



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 6: Ecosystem services concepts for accounting

Chapter 7: Accounting for ecosystem services in physical terms

Comments Form

Deadline for responses: 20 August 2020

Send responses to: seea@un.org

Name:	Radoslav Považan
Organization & country:	Slovak Environment Agency, Slovakia

The comment 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 the following e-mail address: 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

Questions related to Chapter 6

Question 1: Do you have comments on the concepts and definitions for ecosystem services, benefits and associated components of the ecosystem accounting framework?

We welcome the guidelines on the concepts and definitions for ecosystem services. The applied approach reflects the relevant international platforms such as TEEB, MAES, IPBES. The benefit of ecosystem services (ES) assessment is that it helps explain the asset of ecosystems for humans, including those ecosystems not traded on the markets. We appreciate that the ecosystem accounting includes also ES which are not considered in the standard accounting.

We have the following comment regarding the text:

We suggest to add the concept „Intrinsic Value“ to the chapter 6. It refers to inherent value, that is the value something has independent of any human experience or evaluation. Such a value is viewed as an inherent property of the entity and not ascribed or generated by external valuing agents ([IPBES](#); [Pascual et al., 2017](#)).

Even though it is not possible to calculate the intrinsic value of nature within the accounting systems, this concept should be at least mentioned in the text.

Question 2. Do you have comments on the content and descriptions in the reference list of selected ecosystem services?

We suggest, also here, add the reference on the intrinsic value of nature which is not possible to calculate but it is necessary to be aware that it exists.

Question 3. Do you agree with the proposed treatments for selected ecosystem services described in Section 6.4 for biomass provisioning services, global climate regulation services, cultural services, water supply and abiotic flows?

We agree.

Question 4. Do you have any other comments on Chapter 6?

No other comments.

Questions related to Chapter 7

Question 5. Do you have comments on the proposed recording approaches for ecosystem services supply and use tables described in section 7.2?

As we already commented in previous round of consultation (on chapter 3), the presented classification of ecosystems is based on IUCN Global Ecosystem Typology, but we in Slovakia apply the EU classification EUNIS which reflects all relevant EU directives and the data reporting is set up accordingly. We recommend to harmonize the two systems or possibly introduce a correspondence table between these two systems.

Question 6. Do you have any other comments on Chapter 7?

There is missing part containing „references“ at the end of chapter 7.