



**MINUTES OF THE 58th MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING
held on 24 November 2010**

Approved by the Chairman of the Management Board on 16 March 2011

_____ *SIGNED* _____

Dr Karsten Sach
Chairman EEA Management

Record of proceedings:

The Chairman Dr Karsten Sach opened the meeting by welcoming new Board members and presenting apologies on behalf of those members unable to attend. The following tabled documents were acknowledged during the course of the meeting (list included after the agenda in Annex 1).

Final agenda:	Annex 1
Attendance list:	Annex 2
Action list:	Annex 3
Decision list:	Annex 4
Summary MB seminar	Annex 5

Item 1 Adoption of draft agenda

The Board adopted the tabled agenda (Doc. EEA/MB/58/01rev2 on ([CIRCA](#)) without changes.

Item 2 Adoption of the 57th Management Board minutes, 16 June 2010

The Board adopted the minutes of the 57th MB meeting held on 16 June 2010 with minor changes. The final version (Doc. EEA/MB/58/02-final) of the minutes is available on [CIRCA](#).

The members also took note of the tabled MB rolling action list.

ITEMS 3-5 FOR INFORMATION

Item 3 Draft minutes of the 52nd Bureau meeting, 5 October 2010

The members took note of the draft minutes from the May Bureau meeting that had been sent to them for information.

Item 4 Update by the Chairman (oral)

Under this item the Chairman updated the MB on the following issues:

- Council conclusions to be adopted in the Environment Council in December could cover issues of importance for the work of the Agency, including SEIS and a possible 7th Environmental Action Program
- Third meeting of MB Chairs of EU Agencies on 5 October (same days as the Bureau). The minutes of this meeting will be distributed as soon as they become available
- Potential MB written procedures on the AMP2011 and Budget 2011, to be discussed under their respective items
- Implementing Rules of Staff (IRS): these will be endorsed through MB written procedure as they become available

Item 5 Update by the Executive Director, including plans for the SOER2010 launch in Brussels on 30 November and update on the establishment of the new ETCs

Taking the progress report as read (Doc.EEA/MB/58/05), the Executive Director highlighted the following issues:

- Launch of the SOER2010 report in Brussels, as well as the different parts of the report (Synthesis, Megatrends, Country assessments)
- ENDS: a list of ENDS needs for 2011 had been sent for information. The official launch of the call will be sent in early 2011.
- ETCs: reference to tabled letter from RIVM ([CIRCA](#)). New ETCs on track to start activities in January 2011
- Russian Federation: the Executive Director had attended a meeting in DUMA on convergence and SEIS, followed by a second meeting at the EEA. The outcome of such meetings was a tentative agreement on a set of joint projects (forest and land cover, SEIS, long-range transport and pollutants, the creation of a web-based portal on handling waste and hazardous chemicals, GMES, space technology and training using information for sustainable development), all under the EU-Russia framework dialog

In addition, the Executive Director announced that UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme) will be promoting SOER2010 through their portal.

The Board members congratulated the Agency on the SOER2010 report, and further discussed its different components of the report and the implications of possible conclusions from the upcoming Environment Council (see item 4). The MB welcomed the possibility of continuous updating of the country assessments

in the website, and encouraged the Agency to use the same system for other reports.

With reference to the list of ENDS for 2011, the MB recommended to rephrase the job descriptions in order to make them more attractive for countries, and to develop a short paper outlining the benefits that ENDS bring to the national institutions.

In closing, the Chairman thanked the Agency for the efforts and work done for the SOER2010 report, which had been a shared endeavour from experts in the Agency and countries alike. In addition, he recommended to hold a discussion on the lessons learned from this process in 2011.

ITEMS 6-12 FOR DECISION / GUIDANCE

Item 6 SEIS, Inspire, GMES, GEOSS, and 'Group of Four' developments

The EEA gave a presentation based on doc.EEA/MB/58/06, which highlighted the main elements for the discussion to follow (see [CIRCA](#)), amongst them:

- GMES: new regulation in force since 9 November 2010 and main implications for EEA
- Main elements of the SEIS conference in Brussels (29 November-1 December)
- Collaboration with Go4 partners
- New ICT strategy 2011

In addition, the Executive Director informed the MB about the agreement reached at the GIO summit in Beijing, by which a task force for the in-situ monitoring and modelling would be set in 2011. The Agency would organise a meeting in May to launch this process.

Further to that, Christine Berg, Head of the GMES Bureau since 1 October 2010, informed the Board members on the work being done by the Bureau:

- Working closely with institutional users in order to define the requirements for future land monitoring services, and carrying out the same work in areas such as atmospheric and marine monitoring services
- Governance of GMES: there is a process of validation with Member States (MS) the user requirements before starting to put these services into permanent operations, and before delegating tasks to the EEA
- SEIS conference in Brussels: aiming at a discussion with MS to build over the work done in past years, and to formalise it as quickly as possible in order to enter the operational phase. In the current economic situation the focus is on the essential services, ensuring they are operational, and in a second phase look into additional services

Ms Berg requested from the Board members that they would agree to give a mandate to the EEA Executive Director to start negotiations with the European Commission (EC) for an agreement by which the EC could delegate to the EEA

the operational services function for the land service monitoring. This would allow the Agency to hire new staff from the GMES Bureau budget.

In the discussion that followed, the Board members raised questions on the implications for the work of the Agency, including budgetary implications and staffing. With regard to the financing aspect of GMES, the Executive Director made a reference to the Agency's reply to Paul Weissenberg (, clarifying that the staff to be hired would be time-limited Contract Agents from 2011-2013. With them in place, the Agency would ensure having the best service components and that the data management in-house is handled properly in relation to Eionet. In recognising that not all answers are available at this point in time, the Executive Director assured that the EEA was looking into the kind of applications that could be built around these GMES services. The Agency's core job is to ensure best use of national data collection, monitoring and observing.

On the partnership with ESRI, the Executive Director clarified that the Agency would be able to offer to the Eionet network free access to software and the different platforms that could be used for viewing and downloading services of geospatial data including GMES services.

The representative of the European Commission stressed the importance of ensuring proper representation in the GMES Users Forum and the need to strengthen the dialog between those involved in Eionet and policy makers.

The expert nominated by the European Parliament expressed the need to bring on board major users from outside of the Eionet network. Eionet members are data providers more than users.

