

Global Assessment of Environmental-Economic Accounting and Supporting Statistics 2014

I. Introduction

1. The Global Assessment of Environmental-Economic Accounting was undertaken by the United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD) under the auspices of the United Nations Committee of Experts on Environmental-Economic Accounting (UNCEEAA). Following the adoption of the System of Environmental Economic Accounting 2012 Central Framework (SEEA Central Framework), the UNCEEAA undertook a follow up assessment to the one which took place in 2006.

2. The questionnaire was developed using web-based survey software¹, and was shortened from the 2006 version. It was carried out in one phase, and took approximately 30-60 minutes to complete. While the majority of respondents filled in the survey online, there was also the possibility to complete the survey on paper and submit it to UNSD in hardcopy. Respondents were strongly encouraged to fill in the assessment online however, as its interactive features enabled the respondent to answer only those questions which were relevant based on previous answers.

3. The Global Assessment was sent by email on 13 November 2014 to the 192 Member Countries. As of 29 January 2015, 85 countries responded to the Assessment, corresponding to a response rate of 44 percent. The list of countries that responded to the Assessment is reported in Annex I. The analysis will be updated once more responses are received, and will be made available on the UNSD website. Individual country responses will also be made available, based on explicit permission obtained from responding countries.

4. The aim of the Global Assessment was to delineate a baseline for the SEEA implementation against which progress will be assessed on a regular basis. The assessment also serves to gain a better understanding of (a) the current status of national SEEA implementation, including institutional arrangements; (b) countries' priorities and future plans for the implementation of selected SEEA-based accounts; and (c) countries' needs in terms of support for implementation of the SEEA. The Assessment included questions on countries' environmental-economic accounting programmes, the current scope and future plans for said national programmes, institutional and inter-institutional arrangements, receipt of technical assistance and availability of supporting statistics.

5. This report presents the main findings of the Assessment. It is organized as follows: Section 2 presents a summary of the main conclusions; section 3 presents the extent of current environmental-economic accounting programmes in countries, including the number of staff dedicated to environmental-economic accounting and the extent of integration of these programmes with environment statistics programmes; section 4 presents the scope of environmental-economic accounting programmes, both in terms of the accounts currently compiled and national plans for the compilation of SEEA-based accounts in the future; section 5 presents national institutional arrangements, identifying inter-institutional arrangements for the compilation of environmental-economic accounts and the extent of coordination mechanisms between institutions; section 6 presents

¹ Survey Monkey software was used to design and collect survey responses; countries could also submit their responses via email.

details of technical assistance received by countries; and section 7 describes findings on national availability of supporting data sources.

II. Summary of the Conclusions

6. The Assessment indicated that environmental-economic accounting programmes are established and expanding components of national statistics programmes. In particular 64% of responding countries had programmes on environmental-economic accounts, corresponding to fifty-four countries, while 18% of respondents (i.e. fifteen countries) were planning to start the compilation of accounts for the first time. This corresponds to a 31% increase in the percentage of countries with a programme on environmental-economic accounting compared to the Global Assessment conducted in 2006.

7. Roughly 59% of countries indicated that their environmental-economic accounting programmes use the same definitions, classifications and data collections as their environment statistics programmes.

8. The topics covered by accounting programmes differed between developing and developed countries. In developed countries, the choice of accounts to compile, as well as future plans to expand/begin compilation of accounts was shaped largely by EU legislation. In developing countries, existing activities and future plans were largely linked to accounts related to water and energy.

9. In roughly 33% of countries with programmes on environmental accounts, more than one institution was responsible for the compilation of environmental-economic accounts/modules (or part of an account/module). More than two-thirds of countries had set up a multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism to enable coordination in the production of environmental-economic accounts and supporting statistics.

10. On average, 69% of countries received technical assistance in setting up their programme for the compilation of specific accounts. Of the responding countries, Eurostat was most often cited as a provider of technical assistance in developed countries, while the United Nations Statistics Division was the largest provider in developing countries.

III. Programmes for Environmental-Economic Accounts

11. The Assessment aimed to ascertain the extent to which programmes on environmental-economic accounting exist within countries. For the purposes of the assessment, a country was considered to have a programme on environmental-economic accounting if it compiles any part/module of the SEEA based accounts in physical or monetary terms. Table 1 shows the existence of such programmes in countries, disaggregated both by economic and geographical region². Of the eighty-five countries which responded to the questionnaire, fifty-four currently have a programme on environmental-economic accounts.

12. Those respondents which indicated that they did not have an existing programme were asked whether they had plans to begin the compilation of environmental-economic accounts in the future.

