



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:	Felipe García (FG) / Natalia Román (NR) / Carolina Balian (CB)
Organization&country:	Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca (MGAP) - Oficina de Programación y Política Agropecuaria (OPYPA), Uruguay

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?

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

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

NR: Every country should use their own classification first, and then the country can use the SEEA Ecosystem Type Reference Classification or can work on an equivalence table.

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?

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?

NR: I think the approach is correct and allows to make visible a first picture of the ecosystem condition, once you have it, you can analyse that condition with indicators and finally you can observe the interaction between different ecosystems.

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?

FG: I would suggest providing more detailed guidance and making direct recommendations on how to define reference conditions in the main text, encouraging more emphatically to use global agreed approaches from international conventions (Annex 5.5). This is a key point for the success of the condition assessment and many countries may not have the technical capacity to define reference conditions on their own with a strong approach.

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?

NR: On climate drivers of the ecosystem could be important to consider radiation too.

CB: Within 3.4 Considerations in the delineation of spatial units—3.4.2 Relationship with data on land, I consider that the statement “*land use reflects... (b) the institutional arrangements put in place for a given area for the purposes of economic production, or the maintenance and restoration of environmental functions*” does not include other non-productive land uses as human settlements (paragraph 3.61).

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?

FG: Specifically on chapter 5, I think it is technically sound and supported by research. I would suggest making an effort to include more examples from marine ecosystems (e.g. table 5.1).

CB: I suggest simplifying the phrase “*The capacity for evolutionary processes requires a redundancy reserve of latent genetic material and processes that can be used in the future*” when defining Ecosystem integrity in Annex 5.1: Conceptual framing for ecosystem condition.

CB: It could be convenient to provide guideline on how to define “*heavily transformed ecosystems management*” in Annex 5.4: Ancillary data for ecosystem condition measurement.