



SUMMARY REPORT

3rd Regional Workshop on Sustainable Transport Indicators

29 March 2017
Bangkok, Thailand





The project context

The TCC Project 'Energy Efficiency and Climate Change Mitigation in the Land Transport Sector in the ASEAN region' (Transport and Climate Change (TCC) www.TransportandClimateChange.org) aims to develop strategies and action plans for more sustainable transport.

The project is funded by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development and implemented by GIZ in cooperation with the ASEAN secretariat.

TCC's regional activities are in the area of fuel efficiency, green freight and logistics, as well as data, indicators, and MRV. At the national level the project supports relevant transport and environment government bodies in Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam for the development of national action plans on sustainable transport. TCC also offers capacity building through different training courses.

Author: Anders Imboden

Editor: Julia Nagel

Contact: ASEAN – German Technical Cooperation
Transport and Climate Change
c/o Office of Transport and Traffic Policy and Planning
35 Petchaburi Road
Thung Phaya Thai
Ratchathewi
Bangkok 10400 Thailand
www.transportandclimatechange.org

Project Director: Tali Trigg



Table of Contents

Table of Contents	3
Abbreviations	4
1 Background	1
2 Summary of Meeting	1
2.1 Welcome and Opening Remarks	1
2.2 Workshop Proceedings	2
2.2.1 ‘From KLTSP to Guidelines – The Way Forward’ (Julia Nagel).....	2
2.2.2 ‘Data Availability Demonstration’ (Sudhir Gota)	2
2.2.3 ‘Other Initiatives and Guidelines’ (Sudhir Gota)	5
2.2.4 ‘Technical Appetiser: Possible Elements for the Guidelines’ (Julia Nagel & Sudhir Gota) 6	
2.2.5 Brainstorming session on elements of the guidelines	7
2.2.6 ‘Standardised Templates for Indicators’ (Sudhir Gota).....	8
2.2.7 Summary of discussion and next steps (Sudhir Gota)	11
3 Closing	11
4 Annexes	13
Annex 1: Workshop Agenda	14
Annex 2: List of Participants	15



Abbreviations

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AJTP	ASEAN-Japan Transport Partnership
AMS	ASEAN Member States
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
ASIF	Activity, Mode Share, Intensity, and Fuel Mix
BMZ	<i>Deutsches Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung</i> (German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development)
BUR	Biennial Update Report
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
DPSIR	Drivers, Pressures, States, Impacts, and Responses
EGSLT	Expert Group on Sustainable Land Transport
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH (German International Cooperation Agency)
KLTSP	Kuala Lumpur Transport Strategic Plan
NAMA	Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action
NC	National Communication
NDC	Nationally Determined Contribution
SSATP	Africa Transport Policy Programme
TCC	Transport and Climate Change Project
TERM	Transport and Environment Reporting Mechanism
UNCRD	United Nations Centre for Regional Development
UNESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change



1 Background

With the second largest vehicle fleet in Asia after China, member countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) already face serious problems including congestion, fossil fuel consumption and related CO₂ emissions, air pollution, and road safety. In many developing countries, the information made available on the emissions impact of transport policies and projects is insufficient and even potentially misleading, as the necessary data for indicators is missing. Further, the majority of ASEAN member states (AMS) have not yet defined or are still in the process of defining sustainability goals within the transport sector, and hence require support in terms of improving indicator and data availability.

The recent Kuala Lumpur Transport Strategy Plan 2016-2025 (KLTSP) reinforced the need to ‘develop [a] monitoring framework and harmonised approach for indicators on energy and greenhouse gas emissions in the transport sector’ (KLTSP ST-2.3). It calls for a ‘workshop and study on potential indicators and monitoring’ (KLTSP ST-2.3.1) and the adoption of ‘an action plan to develop and operationalise indicators (and/or) [sic] guidelines on monitoring and indicators’ (KLTSP ST-2.3.2) in order to ‘compile data on transport indicators’ (KLTSP ST-2.3.3). In order to develop this monitoring mechanism and associated guidelines, consultations need to be carried out in order to gain support from and raise awareness among diverse public and private stakeholders.

