

# Technical expert group on SDG Indicator 17.7.1: Environmentally-Sound Technologies

Second Expert Group Meeting – Paris, 28-29 March 2018

## Summary of discussions

### Background

In the context of monitoring progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), UN Environment is the custodian of several indicators, including for SDG 17.7.1 on environmentally sound technologies (ESTs). This indicator is classified as Tier III since no methodology exists for its monitoring. In its role as custodian, UN Environment is therefore responsible for leading the methodological development of the indicator, and subsequently for compiling and reporting data on it to the Global SDGs Database.

**SDG Target 17.7** Promote development, transfer, dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies to developing countries on favorable terms, including on concessional and preferential terms, as mutually agreed

**Indicator 17.7.1** Total amount of approved funding for developing countries to promote the development, transfer, dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies.

To support the development of the methodology, UN Environment has established a Technical Expert Group, comprising of experts from relevant UN agencies, other International and Regional Organisations, National governments, research organisations, and academia.

A first Technical Expert Group Meeting, held in January 2018 (via webinar), provided an opportunity for an initial brainstorming on some of the key issues related to the indicator. Subsequently, a questionnaire was circulated to capture additional input and stimulate further reflection on the key elements of the indicator. A series of bilateral consultations were also held with various members of the Group.

The Group met in person for the first time on 28-29 March 2018 at UN Environment's Office in Paris. Given the complexity of the indicator, the main objective of this meeting was to gain convergence on the key definitional and methodological issues and define a way forward for its further development.

The key issues for discussion and agreement were:

#### 1. The purpose of the indicator

- What is valuable to measure? Should the indicator promote and measure investments in ESTs in all countries? Or should it focus on financial support for developing countries?

#### 2. The definition of Technology

- What is feasible to measure within the scope of the indicator – both hard and soft technologies?

#### 3. Agreement on approach for categorizing 'environmentally-sound technologies':

- Criteria, i.e. impact-based, performance gains, purpose-based
- International standard v. nationally-defined based on common criteria and guidance

#### 4. Agreement on which financial flows may be measured

#### 5. Identification of suitable data sources (international or national level)

This note provides a brief summary of the main issues discussed at the second meeting. It does not aim to reproduce in detail all discussions at the meeting but rather to capture the most salient points raised and implications for the development of a methodology to measure the support to environmentally sound technologies.

## Highlights of Day 1:

### Opening Remarks

Mark Radka (UN Environment) welcomed participants and presented opening remarks to the Expert Group<sup>1</sup>. He mentioned that UN Environment is responsible for 26 indicators, out of which 18 of them are Tier-III<sup>2</sup>. He specified that this indicator is one of the most complex to measure as it requires us to answer questions such as what is a technology, what is an Environmentally Sound Technology and can they be defined in an absolute sense, or contextualized in the environment, static or dynamic. He also referred to the divergent nature of responses to the questionnaire and emphasized that it is crucial to reach consensus on the key issues of the indicator at the end of the meeting.

### UN Environment's role as custodian agency and an overview of Indicator 17.7.1

Lowri Angharad Rees (UN Environment) provided a brief overview of the SDGs and UN Environment's role as custodian. She provided experts with additional background on the process of monitoring and reporting on the SDG indicators. She reminded experts that the General Assembly has already agreed on the Goals and Targets but tasked the UN Statistical Commission with developing an indicator framework for monitoring, and that the Commission established the Inter-Agency Expert Group on the SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDG), and a sub-group of 30 countries, to undertake this work.

Ms. Rees described the process for adopting the indicator methodology, explaining that once it has been agreed upon by the Expert Group it will be submitted to the IAEG-SDG for their consideration, after which a reporting system will need to be established. Following the adoption of the methodology, the custodian agencies are also responsible for the data collection, aggregation and analysis at sub-regional, regional and global levels.

Governments will not be required to use the methodology proposed by the custodian agency and can instead adopt their own. Therefore, in order to encourage its use and ensure compatibility and comparability of data, the Group will need to find a balance between striving for the most comprehensive data and managing the reporting burden of national governments.