² Classification of countries by economic and geographical region is done according to the United Nations Statistics Division's Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings. See: <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm>

As illustrated in Table 1, fifteen of the responding countries indicated that they intended to begin compilation of the accounts in the future. This corresponds to roughly 50% of all responding countries which do not have a programme to date.

Table 1: Existence of Environmental-Economic Accounting Programmes in Countries

	<i>Number of Responses</i> (1)	<i>Number countries* without a programme</i> (2)	Existing Programme		Planning a Programme	
			<i>Number of countries with a programme</i> (3)	<i>Percentage countries with a programme</i> (3÷1)	<i>Number of countries* planning a programme</i> (4)	<i>Percentage of countries planning a programme</i> (4÷1)
All Member States	85	31	54	64%	15	18%
By Economic Region:						
<i>Developed</i>	40	9	31	78%	3	8%
<i>Developing</i>	45	22	23	51%	12	27%
By Geographical Region:						
<i>Africa</i>	15	10	5	33%	5	33%
<i>Central, Eastern, Southern and South-Eastern Asia</i>	12	5	7	58%	3	25%
<i>Europe and Northern America</i>	37	8	29	78%	3	8%
<i>Latin America and Caribbean</i>	10	4	6	60%	2	20%
<i>Oceania</i>	3	0	3	100%	0	0%
<i>Western Asia</i>	8	4	4	50%	2	25%

*Where countries refers to those which responded to the questionnaire

13. The figures show that the percentage of countries with an existing programme on environmental economic accounting was higher in developed regions compared with developing regions, although a higher proportion of developing countries without a programme planned to begin one when compared to developed countries. Overall, the percentage of responding countries which had a programme on environmental-economic accounts increased by 8% in developed countries and 50% in developing countries³ when compared to the 2006 Global Assessment.

14. Countries which have a programme on environmental-economic accounting were asked to indicate the number of staff employed in the programme. On average, the responding institutions employed four professional staff in the environmental-economic accounting programme, and one support staff. Professional staff was defined as professionals in the subject matter as opposed to support staff which referred to other administrative staff. Both were measured in full time equivalent. Table 2 illustrates these figures disaggregated by economic region. While the average number of professional staff employed is slightly lower in developing regions, the average number of support staff is almost double the average for developed countries.

³ It is important to note that the Global Assessment in 2006 also included the category “Transition Economies”

Table 2: Average Number of Staff Employed in current Environmental-Economic Accounting Programmes in Countries

	<i>Average number of Professional Staff</i>	<i>Average Number of Support Staff</i>
All Member States	4	1
Developed Region	4	0.7
Developing Region	3.9	1.6

15. Responding countries were asked whether their environmental-economic accounting programme used the same definitions, classifications and data collection as their environment statistics programme. Countries were asked this question regardless of whether they were currently engaged in compiling accounts, as is was also deemed relevant for countries in the planning phase of environmental-economic accounting. Table 3 illustrates the breakdown of answers by economic region, as well as by current compilation activities.

Table 3: Percentage of Countries with Programmes on Environmental-Economic Accounting which use the same Definitions, Classifications and Data Collection as their Environment Statistics Programme

	<i>Percentage of integrated programmes⁴</i>	<i>Percentage of non-integrated programmes</i>	<i>Percentage of countries not responding</i>
All Member States	45%	49%	6%
Developed Region	55%	38%	7%
Developing Region	36%	60%	4%
Countries with a programme	59%	37%	4%
Developed Region	68%	29%	3%
Developing Region	48%	48%	4%
Countries without a programme	19%	71%	10%
Developed Region	11%	67%	22%
Developing Region	23%	73%	4%

16. Of the fifty-four countries which actually compile environmental-economic accounts, 59% indicated that their programmes used the same definitions, classifications and data collection as their Environment Statistics Programme⁵. When disaggregated by economic region, the percentage of countries was lower for developing countries.

IV. Scope of Environmental Accounting Programmes

17. A number of questions in the Assessment aimed to identify the subject areas covered by countries' environmental-economic accounting programmes, both in terms of accounts which have been compiled in the past and future plans to expand and/or begin the compilation of new modules.

Scope of Current Programmes:

18. This section only applies to those countries which indicated that they currently have an environmental-economic accounting programme, and relates to the scope of their current programmes in terms of the accounts compiled.

⁴ Where integrated refers to the use of the same definitions, classifications and data

⁵ Of the 54 countries with a programme on environmental economic accounts, 2 did not respond to this question, while 20 said the programmes were not integrated.

