



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:	François Soulard
Organization & country:	Statistics Canada

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?**

- We generally agree with the definition of ecosystem assets and accounting areas, and the associated measurement boundaries and treatments.
- Minor comment about new figure 3.2: The grid has been removed, but Table 3.1 refers to areas that used to be measured by the grid.
- Correction: 3.4.2 *Relationship with data on land cover*

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

- The GET is a useful tool, and we will start using the concepts and terminology in our own reporting. However, the lack of specificity in the measurement of the different elements used to identify individual GETs may affect international comparability. Accepting that SEEA is a conceptual framework and not a measurement framework, it may be an issue that countries will go about measuring assets differently. Hopefully the current attempts at mapping GETS will shed light on the metrics, and perhaps best practice guidance will be made available.
- Also, some classes appear to be missing or limited in this version the GET. Hopefully they can be added in the future (e.g. boreal peat wetland). Also, given that the ultimate goal is (arguably) to add monetary values to ecosystem services, and that the highest values for services are likely found in urban areas, the GET offers limited use for accounting for ecosystem asset and services values in urban areas.

**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?**

- It remains conceptually challenging (and potentially politically delicate) to identify and tag changes in ecosystem condition as actual ecosystem type changes (ecosystem conversions). The identification of a reference condition remains a point of discussion.
- However, compiling nationally consistent and coherent data on extent and condition is a most useful exercise, and the potential debate stemming from the classification exercise mentioned above can only help better understand the state of the environment. But these data may be hard to come by.



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

We are not clear on the relationship between ecosystem extent characteristics (those elements that allow the delineation of GETs) and ecosystem condition characteristics. We need to review this further.

But overall very useful and we look forward using the recommended concepts and guidelines in our national and subnational reporting.

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

Overall very useful and we look forward using the recommended concepts and guidelines in our national and subnational reporting.

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

Overall very useful and we look forward using the recommended concepts and guidelines in our national and subnational reporting.