The 3rd Regional Workshop on Sustainable Transport Indicators was held on Wednesday, 29 March 2017, in Bangkok, Thailand. The workshop brought together stakeholders and experts from all 10 AMS, the ASEAN Secretariat, universities, civil society and the private sector (a complete list of participants can be found in Annex 2). The main objectives of the workshop were to:

- Strengthen awareness on data availability in the ASEAN region.
- Discuss the preliminary elements and table of contents of the guidelines (KLTSP ST-2.3.2).
- Agree on standardised templates (KLTSP ST-2.3.2).

2 Summary of Meeting

2.1 Welcome and Opening Remarks

Mr. Tali Trigg (GIZ), Project Director for the ASEAN-German technical cooperation project on Transport and Climate Change (TCC), welcomed participants and thanked Thailand for its continued support in hosting the TCC project as well as this workshop. He provided a short summary of TCC and its work on data and indicators in the land transport sector. Reflecting on some of the indicators-related activities in the region, Mr. Trigg observed the importance of developing continuous and long-term data collection and monitoring regimes across ministries and agencies. Shifting to the logistics of the day’s workshop, Mr. Trigg introduced Ms. Julia Nagel and Mr. Sudhir Gota, the workshop’s facilitators. He then overviewed the agenda for the day and noted the role of indicators in the KLTSP and the SDGs, working on both the regional and national levels to help guide achievement of the goals under these and other international processes and frameworks. He acknowledged the challenges of dealing with data and indicators across ministries or sectors which may have



different templates, approaches, etc. But he also suggested the situation is not as ‘scary’ as it may seem – and wished the participants a productive day confronting these issues.

2.2 Workshop Proceedings

2.2.1 ‘From KLTSP to Guidelines – The Way Forward’ (Julia Nagel)

Ms. Nagel began by [reintroducing GIZ and the TCC project](#) to the workshop participants. She highlighted GIZ’s work around the world and across a wide range of topics, among which transport and climate change is a significant component. TCC works with the ASEAN Secretariat; it has been active since 2012 and will continue until the end of 2018, and is funded by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). TCC has implementation partners in five AMS (Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam), but also aims to provide a broader benefit through regional activities, including this process on sustainable transport indicators.

TCC supports implementation of the KLTSP, particularly by aiding partner countries in aligning national policies with regional guidance. KLTSP’s chapter on sustainable transport includes specific goals and actions on developing a ‘monitoring framework and harmonised approach for indicators on energy and GHG emissions in the transport sector’ (KLSTP ST-2.3) through development of specific indicators and guidelines, and compiling data on transport indicators (ST-2.3.2 and ST-2.3.3). This workshop and the larger process of developing sustainable transport indicators for the ASEAN region are critical in putting those goals and actions into practice.

To do that, there have been consultation workshops (first in Jakarta, then Kuala Lumpur, and now in Bangkok); meetings of the ASEAN Expert Group on Sustainable Land Transport (EGSLT), including later in the week on 30-31 March; and discussion of suggested indicators and guidelines, leading up to the formulation of ASEAN Guidelines on Sustainable Transport Indicators. A first draft will be prepared by October and finalisation is expected by August 2018.

Ms. Nagel reminded participants of the objectives of the workshop, namely to strengthen awareness of data availability in the ASEAN region; discuss the preliminary elements and table of contents of the guidelines; and agree on standardised templates. She made clear that the results of the workshop would be presented to the EGSLT later in the week.

Finally, participants heard about the workshop programme, which included three main elements. First would be a look at data availability in the ASEAN region, followed by a discussion of the structure and composition of the regional guidelines, and lastly, feedback on developing a standardised template for indicator factsheets.

