Accounting for demand and supply of the Biosphere's regenerative capacity: the National Footprint Accounts' underlying methodology and framework

Michael Borucke[1], David Moore[2], Gemma Cranston[3], Kyle Gracey[1], Katsunori Iha[1], Joy Larson[1], Elias Lazarus[1], Juan Carlos Morales[1], Mathis Wackernagel[1], Alessandro Galli[2,*]

[1] Global Footprint Network, 312 Clay Street, Oakland, CA, 94607-3510 USA

[2] Global Footprint Network, International Environment House 2, 7-9 Chemin de Balexert, 1219 Geneva - Switzerland

[3]University of Cambridge, Programme for Sustainability Leadership, UK

*Corresponding author:

Alessandro Galli, Ph.D.
Global Footprint Network,
International Environment House 2,
7-9 Chemin de Balexert,
1219 Geneva - Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 797 41 10
Mobile: +39 346 6760884
e-mail: alessandro@footprintnetwork.org

NOTICE: This is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in *Ecological Indicators*. A definitive version was subsequently published as *Ecological Indicators*, Issue 24, 2013, DOI 10.1016/j.ecolind.2012.08.005

ABSTRACT

Human demand on ecosystem services continues to increase, and evidence suggests that this demand is outpacing the regenerative and absorptive capacity of the biosphere. As a result, the productivity of natural capital may increasingly become a limiting factor for the human endeavor. Metrics tracking human demand on, and availability of, regenerative and waste absorptive capacity within the biosphere are therefore needed. Ecological Footprint analysis is such a metric; it measures human appropriation (Ecological Footprint) and the biosphere's supply (biocapacity) of ecosystem products and services in terms of the amount of bioproductive land and sea area (ecological assets) needed to supply these products and services.

This paper documents the latest method for estimating the Ecological Footprint and biocapacity of nations, using the National Footprint Accounts (NFA) applied to more than 200 countries and for the world overall. Results are also compared with those obtained from previous editions of the NFA. According to the 2011 Edition of the National Footprint Accounts, humanity demanded the resources and services of 1.5 planets in 2008; this human demand was 0.7 planets in 1961.

Situations in which total demand for ecological goods and services exceed the available supply for a given location, are called 'overshoot'. 'Global overshoot' indicates that stocks of ecological capital are depleting and/or that waste is accumulating. As the methodology keeps being improved, each new edition of the NFA supports the findings of a global overshoot.

Keywords: Ecological Footprint, biocapacity, resource accounting, planetary limits, NFA editions comparison, sensitivity analysis.

1. Introduction

Economic prosperity and societal well-being depend on the planet's capacity to provide resources and ecosystem services (e.g., Costanza et al., 1997; Costanza and Daly, 1992; Daly, 1990; Daly and Farley, 2004; DeFries et al., 2004; Max-Neef, 1995). While most policy decisions are made under an assumption of limitless resources and ecosystem services, the planet has boundaries and sustainable development cannot be secured without operating within them (Rockström et al., 2009a).

Environmental changes such as deforestation, collapsing fisheries, and carbon dioxide accumulation in the atmosphere indicate that human demand is likely to be exceeding the regenerative and absorptive capacity of the biosphere. As the demands upon natural systems rapidly increase due to the swelling global economy and the need to attain better standards of living, several studies suggest that many of the Earth's thresholds are being exceeded and that, because of this, the Biosphere's future ability to provide for humanity is at risk (Goudie, 1981; Haberl, 2006; Nelson et al., 2006; Moore et al., 2012: Rockström et al., 2009b; Scheffer et al., 2001; Schlesinger, 2009; Thomas et al., 2004).

Barnosky et al (2012) argue that a planetary-scale critical transition is approaching as a result of the many human pressures, and that tools are needed to detect early warning signs and to forecast the consequences of such pressures on ecosystems. Careful management of human interaction with the biosphere is thus essential to ensure future prosperity; systemic accounting tools are needed for tracking the combined effects of the many pressures that humans are placing on the planet (Galli et al., 2012).

The Ecological Footprint is a potential tool to jointly measure planetary boundaries and the extent to which humanity is exceeding them. It can be used to investigate issues such as the limits of resource consumption, the international distribution of the world's natural resources, and how to address the sustainability of natural resource use across the globe. Assessing current ecological supply and demand as well as historical trends provides a basis for setting goals, identifying options for action, and tracking progress toward stated goals.

The first systematic attempt to calculate the Ecological Footprint and biocapacity of nations began in 1997 (Wackernagel et al. 1997). Building on these assessments, Global Footprint Network initiated its National Footprint Accounts (NFA) program in 2003, with the most recent Edition issued in 2011. NFAs constitute an accounting framework quantifying the annual supply of, and demand for, key ecosystem services by means of two measures (Wackernagel et al., 2002):

- ***Ecological Footprint*:** a measure of the demand populations and activities place on the biosphere in a given year, given the prevailing technology and resource management of that year.
- ***Biocapacity*:** a measure of the amount of biologically productive land and sea area available to provide the ecosystem services that humanity consumes – our ecological budget or nature's regenerative capacity.

