



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 April2020

Send responses to: seea@un.org

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Name: | Fayvush Georgi |
| Organization&country: | Dpt. of Geobotany, Institute of Botany NAS RA, Armenia |

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?

We consider that in such small countries but with great variability of ecosystems like Armenia it is necessary to use maps for EAs delineation on national level (if they absent it is necessary to compile them), and not to use global datasets. It is better to waste time preparing the base (maps) than presenting inaccurate and dubious data using this source. (3.56)

We agree that “Delineating the boundaries between ecosystem assets might be undertaken through assessments by ecologists on the ground, including delineation of changes over time”, and it is absolutely necessary to involve in this work scientists (first of all botanists and zoologists).

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

To classify ecosystems (or habitats) in Armenia, we use the EUNIS classification scheme, adapted to our conditions. For international reporting, of course, its transformation into the IUCN classification (GET) is possible, but in this case data loss is expected. GET is good for large areas, especially plains, but in mountains with very variable conditions, when ecosystems change on very short distances, this system is not convenient. Sure, for international reporting it is possible to transfer data from national ecosystem classification scheme to GET.

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?

On our opinion, length of accounting period (1 year) (4.21) is too short for natural and semi-natural ecosystems, especially considering the small number of specialists in Armenia.

In our opinion, to record changes in the extent and configuration of EAs over long periods of time (4.23) is almost impossible. It will be extremely difficult to compare most indicators even with the 1990s, since the necessary data were not collected at that time. Moreover, it is absolutely impossible to draw a comparison with the year 1750, when botanists and zoologists from Europe and Russia had just begun to visit Armenia.

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?

We agree with this approach.

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?

No, only we want one more time to draw attention that it is necessary to train specialists, especially for field work.

Question 6. Do you have any comments on Ecosystem Condition Typology for organising characteristics, data and indicators about ecosystem condition?

We agree, but again, there is no sufficient quantity of specialists in Armenia who will be able to collect such data.

Question 7. Do you have any other comments on Chapter 3?

The most doubtful point for the whole work is lack of specialists, especially for fieldwork. We consider that it is very important to involve specialists (botanists, zoologists, etc.) from Academy of Sciences and Universities for this work on the basis similar to Government Order. Government of Armenia has to think about training of specialists, especially young specialists or students.

We consider that governmental agencies (like State Council on Statistics of Armenia) will be not able to establish NSDI (National Spatial Data Infrastructure) without scientists, especially without botanists and zoologists.

Question 8. Do you have any other comments on Chapter 4?

The most doubtful point for the whole work is lack of specialists, especially for fieldwork. We consider that it is very important to involve specialists (botanists, zoologists, etc.) from Academy of Sciences and Universities for this work on the basis similar to Government Order.

Question 9. Do you have any other comments on Chapter 5?

The most doubtful point for the whole work is lack of specialists, especially for fieldwork. We consider that it is very important to involve specialists (botanists, zoologists, etc.) from Academy of Sciences and Universities for this work on the basis similar to Government Order. It is absolutely necessary to include in the system of state environmental monitoring biodiversity monitoring. Now this part of monitoring is absent in Armenia, some parts of it are going in the Institute of Botany and in the Centre of Zoology and Hydroecology of NAS RA, but observations are not regularly and not on permanent plots.