19. Table 4 presents the seven environmental-economic accounts/modules most commonly compiled by countries with an existing accounting programme over the period 2005 to 2015, disaggregated by economic region. An account was considered to be compiled if it had been compiled at least once between 2005 and 2015. In addition, an account was considered to be compiled if any part of it was compiled. For example, ‘energy accounts’ were considered as being compiled even if countries only compiled physical use tables for energy.

20. Table 4 illustrates that the order of importance in terms of accounts most compiled differs somewhat between developed and developing regions. In particular, the most commonly compiled accounts in developing regions tend to be water and energy accounts⁶, a finding which has not changed since the 2006 Global Assessment. While developed countries also showed a high tendency to compile energy accounts, the accounts most commonly compiled differed from the developing region in that they were air emissions accounts and environmental taxes and subsidies. This is also similar to findings in the 2006 Global Assessment.

21. In this regard it is important to note that there is a legal mandate in the European Union to compile air emissions accounts, environmental taxes and subsidies, and material flow accounts as of 2013⁷. Transmission of accounts for EPEA, EGSS and physical energy flow will be obligatory as of 2017⁸. As European Union countries make up a large portion of countries in the developed region, it is to be expected that these are the main accounts listed.

Table 4: Modules/Accounts covered in Environmental-Economic Accounting Programmes by Economic Region

All Member States		Developed Region		Developing Region	
<i>Account/Module</i>	<i>Number of Countries</i>	<i>Account/Module</i>	<i>Number of Countries</i>	<i>Account/Module</i>	<i>Number of Countries</i>
Air Emission Accounts	34	Air Emission Accounts	27	Water Accounts	12
Material Accounts ^a	32	Environmental Taxes and Subsidies	25	Energy Accounts	11
Energy Accounts	30	Material Accounts	24	Material Accounts	8
EPEA ^b	28	EPEA	21	Air Emission Accounts	7
Environmental Taxes and Subsidies	27	Energy Accounts	19	EPEA	7
Water Accounts	23	EGSS	17	Forest Accounts	6
EGSS ^c	18	Water Accounts / Forest Accounts	11	Land Accounts	6

a. Including Material Flow Accounts and Supply and Use Tables for Material

b. Environmental Protection Expenditure Accounts

c. Environmental Goods and Service Sector Accounts

22. Reference is made to the Global Assessment conducted in 2006, which illustrated that as of 2006, the modules most commonly compiled in order of importance were: Energy and Emission

⁶ The disaggregated results indicated that this was driven largely by the compilation of physical supply and use tables for water and energy.

⁷ Regulation (EU) No 691/2011 of the European Parliament and Council on European environmental economic accounts

⁸ Regulation (EU) No 691/2011 was amended by Regulation No 534/2014 on 16 June 2014. This adds 3 new modules with data transmission obligatory from 2017

Accounts, EPEA, Water Accounts, Forest Accounts and Material Flow Accounts. This remains largely unchanged, although the compilation of Forest Accounts was less common in the 2014 Global Assessment.

Plans to Expand Current Programmes:

23. Countries with an existing programme on environmental-economic accounts were asked whether they had plans to expand the compilation of accounts/modules already being compiled, in terms of broadening their coverage (e.g. compiling supply tables in addition to use tables, developing more detailed spatial disaggregation etc.). Table 5 illustrates that 85% of countries had expansion plans, with this figure being slightly higher in developing countries.

Table 5: Percentage of Countries with Programmes on Environmental-Economic Accounting which are planning to expand compilation of modules/accounts already compiled

	<i>Percentage of countries planning expansion</i>	<i>Percentage of countries not planning expansion</i>	<i>Percentage of countries not responding</i>
All Member States	85%	13%	2%
Developed Region	81%	16%	3%
Developing Region	91%	9%	0%

24. Table 6 shows the five main accounts/modules for which countries with existing programmes intend to expand compilation. While the list of accounts is largely the same as Table 5 for the developed region, results from the developing region suggest that, in addition to water and energy accounts, some countries are focussing expansion efforts on forest accounts.

Table 6: Modules/Accounts for which countries with programmes on Environmental-Economic Accounting have expansion plans

All Member States		Developed Region		Developing Region	
<i>Account/Module</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Account/Module</i>	<i>Number of Countries</i>	<i>Account/Module</i>	<i>Number of Countries</i>
Energy Accounts	23	EPEA	15	Water Accounts	13
Water Accounts	20	Material Accounts	14	Energy Accounts	12
Material Accounts	20	EGSS	12	Forest Accounts	8
EPEA	20	Energy Accounts	11	Material / Air	
EGSS	16	Environmental Taxes and Subsidies	10	Emissions / Ecosystem Accounts	6

25. The results of the 2006 Global Assessment were largely similar to the findings in Table 6, although fewer developing countries are expanding EPEA compared to 2006.

