Preliminary technical findings, China SEEA EEA implementation

Prof. Dr Lars Hein; Wageningen University,

Contents of the presentation

- Findings Guangshi province
- Findings Guizhou province
- Discussions on GEP
- Preliminary recommendations

Guangshi

- Well organised process coordinated by NBS
- Consistency between work of departments
- Large amount of data collected and experience gained
- Potential scope for further work
    - Connect to users (information system?)
    - Consider mapping ecosystem services
    - Better define values
        - Now different types of value (gross revenue, replacement cost, TCM: consumer surplus)
        - Values divided into: direct, indirect and 'ecological and environmental' value – (but some values that are in ecological and env. value are generally seen as indirect use values)

Guangshi (2)

- Double counting may be occurring since some supporting services are included such as nutrient capture in agricultural fields
- Detailed remarks will be provided (Offshore shipping, value used for dust)
- Advice can be provided on amenity service (hedonic pricing)

Guizhou

- Different from Guangshi – SEEA project less far but case study province for the GEP project (see below)
- SEEA considers 2015 and 2016, GEP 2010
- Large degree of consistency in approach, some differences
- Interesting is the Detao big data centre
- Tentative recommendations
    - In part the same: more precise definition of values
    - Consider spatial approach and better linking to users

Guizhou (2)

- Positive: data availability (e.g. for erosion control)
- Also work on asset accounting was conducted by Guizhou normal university in the province (however methods were somewhat unclear also due to time pressure, e.g. environmental liabilities were estimated)
- More detailed technical recommendations
    - Avoid double counting
    - Do not use market interest rate for inflation correction (but e.g. CPI)
    - Consider spatial variability (e.g. erosion control performs differently on different slopes)
    - Examine where work can be aligned with SEEA
        - E.g. organise services by type of service not type of value; use definitions for capacity from SEEA

GEP

- Impressive amount of work has been done, published in high quality journals
- Large amount of data collected (2000, 2005, 2010)
- Some spatial models were made, and many maps were produced,
- Embedding into policy environment, connected to 5 pillars of eco-civilisation
- Work follows generally Millennium Assessment, in many ways aligned with SEEA
    - Alignment: types of services, definition of services, stocks versus assets
    - Not aligned: SEEA: ecosystem services are contributions to benefits, MA: services are benefits; need to better define values

GEP

- Could be very supportive to SEEA implementation
  - Very good basis for extent accounts
  - Good basis for service accounts
  - At national scale: excellent, perhaps scope to further refine for provincial or county scale

General recommendations

- Report on physical and monetary information separately
- Gradually move towards more alignment with SEEA (services, values, capacity)
- Decide which accounts to be produced (Extent, condition, ecosystem services physical and monetary, asset)
- Consider carbon and biodiversity account (water)
- Gradually move towards more sophisticated modelling of water regulating services
- Better explain assumptions underlying accounts
- Coordinate work with GEP project staff (extent account)
- Work, (with partners in other countries?), on how to define different types of values and how to aggregate into overarching indicators for ecological capital
- Consider connecting to users (web tool?, policy briefs?)

Thank you