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Some complex issues between accounts

• Water regulating services- regulation of low flow versus peak flow as different services  
  • Disaggregation of type of service from a single biophysical account! Regulation vs provisioning etc.

Key is maintaining ability to recover spatial and other info going back from tables to interrogate

Some things can’t be measured or calculated at small scales, e.g. many biodiversity indices. At what scales are calculations vs reporting meaningful? (see our proposed change in condition definition)

• For other services such as water and carbon we may keep calcs at small scale and although reporting more aggregated info, avoid loss of information
Input data aggregation e.g.:
GRACE – mm water anomaly at ~100km
Habitat metrics: Karnataka districts
RUSLE output, “default” GIS scaling
For condition (& other normalized accounts?)

- Our reference condition will set the scale- issues with global reporting?
  - Implications of taking "natural" as a reference: collapses information on range of variation in modified landscapes (at first pass look)
  - Implications of swapping between ecosystem types as they change – danger of losing information on major loss of "naturalness", carbon, biodiversity, etc.
Europe: aggregated assessment of cropland condition