Plans to Begin Compilation of New Accounts:

26. Countries which had existing programmes on environmental-economic accounts were asked whether they intended to begin the compilation of new accounts. In addition, countries with no existing programme were asked whether they intended to begin the compilation of any accounts in the future. Plans to begin the compilation of environmental-economic accounts were defined as plans to initiate the compilation of new modules for which no accounts had been compiled to date.

27. Table 7 shows the number of countries with plans to begin the compilation of new modules/accounts disaggregated by economic region. The first section illustrates the proportion of countries planning to begin compilation regardless of whether they have an existing programme. The second section shows the proportion for those which already have a programme, and the third the proportion for those who are planning to compile environmental-economic accounts for the first time. On average, 49% of all countries intended to begin the compilation of at least one new account in the future.

28. Table 7 suggests that 74% of developed countries which are currently compiling at least one account intend to expand their programme and begin compilation of new accounts. A significantly lower percentage of developing countries had plans to compile new accounts in addition to their existing programmes. For those 15 responding countries which indicated that they are planning to start the compilation of environmental-economic accounts for the first time, 80% were from developing countries.

Table 7: Proportion of countries which plan to begin the compilation of accounts/modules

	<i>Number of countries with plans to begin</i>	<i>Percentage of countries with plans to begin</i>	<i>Number of countries with no plans to begin</i>	<i>Percentage of countries with no plans to begin</i>	<i>Percentage of countries not responding</i>
All Member States	42	49%	39	46%	5%
Developed	26	65%	13	33%	2%
Developing	16	36%	26	58%	6%
Countries with a programme	27	50%	25	46%	4%
Developed	23	74%	7	23%	3%
Developing	4	17%	18	78%	5%
Countries with no existing programme	15	48%	14	45%	7%
Developed	3	33%	6	67%	0%
Developing	12	55%	8	36%	9%

29. Table 8 presents the modules for which countries have plans to begin compilation, disaggregated by economic region and the existence of a current programme. Overall, the top five accounts for which countries planned to begin compilation were energy accounts, water accounts, EPEA, EGSS accounts and environmental taxes and subsidies accounts.

30. When disaggregated by economic region, it becomes apparent that energy accounts are a top priority both for developed and developing countries. The next account of priority differs when disaggregated by economic region, with developing countries planning to begin compilation of water accounts while developed countries plan mainly to begin compilation of EPEA and EGSS Accounts. This is to be expected as the European Union has mandated transmission of these three accounts (i.e. Energy Accounts, EPEA and EGSS) by 2017.

31. For countries which already compile some accounts, the energy accounts are once again the main priority. A key difference between economic regions for countries with an existing programme is that many developing countries plan to begin compilation of ecosystem accounts and land accounts, while the corresponding number in developed countries was significantly lower.

Table 8: Modules/Accounts for which countries plan to begin compilation

All Member States		Developed Region		Developing Region	
<i>Account/Module</i>	<i>Number of countries</i>	<i>Account/Module</i>	<i>Number of countries</i>	<i>Account/Module</i>	<i>Number of countries</i>
All Countries (i.e. those with and without programme):					
Energy Accounts	35	Energy Accounts	16	Energy Accounts	19
Water Accounts	28	EPEA	14	Water Accounts	19
EPEA	21	EGSS Accounts	11	Environmental taxes and subsidies	10
EGSS	18	Water Accounts	9	Land Accounts	9
Environmental taxes and subsidies	16	Environmental taxes and subsidies	6	Waste Accounts	8
Countries with a programme on environmental accounting:					
Energy Accounts	25	Energy Accounts	14	Energy Accounts	11
Water Accounts	16	EPEA	13	Water Accounts	9
EGSS Accounts	14	EGSS Accounts	10	Ecosystem Accounts	6
EPEA	14	Water Accounts	7	Environmental taxes and subsidies /	5
Environmental taxes and subsidies	10	Environmental taxes and subsidies	5	Land Accounts	
Countries with no current programme:					
Water Accounts	12	Water Accounts	2	Water Accounts	10
Energy Accounts	10	Energy Accounts	2	Energy Accounts	8
EPEA	7	<i>All other accounts had one response indicating they planned to begin compilation(except ecosystem and soil accounts which received zero)</i>		EPEA	6
Environmental taxes and subsidies	6			Environmental taxes and subsidies	5
Waste Accounts	6			Waste Accounts	5

32. Compared to the Global Assessment in 2006, the results suggest that for countries which are not currently compiling accounts a significantly higher number have plans to begin compilation in 2014. For example, a total of six countries indicated that they will begin compilation of water accounts in 2006, compared to twelve countries in 2014. Similarly, three countries intended to compile energy accounts in 2006 compared to ten countries in 2014.