2.2.2 ‘Data Availability Demonstration’ (Sudhir Gota)

Mr. Sudhir Gota, consultant to GIZ, outlined four main sections of his presentation, including consideration of specific indicators; availability of data; the question of whether AMS should ‘wait for the perfect storm’; and an ongoing discussion of how these issues will impact the usefulness of the forthcoming guidelines and action plan on sustainable transport indicators. He reminded participants of the accomplishments of the previous workshops in Jakarta (which addressed the question of ‘why do we need indicators?’) and Kuala Lumpur (focusing on what, how, and who is involved). Mr. Gota encouraged participants to think of the



recommended indicators put forth during this workshop as just that: recommendations, not set in stone but ready to be refined and improved based on participants' feedback.

Mr. Gota expounded on the criteria used to select recommended indicators. There were three main steps, namely criteria-based identification, framework-based selection, and consultative review-based recommendations. In this case, the frameworks used were the 'Activity, mode Share, Intensity, and Fuel mix' (ASIF) and the 'Drivers, Pressures, States, Impacts, and Responses' (DPSIR) frameworks. In more general terms, the goal was to recommend indicators that are easily defined, measured, and communicated; have technical merit; can be connected to policy; and are not restricted by confidentiality requirements.

Much of Mr. Gota's presentation contrasted 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' data. Top-down data is highly aggregated and should be easier to collect and report. An example is national fuel sales or vehicle registrations. Bottom-up data—things like fleet characteristics and load factors—rely on more granular datasets that are often more challenging to collect. Mr. Gota described the 'headline indicators' like GHG emissions, transport activity, and motorisation, which tend to be normalised by a unit like population, unit of GDP, or distance travelled to help illustrate intensity. In practice, data availability varies widely across and within indicators, and across and within countries as well – but this is normal, and creates opportunities for countries to exchange knowledge and support one another in making indicator assessment possible.

Looking at the data situation in ASEAN, Mr. Gota observed that while top-down data is practically 100% available already, bottom-up data availability varies significantly. He presented his assessment of available bottom-up data for indicators related to transport GHG emissions (e.g. mode, engine size, trip types, etc.) in the ASEAN region. The majority of these data are limited or missing for AMS. Mr. Gota suggested taking a positive perspective on this state of affairs: now we can get to work. He considered the question of whether the ASEAN region should wait for the 'perfect storm' (i.e. perfect data availability) to begin tracking sustainable transport indicators, and offered an unequivocal response – 'no'.

Mr. Gota made his case by pointing to a body of evidence from around the world showing that data availability improves in conjunction with well-planned monitoring efforts. The ASEAN-Japan Transport Partnership's (AJTP) Information Platform for Transport Statistics has seen its data improve over time as a result of its monitoring efforts. On the other hand The Africa Transport Policy Programme (SSATP), comprised of 38 countries and a range of other organisations and agencies led by the World Bank, took on a huge number of indicators (six high-level but 60+ secondary indicators) but did not have much success in actually collecting and reporting the data. Contrast the SSATP's experience with that of the Northern Corridor Data Observatory in East Africa; the latter has experienced great success based in part on the capacity building that occurred under SSATP, which preceded it. Local consultants and agencies produce very useful data for six countries, including under the Transport Observatory, which operates with a very modest \$350,000 annual budget.



Mr. Gota responds to a question from the floor

Lessons can also be learned from the European Environment Agency's Transport and Environment Reporting Mechanism (TERM), which brought together an expert group and launched activities within two years of the mechanism's inception. Data was not immediately available for many indicators (Mr. Gota wryly noted that this was an opportunity to set aside positive stereotypes about data availability in Europe). But a substantial reason TERM has been

successful since over the past 17 years has been the initiative's persistence. Even at the outset, a 'zero version' of its indicator report still allowed them to conduct some analysis and tell a 'story' to readers and policy makers, and now, even compared to the early 2000s, the reported data is far more robust. This is in part because 'people do not always know what they want until you show it to them'.