### Key points raised:

- Amendments to the wording of SDG 17.7.1 may be proposed by the Group. However, the wording of Target 17.7 cannot be changed.
- In terms of the SDGs reporting process, countries will report their data to the custodian agency. The custodian agency will aggregate data and analyse trends at the sub-regional, regional and global levels, and report to the Global SDGs Database. Data from global sources (existing global databases) may also be used instead of, or to complement national data.
- The draft methodology must be pilot tested in a variety of countries before finalisation and submission to the IAEG-SDG for validation.

---

<sup>1</sup> All of the presentations made at the meeting are available for download [here](#).

<sup>2</sup> Internationally established methodology or standards are yet available for the indicator, but methodology/standards are being (or will be) developed or tested.

## Purpose of Indicator 17.7.1

The next session explored the purpose of Indicator 17.7.1, in terms of what was useful for both national governments and the international community to measure and monitor, also taking into account the information captured by other related SDG indicators.

The Group felt that if the indicator only monitored financial flows from developed countries to developing countries, as suggested by its current framing, it would provide too narrow a picture of the EST story.

Access to technologies is influenced by a variety of factors, going far beyond finance. For example, drops in market prices due to deployment at scale of technologies in developed countries can be more effective than concessions in terms of supporting their uptake in developing countries. The deployment of technologies in developing countries and emerging economies also greatly impact the global market. There are important lessons learned from developing countries and South-South cooperation and experience sharing is playing an increasingly important role. Information on the EST market globally is therefore required to have a complete picture of the conditions influencing their uptake in developing countries.

The Group therefore saw the need for an additional sub-indicator to track the uptake of ESTs in all countries, in order to provide a comprehensive picture of the markets and their dynamics. This would in turn allow for a deeper understanding of factors influencing access to and uptake of technologies in developing countries.

### Outcomes of the discussion:

- The Expert Group agreed that the existing indicator was framed too narrowly. An additional sub-indicator to track the uptake of ESTs globally would be needed to complement it and provide a comprehensive picture of markets globally.

## Defining Environmentally Sound Technologies

The next session examined the key issues related to defining ESTs for the purpose of indicator 17.7.1.

Lowri Angharad Rees outlined the main issues and highlighted the results from the questionnaire on how to define 'technology', and which approaches could be taken to define 'environmentally-sound', such as an impact-based approach (reduction of environmental or social impacts), performance-based (enhance environmental performance), or based on the technology having an environmental purpose (such as end-of pipe technologies). She also requested the Group to explore the kind of criteria and guidance/tools could be made available to countries to support the identification of environmentally-sound technologies.

### UN Environment's work on EST assessments standards and tools

Steve Halls (Ministry of Environment of Oman, former Director of UNEP IETC - International Environmental Technologies Centre) presented various assessment processes and tools for ESTs, based on previous work carried out by UNEP IETC. Much of this work could be taken up and adapted for the purposes of the indicator. He added that there is a need for a dynamic system as indicators cannot be static, given the continuous advancements in technology. Steve reiterated that industry associations are interested in creating EST generic guidelines/criteria/benchmarks which will help countries move towards incremental improvements over time. He also outlined how the Government of Oman has established a legislative requirement for BAT criteria to be applied, which helps shape the focus of investors.

### Life cycle assessment of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Mitigation Technologies

Sangwon Suh (University of California Santa Barbara) took the floor to present the conclusions of the International Resources Panel's (IRP) report: 'Green Technology Choices: The Benefits, Risks and Trade-

Offs of Energy Efficient Technologies'<sup>3</sup>. The report's findings demonstrated the significant disparities and highly contextual nature of the environmental performance of technologies, depending on factors such as geographic location, management practices, and the local energy mix. It also explored related issues such as problem-shifting and the rebound effect. The Group saw great potential in using this body of work as a basis for developing guidance on choosing the most effective technologies based on national and local context, managing potential negative impacts, and mitigating problem-shifting and the rebound effect.