V. Institutional Arrangements for Environmental-Economic Accounts

33. For those countries which had programmes on environmental-economic accounting, the responding institutions were asked whether other institutions/agencies compiled any parts/modules of the accounts in their country. This referred to any other institutions/agencies which actually produce parts/modules of the accounts, rather than agencies which contribute to their compilation by providing data, technical advice, etc. In total, 33% of responding institutions indicated that parts/modules of the accounts were compiled in another institution/agency within their country.

34. Table 9 illustrates this, disaggregated by economic and geographic region. The figures suggest there is a higher tendency for compilation of the accounts/modules to be split across different institutions in developing countries.

Table 9: Countries with a programme where more than one institution is involved in the compilation of SEEA based accounts/modules

	<i>Number of Countries with a programme</i>	<i>Number of countries where other institutions are involved</i>	<i>Percentage of countries where other institutions are involved</i>
All Member States	54	18	33%
By Economic Region:			
<i>Developed</i>	31	7	23%
<i>Developing</i>	23	11	48%
By Geographical Region:			
<i>Africa</i>	5	2	40%
<i>Central, Eastern, Southern and South-Eastern Asia</i>	7	4	57%
<i>Europe and Northern America</i>	29	7	24%
<i>Latin America and Caribbean</i>	6	3	50%
<i>Oceania</i>	3	0	0%
<i>Western Asia</i>	4	2	50%

35. Countries were then asked whether a multi-agency coordination mechanism had been established among stakeholder institutions/agencies to enable coordination in the production of SEEA accounts and supporting statistics. This did not refer to coordination between different institutions which actually compile different parts of the accounts, but more generally to institutions involved in data collection and the production of supporting statistics for SEEA-based accounts. In total, 69% percent of countries had established co-ordination mechanisms among stakeholder groups, with this percentage being much higher in developing countries compared to developed countries as indicated in Table 10.

Table 10: Percentage of countries with a programmes which have established a multi-agency coordination mechanism

	<i>Percentage of countries with co-ordination mechanism</i>	<i>Percentage of countries with no co-ordination mechanism</i>	<i>Percentage of countries not responding</i>
All Member States	69%	30%	1%
Developed Region	58%	39%	3%
Developing Region	83%	17%	0%

36. Annex 2 provides a select list of examples of the wide range of coordination mechanisms which have been employed in countries, from informal data sharing initiatives to dedicated committees and implementation of legal mandates.

VI. Technical Assistance for Environmental Accounts

37. Countries with current programmes on environmental-economic accounting were asked whether their country had received technical assistance from international organisations, NGOs or other institutions for the development of their programmes and/or compilation of specific accounts/modules. In total, 69% of countries stated that they had received technical assistance. Table 11 illustrates the disaggregation by economic region.

38. Countries were asked to list the accounts/modules for which they had received technical assistance and the corresponding provider of said assistance. Roughly 30% of countries had received

technical assistance from two or three different providers⁹, while the remainder indicated that they had received technical assistance from only one provider¹⁰. It is important to note that countries were not asked for the dates of the technical assistance, but only whether it was ongoing. As such, it could not be determined for those countries whose technical assistance had ended whether different organizations had been assisting in the country at the same time. However, of those which received assistance from more than one provider, roughly 45% indicated that they are *currently* receiving ongoing technical assistance from more than one institution.

Table 11: Percentage of Countries which received Technical Assistance

	<i>Percentage of countries which received Technical Assistance</i>	<i>Percentage of countries which did not receive Technical Assistance</i>	<i>Percentage of countries not responding</i>
All Member States	69%	30%	1%
Developed Region	65%	32%	3%
Developing Region	74%	26%	0%

39. Of the countries which received technical assistance from one provider, 36% were in developing regions, while the remainder were predominantly European countries which received technical assistance solely from Eurostat. Of the countries which received technical assistance from more than one provider, 81% were in developing regions.