Ecological Footprint and biocapacity values are expressed in mutually exclusive units of area necessary to annually provide (or regenerate) such ecosystem services. They include[1]: cropland for the provision of plant-based food and fiber products; grazing land and cropland for animal products; fishing grounds (marine and inland) for fish products; forests for timber and other forest products; uptake land to neutralize waste emissions (currently only the areas for absorbing anthropogenic carbon dioxide emissions are considered); and built-up areas for shelter and other infrastructure.

This paper describes the methodology for calculating the Ecological Footprint and biocapacity utilized in the 2011 Edition of the National Footprint Accounts and provides researchers and practitioners with information to deepen their understanding of the calculation methodology. It builds on previous Ecological Footprint work and methodology papers for the National Footprint Accounts (Wackernagel, 1991; Rees 1992, Wackernagel, 1994; Wackernagel and Rees, 1996; Wackernagel et al. 1997, Wackernagel et al. 1999a, b, Wackernagel et al. 2002, Monfreda et al. 2004, Wackernagel et al. 2005, Galli, 2007; Kitzes et al. 2007a, Ewing et al. 2010a). It also compares the most recent Ecological Footprint and biocapacity results with those from previous editions of the National Footprint Accounts.

2. National Footprint Accounts: data sources and accounting framework

Global Footprint Network releases National Footprint Accounts (NFA) annually. The NFA 2011 Edition calculate the Ecological Footprint and biocapacity of more than 200 countries and territories, as well as global totals, from 1961 to 2008 (Global Footprint Network, 2011). The intent of the NFA is to provide scientifically robust and transparent calculations to highlight the relevance of biocapacity limits for decision-making. The National Footprint Accounts measure one main aspect of sustainability only - *how much biocapacity humans demand in comparison to how much is available* - not all aspects of sustainability, nor all environmental concerns. The attempt to answer this particular scientific research

[1] In theory, the Ecological Footprint includes all human demands that compete for space, and biocapacity all areas that provide such services. But in practice, consistent data sets for all aspects do not exist. For this reason not all human demands that compete for space are included in actual assessments, nor all areas that provide services.

question is motivated by the assumption that the Earth's regenerative capacity is the limiting factor for the human economy in times when human demand exceeds what the biosphere can renew.

The calculations in the NFA are based primarily on data sets (Table 1) from UN agencies or affiliated organizations such as the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAOSTAT, 2011), the UN Statistics Division (UN Commodity Trade Statistics Database – UN Comtrade 2011), and the International Energy Agency (IEA 2011). Other data sources include studies in peer-reviewed journals and thematic collections.

TABLE 1: Input data to the Ecological Footprint and biocapacity calculation. Approximately 61 million data points are used in the National Footprint Accounts 2011 Edition (6,000 data points per country and year).

DATASET	SOURCE	DESCRIPTION
Production of primary agricultural products	FAO ProdSTAT	Data on physical quantities (tonnes) of primary products produced in each of the considered countries
Production of crop-based feeds used to feed animals	Feed from general marketed crops data is directly drawn from the SUA/FBS from FAOSTAT Data on crops grown specifically for fodder is drawn directly from the FAO ProdSTAT	Data on physical quantities (tonnes) of feeds, by type of crops, available to feed livestock
Production of seeds	Data on crops used as seeds is calculated by Global Footprint Network based on data from the FAO ProdSTAT	Data on physical quantities (tonnes) of seed
Import and Export of primary and derived agricultural and livestock products	FAO TradeSTAT	Data on physical quantities (tonnes) of products imported and exported by each of the considered countries
Import and Export of non-agricultural commodities	COMTRADE	Data on physical quantities (kg) of products imported and exported by each of the considered countries
Livestock crop consumption	Calculated by Global Footprint Network based upon the following datasets: • FAO Production for primary Livestock • Haberl et al., 2007.	Data on crop-based feed for livestock (tonnes of dry matter per year), split into different crop categories

Production of primary forestry products as well as import and export of primary and derived forestry products	FAO ForeSTAT	Data on physical quantities (tonnes and m^3) of products (timber and wood fuel) produced, imported and exported by each country
Production of primary fishery products as well as import and export of primary and derived fishery products	FAO FishSTAT	Data on physical quantities (tonnes) of marine and inland fish species landed as well as import and export of fish commodities
Carbon dioxide emissions by sector	International Energy Agency (IEA)	Data on total amounts of CO_2 emitted by each sector of a country's economy
Built-up/infrastructure areas	A combination of data sources is used, in the following order of preference: 1. CORINE Land Cover 2. FAO ResourceSTAT 3. Global Agro-Ecological Zones (GAEZ) Model 4. Global Land Cover (GLC) 2000 5. Global Land Use Database from the Center for Sustainability and the Global Environment (SAGE) at University of Wisconsin	Built-up areas by infrastructure type and country. Except for data drawn from CORINE for European countries, all other data sources only provide total area values
Cropland yields	FAO ProdSTAT	World average yield for 164 primary crop products
National yield factors for cropland	Calculated by Global Footprint Network based on cropland yields and country specific unharvested percentages	Country specific yield factors for cropland
Grazing land yields	Chad Monfreda (personal communication), 2008. SAGE, University of Wisconsin, Madison	World average yield for grass production. It represents the average above-ground edible net primary production for grassland available for consumption by ruminants
Fish yields	Calculated by Global Footprint Network based on several data sources including: • Sustainable catch value (Gulland, 1971) • Trophic levels of fish species (Fishbase Database available at www.fishbase.org) • Data on discard factors, efficiency transfer, and carbon content of fish per tonne wet weight (Pauly and Christensen, 1995)	World-average yields for fish species. They are based on the annual marine primary production equivalent