The representative from the JRC informed the MB that the Centre's role in Inspire is continuing until 2013, and that the data specification for the Inspire regulation was nearly ready for approval. In addition he told the Board members that the JRC was regularly meeting with Eurostat and DG Environment on various aspects of Inspire, including the way forward.

On SEIS, the JRC was planning to organise a workshop on how to obtain the cross thematic coherence in the data. In addition, he welcomed the paper on the ICT and invited the EEA to discuss it further with the Go4 partners.

Further to that, the representative from the European Commission informed the Board members that the Commission was actively working on the SEIS implementation plan. The Commission had aimed at having a draft at the end of 2010, but the production of the implementation plan had been delayed. A likely timetable would be having the draft ready in early 2011 and aiming at adopting it in the second quarter of 2011.

The Board members recommended stronger coordination between Go4 partners and Member States, strengthened streamlining and cooperation on ICT activities, as well as receiving regular updates on the different areas outlined in the paper.

In closing, the MB agreed to mandate the EEA to enter in negotiations for a Delegation agreement with the GMES Bureau and stressed again the need for further streamlining of reporting requirements.

Item 7 Conclusions from the MB seminar on 23 November

The Board welcomed the fruitful discussions held during the MB seminar and the active participation from all involved. The members supported the need for a more in-depth discussion on the resource efficiency aspect of EU2020, Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), budget and other horizontal issues, at the first Bureau and MB meetings in 2011. The Agency would prepare a paper containing elements such as how to streamline indicators and make them more policy relevant than in the past, clearer overview on how to support the resource efficiency flagship, and support to the CAP reform.

Further to that, the Board members advised to develop a paper with short-term and long-term aims, encouraging the Agency to have close discussions with the Commission to develop the short-term aims in areas such as the resource efficiency flagship and green economy. Moreover, the future role of the EEA and its bodies (MB and SC, see item 12) should be discussed at the next Bureau and MB.

For more information, see the seminar summary points in Annex 5 to the minutes.

Item 8 Approval of the EEA Annual Management Plan 2011

Further to doc. EEA/MB/58/08, the MB members were informed that the AMP2011 could not be approved on the day due to the lack of the European Commission's Opinion on the EEA AMP2011. The AMP2011 would have to be approved through MB written procedure as soon as the Opinion becomes available.

Further to that, the Executive Director thanked all members for their comments, which are fully available in the AMP2011 consultation portal(
<http://forum.eionet.europa.eu/>)

The representative from the European Commission (EC) informed that the Interservice consultation was about to be launched that week and should be ready before the end of the year.

Item 9a Approval of the EEA Annual budget 2011 and other upcoming R

The Chairman and the Executive Director informed of the different scenarios linked to the approval of the overall EU budget by the budgetary authorities, and the discussions held between the Council and the EP on that matter (see annex 4 of doc.EEA/MB/58/9a).

The Board members would receive in late December a proposal to approve through MB written procedure, either the EEA Budget 2011 or the Twelfths – commitments and payments, depending on the outcome of the discussions by the budgetary authorities.

The Board members took note of the process.

Item 9b Approval of Amended Budget 2010

Further to doc.EEA/MB/58/9b, the Executive Director informed that the amendment represented the operational support to the AoA, indicating that the sum from Norway`s contribution would be spent in 2010, ensuring that the budget line would not be expanded further than May 2011 when the AoA report has to be finalised.

The Board approved the amended Budget 2010 on condition that the EC had no objections, which would have to be sent to the Agency in writing by the end of the week.

Item 10 Approval of Eurostat Work Programme 2011

The Board approved the Eurostat Work Programme 2011, congratulating Eurostat for the excellent cooperation and constructive way by which the MB comments raised during the consultation period had been taken on board.

Item 11 Prolongation of 2 Vice-Chairs/Bureau members

Following the information provided in doc. EEA/MB/58/11 and the Chairman`s letter from 13 October 2010, recommending the prolongation of Elisabeth Freytag and Erzsèbet Gergely as Vice-Chairs/Bureau members, the MB approved their prolongation as second three-year term.

Further to that, and due to the fact that M^a Jesús Rodríguez de Sancho, former MB Spain and Vice-Chair/Bureau member, had to step down a few days before the MB meeting, and thus leaving a vacancy in the Bureau, the Chairman proposed to nominate Martin Seychell, MB Malta, as Vice-Chair/Bureau member. This nomination would not exclude future applications from the MB membership to the fifth seat in the Bureau (currently vacant).

The Board elected Martin Seychell as Vice-Chair/Bureau member.

In closing, the member from the Czech Republic suggested to consider nominations from non-EU countries for future Bureau vacancies. The Chairman agreed to take this discussion at the first Bureau and MB meetings in 2011, clarifying that non-EU countries would have to have an observer status, rather than being Bureau members with full voting rights.

Item 12 Prolongation of Scientific Committee memberships

The Chairman of the Scientific Committee (SC) introduced the item, informing the Board members of the SC members due to be prolonged, and the decision taken at the last SC meeting on the prolongation lengths (see doc. EEA/MB/58/12 on [CIRCA](#)).

Further to that, the SC Chairman informed that the SC was undergoing a revision of its work and asked the MB for feedback on areas where they would think the focus of SC work could be useful, as well as the size and areas of expertise.

It was agreed to have a discussion at the Bureau in February and MB in March on the areas of expertise needed for the future SC call for experts, to take place in late 2011/early 2012.

The MB approved the prolongation of SC memberships as proposed.

ITEMS 13-14 – FOR INFORMATION

Item 13 Observations of the auditors

The Board members took note of the information provided in Doc. EEA/MB/58/13. In addition, the Executive Director told the MB that Court of Auditors (CoA) would be visiting the Agency the week after the MB meeting.

Item 14 Feedback from members of the Management Board

Under this item the MB member from Hungary gave a short presentation outlining the priorities of the Hungarian Presidency ([CIRCA](#)).

In closing, the Chairman of the Board and the Executive Director paid farewell to John Custance, MB UK, who would be stepping down after December 2010 and (in absentia) M^a Jesús Rodríguez de Sancho, MB Spain. The Chairman and Executive Director thanked both for their work and contributions to the Board discussions.

