



DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS
STATISTICS DIVISION
UNITED NATIONS

SEEA Revision
Issue 9
Cover Note

Cover Note

Issue #9: Classification of natural resource use and management activities and expenditures

Outcome paper for global consultation

Outcome Paper Issue #9: Classification of natural resource use and management activities and expenditures

Annexes Issues #9: Classification of natural resource use and management activities and expenditures (part of the outcome paper)

Issue description

The SEEA-2003 presents the Classification of Environmental Protection Activity (CEPA). CEPA does not cover natural resources management activities and expenditures. Should a separate classification of natural resources management activities and expenditures (CRUMA) be developed? Should both CEPA and CRUMA separately identify those expenditures for climate change (mitigation and adaptation) purposes?

Background

In the revision of the 2003 System of Environmental and Economic Accounts (SEEA-2003), the area of natural resource use and management activities, and in particular the relevant classifications, has been determined to be an important issue. In general it is considered that the relevant accounting logic and associated classification has been well developed for environmental protection activities through Environmental Protection Expenditure Accounts (EPEA) and the associated Classification of Environmental Protection Activities (CEPA).

The Italian National Statistical Office, Istat, developed a classification for Resource Use and Management Expenditure Accounts (RUMEA) purposes – called CRUMA (Classification of natural Resource Use and Management Activities and expenditures). With this experience Istat took the lead within the London Group to develop an internationally agreed classification in consultation with a range of other interested countries and international agencies.

In proposing the new classification the key elements are understanding the definition and scope of the activities to be covered by the classification and understanding the links to related classifications. In this regard key matters for the proposed CRUMA are the links to the CEPA and the ability to distinguish between resource use and resource management activities within the CRUMA.

Summary of outcomes

The recommendations emerging from the London Group are:

Recommendation 9.1: That in the revised SEEA the scope of resource use and management activities should be defined consistently with the SEEA-2003 noting the limitation of coverage to only non-produced natural resources.

Recommendation 9.2 That the classification of natural resource use and management activities and expenditures (CRUMA) as presented in Table 2 should be adopted in the revised SEEA noting that it is to be complementary, comparable and consistent with the existing Classification of Environmental Protection Activities (CEPA) and that resource management and resource use activities are to be clearly separated.

Recommendation 9.3: That the treatment of borderline classification cases between environmental protection activities and resource use and management activities outlined in paragraph 30 of the outcome paper should be adopted in the revised SEEA.

Recommendation 9.4: That an overarching Classification of Environmental Activities (CEA) should be established which combines CRUMA and CEPA while ensuring that these two classifications are separable.

Questions

1. Do you agree that in the revised SEEA the scope of resource use and management activities should be defined consistently with the SEEA-2003 noting the limitation of coverage to only non-produced natural resources?
2. Do you agree that the classification of natural resource use and management activities and expenditures (CRUMA) as presented in Table 2 should be adopted in the revised SEEA noting that it is to be complementary, comparable and consistent with the existing Classification of Environmental Protection Activities (CEPA) and that resource management and resource use activities are to be clearly separated?
3. Do you agree that the treatment of borderline classification cases between environmental protection activities and resource use and management activities outlined in paragraph 30 of the outcome paper should be adopted in the revised SEEA?
4. Do you agree that an overarching Classification of Environmental Activities (CEA) should be established which combines CRUMA and CEPA while ensuring that these two classifications are separable?
5. Any other comments?

To submit responses to these questions please complete the accompanying comment form available on the website.

Deadline for comments: 18 November 2010