Graciela Batres Díaz	Expert in Institutional Follow-up	Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources Division of Planning and Strategy	(503) 2267-6276	gbatres@marn.gob.sv
El Salvador	Nelly Karolina García González	Expert in Methodology	Division of Social Statistics / DIGESTYC	00 503 2239-2129	nelly.garcia@digestyc.gob.sv

Country	Name	Job Title	Institution	Telephone	E-mail
Honduras	Jania Miroslava Sierra	Planning Assistant	Planning, Evaluation and Unit Management Secretariat for Natural Resources and the Environment	(504) 232 5259/ 232 23 88	janiamiroslava@hotmail.com
Honduras	Rafael Antonio Muñoz Brito	Expert in Statistics	National Institute of Statistics	00 504 239-7154/239-7194	info@ine-hn.org; rafaelmunozb@yahoo.com
Mexico	Arturo Flores Martínez	Director General	SEMARNAT, Department of Statistics and Environmental Information –Under-Secretary of Environmental Planning and Policy	00-52-5554900983	afloresm@semarnat.gob.mx
Mexico	César Rodríguez	Director of Analysis and Environmental Indicators	ILAC		cesar.rodriguez@semarnat.gob.mx
Mexico	Dr. Jesús Romo y García	Deputy Director General	Dirección General Adjunta de Estadísticas del Medio Ambiente. INEGI	00 52 5552781000 ext-1480	jesus.romo@inegi.org.mx
Panama	Neyra Herrera		ANAM		n.herrera@anam.gob.pa
Panama	Beira Torres	Analyst in Environmental Statistics	Dirección de Estadística y Censo de la Contraloría General de la República	00-507-510-4893	btorres@contraloria.gob.pa
Panama	Graciela Metternicht	Regional Coordinator, Evaluation and Early Alert	División de Evaluación y Alerta Temprana Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente Oficina Regional para América Latina y el Caribe	(507) 305-3150 (directo) y 305-3100 (conmutador) Fax: (507) 305-3105	graciela.metternicht@unep.org

Country	Name	Job Title	Institution	Telephone	E-mail
Panama	Johanna Granados		División de Evaluación y Alerta Temprana Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente Oficina Regional para América Latina y el Caribe	(507) 305-3146 (directo) 305-3151 Fax: (507) 305-3105	johanna.granados@pnuma.org
Panama	Mara Murillo	Assistant Regional Director	División de Evaluación y Alerta Temprana Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente Oficina Regional para América Latina y el Caribe		mara.murillo@pnuma.org
Peru	Cirila Gutiérrez	Executive – Social Indicators	Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática	00-511-433-8394	cirila.gutierrez@inei.gob.pe
Peru	Adrián Sánchez	Environmental Specialist	Dirección General de Investigación e Información Ambiental. Ministerio de Ambiente	00-511-2255370 ext. 236	asanchez@minam.gob.pe
Saint Lucia	Jeanne Majella Louis		Department of Statistics Ministry of Economic Affairs and Planning, National Development and Public Administration	00-1-758-452-37-16	jmlouis@gmail.com
Saint Lucia	Donnalyn Charles	Sustainable Development and Environment Officer	Sustainable Development and Environment Section Ministry of Physical Development and The Environment American Drywall Building Castries	758-451-8746 or 468-5804 Fax: 758-451-9706	donnalyncharles@gmail.com, doncharles@sde.gov.lc

Country	Name	Job Title	Institution	Telephone	E-mail
Venezuela	José Leonardo Capote	Statistical Advisor	Ministerio del Poder Popular para el Ambiente	+58 212408-1501/ 1502	leocapote@yahoo.com, jcapote@minamb.gob.ve estadisticas.minamb@gmail.com, klopez@minamb.gob.ve oscci@minamb.gob.ve

ANNEX III – SUMMARY TABLE OF THE ILAC INDICATORS

THEMATIC AREA	GOAL	INDICATIVE PURPOSE	INDICATOR	STATUS
1. BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY	1.1 Increase in wooded surface area:	1.1.1 Ensure the sustainable management of forest resources of the region, significantly reducing the current rate of deforestation.	**1.1.1.1** Proportion of land area covered by forest	AGREED ON
	1.2 Land falling under protected areas.	1.2.1 Significantly increase amount of regional land under protected areas, including in the definition, transmission zones and biological corridors.	**1.2.1.1** Proportion of terrestrial and marine areas protected	AGREED ON
			1.2.1.2 Proportion of species threatened with extinction	EMERGING
	1.3 Genetic resources and equal distribution of resources.	**1.3.1** Adopt regulatory frameworks for access to genetic resources, as well as fair and equitable participation in benefits derived from their use, compatible with the Convention on Biological Diversity.	**1.3.1.1** Existence of laws and/or decrees, national regulations relating to access to genetic resources and the distribution of benefits.	AGREED ON
			1.3.1.2 To be determined (indicator which incorporates management: process)	EMERGING
	1.4 Marine Diversity.	**1.4.1** Ensure the appropriate use and conservation of marine resources of the countries of the Caribbean Watershed, particularly the coastal-marine ecosystems.	**1.2.1.1** Proportion of terrestrial and marine areas protected	AGREED ON
2. MANAGEMENT OF WATER	2.1 Water supply.	**2.1.1** Improve technology to increase efficiency in water use in	**2.1.1.1** Proportion of total water resources used	AGREED ON