Mr. Gota concluded his presentation by reiterating that the ASEAN region does not need to wait for perfect data. The time to start is now. Using a staircase approach, building capacity and knowledge over time, the ASEAN region can successfully build a set of sustainable transport indicators that offers comprehensive analysis of widely-sourced and credible data.

Following Mr. Gota's [presentation](#), participants engaged in a conversation touching on a number of topics, including:

- Clarification of the DPSIR framework. Mr. Gota gave examples of the various components – drivers (e.g. GDP or population growth), pressures (road conditions, trips), state (pollution, crashes), impact (public health, lost economic potential), and responses (policies, targets).
- The difficulty of tracking transport demand by mode, and also assessing the quality of the data once it has been collected. Even when consultants, particularly from overseas, are used for studies, there is the issue of a lack of resources or capacity to conduct ongoing or follow-up data collection.
- Mr. Gota's slides on recommended indicators included Tier 1 and Tier 2 indicators, according to priority. In response to some questions from the floor, he clarified that top-down data is available effectively everywhere in the ASEAN region. Tier 2 indicators, which are chiefly used as part of a bottom-up approach, basically do not exist at the moment, a challenge in many regions of the world. However, through surveys, estimates, etc., it is possible to begin building up these datasets, potentially as part of efforts that need to take place as part of other efforts like the implementation of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) under the Paris Agreement. And finally, Mr. Gota mentioned that government statistics are critical, but credible data from the private sector and academia is also useful.



- Commonalities between TERM and the current effort under KLTSP, including the possibility of using indicators as a way to push for better data, and the parallels between TERM's Detailed Feasibility Study and the Background Report.
- A number of participants underscored the need for common definitions and understandings of indicators and their usage, requisite data, etc. – both across the region and within countries.

2.2.3 'Other Initiatives and Guidelines' (Sudhir Gota)

In this session, Mr. Gota examined examples of initiatives and guidelines on indicators from outside the ASEAN region. He began by asking, what drives transport GHG data and indicators? The main answer is the need to create GHG inventories for national communications (NCs), biennial update reports (BURs), and NDCs. Therefore, Mr. Gota argued for an increased focus on bottom-up modelling of GHG emissions. The subsidiary data that goes into those models has many sources and uses as part of policy formulation, specific projects including Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs), and obtaining climate financing. ASEAN and the KLTSP may not be the main targets of institutionalising transport GHG data and indicators, but they benefit from the bottom-up modelling that should be taking place as part of those climate-related efforts by improving the available data.

The need for improvement is clear: looking at NCs and BURs submitted to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), 56% of all signatories have only submitted data up to the year 2001. In years since, a number of other global and regional processes and initiatives have been signed that also include indicators. These include the Global Decade of Action on Road Safety, the Sustainable Development Goals, and of course the Paris Agreement, among others. Some explicitly include transport indicators, while others may include them indirectly.

The Asian Development Bank (ADB) has a long history of working on transport indicators. It supported top-down data collection from 1995-1998, but seeing a need for stronger data reporting (especially given its need to purchase data for a number of its reports in the 2000s), the ADB spearheaded the launch of the Transport Data Bank in 2017.

Similarly, the Sustainable Mobility for All (or 'Sum4All') initiative aims to track many indicators while focusing on four key elements to better structure the transport agenda. Sum4All is supported by the World Bank.

Within ASEAN, Mr. Gota has analysed the NDCs put forth by each AMS and noted that only Brunei has a transport-specific emissions target. Nonetheless, a number of AMS have transport-focused mitigation actions, and during the workshop, there was clarification that some countries (e.g. Thailand) have developed sectoral targets even if they are not expressed as such within the NDC submissions. Globally, only 10% of NDCs include explicit transport-related emissions reduction targets.

Mr. Gota continued with a number of other examples including the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific's (UNESCAP) Sustainable Urban Transport Index, which includes a multi-indicator index for specific cities; the World Business Council for Sustainable Development's small but growing Sustainable Urban Mobility Project; and



the Mobility Analytics Partnership between Microsoft and the Institute for Transport and Development Policy. Some of these initiatives may also be channels from which to get data.

