



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](mailto:seea@un.org)**

Name:	Achille Carlos DEFFO
Organization & country:	National Institute of Statistics; Cameroon
Contact (e.g., email address):	carlos_deffo@yahoo.fr

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](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)

**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?**

In paragraph 3.8, it's not very clear how ecosystem assets and environmental assets relate to each other, and that ecosystem assets are a subcomponent of environmental assets. The links between the two classifications could be established more clearly. A typo error occurred in figure 3.2: it must likely be "EA1 (ET1)" instead of "EA1 (EA1)". Also, the definition of ecosystem type does not appear anywhere else before its usage in figure 3.2.

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

The IUCN Global Ecosystem Typology as the SEEA Ecosystem Type Reference Classification appears to be well-suited for the purpose; but the wording/phrasing used seems to be too much specialized (in the ecological sense), especially at levels 2/3 and downward. A common wording/phrasing could be more useful and/or appealing both for compilers and users.

**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?**

In paragraph 4.9, the text refers to level 2 (biome level) of the IUCN GET, whereas table 4.1 refers to level 3 (EFG level). Also, table 4.1 could be better presented transposed (ET in rows and changes in columns), since the number of ET is likely to be greater than the number of changes categories (which is fixed).

**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?**

The conceptual definition of an ecosystem asset (EA) appear to be clear and simple, but in practical terms it's a bit hard to associate a concrete reality to this concept (at least for a non-ecological specialist), compare for example to the concept of enterprise or establishment in the SNA. And this can be a great practical difficulty for the implementation of ecosystem accounting, since the EAs are supposed to play a similar role as establishments in national accounting.

**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?**

The implementation of ecosystem accounting requires the collection of a lot of detailed information at ecosystem asset (EA) level, ideally using geographic information systems (GIS) technologies. The chapter (this also apply to chapters 3 and 4) sufficiently emphasize on alternatives methods to be used in country with weaker statistical systems, where for example infrastructures for GIS data collection are not always available, and where the (highly) cost of collecting the required amount of data could underpin the implementation of ecosystem accounting