Forest yields	World average forest yield calculated by Global Footprint Network based on national Net Annual Increment (NAI) of biomass. NAI data is drawn from two sources: • Temperate and Boreal Forest Resource Assessment – TBFRA (UNECE and FAO 2000) • Global Fiber Supply Model – GFSM (FAO, 1998)	World average forest yield. It is based on the forests' Net Annual Increment of biomass. NAI is defined as the average annual volume over a given reference period of gross increment less that of neutral losses on all trees to a minimum diameter of 0 cm (d.b.h.)
Carbon Uptake land yield	Calculated by Global Footprint Network based on data on terrestrial carbon sequestration (IPCC 2006) and the ocean sequestration percentage (Khatiwala et al., 2009) Further details can be found in (Gracey et al., 2012)	World average carbon uptake capacity. Though different ecosystems have the capacity to sequester CO_2, carbon uptake land is currently assumed to be forest land only by the Ecological Footprint methodology
Equivalence Factors (EQF)	Calculated by Global Footprint Network based on data on land cover and agricultural suitability Data on agricultural suitability is obtained from the Global Agro-Ecological Zones (GAEZ) model (FAO and IIASA, 2000). Land cover data drawn from the FAO ResourceSTAT database	EQF for crop, grazing, forest and marine land. Based upon the suitability of land as measured by the Global Agro-Ecological Zones model

Results can be reported at the level of a product category, land use type, or aggregated into a single number (Figure 1) - the latter being the most commonly used reporting format. Normalizing factors, referred as the yield factor and equivalence factor, are used to scale the contribution of each single land use type so that values can be added up into an aggregate number (see sections 4.2 and 4.3). Aggregating results into a single value has the advantage of monitoring the combined demand of anthropogenic activities against nature's overall regenerative capacity. It also helps to understand the complex relationships between the many environmental problems exposing humanity to a "peak-everything" situation (Heinberg, 2007). This is a unique feature since pressures are more commonly evaluated independently (climate change, fisheries collapse, land degradation, land use change, food consumption, etc.).

FIGURE 1: National Footprint Accounts (NFA)' accounting framework.



3. Calculation methodology

3.1 Ecological Footprint and biocapacity: basic equations

The Ecological Footprint measures appropriated biocapacity across five distinct land use types. This is contrasted with six demand categories. The reason for this discrepancy is that two demand categories, forest products and carbon sequestration, compete for the same biocapacity category: forest land. Average bioproductivity differs between various land use types, as well as between countries for any given land use type. For comparability across land use types and countries, Ecological Footprint and biocapacity are usually expressed in units of world-average bioproductive area, referred to as global hectares (gha).

Global hectares provide more information than simply weight - which does not capture the extent of land and sea area used - or physical area - which does not capture how much ecological production is associated with that land. Two important types of coefficients, the yield factors (YF) and the equivalence factors (EQF), allow results to be expressed in terms of a standardized - cross-country comparable - unit of measure (Monfreda et al., 2004; Galli et al., 2007). The use of global hectares allows for the addition of Ecological Footprint (and biocapacity) values of different land use types into a single number: consumption-focused applications that have a global context, and global sustainability studies aiming at comparing the Ecological Footprint (and biocapacity) results of Nations benefit from the use of global hectares (Ferguson, 1999; Wackernagel et al., 2004).

For a given nation, the Ecological Footprint of production, EF_P, represents primary demand for biocapacity and is calculated as

$$\mathrm{EF_P} = \sum_i \frac{P_i}{Y_{N,i}} \cdot YF_{N,i} \cdot EQF_i = \sum_i \frac{P_i}{Y_{W,i}} \cdot EQF_i \qquad \text{(Equation 1)}$$

where P is the amount of each primary product i that is harvested (or carbon dioxide emitted) in the nation; $Y_{N,i}$ is the annual national average yield for the production of commodity i (or its carbon uptake capacity in cases where P is CO_2); $YF_{N,i}$ is the country-specific yield factor for the production of each product i; $Y_{W,i}$ is the average world yield for commodity i; and EQF_i is the equivalence factor for the land use type producing products i.

The definition of $YF_{N,i}$ as the ratio between $Y_{N,i}$ and $Y_{W,i}$ (see section 4.2) leads to the equivalence of the second and third terms in Equation 1. The latter manifestation of the equation is used in the NFA calculations.

A variety of derived products are also tracked in the NFA (see Table 1), for which production yields (Y_W) have to be calculated before the implementation of Equation 1. Primary and derived goods are related by product specific extraction rates. The extraction rate for a derived product, $EXTR_D$, is used to calculate its effective yield as follows:

$$\mathrm{Y_{W,D}} = \mathrm{Y_{W,P}} \cdot \mathrm{EXTR_D} \qquad \text{(Equation 2)}$$

where $Y_{W,D}$ and $Y_{W,P}$ are the world-average yield for the derived and the primary product, respectively.

