

# Minutes of the 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the London Group on Environmental Accounting December 18 2018

---

1-4 October 2018, Dublin

Presentations and other materials can be found here: <https://seea.un.org/events/london-group-environmental-accounting-24th-meeting>

## Brief Summary

The 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the London Group on Environmental Accounting was held from 1-4 October 2018 in Dublin, Ireland and hosted by the CSO of Ireland. The three-and-a-half-day meeting included sessions on the SEEA Central Framework (SEEA CF) methodology, implementation of the SEEA CF, SEEA Experimental Ecosystem Accounting (SEEA EEA) methodology and communications and policy applications of the SEEA. The three-year work plan of the LG (2016-2018) was reviewed, and the Chair of the London Group will begin working on a new plan for the next three years.

In terms of SEEA CF methodology, the London Group supported the current research agenda and method of prioritizing topics and looks forward to the further development of topics including the fossil fuel subsidy methodology and classification of environmental activities. A discussion on the proposed natural reserve index and its placement in the SEEA CF took place. The London group requested these three topics to be further discussed at the next meeting of the group as issues still remain to be resolved. The London group was encouraged to test the methodology suggested by Statistics Sweden.

The London group also took the opportunity to learn more on specific implementation and new developments. For example, the work of the US on natural capital accounts, on quarterly air emission accounts in Sweden and integrated water accounts in Australia. The OECD also encourage the London group to provide input to their new work on a framework dedicated to environmental taxes.

The agenda devoted one-and-a-half days to the SEEA EEA, learning about the progress made by the research area leads of the revision working groups for spatial units, condition, valuation and ecosystem services. Several presentations also highlighted the importance and difficulties of accounting for urban areas, capacity accounts and about services. The group discussed various constraints and provided direct guidance on the specific presentations provided. It became visible that the contributions from the group to provide a link between the national – and environmental accounts are important in the field of ecosystem accounts. The group also learned about country experiences in implementing the SEEA EEA from e.g. South Africa, Norway and Mexico discussing successes and lessons learnt.

The London Group also covered communication and policy applications of the accounts. Several experiences were shared by national statistical offices as well as representatives of the private sector. A wide range of topics were covered, from the SDGs and national approaches to tourism and aligning the public and private sectors in accounting and reporting. During multiple points in the meeting, participants recommended an increased cooperation with multidisciplinary actors, such as the academia, private sector and other agencies to enhance the statistics provided the use of them. The group also discussed how the SEEA community could improve the communication of SEEA in policy fields, such as the SDGs and become better in learning the level of details and macro approaches in the communication.

The London Group also discussed how to move forward the up-coming years. With regards to the revision issues established in the SEEA CF the process is settled through the routine established by the Technical Committee of experts and the UNCEEA. With regards to the revision process of the SEEA EEA the process is still to be established. It was expressed that the London group is a counterpart in the revision process through its knowledge in the national- and environmental accounts, thus providing the stability of the ecosystem account to be within the SEEA framework. The group will continue to serve as a base for knowledge sharing and expanding the areas covered in the SEEA. The current chair was chosen to lead the group for another three years.

## **Session A: Introduction**

### ***1. Welcome address by the Central Statistics Office of Ireland (Paul Morrin, Assistant DG, CSO Ireland).***

Mr. Morrin welcomed participants to the 24th meeting of the London Group on Environmental Accounting. He discussed the statistical office structure in Ireland as well as the work of the Environment and Climate Division, which is responsible for the accounts. Mr Morrin described how the work of the international community of environmental accounts, in which Ireland has contributed, has been implemented nationally. In wishing the group a productive meeting, he shared a map of all of the past (and present) London Group meeting cities, to remind the group how far they've come and where they've still to go.

### ***2. Opening remarks, previous meeting notes, presentation of work plan***

The Chair of the London Group, Nancy Steinbach (Statistics Sweden), welcomed the participants. There were no comments to the minutes of the 2017 meeting, making the latest draft final. Nancy also presented the work plan of the agenda (2016-2018), which reiterated the objectives and long-term goals of the group, the scope of the work and the achievements made over the last few years. She will begin working on a new plan for 2019-2021.

### ***3. Round table of participants***

The participants presented themselves briefly.

### ***4. UNCEEA business and UNSD update***

Anton Steurer (Eurostat) shared an update of the 13<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNCEEA. Anton also noted a recent development with regards to the proposed SEEA subgroup within the Interlinkages Working Group of the SDG-IAEG. More specifically, during a WebEx for the SDG-IAEG, the idea of a SEEA subgroup was not received positively, so it remains unknown whether a formal subgroup will emerge. However, several participants noted that this should not be seen as a closed door, and that there is still room to engage informally.

