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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.
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