



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](mailto:seea@un.org)

Name:	Jillian Campbell
Organization & country:	CBD

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](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)

## **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?**

I think that it might be useful to use the phrase natural capital in the concepts and definitions as a way to demonstrate the use of the SEEA for measuring natural capital. The fact that this phrase is not used is a missed opportunity to better position the SEEA in the natural capital implementation and dialogues (as you know many MoE and UNEP and CBD colleagues use the phrase natural capital). Additionally, I think that there is a need to go into a bit more detail on cultivated versus natural. I know that Chapter 3 is referenced, but I think that it is not so straightforward to delineate.

On a side note, perhaps in the description of biomass extraction you could specifically mention MFA.

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

I would think that harvesting of wild food (not hunting, but gathering), medicine, supplies for craft making and such should be in that initial list under biomass in the table (also this provides a greater link with cultural services).

**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?**

It is not clear to me if it would really be possible to split the ecosystem service provisioning from natural ecosystems from cultivated ecosystems in practice.

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

I think that it might be useful to somewhere make reference to how ecosystem accounting could be used to create useful indicators on ecosystem extent and services which could be used for high-level tracking and informing policy. (Also, here it might be useful to re-enforce that such indicators could be non-monetary.)

**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?**

I think that it might be useful to make a direct link with MFA accounts. Biomass provisioning services can be directly incorporated into the estimation of Biomass extraction in the MFA account. I also think that it might be useful to attempt to align the biomass categories with those used in the MFA guidance.

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

Is baseline the right word for table 7.6? It is more the basis for determining the services provided by a particular ecosystem – to me baseline refers to some existing state but really what is described is just the basis for the calculation (a theoretical basis).