Often $EXTR_D$ is simply the mass ratio of derived product to primary input required. This ratio is known as the technical conversion factor (FAO, 2000) for the derived product, denoted as TCF_D below. There are a few cases where multiple derived products are created simultaneously from the same primary product. For example, soybean oil and soybean cake are both extracted simultaneously from the same primary product, in this case soybeans. In this situation, summing the primary product equivalents of the derived products would lead to double counting. To resolve this problem, the Ecological Footprint of the primary product must be shared between the simultaneously derived goods. The generalized formula for the extraction rate for a derived good *D* is

$$EXTR_D = \frac{TCF_D}{FAF_D} \qquad \text{(Equation 3)}$$

where FAF_D is the Footprint allocation factor. This allocates the Footprint of a primary product between simultaneously derived goods according to the TCF-weighted prices. The prices of derived goods represent their relative contributions to the incentive for the harvest of the primary product. This is the only point in the entire NFA framework where monetary data is used to allocate physical flows; moreover, this method assumes a constant price-to-mass relationship over time, which is unlikely to be the case.

The equation for the Footprint allocation factor of a derived product is

$$FAF_D = \frac{TCF_D \cdot V_D}{\sum TCF_i \cdot V_i} \qquad \text{(Equation 4)}$$

where V_i is the market price of each simultaneous derived product (2008 market prices were used in the NFA 2011 Edition, throughout the whole 1961-2008 period). For a production chain with only one derived product, then, FAF_D is 1 and the extraction rate is equal to the technical conversion factor.

For a given country, the biocapacity *BC* is calculated as follows:

$$BC = \sum_i A_{N,i} \cdot YF_{N,i} \cdot EQF_i \qquad \text{(Equation 5)}$$

where $A_{N,i}$ is the bioproductive area that is available for the production of each product i at the country level, $YF_{N,i}$ is the country-specific yield factor for the land producing products i, and EQF_i is the equivalence factor for the land use type producing each product i.

3.2 Yield factors

Yield factors (YFs) account for countries' differing levels of productivity for particular land use types.[2] YFs are country-specific and vary by land use type and year. They may reflect natural factors such as differences in precipitation or soil quality, as well as anthropogenic differences such as management practices.

The YF is the ratio of national average to world average yields. It is calculated in terms of the annual availability of usable products. For any land use type L, a country's yield factor YF_L, is given by

$$YF_L = \frac{\sum_{i \in U} A_{W,i}}{\sum_{i \in U} A_{N,i}} \qquad \text{(Equation 6)}$$

where U is the set of all usable primary products that a given land use type yields, and $A_{W,i}$ and $A_{N,i}$ are the areas necessary to furnish that country's annually available amount of product i at world and national yields, respectively. These areas are calculated as

$$A_{N,i} = \frac{P_i}{Y_{N,i}} \text{ and } A_{W,i} = \frac{P_i}{Y_{W,i}} \qquad \text{(Equation 7)}$$

where P_i is the total national annual growth of product i, and $Y_{N,i}$ and $Y_{W,i}$ are national and world yields for the same product, respectively. Thus $A_{N,i}$ is always the area that produces a given product i within a given country, while $A_{W,i}$ gives the equivalent area of world-average land yielding the same product i.

With the exception of cropland, all land use types included in the NFAs are assumed to provide only a single human-useful primary product i, such as wood from forest land or grass from grazing land. For these land use types, the equation for the YF simplifies to

[2] For example, the average hectare of pasture in New Zealand produces more grass than a world average hectare of pasture land. Thus, in terms of productivity, one hectare of grassland in New Zealand is equivalent to more than one world average grazing land hectare; it is potentially capable of supporting more meat production.

$$YF_L = \frac{Y_{N,i}}{Y_{W,i}}$$ (Equation 8)

Due to the difficulty of assigning a yield to built-up land, the YF for this land use type is assumed to be the same as that for cropland; urban areas are assumed to be built on productive agricultural lands. For lack of detailed global datasets, areas inundated by hydroelectric reservoirs are presumed to have previously had world average productivity. The YF for the carbon Footprint is assumed to be the same as that for forest land, due to limited data availability regarding the carbon uptake of other land use types. All inland waters are assigned a YF of one, due to the lack of a comprehensive global dataset on freshwater ecosystem productivities.

3.3 Equivalence factors

In order to combine the Ecological Footprint or biocapacity of different land-use types, a second coefficient is necessary (Galli et al., 2007). Equivalence factors (EQFs) convert the areas of different land use types, at their respective world average productivities, into their equivalent areas at global average bioproductivity across all land use types. EQFs vary by land use type as well as by year.

The rationale behind the EQF calculation is to weight different land areas in terms of their inherent capacity to produce human-useful biological resources. The weighting criterion is not the actual quantity of biomass produced, but what each hectare would be able to inherently deliver.
As an approximation of inherent capacity, EQFs are currently calculated[3] using suitability indexes from the Global Agro-Ecological Zones model combined with data on the actual areas of cropland, forest land, and grazing land area from FAOSTAT (FAO and IIASA, 2000; FAO ResourceSTAT Statistical Database 2008). The GAEZ model divides all land globally into five categories, based on calculated potential crop productivity under assumption of agricultural input. All land is assigned a quantitative suitability index from among the following:

- Very Suitable (VS) – 0.9

[3] Actual Net Primary Production (NPP) values have been suggested for use in scaling land type productivity (Venetoulis and Talberth, 2008) and were also used in the earliest Footprint accounts; however, this would not allow incorporating the inherent productivity as, for instance, crop land is managed for maximum crop, not for maximum biomass production.
Potential NPP data - the NPP of useable biological materials that could be potentially available in the absence of human management - could theoretically be used as weighting factors (see Kitzes et al., 2009). A global data set exists (FAO, 2006) and research is under way at Global Footprint Network to assess the possibility of using potential NPP data in calculating EQFs.