THEMATIC AREA	GOAL	INDICATIVE PURPOSE	INDICATOR	STATUS
			2.1.1.2 To be determined.	EMERGING
			2.1.1.3 Domestic water consumption per household or dwelling	UNDER DEVELOPMENT
		2.1.2 Introduce modern technologies to purify sea water.	**2.1.2.1** Water purification	EMERGING
		2.1.3 Integrate management of coastal aquifers to prevent the entry of salt water	**2.1.3.1** Regulatory framework, quotas for the management of ground water	EMERGING
	2.2 Watershed management.	**2.2.1** Improve and strengthen institutional capacity for the integrated management of watersheds and aquifers, through, *inter alia*, the establishment of watershed committees, the participation of all governments at the sub-national level, the civil society, the private sector and all stakeholders involved.	**2.2.1.1** Number of watersheds with management committees	AGREED ON
			2.2.1.2 Proportion of land area managed under watershed criterion	EMERGING
			2.2.1.3 Efficiency in the management of watersheds	EMERGING
	2.3 Management of coastal areas and their resources.	**2.3.1** Implement action plans for the integrated management of coastal and ecosystem resources, paying particular attention to the small island developing states.	**2.3.1.1** Fish extraction	AGREED ON
		2.3.2 Adopt a comprehensive and integrated focus for the management of the Caribbean Sea through the development of a comprehensive strategy for is protection and management.	**2.3.2.1** Projects or amount of Money aimed at improving the management of the Caribbean Sea or the coasts	EMERGING

THEMATIC AREA	GOAL	INDICATIVE PURPOSE	INDICATOR	STATUS
3. VULNERABILITY, HUMAN	2.4 Improved surface water quality.	**2.4.1** Improve the quality of effluents and reduce the discharge of contaminants into surface and underground water bodies as well as coastal area.	**2.4.1.1** Percentage of effluent that is collected and treated	EMERGING
			2.4.1.2 Population with access to sanitary facilities	AGREED ON
	3.1 Land-use Planning	**3.1.1**Implement land-use plans and policies, from the perspective of sustainable development.	**3.1.1.1** Proportion of national territory with management plans	AGREED ON

THEMATIC AREA	GOAL	INDICATIVE PURPOSE	INDICATOR	STATUS
		3.1.2 Incorporate instruments for risk management in planning	**3.1.2.1** Annual change of the different uses of land	AGREED ON
	3.2 Areas affected by degradation	**3.2.1** Significantly reduce the regional land area prone to erosion, saltiness and other soil degradation processes.	**3.2.1.1** Areas affected by degradation	AGREED ON
	3.3 Air Pollution	3.3.1 Reduce the concentration of polluting emissions in the air.	**3.3.1.2** Carbon dioxide emissions	AGREED ON
	3.4 Water Contamination.	**3.4.1** Expand the coverage of drinking water services and the treatment of waste water.	**3.4.1.1** Population with access to drinking water.	AGREED ON
			3.4.1.2 Population with access to ground water	AGREED ON
	3.5 Solid Waste	**3.5.1** Significantly reduce the generation of solid wastes (domestic and industrial) and promote, among others, recycling and reuse.	**3.5.1.1** Population with access to garbage collection services	AGREED ON
		3.5.2 Implement integrated solid waste management, including the treatment and appropriate final disposal.	**3.5.2.1** Collection and appropriate disposal of garbage	AGREED ON
	3.6 Vulnerability to anthropogenic disasters and disasters caused by natural phenomenon	**3.6.1** Implement and strengthen regional cooperation mechanisms for risk management and mitigation of anthropogenic disasters and those caused by natural phenomena, including the formulation of a regional early-warning system and the formation of a quick-response	**3.6.1.1** National Emergency Commissions or quick-response groups.	AGREED ON

THEMATIC AREA	GOAL	INDICATIVE PURPOSE	INDICATOR	STATUS
		group.		
	3.7 Vulnerability and Risk Management	**3.7.1** Refine and implement vulnerability indicators.	**3.7.1.1** Population living in high-risk areas.	EMERGING
			3.7.1.2 Occurrence of natural disasters	AGREED ON
		3.7.2 Incorporate indicators in the national development plans.	**3.7.2.1** To be determined.	EMERGING
4. SOCIAL TOPICS, INCLUDING HEALTH, INEQUALITY AND POVERTY	4.1 Health and the Environment.	**4.1.1** Implement comprehensive measures to control and reduce the spread of the AIDS virus, including the development of coordinated focus for research, education, treatment and access to retroviral drugs.	**4.1.1.1** HIV/AIDS prevalence in persons aged 15 to 49 years	AGREED ON