Table 12: Institutions providing technical assistance to countries with programmes on environmental economic accounts

Providers of Technical Assistance	<i>Number of Countries where institution has provided technical assistance</i>	<i>Number of countries where institution has been the only provider</i>	<i>Number of countries where institution has been one of two providers</i>	<i>Number of countries where institution has been one of three providers</i>
Eurostat	18	14	3	1
National Development Agencies (USAID, UK DFID, GIZ etc.)	2	1	1	0
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	2	0	1	1
United Nations Regional Commissions	3	0	1	2
United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD)	12	6	2	4
World Bank	6	2	1	3
Other Providers	9	2	4	3

40. Table 12 illustrates the breakdown of institutions which provided technical assistance for environmental-economic accounting. Eurostat provided the largest number of countries with assistance, although the focus was largely on EU member states. The table also illustrates the breakdown of technical assistance provided in terms of the number countries for which multiple institutions had provided assistance.

⁹ I.e. technical assistance was provided by different organizations on the development of different accounts. This technical assistance could have taken place simultaneously or at different times.

¹⁰ Sometimes for multiple accounts/modules

VII. Availability of Supporting Data

41. Section B of the Global Assessment asked all countries to provide a general indication of the availability of data relevant to environmental accounting. Response rates to this section of the questionnaire were lower than for part A. Tables 13 and 14 below present information on the availability of a range of data sources, disaggregated by economic region. As is to be expected, the results suggest that data availability is lower in developing countries.

Table 13: Availability of supporting data in developed region

Data Item	<i>No Data Available</i>	<i>Data Available at Local Level</i>	<i>Data Available at Regional Level</i>	<i>Data Available at National Level</i>	<i>Data Available at Multiple Levels</i>	<i>No Response</i>
Water resources (stocks and flows)	3%	3%	28%	30%	10%	28%
Water abstractions	0%	8%	35%	30%	8%	20%
Water use by type of economic unit	8%	3%	33%	28%	3%	28%
Water quality statistics	8%	18%	15%	18%	8%	35%
Energy statistics/balances	0%	0%	15%	63%	3%	20%
Emissions to air	0%	3%	15%	58%	8%	18%
Air quality statistics	5%	25%	20%	10%	13%	28%
Solid waste flows	5%	5%	30%	35%	3%	23%
Environmental protection expenditure	3%	0%	18%	53%	5%	23%
Environmental goods and services statistics	20%	0%	5%	35%	3%	38%
Environmental taxes and subsidies	10%	0%	5%	55%	3%	28%
Mineral and energy resources	3%	8%	13%	40%	8%	30%
Forestry and timber resources	0%	3%	20%	48%	8%	23%
Fisheries statistics	0%	0%	15%	53%	5%	28%
Land use statistics/maps	3%	10%	23%	23%	13%	30%
Land cover statistics/maps	3%	10%	15%	23%	15%	35%
Economic production data by industry (incl output, value-added)	0%	3%	25%	43%	8%	23%
Supply and use / I-O tables	0%	0%	5%	68%	0%	28%
Household consumption statistics	0%	3%	20%	48%	5%	25%
International trade statistics	0%	3%	13%	60%	3%	23%
Geo-spatial data program	15%	5%	8%	10%	8%	55%
Measures of ecosystem services and/or ecosystem condition	38%	3%	8%	5%	3%	45%
Biodiversity statistics (e.g. abundance and distribution of species, status of threatened species)	5%	0%	15%	38%	13%	30%
Resilience to disasters statistics	28%	0%	13%	3%	8%	50%

Table 14: Availability of supporting data in developing region

Data Item	<i>No Data Available</i>	<i>Data Available at Local Level</i>	<i>Data Available at Regional Level</i>	<i>Data Available at National Level</i>	<i>Data Available at Multiple Levels</i>	<i>No Response</i>
Water resources (stocks and flows)	4%	0%	4%	51%	11%	29%
Water abstractions	9%	2%	7%	42%	13%	27%
Water use by type of economic unit	11%	2%	4%	49%	9%	24%
Water quality statistics	16%	16%	4%	29%	9%	27%
Energy statistics/balances	9%	2%	2%	56%	4%	27%
Emissions to air	27%	0%	4%	38%	2%	29%
Air quality statistics	33%	11%	4%	18%	4%	29%
Solid waste flows	18%	2%	16%	22%	11%	31%
Environmental protection expenditure	27%	0%	2%	42%	2%	27%
Environmental goods and services statistics	51%	0%	2%	11%	0%	36%
Environmental taxes and subsidies	44%	0%	0%	29%	0%	27%
Mineral and energy resources	11%	2%	2%	47%	9%	29%
Forestry and timber resources	16%	0%	7%	42%	11%	24%
Fisheries statistics	11%	4%	2%	49%	9%	24%
Land use statistics/maps	13%	2%	9%	38%	13%	24%
Land cover statistics/maps	18%	2%	11%	33%	11%	24%
Economic production data by industry (incl output, value-added)	2%	0%	4%	56%	13%	24%
Supply and use / I-O tables	9%	0%	0%	60%	2%	29%
Household consumption statistics	2%	2%	4%	56%	13%	22%
International trade statistics	2%	2%	2%	67%	4%	22%
Geo-spatial data program	22%	4%	0%	24%	13%	36%
Measures of ecosystem services and/or ecosystem condition	42%	2%	2%	13%	7%	33%
Biodiversity statistics (e.g. abundance and distribution of species, status of threatened species)	11%	0%	2%	44%	11%	31%
Resilience to disasters statistics	49%	2%	0%	13%	2%	33%