- Suitable (S) – 0.7
- Moderately Suitable (MS) – 0.5
- Marginally Suitable (mS) – 0.3
- Not Suitable (NS) – 0.1

The calculation of the EQFs assumes that within each country, the most suitable land available will be planted to cropland, after which the most suitable remaining land will be under forest land, and the least suitable land will be devoted to grazing land (Wackernagel et al., 2002). In each year, EQFs are calculated as the ratio of the world average suitability index for a given land use type to the average suitability index for all land use types. Figure 2 shows a schematic of this calculation.

FIGURE 2: Schematic Representation of equivalence factor calculations.



The total number of bioproductive land hectares is shown by the length of the horizontal axis. Vertical dashed lines divide this total land area into the three terrestrial land use types for which equivalence factors are calculated (cropland, forest, and grazing land). The length of each horizontal bar in the graph shows the total amount of land available with each suitability index. The vertical location of each bar reflects the suitability score for that suitability index, between 10 and 90.

For the reasons detailed above, the EQF for built-up land is set equal to that for cropland, except when there is clear evidence that built-up land does not sit on cropland. EQF of carbon uptake land is set equal to that of forest land since the carbon Footprint is assumed to draw on forest area. The EQF for hydroelectric reservoir area is set equal to one, reflecting the assumption that hydroelectric reservoirs flood world average bioproductive land. The EQF for marine area is calculated such that the amount of calories of salmon that can be produced by a single global hectare of marine area will be equal to the amount of calories of beef produced by a single global hectare of pasture. This is based on the assumption that a calorie from animal protein from land and from sea would be considered to be of equivalent resource value for human consumption. The EQF for inland water is set equal to that of marine area.

3.4 A Consumer approach for the National Footprint Accounts

All manufacturing processes rely to some degree on the use of biocapacity to provide material inputs and remove wastes at various points in the production chain. Thus all products carry with them an embodied Footprint and international trade flows can be seen as flows of embodied demand for biocapacity (see Figure 3).

In order to keep track of the biocapacity - both direct and indirect - needed to support people's consumption patterns and to properly allocate the Footprints of traded goods to final consumers, the National Footprint Accounts use a consumer-based approach; for each land use type, the Ecological Footprint of consumption (EF_C) is thus calculated as

$$EF_C = EF_P + EF_I - EF_E \qquad \text{(Equation 9)}$$

where EF_P is the Ecological Footprint of production and EF_I and EF_E are the Footprints embodied in imported and exported commodity flows, respectively. For each traded product, EF_I and EF_E are calculated as in equation 1, with production P being the amount of product i imported or exported, respectively.

FIGURE 3: Schematic of direct and indirect demand for domestic and global biocapacity.



4. Land use types in the National Footprint Accounts

The Ecological Footprint represents demand for ecosystem products and services in terms of appropriation of various land use types (see Section 1) while biocapacity represents the productivity available to serve each use. In 2008, the area of biologically productive land and water on Earth was approximately 12 billion hectares. After multiplying by the EQFs, the relative area of each land use type expressed in global hectares differs from the distribution in actual hectares as shown in Figure 4.

FIGURE 4: Relative area of land use types worldwide in hectares and global hectares, 2008.



4.1 Cropland

Cropland[4] consists of the area required to grow all crop products, including livestock feeds, fish meals, oil crops and rubber. It is the most bioproductive of the land use types included in the NFAs. In other words, the number of global hectares of cropland is large compared to the number of physical hectares of cropland in the world, as shown in Figure 4.

NFAs calculate the Footprint of cropland using data on production, import and export of primary and derived agricultural products. The Footprint of each crop type is calculated as the area of cropland that would be required to produce the harvested quantity at world-average yields.

Cropland biocapacity represents the combined productivity of all land devoted to growing crops, which the cropland Footprint cannot exceed. As an actively managed land use type, cropland has yields of harvest equal to yields of growth by definition and thus it is not possible for the Footprint of production of this land use type to exceed biocapacity within any given area (Kitzes et al., 2009). The eventual availability of data on present and historical sustainable crop yields would allow for improving the cropland footprint calculation and tracking crop overexploitation (Bastianoni et al., 2012).

4.2 Grazing Land

The grazing land Footprint measures the area of grassland used in addition to crop feeds to support livestock. Grazing land[5] comprises all grasslands used to provide feed for animals, including cultivated pastures as well as wild grasslands and prairies. The grazing land Footprint is calculated following Equation 1, where yield represents average above-ground NPP for grassland. The total demand for pasture grass, P_{GR}, is the amount of biomass required by livestock after cropped feeds are accounted for, following the formula

$$P_{GR} = TFR - F_{Mkt} - F_{Crop} - F_{Res} \quad \text{(Equation 10)}$$

where TFR is the calculated total feed requirement, and F_{Mkt}, F_{Crop} and F_{Res} are the amounts of feed available from general marketed crops, crops grown specifically for fodder, and crop residues, respectively.