Shifting to guidelines, Mr. Gota highlighted Eurostat's guidelines on passenger mobility statistics; Japan's Environmental Performance Indicators Guideline for Organisations; the United Nations' Indicators of Sustainable Development Guidelines and Methodologies; a helpful structure from the Knowledge Partnership for Measuring Air Pollution and GHG Emissions in Asia; the United Nations Centre for Regional Development (UNCRD) Environmentally Sustainable Transport Forum; and the Operational Guidelines of the ASEAN-Japan Transport Statistics Database. Each example provides ideas and lessons for how to define, structure, collect, and present information. Consideration of all these examples will help avoid duplication and improve the final guidelines and action plan within the ASEAN region.

Following Mr. Gota's thorough [presentation](#), there was a short discussion. Points included:

- Clarification that NDCs from AMS are individual NDCs submitted by each AMS as part of its own commitments under the Paris Agreement
- Definitions should be as consistent as possible in order to support standardisation of indicators. Since perfect standardisation is not possible, it would be useful to include a glossary of definitions and methodologies used by different countries. The key is to be transparent about differences that exist within the body of indicators.
- The private sector is also interested in sustainability indicators. Siemens is an example of a company active in this area, but there may be others.

2.2.4 'Technical Appetiser: Possible Elements for the Guidelines' (Julia Nagel & Sudhir Gota)

With lunch on participants' minds, Ms. Nagel and Mr. Gota offered them a 'technical appetiser'. Ms. Nagel reminded the group that the plan is to have a single document that includes guidelines and an action plan for sustainable transport indicators, and asked them to think about what they would like the guidelines to include and any specific suggestions they may have. Mr. Gota shortly presented the suggested set of elements, which include a background and purpose, along with scope and intended users. The guidelines would further consist of a description of indicators and the rationale for their inclusion; templates for collecting the statistical data; potential data sources (from which agency); reporting formats; identification of stakeholders; and best practices/approaches for data collection. The action plan would address the possible mechanisms for reporting of sustainable transport indicators on the regional level, and a zero version analysis of the indicators.

Mr. Gota then summarised the morning session's key points:

- Start now – don't wait for the 'perfect storm' or the 'perfect data'.
- Use a flexible approach to indicators.
- Enough data is already available to start the process.
- Sync up with NDCs: countries are already developing sector mitigation actions.
- Look also to global and regional initiatives that have relevant data and indicators.
- Indicators should not just be a statistical compendium, but should instead include comprehensive analysis using data from a range of sources.

- Perhaps the greatest barrier to collecting and using stakeholders is the lack of cooperation among stakeholders.

2.2.5 Brainstorming session on elements of the guidelines

Participants were asked to work with their neighbours at each table and discuss what specific content, suggestions, or other aspects they would like to be considered in the regional guidelines and action plan. Each table received note cards on which to write their ideas, which they later presented to the entire group. After all tables had presented a summary of their discussion, the responses were synthesised (Table 1).



Participants discuss potential guideline elements

Table 1. Synthesis of results from brainstorming session on guideline elements

Selection & Rationale of Indicators	Indicator Template/Factsheets	Potential Data Sources	Stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain and identify frameworks and indicator tiers • Evaluate co-benefits according to stakeholders • Prioritise indicators based on gap analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use flow charts to assist in decision making • Assess, validate, and verify data to ensure quality • Enable monitoring and evaluation • Set clear standards and definitions for indicators and units • Include project planning tools and estimate required resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify data sources (with qualifiers) • Delineate between primary and secondary data • Address confidentiality restrictions and data accessibility • Provide guidance on disclaimers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct stakeholder analysis/mapping (regionally and ideally by country)
Best Practices	Action Plan	Zero Version of Indicators Analysis	Other Suggestions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case studies • Lessons learned • Use callout boxes • Template for sharing experiences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set frequency of data collection • Identify designated coordinating body to prevent duplication, set priorities, and assess budget requirements • Include feedback mechanism • Common format • Define relationship with existing ASEAN data systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasise how to use the data – ‘telling the story’ • Support establishment of a database for indicators in ASEAN 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New chapter: regional and international collaboration (e.g. data collection and exchange) • Visualise links between data and indicators; make this attractive • Explain how to use the guidelines according to user