The meeting closed at 16.50

ANNEX 1 to MB minutes

Subject: Draft agenda of the 58th Management Board meeting

FOR DECISION

1. Adoption of draft agenda
2. Adoption of the 57th Management Board minutes, 16 June 2010

FOR INFORMATION

3. Draft minutes of the 52nd Bureau meeting, 5 October 2010
4. Update by the Chairman
5. Update by the Executive Director, including plans for the SOER2010 launch in Brussels on 30 November and update on the establishment of the new ETCs

FOR DECISION / GUIDANCE

6. SEIS, Inspire, GMES, GEOSS and 'Group of Four' developments
7. Conclusions from the MB Seminar on 23 November 2010
8. Approval of the EEA Annual Management Plan 2011
- 9a. Approval of the Annual Budget 2011 and other upcoming multiannual projects/activities
- 9b. Approval of amended Budget 2010
10. Approval of Eurostat Work Programme 2011
11. Prolongation of 2 Vice-Chairs/Bureau members
12. Prolongation of Scientific Committee memberships

FOR INFORMATION

13. Observations of the auditors
14. Feedback from members of the Management Board, incl. short presentation on the priorities of the Hungarian EU Presidency

Tabled documents:

- 01 Draft agenda 58th Management Board, rev.2
- 02 Rolling action list
- 09a Approval Annual Budget 2011, Annex 4
- 09b Approval amended Budget 2010

ANNEX 2

58th EEA Management Board meeting – Attendance list

Conference room, 24 November 2010

MEMBER COUNTRIES			
COUNTRY	NAME	ORGANISATION	SIGNATURE
	<i>Chairman:</i> Karsten SACH	Chairman of the EEA Management Board	Signed
AUSTRIA	<i>Member:</i> Elisabeth FREYTAG	Ministry of Environment	Signed
	<i>Alternate:</i> Georg REBERNIG	Umweltbundesamt	
BELGIUM	<i>Member:</i> Véronique VERBEKE	Institut Bruxellois pour la gestion de l'environnement	Signed
	<i>Alternate:</i> Philipp D'Hondt		
BULGARIA	<i>Member:</i> Vanya GRIGOROVA	Bulgarian Environment Agency	Signed
CYPRUS	<i>Member:</i>	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment	Apologies
	<i>Alternate:</i> Charalambos HAJIPAKKOS	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment	
CZECH REPUBLIC	<i>Member:</i> Veronika HUNT ŠAFRÁNKOVÁ	Ministry of Environment	Signed
	<i>Alternate:</i> Helen HŮLOVÁ	Ministry of Environment	
DENMARK	<i>Member:</i> Henrik Hedemann OLSEN	Agency for Spatial and Environmental Planning	Signed
	<i>Alternate:</i> Helle PILSGAARD	Agency for Spatial and Environmental Planning	Signed
	<i>Expert:</i> Esben TIND	Agency for Spatial and Environmental Planning	
ESTONIA	<i>Member:</i> Allan GROMOV	Ministry of Environment	Signed
	<i>Alternate:</i> Andres KRATOVITS	Ministry of Environment	
FINLAND	<i>Member:</i> Laura HÖIJER	Ministry of Environment	Signed
	<i>Alternate:</i> Antero HONKASALO	Ministry of Environment	
FRANCE	<i>Member:</i> Michèle ROUSSEAU	Ministère de l'écologie et du développement durable	Signed
	<i>Alternate:</i> Marie BONNET	Ministère de l'écologie et du développement durable	

	<u>Expert:</u> Valery MORARD	NFP	Signed
GERMANY	<u>Member:</u>	Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz & Reaktorsicherheit	Signed
	<u>Alternate:</u> Julia WERNER		
	<u>Expert:</u>		
GREECE	<u>Member:</u> Maria PEPPA	Ministry of Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works	Signed
	<u>Alternate:</u>		
HUNGARY	<u>Member:</u> Erzsébet GERGELY	Ministry of Environment	Signed
ICELAND	<u>Member:</u> Hermann SVEINBJÖRNSSON	Ministry of Environment The Environmental Agency	Signed
	<u>Alternate:</u> Gunnar Steinn JONSSON		
IRELAND	<u>Member:</u> John McCARTHY	Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government Environmental Protection Agency	Apologies
	<u>Alternate:</u> Mary KELLY		
ITALY	<u>Member:</u> Corrado CLINI	Ministerio dell'Ambiente Ministerio dell'Ambiente	Apologies Signed
	<u>Alternate:</u> Giuliana GASPARRINI		
LATVIA	<u>Member:</u> Andris EGLĀS	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development Latvian Environment Agency	Signed
	<u>Alternate:</u> Andris LEITASS		
LIECHTENSTEIN	<u>Member:</u> Felix NÄSCHER	Ministry of Environment, Dept. Forests, Nature and Landscape	Apologies
LITHUANIA	<u>Member:</u> Aleksandras SPRUOGIS	Ministry of Environment Environmental Protection Agency	Signed
	<u>Alternate:</u> Liutauras STOSKUS		
LUXEMBOURG	<u>Member:</u> Eric DE BRABANTER	Ministère de l'Environnement Ministère de l'Environnement	Apologies
	<u>Alternate:</u> Pierre PRUM		
	<u>Expert:</u> Marguy KOHNEN		
MALTA	<u>Member:</u> Martin SEYCHELL	Environment and Planning Authority Environment and Planning Authority	Signed
	<u>Alternate:</u> Louis VELLA		
THE NETHERLANDS	<u>Member:</u> Kees PLUG	Ministry of Housing, Physical Planning and	Apologies