[4] In the National Footprint Accounts, “cropland” is defined to match the FAO land use category ‘Arable land and Permanent crops’ – FAO code 6620.

[5] In the National Footprint Accounts, “grazing land” is defined to match the FAO land use category ‘Permanent meadows and pastures’ – FAO code 6655.

The grazing land calculation is the most complex in the NFAs and significant improvements have taken place over the past seven years; including improvements to the total feed requirement, the inclusion of fish and animal products used as livestock feed, and the inclusion of livestock food aid (see Ewing et al., 2010a for further details).

However, as the yield of grazing land represents the amount of above-ground primary production available in a year with no significant prior stocks to draw down, and given the fact that soil depletion is not tracked by the Ecological Footprint methodology (Kitzes et al., 2009), an eventual overshoot for this land use type still cannot be shown.

4.3 Fishing Grounds

The fishing grounds Footprint is calculated based on the annual primary production required to sustain a harvested aquatic species. This primary production requirement, denoted *PPR*, is the mass ratio of harvested fish to annual primary production needed to sustain that species, based on its average trophic level. Equation 11 provides the formula used to calculate *PPR*. It is based on the work of Pauly and Christensen (1995).

$$\text{PPR} = \text{CC} \cdot \text{DR} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\text{TE}}\right)^{(\text{TL}-1)} \qquad \text{(Equation 11)}$$

where *CC* is the carbon content of wet-weight fish biomass, *DR* is the discard rate for bycatch, *TE* is the transfer efficiency of biomass between trophic levels, and *TL* is the trophic level of the fish species in question.

In the NFAs, *DR* is assigned the global average value of 1.27 for all fish species, meaning that for every ton of fish harvested, 0.27 tonnes of bycatch are also harvested (Pauly and Christensen 1995). This bycatch rate is applied as a constant coefficient in the PPR equation, reflecting the assumption that the trophic level of bycatch is the same as that of the primary catch species. These approximations are employed for lack of higher resolution data on bycatch. *TE* is assumed to be 0.1 for all fish, meaning that 10% of biomass is transferred between successive trophic levels (Pauly and Christensen, 1995).

The estimate of annually available primary production used to calculate marine yields is based on estimates of the sustainable annual harvests of 19 different aquatic species groups (Gulland, 1971).

These quantities are converted to primary production equivalents using Equation 11, and the sum of these is taken to be the total primary production requirement that global fisheries may sustainably harvest. Thus the total sustainably harvestable primary production requirement, PP_S, is calculated as

$$PP_S = \sum \left(Q_{S,i} \cdot PPR_i \right) \qquad \text{(Equation 12)}$$

where $Q_{S,i}$ is the estimated sustainable catch for species group i, and PPR_i is the primary production requirement corresponding to the average trophic level of species group i. Thus the world-average marine yield Y_M, in terms of PPR, is given by

$$Y_M = \frac{PP_S}{A_{CS}} \qquad \text{(Equation 13)}$$

where PP_S is the global sustainable harvest from Equation 12, and A_{CS} is the global total continental shelf area.

Significant improvements have taken place over the past seven years in the calculation of the fishing grounds section of the NFAs, including the revision of many fish extraction rates, the inclusion of aquaculture production and of crops used in aquafeeds (see Ewing et al., 2010a for further).

4.4 Forest Land

The forest land[6] Footprint measures the annual harvest of fuel wood and timber to supply forest products. The yield used in the forest land Footprint is the net annual increment (NAI) of merchantable timber per hectare. Timber productivity data from the UNEC and FAO Forest Resource Assessment and the FAO Global Fiber Supply are utilized to calculate the world average yield of 1.81 m^3 of harvestable wood per hectare per year (UNECE and FAO 2000; FAO 1998).

NFAs calculate the Footprint of forest land according to the production quantities of 13 primary timber products and three wood fuel products. Trade flows include 30 timber products and 3 wood fuel products.

[6] In the National Footprint Accounts, "forest" is defined to match the FAO land use category 'Forest Area' – FAO code 6661. Due to data limitation, current accounts do not distinguish between forests for forest products, for long-term carbon uptake, or for biodiversity reserves.

4.5 Carbon Footprint

The uptake land to accommodate the carbon Footprint is the only land use type included in the NFAs that is exclusively dedicated to tracking a waste product: carbon dioxide.[7] In addition, it is the only land use type for which biocapacity is currently not explicitly defined. Many different ecosystem types have the capacity for long-term storage of CO_2, including land use types such as cropland or grassland. However, since most terrestrial carbon uptake in the biosphere occurs in forests, and to avoid overestimations, carbon uptake land is assumed to be (a subcategory of) forest land by the Ecological Footprint methodology. Therefore, forest for timber and fuelwood is not separated from forest for carbon uptake.[8]

CO_2 is released into the atmosphere from a variety of sources, including human activities such as burning fossil fuels and certain land use practices; as well as natural events such as forest fires, volcanoes, and respiration by animals and microbes. Analogous to Equation 1, the formula for the carbon Ecological Footprint (EF_c) is

$$EF_C = \frac{P_C \cdot (1 - S_{Ocean})}{Y_C} * EQF \qquad \text{(Equation 14)}$$

where P_C is the annual anthropogenic emissions (production) of carbon dioxide, S_{Ocean} is the fraction of anthropogenic emissions sequestered by oceans in a given year (see section 5.3 for further details) and Y_C is the annual rate of carbon uptake per hectare of world average forest land.