#### Ecosystem thinking for defining EST

In this session, Felicia Jackson (SOAS London) introduced the Ecosystem thinking approach for defining Environmentally Sound Technologies. This approach touched upon the fact that for a transition to a sustainable low carbon economy, social change along with a financial and technological change is required. This approach could help understand how the market works and focussed more on the right kind of finance for ESTs available rather than the quantum of finance.

#### Tracking progress towards 'soft technologies'

Enzo Sauma (University of Chile) made a brief presentation on how impacts of soft technologies can be measured. He presented a methodology for 'Impact Assessment of Indirect Effects' based on the Chilean experience. He highlighted that presence, valuation and mobilizing capacity were the three main axis to measure soft technologies at the project, programme or policy level. He concluded by reiterating that this information is essential to move towards transforming markets to a more sustainable one.

#### Discussion on defining Environmentally Sound Technologies:

The Expert Group recommended adopting a broad definition of technologies, which would include both hard and soft technologies, given the importance of both in contributing to sustainable development. The definition would align with existing international agreements and outcomes documents, including Agenda 21, which include elements such as 'know-how', 'procedures', 'goods and services', and 'organisational and management procedures' in their definitions of Environmentally Sound Technologies.

The Group agreed that 'Environmentally Sound Technologies' do not exist in absolute terms. How environmentally sound a technology is will depend to a large extent on the context in which it is used. Socio-economic, geographic, temporal and other factors influence the effectiveness of technologies. Further, in deciding which technologies are most appropriate, there will always be trade-offs between cost and a range of economic, social, health and environment impacts, to be determined based on national or local contexts and priorities. Therefore, defining a list of "environmentally-sound technologies", as has been done at the national level in some cases, would not be feasible (previous attempts to do so at the regional and international levels have failed).

The Group therefore agreed that the best approach would be to define a set of international criteria for ESTs, which could then be applied by national governments, taking into account their national context. This would be in the form of a multi-criteria analysis, and include a mix of impact-based, performance based and purpose-based criteria.

The Group further proposed to develop detailed guidance for the application of the criteria at the national level, plus additional information that would support governments and other actors with decision-making and defining the most nationally appropriate technologies. This would draw upon existing bodies of work, including UNEP IETC's work on technology assessment criteria and tools, and

---

<sup>3</sup>IRP (2017): Green Technology Choices: The Environmental and Resource Implications of Low-Carbon Technologies. Suh, S., Bergesen, J., Gibon, T. J., Hertwich, E., Taptich M. A report of the International Resource Panel. United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi, Kenya. <http://www.resourcepanel.org/reports/green-energy-choices-benefits-risks-and-trade-offs-low-carbon-technologies-electricity>

the findings of the IRP on life cycle impacts, context-based effectiveness of technologies, problem shifting and rebound effects.

The Group recognised that the criteria and guidance would have to take into account the dynamic nature of ESTs, with innovation and improvements continuously taking place. The guidance would also need to outline how contextual factors at the national level may evolve with time and influence the way that the criteria would be applied. For example, changes in the regional or national energy mix would greatly affect the performance of energy efficiency technologies. The Group suggested that provision should be made for the criteria and guidance to be re-visited and potentially revised by the Expert Group in 2025.

#### Outcomes of the discussion:

- Agreement to recommend a broad definition of technologies, including hard and soft technologies, and as defined in internationally agreed texts (such as Agenda 21).
- Agreement that the Expert Group will develop international criteria, to be applied at the national level by governments so that they may define the “most appropriate technology” at national/local level, taking into account their own specific context and priorities.
- Agreement on the need to develop guidance for countries (and potentially decision support tools) to assist them in identifying and prioritising environmentally-sound technologies, in sustainably managing them, and also reporting on indicator 17.7.1.
- The guidance will outline contextual elements at the national level that may evolve with time and require review by national governments.
- Provision to be made for a potential review of the criteria and guidance by the Expert Group in 2025.

