



DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS  
STATISTICS DIVISION  
UNITED NATIONS



System of  
Environmental  
Economic  
Accounting

---

## System of Environmental-Economic Accounting 2012 – Experimental Ecosystem Accounting Revision

### First Global Consultation on:

**Chapter 3: Spatial units for Ecosystem Accounting**

**Chapter 4: Accounting for Ecosystem Extent**

**Chapter 5: Accounting for Ecosystem Condition**

### *Comments Form*

**Deadline for responses: 30 April 2020**

**Send responses to: [seea@un.org](mailto:seea@un.org)**

Name:	Environment and Natural Resources Accounts Division Macroeconomic Accounts Service
Organization & country:	Philippine Statistics Authority , Philippines

The comment form has been designed to facilitate the analysis of comments. There are nine guiding questions in the form, please respond to the questions in the indicated boxes below. To submit responses please save this document and send it as an attachment to the following e-mail address: [seea@un.org](mailto:seea@un.org).

All documents can be also found on the SEEA EEA Revision website at:  
<https://seea.un.org/content/seea-experimental-ecosystem-accounting-revision>

In case you have any questions or have issues with accessing the documents, please contact us at [seea@un.org](mailto:seea@un.org)

**Question 1: Do you have any comments on the definition and description of ecosystem assets and ecosystem accounting areas and the associated measurement boundaries and treatments?**

The definition in the Chapter 3 of the ecosystem assets is clear to understand. It is good that there is a comparison of definition between the environmental assets and ecosystem assets to lessen the confusions of the compiler, as ecosystem assets are considered on the basis of biophysical existence and not dependent on establishing flows of benefits or ownership as is required for economic assets in the SNA. In terms of linking ecosystem asset and ecosystem accounting areas, in the revision, it is suggested to have concrete examples of EA and EAA on the basis of relationship between spatial units. In the tabulations instead of EA Type #1 then column for size, we could have instead an actual EA e.g. terrestrial, to visualize the relationship. In the treatment of specific ecosystems and features, it is better if there is a tabular presentation of the specific ecosystems and their features, e.g. summary table.

**Question 2. Do you have any comments on the use of the IUCN Global Ecosystem Typology as the SEEA Ecosystem Type Reference Classification?**

The chapter stated the recommendation for the classification of EAs used for ecosystem accounting be based on an existing national ecosystem classification scheme, if not available the recommendation is to be based on the IUCN Global Ecosystem Typology that can be used to focus on the most relevant ETs in local context. However, for the purpose of international reporting and comparison, the SEEA Ecosystem type should be applied. If the existing national ecosystem classification should be used, but is not aligned with the SEEA ecosystem classification, it is suggested to have a bridge table in the local context to be comparable with SEEA. To do this, defining SEEA Ecosystem type reference classification is needed and should be included in the annex, this is very relevant in comparing local operational typology of ecosystems with the international context such as for realms, biome and ecosystem functional groups.

**Question 3. Do you have any comments on the recording of changes in ecosystem extent and ecosystem condition, including the recording of ecosystem conversions, as described in chapters 4 and 5?**

During the recording of the ecosystem extent, for the natural regression the difference from the SEEA Central Framework is that there is a separate entry for catastrophic losses this includes the extreme events events. However, in ecosystem extent the entry in the natural regression wherein there is a decrease in area of an associated ecosystem type is due to extreme events and can be influenced by human activity, are there any example of other natural processes that can be included in the natural regression. It is suggested to have a comparison of the entry for catastrophic losses from central framework and natural regression for ecosystem extent. The challenges for the compiler in accounting to record changes in extent over a long period of time are the availability of data, such as entries in coral bleaching or loss of coral reefs, deforestations and recording of the loss during the extreme events.

**Question 4. Do you have any comments on the three-stage approach to accounting for ecosystem condition, including the aggregation of condition variables and indicators?**

For the key characteristics, in this stage though it was mentioned in the chapter the criteria for the characteristics, variables and indicators, and also shown in table for ecosystem condition variable account, it is suggested there should be a clear tabular example on how to describe the variable and its measurement and ecosystem type in terms of changes in the level. In the In terms of the ecosystem index account it is clearly stated that the setting of reference levels is beyond the scope of the SEEA ecosystem condition accounts. It is noted that the findings from the testing of the approach is currently underway to support this chapter.

**Question 5. Do you have any comments on the description and application of the concept of reference condition and the use of both natural and anthropogenic reference conditions in accounting for ecosystem condition?**

For the reference condition both for natural and anthropogenic, it is well noted in the annex the strength and weaknesses, however, there should be more examples of references conditions in terms of stable or resilient ecological state maintaining ecosystem integrity. It also stated in the criteria to have a good scientific understanding on what constitutes ecological integrity can also be used as starting point to determine characteristics need to be considered relevant. We have also to consider data availability on the variables sensitive change such as remote sensing data. It is clear in the revision that feasibility in variables should covered by potentially available data sources over and those characteristics that are difficult to measure or are unfeasible to covered by data should be avoided, however, an example of this characteristic that are difficult to measures have to be mentioned. The ancillary data for ecosystem condition that can be compiled following the SEEA Central Framework and the FDES, however, it was mentioned that these types of data do not satisfy the criteria for selection as ecosystem condition variables consistent with SEEA ecosystem condition type, it should mentioned how the compilation of this statistics can be used.

**Question 6. Do you have any comments on Ecosystem Condition Typology for organising characteristics, data and indicators about ecosystem condition?**

For the SEEA ecosystem condition typology , the description should have specific example and measurements of variables and indicators related to class, e.g. class of physical state characteristics abiotic components : soil , water and air , what type of data do we need for these abiotic components and the corresponding measurement in order to describe the physical stocks. For chemical state characteristics , how to measure/describe the stock of pollutants in terms of the availability of the data, some data on the various pollutants are in concentration level, this can be well explore through examples and definitions of related terms.

**Question 7. Do you have any other comments on Chapter 3?**

The presentation of the chapter 3 is clear and well stated and well-defined terms of ecosystem assets, ecosystem accounting areas, and other terms used. It is well noted that for the figures e.g. vertical structure of a terrestrial ecosystem and marine ecosystem, further refinement will be made to facilitate clearer visualization.

**Question 8. Do you have any other comments on Chapter 4?**

The presentation of the chapter 4 is clear and well stated in the purpose of accounting for ecosystem extent, and also, relevant accounting entries are well-defined. However, refinement on the tables for ecosystem extent account and ET change matrix is recommended for clearer visualization on the illustration of the structure of the accounts.

**Question 9. Do you have any other comments on Chapter 5?**

The presentation of the chapter 4 is clear and well stated in the purpose of accounting for the ecosystem condition, it also well noted that for the stylised example as to the incorporation of the three conditions e.g. ecosystem condition variable account, indicator account and index account will have its generic method and also, detailed compilation guidance will be developed.