Framework contract for Expert assistance on State of the Environment Reporting (SOER2005) and indicator-related activities

Criteria for the selection of the EEA core set of indicators

The indicators in the core set should:

Detailed criteria	Key word	Sections in Indicator profile (IP)* which are relevant to assessment of criteria	Form of assessment
1. Be *policy relevant* - support EU policies' priority issues of increasing policy relevance (on the basic of available EU policy documentation, DG environment work programme..)	policy relevance	2.2 policy questions 1.6. countries consultation	Yes/no % and number of countries which consider indicator relevant
2. Monitor *progress toward the quantified targets* (if there is no targets than use thresholds)	progress toward the targets	2.2.4 policy targets	Yes/no
3. Be based on *ready available and routinely collected data* for EEA countries within specified timescale (to be determined country by country) at reasonable cost-benefit ratio	routinely collected data	3.5. sources of data 3.5. reporting obligation 3.5. data sets used 1.6.countries consultation	Number of sources Number of reporting obligations for the indicator (distinguish between legal, moral and well established data flows outside both) Number of the data sets used for the indicator % and number of countries which in consultation indicated availability of data in ST, MT or LT
4. Be consistent in *space coverage and cover all or most of EEA countries*	space coverage	3.1. target coverage (countries required to report from reporting obligation) 11 actual coverage (available data from countries included in the indicator	Number of countries Number of countries

		calculation)	
5. Time coverage – sufficient/insufficient time trends (exemptions of general nature to be verified – e.g. situation of candidate countries)	time series	3.2. target coverage target time series depends on RO request 11 actual coverage (number of years covered in indicator)	Number of years (difficult to assess) Number of years
6. Primarily be national in *scale* and representative for countries (countries benchmarking)	national scale and representatives for countries	3.5. data sources (verification from countries) 3.5. space and temporal requirements 3.4. Quality of national data sets 4 methodology	Yes/no Good/bad/ Short identification of problems
7. Be *understandable* and simple	understandability	2.1. indicator definition 6 presentation of indicator	Yes/no
8. *Be conceptually and methodologically* well founded and representative (to be used by at least one community or international organization) and on the bases of well established consultation with countries	methodologically well founded	2.3.2. usage of indicator in the international organizations 4. methodology exists; described methodology ensure calculation of indicator clearly; scientific references to the methodology	Yes/no and number of organizations Yes/no Yes/no Yes/no
9. EEA priorities in management plan	priority topics	link with management plan	Yes/no

Additional 2 criteria will be assessed in future updating circles.

10. Be timely (be produced in reasonable and "useful" time)	timeliness	3.5 update frequency of data sets and reporting date -actual publication of indicator (6 months for CSI)	Time lag between reported data and publishing of indicator: -reporting obligation dates - date of publishing
11. *Indicator well documented and of known quality*	transparency clearness and quality of the process	documentation on metadata part and fact sheet part	fulfilled obligatory parts of indicator profile

See template of indicator profile (available in CIRCA as Annex 4) that will be used to describe indicators in CSI Manual.

The section numbers and text in this column correspond to the template structure.

1. Policy relevance is checked by policy questions linked to policy documents and by results of countries consultation.

2. Progress toward the targets is checked by information in policy documents. If targets are not available than thresholds could be used.

3. Available and routinely collected data are checked through reporting obligations of the countries. It provides information on linkage of the indicator to data, which should be available. This criteria support streamlining of the data flows. If data are not part of reporting obligation in agreement with countries could be decided to include indicator anyway and/or to plan data collection. It ensure also that indicator is updated regularly.

4. and 5. Space and temporal coverage shows actual coverage of reported data and in relation to demands from reporting obligations. On the bases of this quality of indicator can be assessed. If coverage is not sufficient indicator can't be part of core set. Even if indicator is once included and non-reporting from countries provides bad quality of indicator, it can be excluded. It should motivate countries on reporting.

6. National scale and representatives of data for country enable countries benchmarking (very highly aggregated indicators, global indicators or indicators where national data don't provide appropriate information for the country-either due to geographical coverage or bad quality of data, can't be used for countries benchmarking). For this reason countries should also agree on data sources used for calculation of indicators.

7.Understandability of indicators is provided by clear definition of indicator (with unites) and appropriate presentation of the indicator. Contradictory messages shouldn't occur (crosschecking across Core set is needed) but when it happens they should be explained.

8. If the indicator is **methodologically well founded** can be shown by description of methodology used, formula used, stated scientific references for this and if indicator is used in other indicator initiatives also.

9. <u>**Topics covered and priorities**</u> depends on the EEA management plan and frame the core set as whole and support annual update of it.

<u>**10. Timeliness**</u> of indicator should enable for core set indicators to be published 6 months after collection of the data. It is quality criteria, which will be checked later after approval of Core set through Indicator management system.

<u>**11. Well documented and qualitative indicators**</u> are defined by documentation available for indicators, regularly update and management. It will be supported also by developed indicator management system, which will provide transparency and bases for better management of the process for indicator production and publishing.