	<u>Alternate:</u> Adriaan OUDEMAN	Environment Ministry of Housing, Physical Planning and Environment	Signed
NORWAY	<u>Member:</u> Ellen HAMBRO <u>Alternate:</u> Øysten NESJE	Climate and Pollution Agency Ministry of Environment	Signed
POLAND	<u>Member:</u> Andrzes JAGUSIEWICZ <u>Alternate:</u> Lucyna DYGAS CIOLKOWSKA	Chief Inspectorate for Environmental Protection NFP	Signed
PORTUGAL	<u>Member:</u> Mario GRACIO <u>Alternate:</u> Anabela TRINIDADE	Ministério do Ambiente, do Ordenamento do Território e do Desenvolvimento Regional Ministério do Ambiente, do Ordenamento do Território e do Desenvolvimento Regional	Signed Signed
ROMANIA	<u>Member:</u> Iosif NAGY <u>Alternate:</u> <u>Expert:</u> Madalina COZMA	National Environmental Protection Agency National Environmental Protection Agency	Signed Signed
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	<u>Member:</u> <u>Alternate:</u> Vladimir BENKO	Slovak Environment Agency Slovak Environment Agency	Signed
SLOVENIA	<u>Member:</u> Silvo ŽLEBIR	Environmental Agency	Signed
SPAIN	<u>Member:</u> Jesús HUERTAS GARCÍA <u>Alternate:</u> Javier CACHÓN DE MESA	Ministerio de Medio Ambiente Ministerio de Medio Ambiente	Signed Signed
SWEDEN	<u>Member:</u> Maria ÅGREN <u>Alternate:</u> Martin ERIKSSON	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency Swedish Environmental Protection Agency	
SWITZERLAND	<u>Member:</u> Bruno OBERLE <u>Alternate:</u> Gérard POFFET <u>Expert:</u> Nicolas PERRITAZ	Federal Office for the Environment Federal Office for the Environment NFP	Apologies Signed Signed
TURKEY	<u>Member:</u> Lütfi AKÇA <u>Alternate:</u> Sedat KADOĞLU <u>Expert:</u> Cagatay DIKMEN	Ministry of Environment and Forestry Ministry of Environment and Forestry Ministry of Environment and Forestry, NFP	Signed Signed
UNITED KINGDOM	<u>Member:</u> John CUSTANCE <u>Alternate:</u>	Dept. for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs	Signed
EUROPEAN COMMISSION	<u>Member:</u> Robin MIÈGE <u>Alternate:</u> Leendert HORDIJK	DG Environment Joint Research Centre	Signed Signed

	<u>Expert:</u>	Christine BERG	European Commission	Signed
	<u>Expert:</u>	Peter WICKS	DG Environment	Signed
	<u>Member:</u>	Manuela SOARES	DG Research	Signed
	<u>Alternate:</u>	Pedro DIAZ MUNOZ	Eurostat – Sectoral and regional statistics	Apologies
	<u>Expert:</u>	Birgit de BOISSEZON	DG Research	
	<u>Expert:</u>	Christian HEIDORN	Eurostat – Sectoral and regional statistics	Signed
EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT	<u>Member:</u>	Ludger-Anselm VERSTEYL	Prof. Versteysl Rechtsanwälte	Signed
	<u>Member:</u>	Michael SCOULLOS	University of Athens	Signed
	<u>Alternate:</u>	Ludo HOLSBECK	Free University of Brussels	
	<u>Alternate:</u>	Tomás MARCHESCU		
EEA SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE	<u>Guest:</u>	Detlef Sprinz	Chair, EEA Scientific Committee	Signed
EEA STAFF		Jacqueline McGLADE	Executive Director	Signed
		Gordon McINNIS	Deputy Director, Head of Programme GAN	Signed
		Chris STEENMANS	Head of programme, SES	Signed
		Jock MARTIN	Head of programme, IAS	Signed
		Petra FAGERHOLM	Head of Group, EDO1	Signed
		Elena OSTÁRIZ	Management Board secretariat	Signed

ANNEX 3 DRAFT ACTION LIST

ACTIONS	Status 17 January 2011
To publish on CIRCA the final minutes of the 57 th Management Board meeting	Done
EEA to develop a summary of main points from MB seminar	Done for the Bureau
EEA to prepare a draft paper on the roles of EEA, its bodies (MB and SC) and EU2020, including for the 53 rd Bureau and 59 th MB	Done for the Bureau
To keep the decision item on SEIS, GMES, GEO, INSPIRE as a living document	Ongoing
EEA to send the Annual Budget 2011 for approval through MB written procedure when the Community budget is ready	Done in December 2010
EEA to send the AMP 2011 for approval through MB written procedure as soon as the EC Opinion is ready	To do

ANNEX 4

DECISIONS taken at the 58th Management Board meeting, 24 November 2010, EEA

Agenda item	Decisions	Comments
Item 2. Adoption of agenda	Adopted	The Board adopted the agenda of the 58 th Management Board with minor changes
Item 3. Adoption of the 57 th Management Board minutes, 16 June 2010	Adopted	Adopted with an addition to the discussion on GMES
Item 6. SEIS, Inspire, GMES, GEOSS and 'Group of Four' developments	Took note of the information in the paper, in particular with regard to GMES activities, and provided guidance on the further steps	The Board recommended stronger coordination between Go4 members and MS, strengthened streamlining and cooperation on ICT activities. The MB agreed that the EEA enters in negotiations for a Delegation agreement with the GMES Bureau
Item 7. Conclusions from the MB Seminar on 23 November 2010	The Board welcomed the topic of resource efficiency, the green economy and physical ecosystem accounting as very timely and interesting	Agreed to circulate a summary with main bullet points raised in the round-table discussions as soon as possible. The MB will have a more in-depth discussion at the meeting in March 2011.
Item 8. Approval of the EEA Annual Management Plan 2011	The Board will adopt the EEA AMP 2011 through MB written procedure, taking into account the tabled opinion of the European Commission and of the EEA Scientific Committee	The members took note of the state of affairs and agreed to approve the EEA AMP2011 through MB written procedure, once the European Commission opinion on AMP2011 is available.

Item 9. Approval of the Annual Budget 2011 and other upcoming multiannual projects/activities	The Board will approve the EEA Annual Budget 2011 through MB written procedure, taking into account the outcome of the negotiations between the Council and the European Parliament in the Conciliation Committee	The adoption of the EEA budget 2011 is conditional upon the approval by the budgetary authorities of the subsidy to the Agency within the Community budget for 2011, as well as the EEA establishment table for 2011. The MB will be informed on the outcome of the deliberation between the Council and European Parliament in due time.
	The Board approved an amendment of the Budget 2010 with regard to external assigned revenue, on the condition that there is no objection raised by the end of the week.	
Item 10. Approval of Eurostat Work Programme 2011	The Board approved the Eurostat Work Programme in the field of environment 2011	The members welcomed the Eurostat Work Programme 2011 and the transparent and constructive way they have incorporated the comments received during the consultation with the EEA, MB and SC.
Item 11. Prolongation of 2 Vice-Chairs/Bureau members	The Board approved the prolongation of 2 Vice-Chairs/Bureau members for a second term in office and elected 1 Vice-Chair for a three-year mandate	The MB approved the prolongation of Elisabeth Freytag (MB Austria) and Erzsébet Gergely (MB Hungary) as Vice-Chairs/Bureau members for a second three-year mandate
		The MB elected Martin Seychell (MB Malta) as Vice-Chair/Bureau member for a three-year mandate.
Item 12. Prolongation of Scientific Committee memberships	The Board approved the prolongation of five SC members as proposed by the SC Chairman	The MB approved the prolongation of five SC members as follows: Marc Bonazountas (1 year), Pierluigi Cocco (4 years), Yves Desaubies (4 years), Ulrike Kastrup (4 years), Nadia Pinardi (2 years)

Approved by the Chairman of the Management Board
on 24 November 2010

_____ *SIGNED* _____
Dr. Karsten Sach
Chairman EEA Management Board

**Summary of EEA Management Board seminar of 23 November 2010 on
Resource efficiency, the green economy and physical ecosystem
accounting**

Draft report by EEA, 1 February 2011

This report on the 2010 EEA Management Board seminar contains three components:

Section A of this document provides an overview of the meeting agenda and issues discussed; Section B sets out a short summary with initial conclusions from the EEA; and Section C provides a compilation of reporting notes from the different break-out sessions and the final plenary discussion.

