

Table 1. Summary of the developed SDG indicators.

SDG Indicator	Value (year/years)	Use of EO	Cost-effectiveness	Reusability	Maturity	Level of confidence	Harmonization	Regional aggregations
6.3.2	Lakes: tentatively 80-85% (2017-2023)	79% of lakes	2.5	2.5	2	2	recalculated for years 2017-2024	yes, waterbodies and water types
6.6.1	+0.18 mm/year (1961-2025, 64 years)	~40 %	2.5	2.5	2	2	no	No, but feasible and data for this exists.
11.3.1	0.52 (2023-2024)	0%	3	3	3	2	no recalculation	No, but possible
14.1.1a	4.5 µg L ⁻¹ (2024)	65 %	2.5	2.5	2	3	recalculated for years 2017-2024	yes, waterbodies and water types
15.3.1	8,1 % (2019)	100 %	2.5	2	2	2	no	yes, land productivity for Forest Lapland
15.4.2	a: 83.4% (2021) b: 2.9% (2021)	100%	2.5	3	2	2	Yes, homogeneous data for 2018 and 2021	No; mountain areas are in the Northern Finland

Description of the columns: Value: value of the SDG indicator, calculated with the developed processing pipeline (year(s): value(s)). Use of EO: How relevant was use of EO data in assessing the indicator (0-100 %). Cost-effectiveness: Degree of automation reached in the processing pipeline and how much preprocessing of input data is required (1-3, 1=considerable manual work needed, 3=fully automated). Re-usability: Re-usability of the processing pipeline, how much customization needed in yearly reporting (1-3, 1 = considerable customization, 3 = little to no customization). Maturity: Level of SDG pipeline maturity reached (1-3, 1 = demonstration, needs more development, 2 = operational, potential improvements identified, 3 = fully operational). Level of confidence: Statement on the level of confidence based on internal evaluation (1-3, 1 = low, 3 = high). Harmonization: If previously reported data was recalculated, was the whole time-series harmonized with the new processing pipeline and data? (no/yes, free text). Regional aggregations: Was regional aggregations of the SDG indicator also calculated? (no/yes, free text)