

Sharing experience for developing pilot accounts in Czech Republic

Ioanna Grammatikopoulou, David Vačkář

Global Change Research Institute, Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague

Forum of experts in SEEA EEA
18 – 20 July 2018, Long Island, New York



Our work in CR

- Lessons learnt from pilot accounts in Kyrkyz Republic (Poverty-Environment Initiative (UNDP-UNEP))
- Preparing national statistical office
 - Stakeholders engagement
 - Focus on pilot accounts (by asset as well as by ES; priorities)
 - Scale (national, regional, local)
- Data mining
 - Reporting gaps
- Developing a methodological protocol
 - Classification of ecosystems based on CORINE Land Cover and Consolidated Layer of Ecosystems
 - Classification of ecosystem services (CICES)
 - A systematic review of valuation studies (benefit transfer)
- Pilot cases:
 - forest SUT accounts (national scale)
 - Ecosystem extent accounts (land and ecosystem accounts)
 - Water accounts (*next*)

Challenges

- Matching ES data with statistical data
 - ES accounting not a priority at national scale/initiated by research community (research driven)
 - **Methodological challenges (e.g. indicators, methods, linking ES with benefits, allocating flows to beneficiaries)**
 - Mainstreaming ecosystem accounting
- 

Future plans

- Assemble ecosystem accounts based on value transfer (national scale) and based on the methodological protocol developed with close collaboration with statistical office
- Update and improve EKOSERV database
- Integrate forest ES in SNA
- Pilot water accounts
- Consolidate spatial data for facilitating extent ecosystem accounts

Issued to address during SEEA EEA revision

- **Spatial units**
 - Spatial distribution of accounts
 - Quality of data (data requirements)
- **Ecosystem condition**
 - Need of a reference to characterize the level of condition (and notion of sustainability)
 - Link to degradation
- **Ecosystem services**
 - conclude in 'common grounds' (e.g. ES confused with functions and processes, ES versus benefits and then SNA vs non SNA benefits, enabling actors vs beneficiaries)
 - Intermediate ES treated in accounting
 - Allocate ES supply across different ecosystem assets
- **Valuation**
 - Valuation on ES or benefits?
 - Welfare methods left out (envir. economics approach vs accounting approach; thinking also the type of transactions-monetary, non monetary and imputed-in SNA)
 - BT relevance in accounting (taking advantage of the large knowledge even though studies are not always comparable)
 - Double counting (e.g. values of ES based on production function methods and market prices of outputs)
- *One last point:* clear lines towards integration (ES, assets and degradation integrated in SNA)
 - Measuring degradation through NPV approach. Is the linear assumption valid for all ecosystems? Clear lines in thresholds values.

Thank you for your attention



*Department
of Human Dimensions
of Global Change*