A) Structure of meeting and issues discussed

Session 1 – What does a green economy look like in reality? (Discussion by region)

Discussions amongst participants of best practices and approaches to building up the green economy from the perspectives of water, energy, land, and materials / recycling

Session 2 – What are the pathways towards developing smart, inclusive and sustainable growth by 2030?

Participants build pathways, targets and indicators, to manage natural capital, ecosystem services and adaptation to climate change, in a low-carbon resource efficient, economy.

Roundtable 1: Water resources and climate change: supply and demand and the integration of the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive and the Water Framework Directive.

Roundtable 2: Energy demand and supply in relation to low carbon processes, eco-innovation, land-use and adaptation.

Roundtable 3: Land use in relation to reform of CAP (Common Agricultural Policy) and green infrastructure.

Roundtable 4: Measuring what is critical in terms of resource efficiency and smart, green growth.

Session 3 – EEA's role in relation to the Europe 2020 reporting process

The debate was introduced by the European Commission's approach to annual reporting, and taking account of earlier discussions on indicators; followed by discussion on the EEA's Regulation and its role in providing the evidence base for policies following on from the Lisbon Treaty and the EU 2020 strategy.

B) Overall summary with initial conclusions from the EEA

The seminar focus was selected having in mind the SOER 2010 outcome and in particular the Synthesis final chapters, the ongoing final assessment of the 6th EAP, as well as the fast-moving progress with EU 2020 strategy. Particular attention was given to the resource efficiency flagship of EU2020 and how it can provide a chapeau for the EAP discussions as well as the many initiatives ongoing around greening the economy.

Several documents were provided by EEA as background, largely reflecting behind the scenes work over the last two years relevant to resource efficiency and green economy and how they can be supported using indicators and other tools.

It was recognised early in the discussions that timing was crucial in that if the environment voice was to be heard then it needed to be putting its analysis and indicators on the table in the first half of 2011 in line with the economic and social actors.

With this in mind attention focused on what short term outputs could be produced by the EEA, taking the SOER 2010 outcomes and other analysis in the store cupboard as a starting point and bringing to the fore other activities that are a more developmental stage e.g. green economy analysis, SCP and ecosystem accounting indicators.

Following break out groups and plenary feedback loops, the EEA Director was invited to provide immediate reflections. She did so along four lines all of which can support the discussions on a successor to the 6th EAP:

1. EEA to embark through 2011 on a spring clean of indicators to re-establish the links between them and policy priorities since most existing indicators are designed to documenting trends and probably not fit for meeting fast-emerging policy demands.
2. EEA to deliver by June 2011 an analysis of how existing indicators could support assessments of natural capital and its relation to other capitals in support of inter-alia the resource efficiency road map. The analysis would

address natural capital from the SCP and ecosystem angles, territorial cohesion, spatial planning, people and governance.

3. EEA to deliver by March 2011 a multi-variate analysis that strengthens the environmental community's argumentation around CAP reform options as presented in the CAP Communication from the Commission of 18 November. Such an analysis would focus in particular on the environment/climate change dimension set out in reform option 3, while taking into account the EU2020 angle of option 2 and the equity dimension of option 1.
4. Further develop analysis through 2011 to Rio+20 in May 2012, based on the SOER outcomes, of how sector-by-sector links to the environment, and across sectors, greater policy coherence could be achieved in support of transition to a green economy.

The seminar then reflected on the issue of whether policy developments such as Green Economy and GMES require a more fundamental reflection on the role of the Agency. It was agreed to schedule a major discussion on this at the March 2011 Board meeting supported by a paper from the EEA taken through the Bureau in February.

C) Compilation of reporting notes from the different break-out sessions and the final plenary discussion

Session 1 – What does a green economy look like in reality? (Discussion by region)

Discussion group: Central catchment west

Chair: Karsten Sach

Participants: Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Slovak Republic, United Kingdom; EEA-SC; EEA

Main points from discussion:

- 1) Resource efficiency, green economy and accounting are priorities in member countries and many initiatives are ongoing from which lessons can be learned and good practices be identified.
- 2) Countries tackle these challenges differently due to different national conditions and priorities. For example, Germany currently has a priority focus on material resources, the UK has a focus on issues such as zero waste and environmental resilience to climate change, the Slovak Republic has a focus on the footprint and what people can understand, the Czech Republic focuses on four policies that go hand in hand, and Switzerland focuses on 6 conditions for a green economy and on measuring both the sustainable consumption and production (SCP) and the ecosystem aspects of a green economy.
- 3) The current situation in the EU in terms of resource efficiency and green economy indicators was considered very challenging – as many indicators are available, but there does not seem agreement on which to use – or even what to measure. This could perhaps even be seen as the “wild west of indicators”.
- 4) Indicators are certainly needed, and the challenge is to link the policy questions for which we need an answer to the many indicators available.
- 5) One indicator will not be sufficient – rather there is a need for a dashboard or a set of indicators that show different aspects.
- 6) Ensuring the environment component of the EU2020 Strategy through its priority on resource efficiency, including its environmental aspects is of utmost importance. The EEA should play a key role in ensuring the environmental component, for example through leading the development a set of indicators for the resource efficiency priority of the Strategy.
- 7) Future EEA reporting on progress made on resource efficiency and green economy could perhaps be made through outlining a coherent analytical

approach in introductory parts and then focusing on five or six key issues in the assessment.

- 8) The EEA could also contribute to creating a better understanding of concepts and terminologies in the area of resource efficiency and green economy.

