

Kopsavilkums

Kopējā starptautiskās ekosistēmu pakalpojumu klasifikācija (CICES). Vadlīnijas CICES sertifikācijā

Pamatinformācija

i. Pašlaik izmantotā Kopējās starptautiskās ekosistēmu pakalpojumu klasifikācijas (CICES) versija (V4.3) tika publicēta 2013. gadā. Pamatojoties uz lietotāju kopienas gūto pieredzi, ir pārskatīta tās struktūra un darbības joma, un ir izstrādāta pilnībā pārskatīta versija (V5.1). Šajā dokumentā aprakstīta pārskatīšana un tās pamatā esošais process. Tabulas, kurās izklāstīta jaunā versija un tās saistība ar V4.3, var lejupielādēt no www.cices.eu. ii. Darbs pie “5. versijas” tika veikts, pamatojoties uz attiecīgās zinātniskās literatūras pārskatu, 2016. gada apsekojuma rezultātiem, ko EVA uzdevumā veica Fabis Consulting Ltd., un semināriem, kas 2016. gadā notika ES finansēto ESMERALDA un OpenNESS projektu ietvaros. Pārskatīšanu veidoja arī diskusijas sanāksmē, ko 2016. gada jūnijā Ņujorkā rīkoja Apvienoto Nāciju Organizācijas Statistikas nodaļa (UNSD) un ko atbalstīja EVA, un pēc tam 2016. gada novembrī Vāgeningenā notikušajā seminārā, ko kopīgi organizēja EVA, US-EPA un UNSD. Rezultātā izstrādātais galīgais priekšlikuma projekts tika atkārtoti izplatīts ES KIP INCA projekta dalībniekiem un nelielai Eiropas un starptautisku ekspertu grupai, kas saistīta ar SEEA tehniskās pārskatīšanas komiteju, kā V5.0 versija. Šīs pārskatīšanas kārtas rezultātā tika izdarīti galīgie grozījumi, kas ir pamatā pašreizējai atjauninātajai versijai (V5.1), kas tiek iesniegta Londonas grupai. 5.1. versijas darbības joma un uzmanības centrā iii. CICES ekosistēmu pakalpojumi ir definēti kā ekosistēmu ieguldījums cilvēku labklājībā, un tie atšķiras no precēm un ieguvumiem, ko cilvēki no tām iegūst. Šis ieguldījums ir formulēts kā “tas, ko ekosistēmas dara” cilvēku labā.

Turpinājumā: teksts angļu valodā

Executive Summary Background i. The version of the Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services (CICES) in current use (V4.3) was published in 2013. On the basis of the experience gained by the user community its structure and scope has been reviewed, and a fully revised version (V5.1) has been developed. This document

describes the revision and the process underlying it. Tables setting out the new version and its relationship to V4.3 can be downloaded from www.cices.eu. ii. The work on 'Version 5' was informed by a review of the relevant scientific literature, the results of the 2016 Survey conducted by Fabis Consulting Ltd. for the EEA, and workshops held in 2016 as part of the EU-funded ESMERALDA and OpenNESS Projects. The revision has also been shaped by discussion at a meeting hosted by the United Nations Statistical Division (UNSD), in New York, in June 2016 which was supported by the EEA, and a subsequent workshop in Wageningen, in November 2016, co-organised between the EEA, US-EPA and UNSD. The resulting final draft proposal was circulated again to members of the EU KIP INCA project and a small group of European and international experts associated with the SEEA technical review committee as V5.0. This review round resulted in final modifications which form the basis for the current updated version (V5.1) that is being presented to the London Group. Scope and focus of Version 5.1 iii. In CICES ecosystem services are defined as the contributions that ecosystems make to human well-being, and distinct from the goods and benefits that people subsequently derive from them. These contributions are framed in terms of 'what ecosystems do' for people. Thus, in the revised version the definition of each service identifies both the purposes or uses that people have for the different kinds of ecosystem service and the particular ecosystem attributes or behaviours that support them iv. CICES aims to classify the contributions that ecosystems make to human well-being that arise from living processes. Although biotic ecosystem outputs remain the focus in V5.1, feedback from the user community to broaden the classification to cover abiotic outputs has been addressed. The new version allows users to select only those ecosystem services that depend on living systems (i.e. biodiversity in its broadest sense) or to include the non-living parts of ecosystems that can also contribute to human well-being. v. The importance of providing detailed guidance to help people apply the classification was one of the key points to arise from the consultation on V5.1. The more formal and systematic definitions provided in V5.1 will help people identify more easily what the different services categories cover. The new structure also provides examples of the services themselves and types of associated benefit. In order to help users to work in more

