



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

Name:	Zsuzsanna Szabó
Organization & country:	Hungarian Central Statistical Office

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.

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

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 Spatial Units document (Ch 3) recommends the term „biotope” presented together with habitat, to provide distinguished place-based concepts besides ecosystems. In the description, it is mentioned that they also focus on abiotic factors, and have a geographical component. We also consider it very important to refer to handle ecosystems and biomes with an interdisciplinary approach in the whole ecosystem accounting process. Therefore, we propose to take into consideration to use the term „ecotope” (perhaps instead of biotope), which is also an existing and widely used term (Bastian et al. 2002, Radoux et al. 2019), and might drive the attention of those readers and users of the material to this viewpoint, who will not go into details in definitions and background concepts. We know that these nomenclature issues are not among the most important questions in this practice-oriented field and in these documents, and using „biotope” is of course also reasonable. But if there is nothing against, it might work at least some mentioning somewhere in the referring subsection.

Bastian, O., Beierkuhlein, C., Klink, H.J., Löffler, J., Steinhardt, U., Volk, M., Wilmking, M. . 2002. Landscape structures and processes. Pages 49-112 in O. Bastian and U. Steinhardt, eds. Development and Perspectives of Landscape Ecology. Kluwer Academic Publishers

Radoux, J.,Bourdouxhe, A., Coos, W.,Dufrière, M., Defourny, P. 2019. Improving Ecotope Segmentation by Combining Topographic and Spectral Data. Remote Sensing 11(3), 354; <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11030354>

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

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

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?

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

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?

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

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?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As a remark not to a concrete definition or methodological issue, but only to the text of the Condition document (Ch 5) in general: We consider one of the main added value of the ecosystem accounting concept (and generally the integrated ecosystem service assessments) that it aims to provide a very systematic and quantitative, monitorable platform for detecting the complex but clear dependency of ecosystem services and their values on ecosystem condition. This could have an enormous added value for the whole environmental policy in many parts of the world. Because in many cases, the most important gap, which contributes to the ineffectiveness of efforts is that these dependencies are not revealed, handled and monitored clearly, in a systematic way, and moreover, as an inherent part of regional or national statistics. (Without that, it is more easy to handle these viewpoints as something which is not justified enough.) This makes harder not only environmental management activities but also the communication of these interdependencies and its consequences on the well-being of the society. It is perhaps not stated such clearly, which might be considered somewhere (e.g. Annex 5.1. Conceptual framing of environmental condition?), even if not with the simplified sentences above.