

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	2
II. METHODOLOGY	3
III. LIST OF INDICATORS	5

I- INTRODUCTION

During 2013, the Secretariat in accordance with the MAP programme of work 2012-2013 developed the draft guidelines for updating NAPs that were adopted by the Contracting Parties between 2003-2005, in the framework of Article 5 of the LBS Protocol of the Barcelona Convention. The NAP update guidelines included a number of technical annexes regarding criteria for the assessment of hotspots, NAP follow-up and reporting indicators, etc.

Regarding the NAP follow up and reporting indicators in particular, Annex E of the NAP update guidelines provided a comprehensive list of potential indicators, which were consistent with regional and international reporting requirements. The criteria for listing the indicators included ECAP monitoring indicators, national pollutant load indicators (NBB), indicators related to the legally binding measures under the regional plans adopted by the Contracting Parties in the framework of Article 15 of the LBS Protocol, and relevant indicators elaborated under other policy frameworks such as MSSD, H2020 initiative, relevant MEA, etc.

At the meeting of the MEDPOL FP held on 26-28 March 2014 (Athens), the document “Draft Guidelines for Updating National Action Plans (NAPs)” (UNEP(DEPI)MED WG.394/4) was presented, reviewed and generally endorsed by countries, which were asked to provide inputs and comments regarding Annexes. On the other hand, the Secretariat was asked to undertake a priority exercise of the potential list of NAP follow up and reporting indicators taking into account a number of potential criteria including the mandatory nature of each of them, with the aim to obtain a shortlist of common NAP indicators for the region.

In this context, the present document represent the first effort to review the list of the potential NAP follow up and reporting indicators presented in Annex E of the NAP update guidelines, and propose criteria to prioritize them. The present document analyses this list and the methodology for the selection of criteria and a scoring system will be discussed during the meeting to be held 16-17 June 2014 (Ankara) in the framework of the SEIS project.

II- METHODOLOGY

The list of the potential proposed indicators for following up NAP implementation included in Annex E of NAP update guidelines (document UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.394/10) has been first checked against the following agreed indicators:

- a) MAP effectiveness indicators adopted in COP 16
- b) MAP reporting system adopted by COP 15
- c) MSSD indicators, 2005
- d) Indicators with regards to other relevant policy frameworks, mainly Horizon 2020 Initiative and IWRM (Integrated Water Resources Management)
- e) Indicators agreed in the framework of relevant MEA.

Once a complete list of potential indicators is obtained, a selection process is undergone to shortlist a number of common indicators. In general, official indicators are selected based on a thematic approach as it facilitates the connection with the target and political processes, while providing a clear message to policy makers.

The list consists of a spreadsheet with all the potential indicators (rows) and contains the following fields (columns) for each of them: Indicator code, Indicator title, Units, SAP/NBB sector, Link to ECAP/Regional plans targets, Link to other policy frameworks, Type of indicator (D = Driving force, P = Pressure, S = State, I = Impact, R = Response), Description, Data source, Criteria and Total.

In general, according to the selection criteria used for the Sustainable Development Indicators of the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UN-CSD)¹ an indicator has to be:

- Conceptually well founded.
- Understandable (clear, simple and unambiguous).
- Based on data that is readily available or available at a reasonable cost, adequately documented, of good quality and updated at regular intervals.
- Within the capacities of the governments to implement, given logistics, time, technical and other constraints.

For this purpose, the listed potential indicators are prioritized based on the methodology from Plan Bleu RAC of UNEP/MAP. A criterion on the mandatory nature of the indicator within MAP framework has also been included. The criteria for each indicator is classified into four main areas:

- a) Mandatory nature
- b) Relevant
- c) Measurable
- d) Understandable

Mandatory nature: Not Mandatory=0; Overall objective (Mandatory but not legally binding)=1; Legally binding=2

- Legally binding indicators can be those related to requirements or measures established by the Barcelona Convention, Protocols, Regional plans adopted in the framework of Article 15 of the LBS Protocol.

¹ UNDESA, 2007. Indicators of Sustainable Development: Guidelines and Methodologies, 3rd Edition.
<http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/natlinfo/indicators/guidelines.pdf>

- Overall objective: those indicators that track the achievement of a related objective/target, e.g. from non legally binding regional plans or SAP MED, ECAP indicators or MAP effectiveness indicators that have been adopted or approved by COP but are not strictly legally binding by themselves.
- Non mandatory indicators but smart and useful for assessment purposes.

Relevant. For each of the single criterion:

- Meaningful: indicators closely linked to the related objectives/targets.
- Applicable to different regions or scales.
- Conceptually sound.
- Responsive to change.
- Useful to decision makers.

The following score is assigned:

"0" (= does not meet the criteria) ,

"1" (= more or less meets the criteria) or

"2" (= meets the criteria)

Measurable. For each of the single criterion:

- Based on data readily available
- Cost-effective

The following score is assigned:

"0" (= does not meet the criteria) ,

"1" (= more or less meets the criteria) or

"2" (= meets the criteria)

For each indicator, a total score is deducted from 0 to 18, with a score of 18 meaning that the indicator perfectly meets all the criteria.

The list of 51 potential indicators analyzed in this context based on the above criteria is presented in the next section. The Secretariat has completed the columns related to title, description, type of the indicator as well as the scoring for the criteria related to mandatory nature of the indicators. The participants of the meeting are expected to undertake a scoring analysis with regards to the other proposed criteria during the meeting.