Discussion group: Atlantic catchment west

Chair: Jacqueline McGlade

Participants: Sweden, Norway, Iceland, UK, Ireland, France, Belgium, Netherlands; EEA

Main points from discussion:

- 1) The Management Board members were asked to list examples of governance measures in their countries. Most examples related to taxation, legislation, eco-labelling, spatial planning and nature conservation. 'Green' taxes (on e.g. energy use and waste disposal) and environmental legislation were mentioned by all. The importance of eco-labelling for trade was highlighted by the Irish representative and discussed extensively in view of its implications for recycling.
- 2) Another prominent issue, as raised by the Dutch representative, was the tension between resource efficiency and security, notably in the food system. The most efficient systems may also be vulnerable because of concentrated intensive production and sensitive supply chains. A model of local (and more extensive) production and regional self sufficiency would be less resource efficient, but more robust.
- 3) Finally spatial planning practices were discussed, the Netherlands providing an example of a restrictive approach with a rather condensed urbanisation pattern, as opposed to for example Belgium with more urban sprawl. The Dutch model includes the establishment of an 'ecological infrastructure', originally intended to spatially separate high-dynamic and low-dynamic functions. Other development models focus more on integration and multi-functionality.
- 4) Overall, the consequences of governance measures on natural capital were considered to be quite diffuse and difficult to measure. As the French representative said: we have lots of measures, but the combined effectiveness is rather unclear.

Discussion group: Mediterranean basin west

Chair: Michael Scoullos

Participants: Spain, Portugal, Greece, France, Slovenia, Malta; EEA

Main points from discussion:

- 1) The relevant issues to address are:
 - Climate change, soil (productivity, erosion, desertification),
 - Water (to secure adequate good quality water for 2030 and beyond)
 - Energy – solar potential
 - Marine – huge space under national jurisdictions
 - Land use – sustainable cities balance between expansion and intensity/ social and health problems within)
- 2) In the Mediterranean interconnectivity is felt more than in any other part of the EU. The issue of the neighbourhood and also the “EU outside” (Azores, Indian Pacific).
- 3) Specificities of the Mediterranean (mostly)
 - The Mediterranean is peripheral (see Malta vs. Luxembourg).
 - Particularities in governance.
 - The countries of this area the ones hit first by the economic crisis.
 - The ones accepting by far the most pressure of illegal immigrants.
 - The role of the state is “shrinking”, thus less ability to monitor and implement.
- 4) Conceptual issues
 - Green economy: the natural evolution of economy
 - but viewed differently
 - in parts of EU: long term sustainable development
 - in parts of the Mediterranean: escape poverty
 - Careful not to widen the issue of resource efficiency too much and “replace” sustainable development, make it not too “inclusive”.

Discussion group: Mediterranean basin east

Chair: Erzsébet Gergely

Participants: Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary, Turkey; EEA-SC; EEA

Main points from discussion:

1) Participants' approach and practical interpretation of how the resource efficiency concept is integrated into general and sector policy frameworks

- The discussion revealed a strong interrelation between resource efficiency, green economy, competitiveness and job creation. These issues are all important to promote the shift towards sustainability. However, peculiarly in this region, this issue is emphasized eminently not because of philosophical or ethical arguments of sustainability, but much more because of social necessity and economic rationale.
- Examples were mentioned, highlighting that the countries face similar problems, both of socio-economic and environmental kind. According to the examples, there is a certain need for creating (permanent) green jobs and at the same time to introduce competitive, eco-efficient new technologies. However, economic constraints partly encourage and partly hinder this effort.

2) Region-specific approach

Taking into account the specific conditions of different Member States, the economic disparities, social, cultural and environmental characteristics and diversity, participants emphasized that both the relevant EU and the Member State level target setting should take into consideration national and regional conditions and potential.

Region-specific issues were discussed in detail. The main challenges identified were in the fields of

- water management (including extreme events, floods and droughts, water scarcity, soil productivity, sustainable use of water resources);
- energy (energy saving, energy efficiency, use of renewable energy sources)
- transport;
- negative impacts of climate change.

3) Best practices

Participants were asked to present best practices which reflect on the challenges identified, and offer more resource efficient and region-specific solution in these crucial policy areas.

Several “best practices” were mentioned, including:

- modernisation of the irrigation system (saving approximately 50% of water use);

- alternative energy technology, installing solar energy systems in small settlements located in forested areas (which can reduce illegal logging).

Nevertheless, there is a need to collect and disseminate all relevant best practices, in the region as well as at EU/international level.

4) *Governance issues*

It was said that if we look at the characteristics of policy making in the region, a sectoral approach is prevalent. As agreed among the participants

- broadening the terminology is essential;
- more integrated approach is needed (integrating the different aspects and the integration of different policies both horizontally and vertically);
- strong links to the EU 2020 Strategy as well as to SDS are important. Good, new questions have to be raised and coordinated, appropriate (dashboard) indicators are needed, reflecting both the challenges and the results of the responses;
- life-cycle approach, material flow accounting methods should be used;
- an overall environment policy framework of the EU (e.g. the preparation of the 7th EAP) is crucial.

Discussion group: South-eastern catchment

Chair: Sissi Freytag

Participants: Austria, Bulgaria, Romania, Slovenia; DG ENV; EEA

Main points from discussion:

1) Points raised in opening statements:

- First build an environmental vision (to 2050)
- Green economy needs to contribute to this vision
- Resource efficiency as key component (of DG ENV approach)
- Change (behaviour of) economic sectors through environmental integration
- Key entry point: national energy/strategy
- Provide economic incentives, e.g. to retire polluting cars, increase renewable energy production, domestic energy efficiency
- Use public programmes for land and resource management, e.g. through afforestation
- Change environmental awareness, e.g. through schools and NGOs
- Use taxation instruments, e.g. on CO2 emissions or waste generation
- Financial crisis as a threat for the momentum behind greening the economy, -> Need to reflect on how to generate growth and jobs through 'green economy' approaches; renewable energy transition as an economic opportunity
- Feed-in tariffs for renewable energy as a practical example
- Very important: consistent public framework that establishes incentives and clear legal baselines and standards -> effective implementation is required!