Annex 1: List of responding countries

Albania	Iceland	Republic of Korea
Armenia	Indonesia	Republic of Macedonia
Australia	Iran	Republic of Moldova
Austria	Iraq	Republic of Sierra Leone
Belarus	Ireland	Romania
Belgium	Israel	Russian Federation
Belize	Italy	Samoa
Bhutan	Jamaica	Serbia
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Japan	Singapore
Botswana	Kazakhstan	Slovak Republic
Brazil	Kenya	Slovenia
Bulgaria	Latvia	South Africa
Canada	Libya	South Sudan
Cape Verde	Lithuania	Spain
Colombia	Malaysia	Sudan
Costa Rica	Mauritius	Sultanate of Oman
Croatia	México	Sweden
Cyprus	Mongolia	Switzerland
Czech Republic	Morocco	Thailand
Denmark	Netherlands	Tunisia
Dominica	New Zealand	Turkey
Dominican Republic	Norway	Uganda
Ecuador	Palestine	Ukraine
Finland	Peru	United States of America
France	Philippines	Vietnam
Georgia	Poland	Zambia
Germany	Portugal	Zimbabwe
Ghana	Qatar	
Hungary	Republic of Azerbaijan	

**The following countries submitted questionnaires after 29 January and have not been included in this analysis: Cameroon, Chile and India.*

Annex 2: Examples of various multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms

Country	Details of Coordination Mechanism
Australia	Australian Environmental-Economic Accounting (AEEA) Implementation Board - the objectives of the AEEA Implementation Board (AEEA-IB) are to ensure: 1) establishment of the technical capacity for producing a core set of environmental-economic accounts for Australia, 2) related projects and resources are leveraged effectively, 3) effective co-ordination with related international and national initiatives, and 4) support for the implementation of SEEA using a flexible and modular approach. In the implementation stage, the Board is composed of the ABS, Bureau of Meteorology and the Department of Environment.
Austria	There is a gentleman's agreement between Statistics Austria and the Environment Agency Austria to provide each other with the data necessary for compiling SEEA accounts.
Bulgaria	The multi-agency co-ordination mechanism is established within the National Statistical System. The National Statistical System consists of the National Statistical Institute, the Bodies of Statistics and the Bulgarian National Bank. The Bodies of Statistics are state bodies or their structural units, which develop, produce and disseminate statistical information. The National Statistical System carries out the statistical activity by conducting statistical surveys and activities, included in the annual National Statistical Programme approved by Council of Ministers. The data exchange in particular cases is conducted under specific bilateral agreements between NSI and the corresponding institution.
Colombia	Under the -WAVES- project: is developing the policy document that will regulate the production of environmental economic accounts in Colombia; defining roles and inter-institutional products
Ecuador	The co-ordination mechanism consists of the facilities to get relevant information from each institution and the technical support in any topic to compiling the accounts. The co-ordination has taken place by meetings and workshops, to explain the objectives and methodology, solving the technical problems, and making strategies to get the information needs.
Finland	Co-operation group for environmental accounting for communication with / between interest groups, co-operation in international affairs and other possible issues Members: Ministry of the Environment, Finnish Environment Institute Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Forest research institute, Ministry of Employment and Economy, Geological Survey of Finland Government Institute for Economic Research, Thule-institute of University of Oulu, The Federation of Finnish Technology Industries, Finnish Game and Fishery Research Institute
France	We established some relations with the main data producers, in particular with the National Statistical Institute, to improve our uses of their statistics (SBS data, COFOG data...).
Indonesia	WAVES project has established an institutional arrangement involving National Planning Agency (Bappenas) as the focal point with 4 agencies involved as Steering Committee (Bappenas, BPS-Statistics Indonesia, Ministry of Finance, and Ministry of Environment), and several line ministries involve in Technical Committee such as MoForestry, MoAgriculture, MoMining and Mineral Resources, BIG (Badan Informasi Geospasial), etc.
Iraq	The Co-ordination mechanism is done through members of the environmental statistical committee who supply the CSO [<i>i.e. Central Statistics Office</i>] with their data, then the prepare team are preparing the tables of the environmental economic accounting for the water sector.
Ireland	Liaison Groups with the Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland and the Environmental Protection Agency. An inter-departmental working group on water statistics. An inter-organisational group on energy consumption of households.
Latvia	Central Statistical bureau of Latvia have agreements on data exchange with several institutions, whose data are used for compilation of environmental accounts. State Revenue Services (data on environmental taxes), Latvian Environment, geology and meteorology center (data on emissions, waste, water etc.), State Forest service (forestry data) and Ministry of Agriculture (forestry and agriculture data).