informal settings with the classification, suggestions for simpler non-technical names for services are also provided in the new classification structure. iv Compatibility with V4.3 vi. The hierarchal structure that was the basis of CICES V4.3 has been retained; at the highest level in the classification services are grouped according into three Sections that relate to whether the contributions to human well-being support a) the provisioning of material and energy needs, b) regulation and maintenance of the environment for humans, or c) the nonmaterial characteristics of ecosystems that affect physical and mental states of people. vii. Although the majority of the classes included in V4.3 carry over to V5.1, their ordering and coding has been modified in the new version to enable users to more easily aggregate Classes for reporting purposes. The classification structure for provisioning services has, for example, been modified in V5.1 to permit aggregation where no 'end use' is known so that the classification can be more easily used for accounting purposes. A full set of equivalences at Class level have been provided to enable users to make the transition to V5.1. viii. In response to the difficulties that some users had in using CICES V4.3 to classify cultural ecosystem services, the definitions in this Section of the classification have been revised to better distinguish services from benefits. Thus, cultural services are now seen as the characteristics of elements of nature that provide opportunities for people to derive cultural goods or benefits. In the new version, cultural services are grouped into those opportunities that are realised from direct contact with nature or a more remote type of interaction; in the case of direct contact services are further classified according to whether the interaction is active or passive. CICES as a reference classification ix. In addition to providing a way to classify ecosystem services, CICES was also intended as a reference classification that would allow translation between different ecosystem service classification systems, such as those used by the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA), The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB). This feature has been retained in V5.1, and equivalence tables will be provided via the CICES web-site (www.cices.eu). Draft Tables for equivalences between CICES V5.1 and the USEPA FEGS1 (Landers et al. 2016) categories are also available. 1 <https://www.epa.gov/eco-research/final-ecosystem-goods-and-services-classification-system> 1 1. Introduction 1.1. The Common

International Classification of Ecosystem Services (CICES) has been designed to help measure, account for, and assess ecosystem services. Although it was developed in the context of work on the System of Environmental and Economic Accounting (SEEA) that is being led by the United Nations Statistical Division (UNSD), it has been used widely in ecosystem services research for designing indicators, mapping and for valuation. 1.2. The version of CICES in widespread use (V.4.3) was published at the beginning of 2013². This version developed from work started in 2009, which took as a starting point the approach of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA, 2005) for describing ecosystem services, and then refined it to reflect some of the key issues identified in the wider research literature. As a result of the considerable body of work that has been built up around its application since 2013 and the clarification of key related concepts in ecosystem accounting, a review of its structure has been undertaken and this has provided the basis of the revised structure described in this document. 1.3. The work on 'Version 5' was informed by the results of the 2016 Survey conducted by Fabis Consulting Ltd. for the European Environment Agency (EEA), the results of which can be found on the CICES website (www.cices.eu)³ (See also Appendix 2). Valuable input was also obtained from two workshops organised as part of the EU-funded ESmeralda Project (www.esmeralda-project.eu). The first was jointly held with the European Environment Agency in February 2016, entitled Customisation of CICES across Member States. The second was on Flexible Methods for Ecosystem Service Mapping and Assessing, held at the University of Nottingham in April 2016 (Potschin and Haines-Young 2016a). The work in ESmeralda built on the practical thinking on CICES that was begun earlier in the EU-funded OpenNESS Project (www.openness-project.eu) (see Czucz et al., 2016; Haines-Young et al., 2016). 1.4. The revision represented by V5.1 has also been shaped by discussion at a meeting hosted by the United Nations Statistical Division (UNSD), in New York, in June 2016⁴ and a subsequent workshop in Wageningen, in November 2016, co-organised between the EEA, The United States Environmental Protection Agency (US-EPA) and UNSD and hosted by Wageningen University. The workshops explored the characteristics and approaches of different ecosystem service classification systems in the context of ecosystem accounting. This helped to clarify key concepts in ecosystem

service classification of relevance to ecosystem accounting (e.g. the definition of ‘final ecosystem service’) and provided input to developing further guidance on the development of experimental ecosystem accounts within the SEEA process. 1.5. The 2016 consultation and workshops suggested that it would be helpful to support the use of CICES with detailed technical guidance. This document aims to fulfil that role. It is intended for those seeking to understand the rationale that underpins the classification and so apply it in a rigorous way. Despite the clear logic of the idea of ecosystem services, their naming and 2 For a history of the development of CICES see Potschin and Haines-Young (2016a) and the documents on the CICES website (www.cices.eu). 3 The CICES 2016 survey and its results have been described in Deliverable 2 under the EEA contract No EEA/NSS/16/002. Over 220 people responded to the on-line survey; 59% had experience in using CICES V4.3, and the remainder interest in the problem of classifying ecosystem services more generally. 4 Supported by the EEA. 2 classification has proved to be a complex undertaking, especially in the context of ecosystem accounting. In the time since its publication in 2013, V4.3 of CICES has been used widely (for a review see Haines-Young et. al, 2016). This revision seeks to build on the experience gained and to provide a more robust and easily understood tool for future work in accounting, mapping and ecosystem assessments more generally.