The London group agreed that the SDG work is important and that efforts in showing results from our data compilations are key. There are indicators within the SDG, such as e.g. the material flows already and that we have opportunities to advance on the fossil fuel subsidies as well. The SEEA is covering several dimensions, which means that the function of it as an underlying analytical tool should be remembered and communicated.

## **Session B: Methodological Work SEEA CF**

### ***5. Progress Report on the SEEA CF Research Agenda***

Sjoerd Schenau (Statistics Netherlands) provided an overview of the current topics in the SEEA CF research agenda as well as a more detailed timeline for 2017-2019. It was noted that certain topics were dropped from the agenda—fisheries and valuation—while others were added—raw material equivalents and LULUCF. Sjoerd reviewed the proposed process for finalizing research

topics, which includes review by the SEEA CF TC and then submission to UNCEEA for approval. Global consultation will only be needed for topics which propose a significant change with respects to the Central Framework (which the UNCEEA will decide). So far, out of 12 research topics, three outcome papers have been finalized and approved (integrated framework for environmental activity accounts, economy-wide material flow accounts and global DSDs for SDMX). Work will commence this year on the revision for the classification of environmental activities/definition of resource management, as well as fossil fuel subsidies.

### ***6. Fossil fuel subsidies***

Viveka Palm introduced the work done by Statistics Sweden and Statistics New Zealand on fossil fuel subsidies. The IAEG-SDG has accepted the methodology for SDG indicator 12.c.1, and the UNCEEA has also reviewed the methodology. While no countries have yet tested the methodology, Sweden and New Zealand have found that the indicator is possible to extract using existing statistics and that the SEEA can broaden the analysis by including more than CO<sub>2</sub> and other instruments beyond subsidies.

During the discussion, participants discussed how this work might fit into the scope of the SEEA CF, as it is essentially the opposite of Chapter 4. Viveka clarified that fossil fuel transfers under the SEEA were covered in the methodology (through on-budget transfers, as in the SNA), but also included transfers to international beneficiaries, households, capital transfers, preferential tax treatment transfers and undertaxed external effects. In terms of tax exemptions, it was noted that more effort needed to be done to ensure comparability between countries. It was also suggested that more work needs to be done on the definition and scope of what is included, as well as how the residence principle will affect the indicator. Viveka clarified the process for upcoming work—a year will be needed for testing after which an outcome paper will be compiled for review by the SEEA CF TC and then the UNCEEA.

The London Group discussed technical issues such as the residential principle, and the accounting principle of tax exemptions. The work will carry on to take heed of the discussions and the group was asked to test this method; Anton noted that Eurostat is offering grants and could possibly help finance testing for next year.

### ***7. Classification of environmental activities***

Veronika Vysna (Eurostat) described the activities of the Eurostat Task Force on the classification of environmental activities (CEPA and CREMA). Veronika asked the London Group for specific examples or case studies that would help the TF refine its overall conceptual questions and provide improved guidance on the treatment of boundary cases as a first step. Veronika described two types of proposals for the integrated classification. One proposal was put forth for a small revision that retains CEPA and improves CREMA. Most proposals (seven) consisted of a large revision through a thorough reconsideration of the distinction between environmental protection and resource management. Veronika asked the London Group to consider 1) any other options besides the large and small revisions and 2) whether or not cultivated forests should be considered within the scope of CREMA.

There was wide agreement that cultivated forests should be within the scope of CREMA. Particular areas/subjects for boundary cases that were suggested to the TF included climate change-related cases, enabling access to reserves, CBD expenditures, restoration versus maintenance costs and urban ecosystem accounting issues such as blue-green infrastructure and public green space management costs for vegetation. While there was no consensus on whether a big or small revision should take place, participants noted that the resource side will need special attention and more work. Eurostat also pointed out that the work of the TF will also tackle

whether the classification system(s) will be a classification of activities, products or purposes, and thus, whether it will be possible to have one classification that can be used for EGSS, EPEA and ReMEA accounts. Arturo de la Fuente (Eurostat) clarified that the Task Force itself will not decide on the type of revision but will put forth proposals for each type.