4.6 Built-Up Land

The built-up land Footprint is calculated based on the area of land covered by human infrastructure: transportation, housing, industrial structures and reservoirs for hydroelectric power generation. The NFA 2011 Edition assumes that built-up land occupies what would previously have been cropland, except in cases where evidences exist that built-up land does not sit on cropland (e.g., in the United Arab Emirates – see Abdullatif and Alam, 2011). This assumption is based on the observation that

[7] Today, the term "carbon footprint" is widely used as shorthand for the amount of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions; in the Ecological Footprint methodology however, it translates the amount of anthropogenic carbon dioxide into the amount of productive land and sea area required to sequester carbon dioxide emissions. (See Galli et al. (2012) for additional information.)

[8] Human demands for forest products and carbon uptake capacity are competing for forest land. However, when a forest is used for products, CO_2 is released again in the athmosphere; as such, only legally protected forests with a commitment to long term storage of carbon can truly be counted as uptake areas. Global Footprint Network has not yet identified reliable global data sets on how much of the forest areas are legally protected and dedicated to long-term carbon uptake. For this reason, current National Footprint Accounts do not include a carbon uptake category within the biocapacity calculation.

human settlements are generally situated in fertile areas with the potential for supporting high yielding cropland (Imhoff et al., 1997; Wackernagel et al., 2002).

For lack of a comprehensive global dataset on hydroelectric reservoirs, NFAs assume these to cover world-average bioproductive areas in proportion to their rated generating capacity. Built-up land always has a biocapacity equal to its Footprint since both quantities capture the amount of bioproductivity lost to encroachment by physical infrastructure. In addition, the Footprint of production and the Footprint of consumption of built-up land are always equal in the NFAs as built-up land embodied in traded goods is not currently included in the calculation due to lack of data. This omission is likely to cause overestimates of the built-up Footprint of net exporting countries and underestimates of the built-up Footprint of net importing countries.

5. Methodological changes between the 2010 and 2011 edition of the National Footprint Accounts

A formal process is in place to assure continuous improvement of the National Footprint Accounts (NFA) methodology. Coordinated by Global Footprint Network, this process is supported by its partners and by the National Footprint Accounts Review Committee, as well as other stakeholders.

There have been three primary motivations for revisions to the NFAs calculation method:

- to adapt to changes in the organization of the source data;
- to respond to issues raised in outside reviews; and
- to increase the detail and accuracy of the NFA calculations.

This section describes each of the method changes implemented since the NFA 2010 Edition.

5.1 Data Cleaning

In the NFA 2011, a source data cleaning algorithm was implemented different to the algorithm used in NFA 2010. The new algorithm is used to reduce (1) spikes and troughs and (2) inconsistencies in the reported time series of source data sets. The new algorithm excludes data points that are beyond a fixed distance from the median value of the reference time series data. The fixed distance is a user-defined multiple of the median value of the time series in question. To replace the removed outliers and/or to fill in data gaps for non-endpoints, the algorithm interpolates the average value of the two neighbouring points. To replace endpoints (outliers or missing data), the algorithm extrapolates values based on the Akaike Information Criterion (Akaike, 1978). The data cleaning algorithm was implemented on the following trade datasets used in the NFA 2011 Edition: the COMTRADE dataset, the FishSTAT Commodity dataset, and the TRADESTAT dataset from FAOSTAT.

5.2 Constant global hectares: a revised method to calculate Ecological Footprint and biocapacity time series

Ecological Footprint and biocapacity calculations are usually presented in units of global hectares (see section 4). Historically, Ecological Footprint analyses have utilized a Yield Factor (YF) for each land use type to capture the difference between local and global productivity. The various land use types are then converted into global hectares using equivalence factors (EQFs) for each land use type. In every year, the total biocapacity of the planet, expressed in global hectares, equals the total number of biologically productive physical hectares on Earth (Kitzes et al., 2007b). Therefore, the number of global hectares of biocapacity available on the planet in any given year only reflects the total physical bioproductive area of the planet and is entirely insensitive to changes in yields (Wackernagel et al., 2004). This can cause difficulties of interpretation when comparing changes in biocapacity and Ecological Footprint over time as it is hard to represent actual variations in demand and supply of regenerative capacity (Haberl et al., 2001).

In the NFA 2011 Edition, we have implemented a method for reporting Ecological Footprint and biocapacity time trends in 'constant global hectares' (hectares normalized to have world-average bioproductivity in a single reference year). This is realized via a set of world-average Intertemporal Yield Factors (IYFs). By expressing results through the constant global hectare approach, it is possible to clearly distinguish trends in both total bioproductive area and trends in yield and productivity. IYFs are calculated for each year and land use type in order to track changes in the world-average bioproductivity over time of each land type.