2) Issues emerging from in-depth discussion:

- Environmental limits for energy infrastructure are, for example: bird protection / Natura 2000; protecting natural river systems
- Further renewable energy options: geothermal energy; nuclear energy; hydro power; wave power; biomass; win-win approaches linked to existing water transportation or production systems. Energy efficiency as a key option.
- Prevent economic disruption from floods or droughts by maintaining ecosystem regulation and adapting to climate change
- Sources of financing: public funds (national + EU); private sector. General infrastructure depends generally on public (EU) funds, e.g. waste water treatment plants

- Recycling: part of resource-efficient approach; behaviour of citizens very important; public campaigns; infrastructure has to be in place; education as a continuous challenge
- Develop pilot areas or 'front runner' sectors for showing the way forward on Green Economy. To be combined with environmental research (focused on Green Economy)

3) (Some) outstanding questions:

- How to integrate 'green economy principles' into economic structures / trends?
- Is (strategic) Environmental Impact Assessment a relevant tool?
- How can we assess + manage potential spill-over effects, e.g. from different types of renewable energy option?
- Application of environmental standards, e.g. IPPC, as driving technological change and cost savings, plus future competitive advantage
- Voluntary approaches and cooperation as important complementary means to reach targets

Discussion group: Baltic/Nordic catchment

Chair: Andrzej Jagusiewicz

Participants: Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Sweden; EEA

Main points from discussion:

- 1) Baltic region is sufficiently covered by legislation. The three main instruments are:
 - HELCOM and its Baltic Sea Action Plan (BSAP), including National Implementation Plans (4 segments: eutrophication, hazardous substances, biodiversity and cleaner shipping),
 - Baltic Sea Regional Strategy (BSRS) and its ecological dimension corresponding to 4 segments of BSAP and finally
 - Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD).
- 2) In support we have WFD calling for good ecological status (GES) of transitional and coastal waters by 2015. If MSFD achieves its objective e.g. good environmental status of the Baltic waters and ecosystems (wider and more complex concept than GES) by 2020 and BSAP theirs by 2021 (eutrophication-free sea) then we can be confident of a secure Baltic ecosystem. But this is a bottom up approach that inter-alia begs the question: will we have a green or greener economy or resource-efficient Baltic economy if these targets/goals are achieved?
- 3) Baltic states comprise 8 EU countries and Russian Federation, while the Baltic basin is also polluted from Belarus and Ukraine via Polish rivers. Extra efforts are therefore needed and HELCOM is well positioned to do and deliver the job. Nordic Dimension and Eastern Partnership may help.
- 4) If Green Economy under the EU 2020 Strategy is envisaged as a 1euro coin then on one side of it we have achieving SCP and on the other maintaining the capacity of ecosystems to deliver essential services then the process of greening the economy can be seen as a never ending story. Success will be balancing the trade offs inherent in SCP and ecosystem objectives.
- 5) But how to measure the impact of the both sides of the coin on the progress in implementing the EU 2020 Strategy? Of course a dashboard of indicators is badly needed, both overall and sector-specific, but to get out of the jungle of indicators we need a guide > possibly via the EEA Scientific Committee, if properly mandated.
- 6) Independently, we need to check the BSRS as a whole against the EU 2020 Strategy and requirements of Green Economy. The latter could be done by COM supported possibly by Sweden (BSRS is a young Swedish baby dated October 2009).

- 7) GE could be seen as a locomotive pulling 21 sectors; we must measure ex-post the progress achieved over last decades, at least over 20 years, both overall progress as well as the sectoral progress related to each of the train wagons. Then we can draw some conclusions/recommendations on the primary focus and optimisation of the economic policy/sectoral policies for the future transition to a Green Economy.
- 8) Marine spatial planning is an important instrument to accommodate conflicting uses of the Baltic waters/coast and put some guidance to the sectors in a GE transition. For example wind farms vs recreational/leisure etc.
- 9) Pricing is important to take into account the marine ecosystems services in GE and make understandable to the many sectoral actors the challenges ahead.
- 10) Conflicting policies at various level must be taken into account and well weighed and accommodated to the overall goal (local vs European or national vs regional etc). For example, energy generation from peat vs biodiversity or high PM standards.

Session 2 – What are the pathways towards developing smart, inclusive and sustainable growth by 2030?

Roundtable 1: Water resources & climate change: supply and demand and the integration of the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive and the Water Framework Directive.

Chair: Michael Scoullios

Participants: Spain, Portugal, Greece, France, Slovenia, Malta; EEA

Main points from discussion:

The issue brings together a long series of interconnected problems, options and opportunities with as central theme the “adaptations” to climate change: from decreasing productivity, lifetime of water treatment plants, biodiversity loss, etc, etc.

“The EU will not experience the same climate change impact throughout”.

Issues relevant to the EEA work:

1. To find the balance from top down (Europe relevant indicator/ approaches) to bottom-up from sites and regions (site-relevant) and also sector relevant.
2. Indicators showing the adaptation effort and result moving from water efficiency, based on water consumption per person, to water consumption per specific sector.
3. Need to work with cities/ enhance work in progress.
4. Better link with research
5. Re-analysis of old data
6. Find ways to implant concerns for new infrastructures e.g. guidelines etc for water reuse, etc.
7. Need to develop (with others?) standards for different uses of reused or gray waters.
8. Elaborate ways to encourage different pricing and billing for different types/ qualities of water
9. Explore good examples (see Latvia) for using revenues from traceable pollution right to finance adaptation

Roundtable 2: Energy demand and supply in relation to low carbon processes, eco-innovation, land-use and adaptation.

Chair: Sissi Freytag

Participants: Austria, Bulgaria, Romania, Slovenia; DG ENV; EEA

Main points from discussion:

1) Points arising from introductory statements:

- Energy has very long planning timeframes:
- Environmental strategies need to reflect that:
 - o Vision 2050 -2040 -2030
 - o What intermediate steps/goals
 - o Clear targets/monitoring framework
 - o Review from time to time whether you are on track, whether strategies are still appropriate
- Increasing renewable energy share
 - o Leads to (very) fluctuating supply
 - o Shows importance of connecting up European energy markets
- Natural resources have a big influence on national (renewable energy sector)
- Role of EU emissions trading system (ETS)
 - o Crucial for promoting renewable energy?
 - o Need for reform in this context?
- There is increasing environmental resistance to (certain types of) renewable energy development e.g.: hydropower + geothermal sources in Iceland; marine wind parks in Spain.
- Energy efficiency and eco-innovation as key approaches for greening energy sector.

2) Role for the EEA in energy policy debate:

- Do not invest too much in indicators
- investigate critical questions and:
 - o security and stability of strategic choices renewable energy – a real dilemma?
 - o Critical enabling conditions?
- Need to think about changes in non-ETS sectors, e.g. agriculture, residential heating, individual mobility. Need tools to understand potential co-benefits from such changes, including indicators, in particular, composite indicators. EEA to help in developing analytical tools and

indicators: in a transparent way that shows strengths + limits of different approaches / composite indicators.