2.2.6 ‘Standardised Templates for Indicators’ (Sudhir Gota)

Mr. Gota began by sharing the session’s objective: to discuss a standardised template and prepare the EGSLT for its decisions. After briefly sharing an example from the AJTP, Mr. Gota moved on to [describe a proposal for an ASEAN indicator template](#), including definition, unit of measurement, sub-indicators, objective and relevance, issues with the indicator, methodology, an example, and a reference link. Ms. Nagel distributed paper copies of the proposed template and asked participants to imagine that they were tasked with collecting and reporting an indicator based on the example provided. When doing so, she asked that participants consider the challenges they might face and whether they are receiving all the information they would need to carry out the task. Finally, Ms. Nagel asked for tables to discuss the overall structure, content, the design/layout, and any other issues regarding the template – and to make suggestions for how to improve it.



There were many animated discussions of the proposed template

Following the discussion, each table reported their findings to the larger group. A summary is provided in Table 2.



Table 2. Summary of discussion on standardised indicator template

Definition	Unit of Measurement	Sub-Indicators	Objective and Relevance
<p>Overall Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harmonising classifications/definitions as much as possible <p>Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meaning of CO₂ intensity and freight transport Not clear – defining freight transport or just intensity? <p>Other</p>	<p>Overall Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specify range of expected values (logical check) Common unit Alternative units with conversions <p>Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unit abbreviated (e.g. g CO₂/tkm) Express in physical unit and include conversion factors <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raw data analysis and collection methodology Include other factors relevant for calculating indicator 	<p>Overall Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What does sub-indicator mean? What is the purpose? Current sub-indicator refers to either input data or related data Harmonising classifications <p>Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain how to use Type of use: private vs. public Additional category for this example: tonne-km by type of goods <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear name 	<p>Overall Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too long Include which stakeholders benefit Contextualise presentation based on user (e.g. for different ministries) Background info State objective first; relevance unclear/too general <p>Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could be more concise What benefits? To whom? Could be made country-specific <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Link to SDGs and other processes
Issues with the Indicator	Methodology	Reference Link	Example
<p>Overall Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is this necessary? Classification of data Rating for data quality/accuracy Empty tractor/car issue for this indicator <p>Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss assumptions (e.g. in this case, across modes) Common problems and how can they be addressed Include other relevant indicators to be observed Should be country-specific <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explicit linkages between input data and indicators 	<p>Overall Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need formula and explanation for each factor Separate annex on methodologies (or links to resources) Frequency/timing of data collection By tier Sources/stakeholders/lead agency <p>Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sounds like objective (in current example) Include proxy indicators Sample size Start from existing reports or make use of existing data (e.g. origin-destination surveys) <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharing of experiences re: cost-effectiveness, collection methods Link to explanatory guidelines 	<p>Overall Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only one reference? Should there be more references? What are TERM indicators? <p>Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to AMS-agreed definitions <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider using AJTP reference guidelines Which monitoring systems are using this? 	<p>Overall Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How to interpret the indicator in simple terms? Real life example or case study with diagram/flow of data <p>Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to be clearer/more understandable Helpful – without this, would be lost Should include data sources <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use infographics or other visualisations to illustrate example



Layout/Design	Other Questions or Suggestions
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Too lengthy; consider putting in table• Put online/make interactive• Flow chart to guide data inputs and hierarchies• More precise and user friendly• Include footnotes for certain terms (e.g. top-down approach)• Make clear, concise, and short	<p>Overall Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What data are needed?• Simplify <p>Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Define priority vis-à-vis other indicators• Include data source <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Guidance on how to treat 'scales', on relevant info (e.g. vehicle categories), and on 'default values'



