



Department
for Environment
Food & Rural Affairs

SEEA EEA Revision

Session 3c Ecosystem Services

Expert Forum
Glen Cove
26 June 2019

Rocky Harris
Defra, UK



Forestry Commission
England



Environment
Agency

Cross-cutting physical accounting issues for ecosystem services

10 papers on key ecosystem services (January 2019)

- Very much a bottom-up approach – are we able to draw more general conclusions?

=> Identified a number of generic issues – 9 short papers on a selection of these issues (May 2019)

What didn't the 10 papers cover?

- Local climate regulation
- Waste mediation/storage (including carbon storage)
- Noise mediation
- Other cultural services – education, film documentaries

Do these services raise other issues?

NB Special attention needed for water-related services

Cross-cutting issues concerning physical supply/use of services in non-monetary terms

1. **Cultivated and non-cultivated biomass services**
2. Treatment of the use of space
3. Connections between services
4. Reducing/preventing externalities
5. **Mediated/unmediated flows**
6. Outputs/outcomes/benefits
7. Counterfactuals
8. Abiotic components of ecosystems
9. Spatial allocation of services

*To be discussed further **in this Forum** and in Technical Expert Groups*

Aims of the 9 papers

- Clarifying the **boundaries** of the definitions of services (e.g. use of space/navigation - Paper #4; services provided by abiotic components – Paper #3)
- Clarifying **language** (e.g. Paper #8 is on distinction between outputs, outcomes and benefits)
- Clarity about **relationship** to SNA flows (Paper #9)
- Putting different **flows in the right boxes** (disservices; externalities - Paper #5; unmediated flows - Paper #2; interactions between services – Paper #1; intermediate and supporting services)
- Addressing **spatial issues** (Paper #6)
- Need for consistency of **counterfactual** and risk-based approaches (Paper #7)

Today's session

- One group to focus on biomass provisioning (Paper #9)
- One group to focus on waste mediation (Papers #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #7)
- NB Carbon accounting is a separate session this afternoon
- Spatial issues to be considered in Technical Expert meeting session on Saturday
- Any carry over and other cross-cutting issues to be picked up at Technical Expert meeting on Friday

Biomass provisioning (Group 1)

Group 1 to discuss **logic chains** for

- “Natural” provisioning services such as timber and fish to clarify the ways in which ecosystem services might be defined (e.g. in terms of available stock or actual harvest) and either determine an agreed position (i.e. agreed logic chain) or describe the leading “contenders”
- “Managed” provisioning services including crops, plantation timber, aquaculture, livestock again to determine an agreed position or identify the leading contenders.

Aspects of the discussion in these two topics could cover the definition and treatment of services such as pollination and nursery services, and the issue of distinguishing natural and managed ecosystems. Ideally a single logic chain for provisioning services might be identified – i.e. one that is not dependent on whether the final output is fish, timber, agriculture, etc.

Questions for discussion (Group 1)

- Do the logic chains for provisioning services shown in the background papers reflect the relevant steps and processes?
- Is the summary of the various definitions and measurement options appropriate? Are there other considerations?
- Should different approaches be used in the context of crops, timber or fish related provisioning services?
- Is it important to distinguish between cultivated/managed and uncultivated/natural ecosystems in these ecosystem service definitions?
- Overall, what options for description and measurement are preferred? Are the criteria proposed in the background paper appropriate?



Questions for discussion (Group 1) (continued)

- How should dependencies between ecosystem assets in relation to biomass production be accounted for – e.g. pollination for crops, nursery services for fish? Are these intermediate or final ecosystem services?
- How should ecosystem services related to cultivated assets such as orchards and vineyards be treated?
- How should ecosystem services related to livestock production be treated?
- How should losses of biomass in production be treated (e.g. discarded catch, harvest losses)?
- Is it agreed that the monetary value of the ecosystem services is unaffected by the description and quantification of the service?



Any questions?