### **8. Natural Resource Reserve Index**

Gabriel Gagnon (Statistics Canada) presented Canada's work on the Natural Resource Reserve Index (NRRI). The NRRI tries to overcome the fact that reserves are measured in different units and that resource prices often fluctuate. The NRRI sums all changes (discovery, depletion, value) into one number to supplement the natural resource assets estimate, which is integrated with land and produced asset accounts in national balance sheet accounts.

Viveka Palm served as a discussant to this topic. The NRRI presents data that represents the idea of natural resources, and especially fossil based natural resources free for economic profits. However, the SEEA CF, has evolved from the original idea of monetizing the natural resources in the national accounts to become more focused on environmental pressures and transactions that are providing pressures or responses to the economy. Therefore the London group should consider how to identify its place in the SEEA and how it is described for best use.

Participants noted the need for further exploration on how NRRI applies to the SEEA versus the SNA, as the definition of capital serves a different purpose in the SNA than it does for the SEEA. Participants also voiced concerns on how the NRRI could be used, whether it had applicability to environmental sustainability or addressed purely economic concerns. The London Group requested a proposal by Statistics Canada on how the NRRI can be incorporated into the SEEA CF during its eventual revision, as well as follow-up via the SEEA CF TC or the next London Group.

## **Session C: SEEA CF Implementation**

### **9. World Café round tables**

Participants split into four separate groups to listen to short 15-minute presentations by four different presenters. These presenters included: Scott Wentland (Bureau of Economic Analysis) and John Matuszak (US Department of State), who presented preliminary SEEA results of the U.S.; Nancy Steinbach, who presented on Sweden's shift from annual to quarterly air emission accounts; Mike Booth (Australian Bureau of Statistics) and Janice Green (Australian Bureau of Meteorology), who presented Australia's integrated water accounts for the Australian Capital Territory; and Viveka Palm, who presented on proposed OECD methodological guidelines on environmentally-related tax revenue accounts.

The London Group appreciated this informal setting of hearing about implementation and took note of the OECD's invitation to pilot test the environmentally-related tax revenue accounts.

## **Session D: Methodological Work SEEA EEA**

### **10. Introduction to the EEA revision and the state of play**

The SEEA EEA session started with Anton Steurer, who set out the process for the revision of the SEEA EEA. There are five research areas, corresponding to the main accounts set out in the framework. Timing is fairly tight, with drafting of chapters expected to start early 2019.

### ***11. EEA revision – ecosystem extent***

Sjoerd Schenau then described the process for the working group for Research Area 1, which concerned spatial units in the SEEA EEA. WG1 is reviewing existing classifications and establishing general ecological principles that will underlie the classification of ecosystem types. Of particular concern was the treatment of the atmosphere, issues of scale, marine ecosystems and options for dealing with mosaic landscapes in both urban and rural areas.

### ***12. EEA revision – ecosystem condition***

Rocky Harris (DEFRA) then presented the work of Research Area 2, covering condition indicators and accounts. This area is led by Joachim Maes from the JRC. Three discussion papers were in preparation, describing the purpose of condition accounts, reviewing existing practices and identifying a typology for ecosystem condition variables. The importance of establishing links with other accounts was stressed (i.e. what are we measuring condition for?). It was also noted that it would be important to include indicators of pressures and drivers within the framework.

### ***13. Developing ecosystem condition accounts for the EU on the basis of parameters identified under the EU MAES process as critical for ecosystem condition in Europe***

Jan-Erik (EEA) then reported on the state of play of condition accounts for the EU. They were looking to establish 3-5 key indicators that could be applicable across the EU. Substantial work had been done on biodiversity indicators and nutrient pressure, and there was good information available on freshwater related indicators. The main message was that establishing appropriate indicators at a detailed spatial level was extremely challenging and much more testing was needed.

The London group discussed the challenges of data availability and the frequency of data. It was noted that most constraints are seen in the manpower available as more and more data becomes available. However, the lack of frequent data did not appear to be a constraint as the topic of conditions was considered slow moving.

### ***14. Development of ecosystem condition accounts for South Africa and Mexico***

Gerhardt Bouwer (Statistics South Africa) presented on the state of play on South African River ecosystems. Detailed indicators of ecosystem condition had been established which showed deterioration in the quality of the rivers over a twelve-year period. Statistics South Africa and SANBI would be doing more work on protected areas, marine ecosystems and species accounts over the next few years.

Raul Figueroa (INEGI) described developments in Mexico. He noted that involvement of scientists and other stakeholders was a key to success, but there were challenges when one tried to incorporate their advice into the accounts. Mexico has developed an ecological integrity index and there were some concerns about how comprehensive the indicator was and how it related to other biodiversity indicators.