3) Role of subsidies & taxes in maintaining & changing energy systems:

- Important factor: jobs linked to different (renewable) energy sectors
 - o role for EEA in evaluating positive economic (employment) effects of moving towards low-carbon energy supply? (also for environmental changes in other sectors)
- Discussion on respective roles and share of public v. private investment in energy transformation
- Can environmental investment help overcome the economic crisis?
- Need to get prices right across the board
 - o Can use different sources of capital + tools (e.g. ETS)
 - o Can better harvest the potential for energy efficiency (domestic + industrial)

Roundtable 3: Land use in relation to reform of CAP (Common Agricultural Policy) and green infrastructure.

Chair: Andrzej Jagusiewicz

Participants: Poland, Hungary, France; EEA

Main points from discussion:

The discussion focused on the CAP reform position paper of DG AGRI with three options for CAP reform. The main points addressed were:

- 1) The trade-offs between resource efficiency (optimal use of the land) and robustness (food security) – an issue put forward by the Dutch representative in the morning session (he wasn't in the CAP session, though). Optimising food security would tend towards self sufficiency at European level and also at local level. Resource efficiency, however, would be optimised by producing the food where agriculture can be most productive and cost effective (free market). The need for a spatially differentiated agricultural policy was acknowledged. A special issue that was highlighted was the loss of prime agricultural land to urbanisation. From an efficiency point of view (and also regarding food security at global scale), maintaining agricultural productivity around urban centres should have priority.
- 2) Making different policies work together: Another issue is the relation between CAP and the Water Framework Directive as achieving key WFD targets depends on changes in agriculture. Hence it is important to provide the right

framework through (reforms of) the CAP; and guidance on cross-compliance, for example, will be key for responsible regional/local authorities to do their jobs most effectively.

- 3) Analysis of the proposed CAP options: A clear preference for one of the proposed CAP options was not stressed, although the increased attention for environmental issues in option 2 and 3 was welcomed. The participants argued for a multi-criteria analysis by EEA of these options, to highlight and analyse the different trade-offs between safe-guarding food, fibre and fuel demands on the one hand, and the full range of ecosystem services on the other. This should be done from a resource efficiency perspective (optimising land use). The EEA would be ideally placed to perform this analysis, since the interests at country level would prevent a coherent European analytical perspective.

Roundtable 4: Measuring what is critical in terms of resource efficiency and smart, green growth.

Chair: Erzsébet Gergely

Participants: France, Hungary, Switzerland, United Kingdom; DG ENV; EEA SC; EEA; ETC-SCP

Main points from discussion:

- 1) One part of the discussion focussed on indicators:
 - Reflections regarding the environmental / resource efficiency dimension in EU 2020 – this is currently largely limited to climate and energy aspects.
 - Birgit Munck-Kampmann (ETC/SCP) introduced a framework of indicators for reporting on progress on sustainable consumption and production (SCP), developed by the EEA and ETC/SCP. This framework and its indicators will be used by the EEA when reporting on progress on SCP in Europe. In 2011, more elements and indicators on resource efficiency will be added to the framework. Indicators from the framework (along with other inputs from the EEA and other group of 4 members) form part of the resource efficiency indicators that DG ENV proposing as part of the resource efficiency roadmap.
 - Debate on the need to provide (resource efficiency) indicators at the appropriate scale (as resource challenges differ by region in Europe)

- Discussion on measuring what is critical in terms of resource efficiency and smart, green growth? How can a baseline for resource efficiency indicators developed? Can modelling be useful in this context?
- How to use the multitude of indicators that exist, many of which are actually not used by policy makers. Why is that, i.e. are they too difficult to understand or there are simply too many?
- How can we increase the interest in using available and future indicators by policy makers, interest groups and others?
- Resource efficiency and 'green economy' approaches are part of sustainable development but cannot replace it.

2) The green economy concept was seen as an option to enhancing resource efficiency. Tools for achieving it include:

- Market-based instruments (Switzerland explained some of the MBIs implemented)
- Information provision
- Regulation

A systematic and coherent approach is needed (note that a regulatory approach could be efficient from one aspect but could be the opposite from another).

3) Participants also discussed the importance of the rebound effect when assessing resource efficiency. A further aspect which should be kept in mind is the socio-economic dimension of green economy/resource efficiency.

There was a debate on target setting, mentioning conceptual questions (such as relative or absolute decoupling, possible methods for taking carrying capacity into account) which are crucial considering the required shift to sustainability.

4) Different regions and countries are defining resource efficiency differently → there is a need for clarification.

Session 3 – EEA’s role in relation to the Europe 2020 reporting process

Speaking notes from Michael Scoullos: relevant points for the EEA position and work:

- 1) The precautionary principle still very valid and useful, it contains the knowledge based decision-making, it is not either/or
- 2) The EU 2020 green growth: yes! but with vision, the social dimension e.g. equity issues are missing, very important for the Mediterranean neighbourhood.
- 3) A lot of methodological issues are linked with EEA work: too many indicators; possible alternatives to a matrix structure:
 - Clustering according to importance/ general use, centrality in three or four categories, e.g. for national, regional, local importance, etc.
 - Clustering for resource efficiency in four groups: carbon footprint; land use; water (quality, quantity); materials (raw, natural resources)
- 4) “Aggregate” indicators?? Often seen as too difficult but some progress perhaps possible rather soon
- 5) Emphasis on “reading” the indicators “together” this is a way for moving “beyond GDP”.
- 6) Encouragement of the work in progress of the EEA on combining ecosystem stock accounting with ecosystem services, etc.
- 7) Encouragement for an approach to combine the more recent data with structural analysis of old data to track evolution (e.g. of CC impact on water scarcity, etc).
- 8) In the “dialogue” about Resource Efficient Economy which is “monopolised” between the Council/Commission and the European Parliament, the EEA may play a role in bringing together other stakeholders (the Committee of Regions, ECOSOC, etc). and propose a “Road Map”.
- 9) The above and few more, such as an opinion on major announcement for future projects –such as the “Solar Energy network in North Africa/ Sahara present new aspects of the role of EEA which should be considered.
- 10) A balance should be found between the “new” and “sticking to it past and present mandate” in order not to spread too thin but also continue to be “relevant” and “central”. In this balance the relationship and distribution of tasks within the Group of 4 (or 5) is important.