Lithuania	The Official Statistics Work Programme is compiled, where the institution responsible for a certain piece of statistical work (survey), its name, periodicity, method and deadline for the submission of results are indicated. Agreements on the organisation, quality assurance and dissemination of official statistics are signed in order to ensure coordination among the stakeholders (institutions/agencies).
Mauritius	Ad-hoc basis (when developing Energy Use & Atmospheric Emissions accounts, Water use accounts and Economy Material Flow accounts (MFA), Physical Supply and Use for Water Accounts and Ecosystem Accountings with consultants) involving the following: 1. Ministry of Environment & Sustainable development 2. Forestry Service 3. Food & Agricultural Research & Extension Institution (FAREI) 4. Mauritius Chamber of Agriculture 5. Ministry of Tourism and Leisure 6. Mauritius Meteorology Services 7. Water Resource Unit 8. Central Water Authority
Mexico	INEGI has worked jointly with Ministry of Environment (SEMARNAT) on some specific technical aspects related to environmental accounting
Poland	In 2010 Task Group on European Environmental Economic Accounts was established in CSO of Poland. The scope of work of the Task Force includes an analysis of the information needs in the field of environmental accounts at national and international levels, in particular Eurostat requirements contained in the 2014 European Strategy on Environmental Accounts (ESEA'2014) and determination of directions of development of environmental accounts. In the work of the Task Force are involved representatives of other ministries (Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Economy) and public authorities, scientists as well as other stakeholders. Chairman of the Task Force at least once a year convenes a meeting of the Task Force.
Slovak Republic	Statistical Office of the SR is responsible for providing data on environmental accounts included in the Regulation (EC) No 691/2011 on European environmental economic accounts. However also other institutions, particularly the Ministry of Environment of the SR (and its organizations Slovak Hydro-meteorological Institute, Slovak Environmental Agency) and the Ministry of Finance of the SR are engaged in environmental accounts statistics. Cooperation is coordinated by the Statistical Office of the SR that also organizes experts meetings in this area.
South Africa	Working agreement with South African Biodiversity Institute (SANBI) who have been assisting in providing data for the development and compilation of the Experimental Ecosystem Account. Through the South African Water Research Commission (WRC) a solicited research project was initiated relating to the development the Water Accounts.
Sweden	In Sweden we have so called user councils. They meet twice a year: http://www.scb.se/en/_/About-us/Main-Activity/Councils-and-boards/User-councils/
Switzerland	A conference bringing together key federal agencies interested in the SEEA will be set up from 2015. It will meet once or twice a year.
Uganda	Multi-agency is comprised of representation from NEMA, UBOS, NFA [<i>i.e. National Environment Management Authority, Uganda Bureau of Statistics and National Forestry Authority</i>], Private Consultant and the Academia under the overall coordination of UBOS
Vietnam	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment's Institute of strategy and policy on natural resources and environment (ISPONRE) established institutional arrangements to implement WAVE TA project including the Inter-Ministerial NCA Policy Working Group and the Data Working Group. The NCA Policy Working Group coordinated by ISPONRE consists of eleven agencies (ISPONRE, GSO, Viet Nam Institute of Forest Sciences, Institute of Policy and Strategy for Agriculture and Rural Development, Department of Water Resources Management, General Department of Land Administration, General Department of Geology and Minerals, Directorate of Fishery, Administration of Sea and Islands, Viet Nam Environmental Administration) and was set up to ensure that accounts proposed in the Road map align with key economic policies. The Data Working Group comprises GSO, VAFS, VNFOREST, IPSARD and ISPONRE and was accountable for data coordination for forest satellite accounts which span different data owners across key ministries and agencies.