2.2.7 Summary of discussion and next steps (Sudhir Gota)

Based on the day's discussion—particularly the feedback produced during the exercises on the elements of the guideline and the standardised template—Mr. Gota provided a summary of the inputs received and how they will be used in preparing the guidelines and action plan. As an illustration of that, he provided an updated outline of the guidelines and action plan with some of the key points to be considered based on the day's feedback:

- **Background**
- **Purpose, scope, and users:** How to use the guidelines.
- **Selection and rationale:** Selection framework, co-benefits, prioritisation, tiers.
- **Indicator template/ factsheets,** which include: Definition of indicator, Methodology for collecting the data and Spreadsheet template for data collection as well as a flow chart on the data input, data quality indication, quality assurance, quality control.
- **Potential data sources:** Clarification, disclaimer, accessibility.
- **Stakeholders:** Regional stakeholder analysis with some form of similar analysis by AMS.
- **Best practices/approaches to data collection:** Case studies, good practices, lessons learned.
- **Action plan:** Frequency of data collection, regional coordination, feedback mechanism, reporting format.
- **Zero Version of Indicators Analysis:** Storyline, support for establishment of database.

Mr. Gota also took note of a number of other suggestions heard during the group reporting sessions (described in the preceding tables in this report), and assured participants that these inputs would be taken into consideration and addressed as thoughtfully as possible in preparation for the EGSLT meeting and in the development of the draft guidelines and action plan. The participants were informed that EGSLT will further deliberate on which of the 33 listed indicators to prioritise.

3 Closing

Closing the day's workshop, Mr. Tali Trigg extended his thanks and appreciation to all the participants for their hard work and contributions. He shared some of his takeaways:

- Looking at indicators processes from around the world, including examples from the 1990s and 2000s, provided many interesting lessons and ideas for this process.
- Specifically, the examples of the Northern Corridor and TERM offered a reminder that the point of indicators is not a fixed final state. Whether you conceptualise it as a journey, or a staircase, the point is that the process of collecting and monitoring indicators will actually reinforce the quality and quantity of information and its usefulness. And recognising that stakeholders cannot do this alone, it is a good sign that so many partners are already engaged in this process within the ASEAN region.
- 'The universe is conspiring to get this data anyway'. Even if data availability is still lacking, it will improve over time through our efforts. This leads to the question of how to make the sustainable transport indicators as useful as possible to AMS and other regional stakeholders. The indicators should go beyond summarising



ASEAN – German Technical Cooperation
Transport and Climate Change



information and create space for deeper and more profound analysis that supports AMS in achieving their environment, transport, or other goals. Feedback is welcome.

Mr. Trigg commented that next steps would include producing a workshop report and sharing the day's presentations, and more broadly, working towards the final guidelines and action plan over the coming year and a half. In the meantime, participants should expect the 4th Sustainable Transport Indicators Workshop to take place in the fall, with a first draft of the guidelines and action plan expected in October. Mr. Trigg concluded with a final thank you to all attendees for their constructive inputs and active participation.



4 Annexes

- Annex 1 [Workshop Agenda](#)
- Annex 2 [List of Participants](#)
- Annex 3 ‘[From KLTSP to Guidelines – The Way Forward](#)’ (Julia Nagel)
- Annex 4 ‘[Demonstration on Data Availability in ASEAN](#)’ (Sudhir Gota)
- Annex 5 ‘[Other Initiatives and Guidelines on Data and Transport Indicators](#)’ (Sudhir Gota)
- Annex 6 [Standardised template/indicator factsheet](#) (Sudhir Gota)