## Highlights from Day-2 (29 March)

### Measuring finance towards Environmentally-Sound Technologies

After having reached consensus on the key issues regarding ESTs, Day-2 primarily focussed on how finance can be measured towards ESTs. Rashmi Jawahar (UN Environment) began by listing some key issues to discuss regarding measuring finance towards ESTs. She highlighted the questionnaire results related to funding sources and mechanisms and Data sources and statistical frameworks. Then she went ahead and listed a non-exhaustive list of international, regional (Eurostat) and national (Statistics Canada) data sources. She outlined that none of the countries have already indicated how they will monitor and report on this indicator. This is an indication that countries need guidance and support to improve their capacity regarding reporting against this indicator.

### The OECD’s International Development Statistics Database

Elena Bernaldo (OECD) gave a brief overview about the OECD’s International Development Statistics Database. This database covers bilateral, multilateral aid (ODA) and private providers’ aid and other resource flows to developing countries. She highlighted the Creditor Reporting System (CRS), which is a project-level database containing data on Official Development Assistance (ODA) and Other Official Flows (OOF). She also briefed about the ‘Purpose codes’ which indicate which specific area of the recipient’s economic or social structure the flow intended to foster. She also spoke about the new developments OECD plans to undertake in the coming months. One of them was the inclusion of an additional Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) field at target level. While the inclusion of information on Goal 17 was not currently planned, there may be scope to discuss the possibility of doing so. However this topic is still under discussion, to be agreed by the members, and would be voluntary to report on. Elena concluded by informing the experts about the previous exercise undertaken with UN Environment regarding testing the feasibility of this database. The outcome of the testing was that the definition/measurement of environmentally sound technologies needs to be developed to extract data from this database.

### Data sets on investments, projects and transactions (Bloomberg New Energy Finance)

Felicia Jackson (SOAS London) then took the floor and spoke about the data sets tracked by Bloomberg New Energy Finance. She mentioned that it included data on various sources of finance including Venture Capital, Private Equity, Project Finance, Public markets (IPOs), Asset Finance, Balance sheet investment, Small-scale solar, Corporate and Public Research and Development (R&D). She mentioned that data can be extracted by sector, country and region to analyse trends. However, she added that BNEF does not have information on a transactional level. She suggested that social impact funds /climate funds etc. might be easier to track transactions and could be seen as an indicator.

### World Energy Investment Report (International Energy Agency)

Following Felicia's talk, Simon Bennett (IEA) presented highlights from IEA's World Energy Investment Report. This report tracked various assets including networks in the energy sector through balance sheet financing, project finance, green bonds, Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) etc. IEA accounts for projects when they come online rather than when they are commissioned to normalise. One interesting trend highlighted was that merely tracking dollar value could be misleading when there are changes in price points (example: falling cost of clean energy technology) as this is not a reflection of the uptake of technologies.

### Eurostat's Environmental Goods and Services (EGSS) and Environmental Protection Expenditure Accounts (EPEA)

Monika Wozowczyk (Eurostat) made a brief presentation on Eurostat's EGSS and EPEA accounts which tracked the adoption of environmental goods and services for European countries. The first account assessed the contribution Of EGSS to the total economy and its employment potential. The second account enabled identification and measurement of society's response to the supply of and demand for environmental protection services. Eurostat collects data on Environmental subsidies and similar transfers, Transfers to environmental producers (irrespective of the purpose), Transfers for provision of environmental specific services and goods (and of cleaner and resource efficient products). Transfers to 'green' the process of manufacturing of non-environmental products, Transfers to finance investments by environmental producers, Transfers to finance R&D expenditure relating to environmental protection and resource management.

### Statistics Canada's Environmental and Clean Technology Products Economic Account

Following the European perspective, Cindy LeCavalier (Statistics Canada) gave an overview of Environmental and Clean Technology Products Economic Account. This account measured the importance of environmental and clean technology products in the Canadian economy in terms of: Output, Gross domestic product (GDP), Employment (number of jobs), and other economic variables. Government of Canada developed a priority list<sup>4</sup> of clean technology goods and services for guidance. Experts also felt that it would be good to have guidance on what should not be included. Although the ECTPEA does not account for grants or subsidies to clean tech start-ups, some clean technology financial investments may be included into the clean tech portion of the "Research and development services" commodity. She also informed the group about a Federal government initiative underway to inventory the administrative data holdings related to clean technology.

