



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:	Jennie Wang
Organization & country:	Statistics Canada

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?

No.

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

This is a helpful list. See specific comment on organic v.s. inorganic.

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?

Yes. The instructions seem generally clear, and the proxy options and alternatives are useful / probably needed for most contexts. See specific comment for unclear sentence on the contribution of the ecosystem.

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

Please see small issues identified in the comments list of the attached PDF, mostly small editorial comments and noting where wording unclear. Also probably inaccurate inclusion of 'nutrients' under the organic pollutants. Unless referring to breakdown of organic matter e.g., manure, but that is not really what is implied with 'organic' and 'inorganic' pollutants and nutrients, in their inorganic form are needed for plant growth and more likely to leach or volatilize etc.

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?

No. Usefully described and presented and the sample table is instructive. Appreciate the recognition in 7.13 and 7.14 of alternate presentations for time series and for mapping approaches.

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

Please see detailed comments in Comment function of PDF.

Am not sure the distinction between the attributed user of a service (7.28/7.29) is clear enough. E.g. is air filtration service not a public good? Why then not attributed to government, as opposed to households. Could it not also benefit non-households?

Some areas may not be completely clear e.g. imports 7.40 v.s. 7.54. One might read import/export as the physical location, but it is rather the residency status of the user.

And a few minor editing suggestions or typos identified in a couple of sentences.