The London group took note of the progress made and discussed how the approach could look like in terms of cooperation with multiple stakeholders and that the knowledge is expanding in the SEEA community on using tools such as GIS. It was also recognized in the group that it is important to bridge the gap between statisticians and researchers and work together. It was also noted that even if the cooperation can sometimes be difficult and critique can be brought to the assumptions and models, that once data becomes available the research community tend to find good use of it.

***15. Testing the development of biodiversity accounts for measuring ecosystem condition in the EU***

Steven King (UNEP-WCMC) then presented work on biodiversity accounts for the EU. This focused on common birds and involved three indicators – abundance, number of species and evenness of distribution. There were significant challenges in establishing indicators at a suitable spatial scale. Data aggregation would need to be flexible, and participants voiced the importance of establishing links with land use and management practices as well as land cover. There was also a discussion on how to pinpoint economic interventions in the data. How can the data be used and tweaked to provide guidance on where and how to invest to improve the biodiversity.

***16. From Moonlight Jewels to Common Browns: Butterfly accounts for the Australian Capital Territory (ACT)***

Mike Booth (ABS) and Michael Vardon (Australia National University) presented work on butterfly accounts in the ACT. They had made a distinction between generalists and specialists, and identified species associated with different habitats.

The London group was informed that also the Netherlands are working on a new type of statistics on butterflies linked to spatial data and ecosystem types. The London group took note of the fact that the communication of the results are highly important, as butterflies are migratory species and with the climate change they change their habitats.

***17. EEA revision – ecosystem services definition and classification issues***

The session then moved on to ecosystem services, (Research Areas 3-4). Lars Hein (Wageningen University) set out the work of Research Area 3, reviewing existing classifications and establishing principles for a new classification. He noted that the paper included as a background note covered disservices and the distinction between intermediate and final services. Participants noted the importance of looking at certain services such as carbon and recreation in more detail.

***18. EEA revision –issues concerning the valuation of ecosystem services***

Rocky then reviewed the work of Research Area 4. The working group for this area is in the process of writing 11 research papers covering particular groups of services. It was felt that the range of services covered was broadly right, however participants noted that the group should make sure that amenity services were effectively included within the discussions.

***19. Ecosystem services SNA and non-SNA benefits***

Alessandra La Notte (JRC) then described a paper she and Charles Rhodes had written discussing the difference between SNA and non-SNA benefits, as investigated through CICES and NESCS. Participants noted the proposal of distinguishing between supporting and intermediate services, flows of services and stocks of assets, and the ways in which ecosystem services contribute to intermediate consumption, final consumption and capital formation in the analysis. The discussions focused on how to interpret the meaning of supporting/intermediate services and the debate highlighted how the topic of ecosystem service classification remains still unsolved. However the London group provided some guidance on how to sharpen the link between the SNA and the allocated non-SNA benefits and this contribution was extremely useful for the authors/presenter.

***20. Crop and timber provisioning services application and revision: a pilot assessment for Europe***

Silvia Cerilli (FAO) finished the session on services with a presentation on the estimation of the ecosystem contribution to crop and timber production in both physical and monetary terms. Silvia explained that to calculate the ecosystem contribution, they were looking to calculate natural

inputs over yield, with natural inputs being sun, rain etc. However, it was difficult for the London Group to give a view on the approach (particularly for the monetary estimation) without more information about the methodology used. Silvia clarified that the methodology was to be published by the JRC later in the year.

### ***21. Ecosystem accounts for urban areas***

Rocky gave a short introduction to the group of presentations on ecosystem accounts for urban areas in the UK. He explained the motivation behind urban accounts in the UK, as well as the policy drivers behind the production of the accounts. Rocky also reviewed some of the particularities of accounting for urban areas, including data sources on green space, both private and public.

### ***22. Integrating ecosystem extent and conditions in an urban context: conceptual issues and illustrations from the URBAN EEA project***

Per Arild Garnasjordet (SSB/NINA) gave a short presentation on how the conceptual issues of spatial units is informed by urban areas. He explained that while we may need fixed spatial units, users must be able to use the spatial units in flexible ways to meet different analysis needs and that aggregation must be able to occur on an ad-hoc basis, relative to the purpose of the analysis. Per Arild reviewed aspects that are particularly important to urban areas, including property borders and cadaster elements. Per Arild also gave an introduction to the URBAN-EEA project, which uses highly accurate maps and administrative data, combined with frequently updated satellite data, to produce more frequent (annual) land use accounts for urban areas.

