



Advancing the SEEA Experimental Ecosystem Accounting

Outcome group discussions on Ecosystem Service Measurement and Modelling

Advancing the SEEA-EEA Project



Convention on
Biological Diversity





Suggestions for breakout groups

- 1. Selection of models:** **a: What are the most important criteria (-groups) and b: the minimum requirements, per Ecosystem Component Account (ECA: land, water, biodiversity, carbon)?**
Criteria; data, scale, users, gaps, link with economic data, etc.
- 2. Generic versus detailed (data and models): Give examples for both types**
Local versus global, policy relevance, type of users and use, are details important, multiple scales
- 3. Reference state and indicators: Discuss reference state(s) for common indicators per ECA**
- 4. Link between asset condition and capacity: Give examples per ECA**
Capacity and Potential Capacity
- 5. Driver account: Discuss additional value and give examples**
Would a separate driver account, that records available socio-economic information, provide information that can be used to explain changes in condition?
- 6. Scenario analysis: How useful are scenarios for the SEEA?**



Outcome group discussion: 1. Selection of models

General: There is no one model that will provide all the answers. Toolbox should be flexible to meet needs of countries and demands on modellers. We'd even go so far as to make the recommendation that different models be used for analysis at different scales.

Two types of users : those who have to interpret the output (data users - national and international) and make decisions and those who have to actually do the modelling (modellers)

Model criteria are important and should be defined per model
But model itself should not determine the outputs



Outcome group discussion: 2. Generic versus detailed (data and models)

Major points

1. Discussion needed between modellers and accountants to specify the desired outputs
2. Corresponding choice of metric (biophysical thing) and then translated to utilities and rated against other utilities to get a value/price. This would help identify model and data needs then identify what you have



Outcome group discussion: 3. Reference state

Major issues:

- Some form of reference state is needed
- Baseline development versus policy targets
- What is natural, what is not
- Crosscutting accounts: Opposite impacts possible:
e.g. Decrease of grassland could also lead to increase of carbon



Outcome group discussion: 4. Link asset condition with capacity

First getting definitions clear:

Condition refers to state and health of an ecosystem

Capacity is the ability to generate potential Ecosystem Services

Major issues:

- How to assess value of potential services
- You need capacity to do monetary valuation
- You need also future (scenario-) information in order to know the Net Present Value
- There is a need for a baseline scenario



Outcome group discussion: 5. Driver accounts

- Need to distinguish between indirect and direct drivers
- Challenges for different accounts
- Linking condition with social information would improve understanding of services
- Good to integrate socio and economic drivers



Outcome group discussion: 6. Scenario analysis

- In contradiction with previous groups 6 concluded that scenario analysis is not needed for SEEA itself.
- Would be useful for post-accounting analysis
- Issue: scenario info is analytical, statistical info is fact-based
- SNA is used for analytical purposes
- SEEA account and info will be useful as input and guidance for scenario analysis



Action points

Resuming: We need to consider in more depth the following issues:

1. Need for accountants to talk with policy makers, modellers and economists to set priorities and use appropriate data and models
2. Do a model criteria analysis of needs and purposes
3. Reference states are not targets, but are needed to index condition
4. What drivers need to be included
5. Need to build in a baseline scenario for the assessment of capacity