Annex 1: Workshop Agenda

Time	Activity	Responsible/Speaker
08:45	Registration	
09:00	Welcome remarks and opening of the workshop	Tali Trigg, GIZ
09:15	From KLTSP to guidelines – the way forward Short summary of previous workshops and the context	Julia Nagel, GIZ
09:30	Objectives and workshop programme	Julia Nagel
09:55	Data availability demonstration Assessment of existing data throughout the ASEAN	Sudhir Gota, Consultant
10:45	<i>Coffee & tea</i>	
11:15	Guidelines in other regions and other data collection initiatives	Sudhir Gota
11:45	Elements of the ASEAN guidelines on sustainable transport indicators Interactive discussion	Sudhir Gota / Julia Nagel
12:15	<i>Lunch</i>	
13:30	Summary of session on elements of the ASEAN guidelines on sustainable transport indicators	Sudhir Gota / Julia Nagel
14:00	Key element of the guidelines: standardised templates for indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation of standardised template for indicators - Discussion about the structure and content of the template <p><i>This section also includes a break for coffee & tea.</i></p>	Sudhir Gota Participants
16:30	Summary of the workshop results and next steps	Sudhir Gota / Julia Nagel
16:45	Closing	Tali Trigg



Annex 2: List of Participants

No.	Salutation	Name	Affiliation
1	Ms.	Sri Wardhani	ASEAN Secretariat
2	Mr.	Edwin Arief	ASEAN Secretariat
3	Mr.	Beny Irzanto	ASEAN Secretariat
4	Mr.	Haji Rozaly Haji Saidon	Brunei Darussalam
5	Mr.	Hasbul Wafi Salleh	Brunei Darussalam
6	Ms.	Chhim Bopta	Cambodia
7	Dr.	Karmini Goemoen	Indonesia
8	Ms.	Hapsari Sri Winahyu	Indonesia
9	Mr.	Torang Hutabarat	Indonesia
10	Mr.	Rizki Wijaya	Indonesia
11	Ms.	Xaysomnuk Souvannavong	Lao PDR
12	Dr.	Syed Fatimah Kamal Batcha	Malaysia
13	Ms.	Noor Aishah Kamarzaman	Malaysia
14	Ms.	Pa Pa Lin	Myanmar
15	Mr.	Mark Richmund de Leon	Philippines
16	Mr.	Doroteo Jose Yjares	Philippines
17	Dr.	Karl Vergel	Philippines
18	Dr.	Jose Bienvenido Manuel Biona	Philippines
19	Dr.	Atit Tipichai	Regional
20	Mr.	Bert Fabian	Regional
21	Dr.	Horizon Gitano	Regional
22	Mr.	Alvin Mejia	Regional
23	Ms.	Kathleen Dematera	Regional
24	Ms.	Mei Wei NG	Regional
25	Mr.	Chun Kit Henry Henry	Singapore
26	Mr.	EU Jin Toh	Singapore
27	Ms.	Shuyan Lin	Singapore
28	Ms.	Pimphan Chumpengphan	Thailand
29	Ms.	Chutinthorn Mankhong	Thailand
30	Ms.	Thanyathorn Sawatdiwong	Thailand
31	Ms.	Wipada Unlumert	Thailand
32	Mr.	Boonsit Suttinoon	Thailand
33	Mr.	Ittipol Paw-armat	Thailand
34	Ms.	Kamolporn Pornrekwiangping	Thailand
35	Mr.	Chessada Sakulku	Thailand
36	Mr.	Tien Nguyen Huu	Vietnam
37	Mr.	Luu Vu Hai	Vietnam
38	Ms.	Nguyen Thi Diem Hang	Vietnam
39	Mr.	Stefan Bakker	Consultant
40	Mr.	Sudhir Gota	Consultant



ASEAN – German Technical Cooperation
Transport and Climate Change



No.	Salutation	Name	Affiliation
41	Mr.	Anders Imboden	Consultant
42	Mr.	Aditya Mahalana	GIZ
43	Ms.	Danielle Guillen	GIZ
44	Ms.	Cristina Villaraza	GIZ
45	Mr.	Tali Trigg	GIZ
46	Ms.	Julia Nagel	GIZ
47	Mr.	Papondhanai Nanthachatchavankul	GIZ
48	Ms.	Gessarín Gunthawong	GIZ