### The challenges and feasibility of measuring finance towards EST at the national levels (Experiences from India and Latin America)

Ambuj Sagar (IIT-Delhi) shared some thoughts from the India context. He mentioned that tracking finance towards ESTs at the national level would require significant coordination between several ministries. He added that the expert group needed to focus on few priority categories/sectors (For example: Energy) which take up a large portion of GDP and are crucial for sustainable development and then provide relevant guidance on procedures and processes for these categories/sectors for a start. Daniel Bouille (Fundacion Bariloche) followed Ambuj and highlighted experiences from the Latin

---

<sup>4</sup> Statistics Canada, Clean technologies and the Survey of Environmental Goods and Services: A technical reference guide, <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/16-511-x/16-511-x2017001-eng.htm>



American context. With an example from Argentina's RenovAr Program, he made the case that it is not just sufficient to look only at the amount of international financial flows to determine success but also to take into account support needed to create enabling conditions, institutional and regulatory framework, capacity building and reinforcing. Most of the experts agreed that it was vital to consider both.

#### Discussion on measuring finance towards ESTs

The Expert Group agreed that it would be important to measure a range of different sources of finance, in order to better understand their respective roles in increasing the uptake of ESTs. They also stressed that it would be important to differentiate between irreversible funding (such as grants) and reversible financial flows (such as loans). The Group felt that it was important to gather information on both the role of public and private finance, to the extent possible. Where relevant data was not publicly available, UN Environment could explore the possibility of establishing new MOUs or partnerships with the hosting organisations.

While it was clear that there are a large number of existing initiatives and databases that are relevant for measuring financing for ESTs, there was no one single data source that provided a perfect match for the indicator. The Expert Group would therefore need to examine in more detail the various sources of data to determine which were the most useful and which may be feasible to use. In the end, a combination of several data sets may be required, encompassing data from both national and global levels, as well as information on public and private finance.

The Group also stressed that finance was only one aspect of ensuring successful access to and uptake of ESTs. They highlighted the key role of capacity development, and other enabling conditions. The most innovative equipment or hardware is useless without capacity, know-how and a multitude of other factors to guarantee their effective deployment. Support for promotion of technologies should therefore include the transfer of know-how. It would be important to consider both and, if possible, measure both, e.g. goods (hardware) and services (which would include capacity development). In this respect, there was significant discussion as to whether having a USD value as the sole indication of uptake of ESTs would be sufficient, and whether it would be possible to have other complementary units of measure, to provide a deeper understanding of the situation and dynamics related to the uptake of ESTs. The fact that an indicator solely tracking finance for ESTs could have misleading data due to fluctuations in pricing (for example reflecting reduced pricing due to their larger-scale deployment of certain technologies) also supported the aim to explore other potential complementary units of measure. The Group agreed that they would explore this aspect further following the meeting.

#### Outcomes of the discussion:

- Agreement among the experts that combination of several data sets may be required, encompassing data from both national and global levels, as well as information on public and private finance will be required.
- Experts highlighted that finance was not the only indicator of successful access to and uptake of ESTs. Potential complementary units of measure that reflect capacity development, and other enabling conditions should be explored.

#### Reframing Indicator 17.7.1

At the end of the workshop, the group revisited the indicator wording, to explore the possibility of revising the indicator in order to reflect:

1. The need for information on the uptake of ESTs globally
2. The importance of enabling conditions other than finance for the promotion of ESTs in developing countries

During the session, the Group developed the following amended indicator, comprised of three sub-indicators. They agreed that as a first step following the workshop, the members of the Expert Group would reflect further on appropriate units of measure, relevant data sources, and refine the indicator wording.