### ***23. Ecosystem accounting for recreation services and amenities in urban areas***

David Barton (NINA), presented on urban ecosystems and recreation services, with a focus on measuring recreation service flow and measuring ecosystem condition for recreation and valuation. He explained how green space is difficult to define in urban areas, as the occurrence of green space differs depending on data sources (e.g. satellite imagery represents green space differently from on the ground) and also reviewed different approaches and methods people have used to determine urban ecosystem boundaries. David introduced the idea that urban areas are more easily mapped as gradients of condition than as well-defined extents, making mapping of ecosystem condition as key to the valuation of urban ecosystems. David also reviewed some issues with valuation, in particular the possibility of double counting when using hedonic pricing due to amenity service bundles in property prices, which are difficult to disaggregate. He also introduced the idea of disaggregating ecosystem service use accounts at a local level, potentially by neighborhood or socioeconomic status, depending on the type of analysis needed.

François Soulard (Statistics Canada) provided a platform for the expansion of the thoughts presented by David through presenting Canada's experience in accounting for urban areas. Statistics Canada used LandSat data to look at all metropolitan areas of Canada from 1971-2011 to create simplified accounts looking at LCLU classes of built up area, arable land, and natural and semi-natural land. Statistics Canada is using these accounts to report on SDG 11.3.1. François also informed the London Group of relevant initiatives, including those by EO4EA and the UN Global Working Group on Big Data.

Overall, participants noted the importance of including urban accounting in the revised SEEA EEA. They also discussed the difficulty of integrating urban accounting into an international standard that still takes into account differences in regional and developing vs. developed countries' experiences as well as analysis needs. It was noted with interest the use of the growing data availability in the field, such as the use of Earth observation by NINA, Statistics Norway and others.

#### ***24. An ecosystem typology for capacity accounts***

Alessandra La Notte (JRC) presented an ecosystem typology for capacity accounts which focused on mapping ecosystem potential and actual flows and whether ecosystem flows were sustainable and/or met demand. Alessandra demonstrated that by overlaying these maps, one was able to highlight cases where there were overused services as well as cases where there was unmet demand. Participants expressed support in understanding how to capture unmet demand and for exploring the relationship between ecosystem condition and ecosystem capacity. This new approach needs to be further tested through applications.

### **Session E: Communication and Policy Applications**

#### ***25. Introduction to the UNCEEA communication strategy and the national approach in Australia***

Mike presented the UNCEEA communication strategy and provided examples of the communications strategy in action in Australia. During the discussion, participants noted the need to involving all stakeholders in communications, filling crucial information gaps and responding to policy demands. He also presented the national approach in Australia, which aims to deliver a common national approach to environmental-economic accounting. Mike explained that this was driven by the demands surrounding the SDGs, State of Environment Reporting and Aichi Targets and shared lessons learnt during the process of drafting the national approach.

#### ***26. Combining forces on public and private sector work on natural capital***

Marta Santamaria (Natural Capital Coalition) presented the work of the Combining Forces initiative of the Natural Capital Coalition. The initiative provides a focal point to bring together different sectors and different strands of thinking on natural capital. Participants noted that this was an opportunity to link the SEEA with corporate sustainability reporting in the private sector and a chance to enhance reporting to NSOs as well as expand the use of statistical products in the private sector. Participants noted that case studies would help in understanding how the statistical community can help drive this forward.

Sofia Ahlroth (World Bank), presented as a discussant expressed the idea of simplifying the message of the SEEA and to pinpoint the questions at hand; why do you want this data, what is the policy relevance you need to look at and after that you choose your account. She voiced the thought of sensitizing the users and making them familiar with the output we can carry out. The work of the Wentworth Group of Concerned Scientists was lifted as a good example of how to utilize the data for key actions in the private sector.

#### ***27. How can we engage better with potential account users?***

Sofia presented on lessons learnt from the WAVES project on how to better engage with potential account users in all aspects of the policy cycle. She reviewed the potential uses of the accounts and the different types of users. She provided examples of policy drivers for the accounts in Australia, Guatemala, Philippines and Zambia. Some lessons learnt included establishing cross ministerial steering committees from the beginning, shortening the production cycle and maintaining flexibility, using economic modeling as a link between the accounts and policy analysis and the importance of engaging with academia. Participants echoed the importance of engaging with academia and also noted the importance of engaging with NGOs.