THEMATIC AREA	GOAL	INDICATIVE PURPOSE	INDICATOR	STATUS
		4.1.2 Implement policies and plans to reduce environmental risks that cause damage to health, particularly via water, vector, air pollution and exposure to chemical substances.	**4.1.2.1**. Morbidity rate attributable to acute respiratory diseases	AGREED ON
			4.1.2.2 Morbidity rate attributable to water-borne diseases.	AGREED ON
		4.1.3 Increase the number of green and safe areas per capita.	**4.1.3.1** Hectares of green urban areas in relation to urban population	UNDER DEVELOPMENT
	4.2 The Environment and Job Creation	**4.2.1** Promote the formulation and implementation of sustainable development programmes and projects, which contribute to creation of jobs and prevent migration and uprooting.	**4.2 1.1** Sustainable development projects or programmes and the total number of persons in these projects	EMERGING
			4.2.1.2 Job creation in sustainable development programmes	EMERGING
	4.3 Poverty and Inequality	**4.3.1** Drastically reduce the poverty levels in countries of the region.	**4.3.1.1**.Number of homes in precarious areas	AGREED ON
			4.3.1.2 Population earning less than $1 (PPP) per day.	AGREED ON
		4.3.2 Create means of sustainable living through the development of microenterprises.	**4.3.2.1** Growth index of the number of small companies	EMERGING
		4.3.3 Formulate and implement strategies for women, youth, indigenous people, afro-	**4.3.3.1** Social expenditure as a percentage of the gross domestic product	AGREED ON

THEMATIC AREA	GOAL	INDICATIVE PURPOSE	INDICATOR	STATUS
		descendant communities and other minority groups of the region, in accordance with human rights and basic liberties.	**4.3.3.2** Environmental expenditure as a percentage of total public expenditure	EMERGING
5. ECONOMIC ASPECTS INCLUDING TRADE AND PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION PATTERNS	5.1 Energy	**5.1.1** Implement, in the region, the use of at least 10% renewable energy of the total energy percentage of the region by 2010.	**5.1.1.1** Population using combustible solids	EMERGING
			5.1.1.2 Amount of renewable energies	AGREED ON
			5.1.1.3 Energy use per capita and per $1 GDP (PPP)	AGREED ON
	5.2 Cleaner Production.	**5.2.1** Establish Cleaner Production Centres in all the countries of the region.	**5.2.1.1** Consumption of ozone-depleting chlorofluorocarbons	AGREED ON
		5.2.2 Incorporate the cleaner production concept in a significant fraction of the main industries, with emphasis on small- and medium-sized industries.	**5.2.2.2** Companies with ISO 14001 certification	AGREED ON
	5.3 Economic Instrument.	**5.3.1** Establish an economic incentive system for productive and industrial projects transformation which preserve natural and energy resources, and produce the final reduction of effluents released into water, land and air.	**5.3.1.1** Economic instrument implemented by the country	AGREED ON
			5.3.1.2 To be determined	EMERGING
6. INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTSASPECTOS INSTITUCIONALES	6.1 Environmental Education.	**6.1.1** Improve and strengthen the incorporation of the environmental dimension in formal and informal education, in	**6.1.1.1** Existence of Formal Comprehensive Environmental Education Programmes in schools	EMERGING

THEMATIC AREA	GOAL	INDICATIVE PURPOSE	INDICATOR	STATUS
		the economy and the society.		

THEMATIC AREA	GOAL	INDICATIVE PURPOSE	INDICATOR	STATUS
	6.2 Education and training of human resources.	**6.2.1** Eradicate illiteracy and make enrolment in basic and secondary education universal.	**6.2.1.1** Net enrolment ratio in primary education	AGREED ON
		6.2.2 Develop capacities to deal with vulnerability in the region.	**6.2.2.1** To be determined/National Emergency Commissions on Disaster Prevention, by province, canton and district	EMERGING
		6.2.3 Establish programmes for the creation of capacities in sustainable development management, for the public and private sector, and at the community level.	**6.2.3.1** Hours of instruction in environmental science in primary schools	EMERGING
	6.3 Evaluation and Indicators.	**6.3.1** Develop and implement an evaluation process to monitor the progress in the achievement of sustainable development objectives, including the results of the Johannesburg Plan of Action, adopting sustainability indicator systems, , at the national and regional level, that respond to the social, economic and political particularities of the region.	**6.3.1.1** Reports on the state of the environment	AGREED ON
			6.3.1.2 Environmental statistics system	AGREED ON
	6.4 Participation of the society.	**6.4.1** Create and strengthen participation mechanisms in the areas of sustainable development, with governmental and non-governmental representation and the main	**6.4.1.1** Existence of national councils for sustainable development	AGREED ON

THEMATIC AREA	GOAL	INDICATIVE PURPOSE	INDICATOR	STATUS
		groups in all the countries of the region.		

⌘ ⌘ ⌘ ⌘