**17.7.1(a):** *Funding and other resources provided to (or received by) entities in developing countries, on favourable terms, for environmentally sound technologies*

- **17.7.1 (a)(1):** *Support for the development of enabling conditions and capacity in developing countries for the development, absorption, dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies*

**17.7.1(b):** *Total amount of funding for the development and deployment of Environmentally Sound Technologies*

Proposed Draft Indicator	Justification/Comments
<b>17.7.1(a): Funding and other resources provided to (or received by) entities in developing countries, on favourable terms, for environmentally sound technologies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In line with the spirit of the current indicator 17.7.1, this focusses on funding provided to developing country entities on favourable terms for ESTs.</li> <li>• The Group decided to include ‘other resources’, acknowledging the importance of other forms of in-kind support, such as seconded staff or technical support, or donated hardware, that could be quantified for the purposes of the indicator.</li> <li>• “Developing country entities” was included rather than ‘countries’ since it was felt that the beneficiaries should not be limited to national governments, but could encompass governments, non-governmental organisations and other actors.</li> <li>• This indicator would not only cover flows from developing to developing countries but also capture South-South cooperation.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>17.7.1 (a)(1): Support for the development of enabling conditions and capacity in developing countries for the development, absorption, dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experts recommended to include 17.7.1 (a) (1) as a subset of 17.7.1 (a).</li> <li>• This indicator would help track support for the development of enabling conditions (regulatory or legal framework, etc) and capacity building for the uptake of ESTs to developing countries.</li> <li>• Similar to 17.7.1 (a), this indicator would not only cover flows from developing to developing countries but also include South-South cooperation.</li> <li>• The unit of measure for this indicator is to be determined – either defining alternative appropriate units of measure to complement USD, or as a percentage of the total support under 17.7.1(a)</li> </ul>
<b>17.7.1(b): Total amount of funding for the development and deployment of Environmentally Sound Technologies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main reason for including this as a sub-indicator of 17.7.1 was that it is necessary to have a global picture (all countries) of the adoption and uptake of ESTs. For example: increased support for R&amp;D in developed countries drive down the cost of new technologies. Hence this plays an important role in transfer of ESTs to developed/developing countries at a lower cost.</li> <li>• This indicator could be a proxy for the ESTs market as a whole.</li> <li>• Data sources/sets could be a mix of international and national. Also it could include data from both the public and private sector.</li> </ul>