#### ***28. Development of the multidimensional statistical framework for the evaluation of the effectiveness of environmental instruments, present state and way forward***

Kaia Oras (Statistics Estonia) presented a multidimensional statistical framework designed to monitor ecological tax reform for Estonia. She reviewed the framework, which is meant to cover the use of revenues, equity of taxes, environmental effectiveness and revenue neutrality of

environmental instruments. Several participants expressed their willingness to help test this methodology and noted its relevance to policy. It was suggested to further investigate the concepts of tax exemptions versus tax differentials, as well as the use of the restrictive-supportive approach to looking at supply and demand-based measures.

The London group was encourage to contact Kaia for testing the methodology and the analysis.

### ***29. SEEA CF and tourism accounts – the Italian Experience***

Angelica Tudini (ISTAT) described the progress of the Measuring Sustainable Tourism (MST) project. The focus of the project is currently on developing a statistical MST framework, which integrates the Tourism Satellite Accounts and the SEEA. She reviewed the technical note on the SEEA and TSA, which outlines the basis for testing and pilot studies. Several countries have produced case studies, and the UN-WTO is now working on providing a summary document of case studies. Angelica reviewed the methodology used in Italy, including challenges encountered when determining air passenger transport and calculating tourism's share of environmental flows.

The London group took note of the progress made and was informed that Statistics Sweden has published a new report looking at tourism's impact of greenhouse gas emissions through final demand.

### ***30. A consumption-based indicator for water purification***

Alessandra La Notte (JRC) described a consumption-based indicator for water purification and presented the results of a comparison between production-based and consumption-based water purification accounts to examine the reliance of certain countries in the EU on imported purified water. Participants noted the need to clarify what was meant by consumption in the context of the analysis, given the SEEA and SNA definitions of consumption. Participants noted the importance of this work and highlighted the need for more information on the methodology in order to understand how this work fits into the accounting framework.

### ***31. New policy relevant indicators on national consumption and environment***

Viveka Palm, Statistics Sweden presented on the PRINCE (policy relevant indicators for national consumption and environment) project, which looks to quantify environmental pressure from consumption by Swedish residents both inside and outside of Sweden's borders. She reviewed that the project has used a single IO model with modeled climate emissions but are now moving to a multiregional IO model, as data sources have improved. She reviewed findings on emissions, water use, fish and agriculture. Participants noted the importance of this work and suggested to also beyond sectoral averages to biodiversity and production.

### ***32. Ensuring policy relevance and promoting the use of the SEEA CF: UK experience***

Gemma Thomas (ONS) described the efforts of the ONS to ensure the policy relevance of the SEEA amidst several new governmental policies on clean growth and the environment. She described the importance of engaging with line ministries and forming a steering committee, as well as making sure that outreach and communications efforts spoke to topical issues and presented things in a non-technical manner. Participants agreed that it was important to use language that users and policy makers were comfortable with. They also noted the importance of having a variety of dissemination materials and modes—from longer methodological reports to the usage of social media.

### ***33. SEEA in the SDG process***

Sven Kaumanns (Destatis) provided a view of how the SEEA framework could make inroads to the SDG indicator framework. The SDG indicators currently has several Tier III indicators which will likely be replaced by proxy indicators (which must meet Tier I/II requirements). These proxy indicators will most likely be the final indicators. In this context, he suggested that the SEEA community become active in the discussion over proxy indicators and complementary indicators and noted the room for influence in indicators for goals 7, 12, 13 and 14.

### ***34. Moving forward with the London Group***

Participants congratulated the Chair, who was chosen for a second term. Participants also thanked the CSO of Ireland for their warm hospitality and excellent planning. Participants expressed their satisfaction with how the past three days went.

The relationship between the LG, the SEEA TCs and the UNCEEA was clarified—specifically that the LG provides input to the SEEA TCs, which then provide input to the UNCEEA. In terms of the revision of the SEEA EEA, the process and involvement still needs to be resolved. It was foreseen though that the upcoming meetings will provide a platform for input in the revision issues. The London Group members will be consulted through the global consultation, and many members are also already part of the technical committee on EEA and therefore involved directly. However, participants noted that the London Group could ensure that the SEEA EEA remains practicable and linked to the SNA and SEEA CF, as most members are practitioners.

For the next meeting, participants provided several suggestions on topics. Topics mentioned included Earth observation, oceans, the outputs of the revision working groups and a greater focus on country implementation of the SEEA, particularly ecosystem accounting.