



DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS
STATISTICS DIVISION
UNITED NATIONS



System of
Environmental
Economic
Accounting

System of Environmental-Economic Accounting— Ecosystem Accounting

Global Consultation on the complete document: Comments Form

Deadline for responses: 30 November 2020

Send responses to: seea@un.org

Name:	Rebeca Palis
Organization & country:	IBGE Brazil

The comments form has been designed to facilitate the analysis of comments. There are six 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: seea@un.org.

All documents can be found on our website at: <https://seea.un.org/content/global-consultation-complete-draft>

In case you have any questions or have issues with accessing the documents, please contact us at seea@un.org

General comments

Question 1: Do you have comments on the overall draft of the SEEA Ecosystem Accounting?

The discussions presented in this version of the manual are broad, ranging from a brief contextualization to practical examples and possible social, economic and political implications

Highlighting some points of great methodological advancement that the Manual brings: the adoption of the IUCN global ecosystem typology as a reference for comparability of country classifications; good recommendations for selecting ecosystem condition indicators; harmonization between the different classifications of ecosystem services; and a series of examples and directions for thematic accounts and integration of ecosystem accounts with other environmental economic accounts.

From these points, a specific and important issue for Brazil is the IUCN typology, largely because of the wide geobiodiversity of our territory. The adoption of this classification by the SEEA and the broad explanation of it in the Manual represents an advance towards standardizing and expanding the international comparability of Ecosystem Accounts. Despite this, the classification can be improved with this initial standard.

Several issues that were discussed a lot in the Virtual Forum sessions are well-worked and clear in this version of the Manual. An example of this is the application of the EAA and ET concepts in the extension and condition accounts and their transposition into the accounting for ecosystem services. On the other hand, a complex aspect - perhaps needs more reflection - is the practical use of Ecosystem Assets and, in this sense, the expansion of the adoption and application of the methodology by other countries may bring greater clarity with its examples and particularities.

Another point is the approach of supply and use tables applied to ecosystem services, in this version they seemed to have advanced quite conceptually, and they may still have adaptations and further development, considering that they have also been relatively little tested by different countries.

Comments by sets of chapters

Question 2. Do you have comments on Chapters 1-2 of the draft SEEA Ecosystem Accounting?

Click here and start typing (The length of your response is not limited by this text box.)

Question 3. Do you have comments on Chapters 3-5 of the draft SEEA Ecosystem Accounting?

Click here and start typing (The length of your response is not limited by this text box.)

Question 4. Do you have comments on Chapters 6-7 of the draft SEEA Ecosystem Accounting?

The changes made in chapter 6, explaining the best definitions, especially in relation to benefits and well-being, as well as further clarification on the applicability of non-use values were appreciated.

In chapter 7, in 7.31, would it not be the case to use an example in which it is made explicit that although the service is used by various economic entities, the benefits remain individual? Would the indicated example be correct?

” For most ecosystem services that contribute to non-SNA benefits... In cases where a single ecosystem service is used by a number of economic units but the benefits remain individual rather than collective – e.g., in the case of water regulation for mitigation of extreme events...”

Still in chapter 7, in table 7.4, in the part that refers to the uses of biomass provision services, shouldn't the product be melon instead of wheat? Or is there any specificity in terms of crop nutrients (or some similar idea)?

Question 5. Do you have comments on Chapters 8-11 of the draft SEEA Ecosystem Accounting?

It is very important that the methods are compatible with the concepts of national accounts.

Chapter 8: The explanations in 8.7 clarified the scope, limitations and applicability of valuation techniques applied in the context of ecosystem accounting.

At 8.30 and 8.41 (in the chapter 9), the paragraph made the understanding clearer on the issue raised in the previous review round on how to consider, for example, forest air filtration services in the context of the contribution to non SNA-benefits.

Chapter 9: The new structure of the chapter made it possible to better target the priorities of the different valuation methods and, mainly, made clear which methods should be avoided in ecosystem accounting.

Regarding valuation, we are still in studies phase and we have some concerns to implemented it.

Question 6. Do you have comments on Chapters 12-14 of the draft SEEA Ecosystem Accounting?

Click here and start typing (The length of your response is not limited by this text box.)