## Next steps, action points, roles and responsibilities

Timeline :	Topic :	Action :	Responsible :
By 12 April	<p><b>Share Meeting Outcome Document</b></p> <p><b>Request experts' availability for May webinar</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✚ Sharing meeting outcome and Next Steps + Doodle poll link to indicate availability for May webinar (2 hours)</li> <li>✚ UN Environment will set up an online work space for the Expert Group and upload relevant documents</li> </ul>	<b>UN Environment</b>
By 27 April	<b>Refining the indicator and data sources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✚ Experts will examine format: how many indicators/sub-indicators? Goals 17 and 12? Or only Goal 17?</li> <li>✚ Refine indicator wording</li> <li>✚ Define metrics, data-sets to be used (international/national) and reporting system</li> </ul> <p><b>Note :</b> Experts provide comments by email to Rashmi and mark a copy to Lily and Lowri</p>	<b>All Technical Expert Group members</b>
By 7 May	<b>UN Environment shares a proposal for the indicator and first elements of the methodology based on expert comments from the previous step</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✚ A proposal for the indicator will be shared based on the expert comments – to be discussed and finalized during the May Webinar</li> </ul>	<b>UN Environment</b>
Mid-May (Date : tbc based on Doodle poll)	<b>Second Webinar (2-hour) to discuss the latest indicator proposal and next steps</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✚ Webinar to discuss the latest proposal and next steps</li> </ul>	<b>UN Environment + Technical Expert Group members</b>
June 2018	<b>Develop reporting system</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✚ International Sources: Partnerships/agreements with partner agencies/organisations</li> <li>✚ National data: Reporting system - Survey?</li> </ul>	<b>UN Environment</b>
June-July 2018	<b>Develop Multi-Criteria Approach to identifying ESTs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✚ Develop criteria based on impact reduction, performance enhancements, and environmental purpose</li> </ul>	<p><b>Task Team :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sangwon Suh</li> <li>• Felicia Jackson</li> <li>• Sara Trærup</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
July-September 2018	<b>Develop Draft Guidance Manual for national governments on criteria for and management of ESTs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop draft elements of guidance manual:</li> <li>• 17.7.1 Indicator interpretation and application</li> <li>• Explain criteria for 'environmentally-sound'</li> </ul>	<p><b>Task Team:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sangwon Suh</li> <li>• Felicia Jackson</li> <li>• Sara Trærup</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contextually-specific information for consideration at national level</li> <li>Explore temporal element</li> <li>Practical step-wise approach to beginning to gather data at national level: Develop priority areas and data sources as a first step. Guidance on procedures and processes.</li> </ul> <p>✚ Explore potential decision-support tools</p>	
September – October 2018	Testing in countries/case studies	<p>✚ Consultations with the National Governments and case studies in several countries :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>China</li> <li>Oman?</li> <li>Canada?</li> <li>India?</li> <li>Chile?</li> <li>Argentina?</li> <li>Kenya</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>China (Can Wang)</li> <li>Oman (Steve Halls ?)</li> <li>Canada (Statistics Canada ?)</li> <li>India (Ambuj Sagar)</li> <li>Chile (Enzo?)</li> <li>Argentina (Daniel Bouille?)</li> <li>Kenya (UN Environment)</li> </ul>
October-November 2018	Refinement and Finalisation of Methodology and Guidance Manual for national governments on criteria for and management of ESTs	<p>✚ Based on the experiences shared by the national governments and case studies, experts refine and finalise the Guidance Manual</p>	<p><b>Technical Expert Group members + UN Environment</b></p>
October-November 2018	Submission of methodology and indicator upgrade request to the IAEG-SDG	<p>✚ Submission of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Methodology document,</li> <li>Tier Upgrade request and justification, and</li> <li>Proposed indicator reformulation to the IAEG-SDG for formal adoption</li> </ol>	<p><b>UN Environment</b></p>
November-December 2018	Outreach to countries on methodology and guidance manual	<p>✚ Depending on funding, outreach events and capacity building on the methodology and guidance manual</p>	<p><b>UN Environment with support of members of the Technical Expert Group</b></p>

## Meeting Documents

All the presentations made during the March meeting (28-29 March) are available in the 'Shared Documents' section of the online workspace [here](#).

## For Further Information

Please contact UN Environment Economy Division (contact people: Rashmi Jawahar, [Rashmi.Jawahar@un.org](mailto:Rashmi.Jawahar@un.org) and Lily Riahi, [lily.riahi@un.org](mailto:lily.riahi@un.org)) and from the Science Division (Lowri Angharad Rees, [Lowri.rees@un.org](mailto:Lowri.rees@un.org)).

## Annex – Meeting Participants List

S.No	Name of Expert	Affiliated Organisation/Institution
<i>Experts who participated in-person</i>		
1	Felicia Jackson	SOAS London
2	Monika Wozowczyk	Eurostat
3	Sangwon Suh	University of California
4	Ambuj Sagar	IIT –Delhi
5	Enzo Sauma	Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile
6	Asher Lessels	UNFCCC
7	Daniel Bouille	Fundacion Bariloche
8	Cindy Le Cavalier	Statistics Canada
9	Patrick Nussbaumer	CTCN/UNIDO
10	Elena Bernaldo	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
11	John Neate	VerifiGlobal
12	Steve Halls	Ministry of Environment, Oman
13	Ioanna Kourti	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
14	Sara Trærup	DTU Partnership
15	Simon Bennett	International Energy Agency
<i>Experts who participated online</i>		
16	Juan Hoffmaister	Green Climate Fund
17	Min Soo Kim	Green Climate Fund
18	Julie Wells	RECP South Africa
19	Rabhi Abdel Salaam	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies
20	Heleen De Connick	Radboud University)