For any given land type producing products *i*, in a given year *j*, with a selected base year *b*, a world average Intertemporal Yield Factor (IYF_W) is thus calculated as:

$$IYF_{W,j} = \frac{\sum_i \frac{P_{W,i,j}}{Y_{W,i,b}}}{\sum_i \frac{P_{W,i,j}}{Y_{W,i,j}}} \qquad \text{(Equation 15)}$$

where P is the amount of a product harvested (or CO_2 emitted) and Y_W is the world-average product-specific yield. For the NFA 2011 Edition, the selected base year is 2008 (the most recent year over the analyzed period).

IYFs complement the function of the Yield Factors (YF) currently employed in the NFAs. While YFs compare the yield of a given land use type in a given nation with the world-average yield for that same land use type, IYFs account for changes in the world-average yield of that same land use type over time.

Ecological Footprint time series are therefore calculated as follows:

$$EF = \sum_i \frac{P_{N,i,j}}{Y_{N,i,j}} \cdot YF_{N,i,j} \cdot IYF_{W,i,j} \cdot EQF_{i,j} = \sum_i \frac{P_{N,i,j}}{Y_{W,i,j}} \cdot IYF_{W,i,j} \cdot EQF_{i,j} \qquad \text{(Equation 16)}$$

Similarly, biocapacity time series are calculated in terms of constant gha as follows:

$$BC = \sum_i A_{N,i,j} \cdot YF_{N,i,j} \cdot IYF_{W,i,j} \cdot EQF_{i,j} \qquad \text{(Equation 17)}$$

Where, for any product i, in a given year j, A_N represents the bioproductive area available at the country level, and YF_N, IYF_W and EQF, are the country-specific yield factor, the world average Intertemporal Yield Factor, and the equivalence factor for the land use type producing that product, respectively.

Calculating IYFs for each land use type requires production quantity and yield data over time. While production quantity data is available for all products tracked by the NFAs over the period 1961-2008, time series yield data are available for crop-based products only. This renders the calculation of IYFs currently possible for the 'cropland' land use type only; in the absence of available data, IYF time series values for all other land types have been set equal to 1.

5.3 Ocean Uptake Changes

A fraction of human-induced carbon emissions is annually taken up by the oceans from the atmosphere. To track this fraction, recent editions of the NFAs have used an averaged ocean uptake value of 1.8 Pg C yr^{-1} based on two data points drawn from the third IPCC assessment report (IPCC, 2001). This quantity has been held constant over time leading to an estimated 82% of anthropogenic emissions taken up by the ocean in 1961, which is likely to be unrealistic. This caused an underestimation of the carbon Footprint component in the early decades tracked by the NFAs.

To create an appropriate time series for the percent uptake of anthropogenic carbon emissions into the ocean, in the NFA 2011 Edition we have used ocean uptake data (in Pg C yr^{-1}) from Khatiwala et al (2009) and divided this data by the corresponding (total anthropogenic) carbon emissions data (in Pg C yr^{-1}) from the Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center (Marland et al., 2007). The outcome of the revised calculation shows a relatively constant percentage uptake for oceans, varying between 28% and 35% over the period 1961-2008.

Implementing this change has caused a major shift in the total humanity's Footprint value from 1961 to the late 1990s; this has significantly contributed to a shift in the global overshoot state - the first occurrence of overshoot is calculated as occurring in the early 1970s (NFA 2011 Edition), changed from the mid 1970s (NFA 2010 Edition).

6. Results

According to the 2011 Edition of the National Footprint Accounts, in 1961 humanity's Ecological Footprint was approximately half of what the biosphere could supply annually; humanity was living off the planet's annual ecological interest, not drawing down its principal (Figure 5). Since then, humanity's overall Footprint has more than doubled, first exceeding the planet's biocapacity in the early 1970s. This situation, known as overshoot, has continued to increase, reaching 52% in 2008.

In 2008, humanity's Ecological Footprint consisted of 22% cropland, 8% grazing land, 10% forest land, 4% fishing ground, 54% carbon uptake land, and 2% built-up land. As these annual "biocapacity deficits" accrue into an ever larger ecological debt, ecological reserves are depleting, and wastes such as CO_2 are accumulating in the biosphere and atmosphere.

FIGURE 5: World overshoot according to the 2011 Edition of the National Footprint Accounts. Humanity's Ecological Footprint, expressed in number of planets demanded, has increased significantly over the past 47 years.



Per capita Ecological Footprint and biocapacity results for all countries for the past two years are reported in Table 2 and 3. These tables contain an ordinal ranking of countries by Footprint and biocapacity respectively, as well as a comparison with values from the previous NFA 2010 Edition.

TABLE 2: NFA 2010 and NFA 2011 Editions comparison: Ecological Footprint data table.

	(a) Ecological Footprint 2008 (2011 Edition) *[gha/capita]*	(b) Ecological Footprint 2007 (2010 Edition) *[gha/capita]*	(c) Ecological Footprint 2007 (2011 Edition) *[gha/capita]*	(c)-(b) / (c) %	(a)-(c) / (a) %	Rank (a)	Rank (b)	Rank (c)	ΔRank between editions - (b) to (c)	ΔRank between years - (c) to (a)
Afghanistan	0.54	0.62	0.54	-15.30	0.00	156	156	157	-1	1
Albania	1.81	1.91	2.13	10.35	-0.18	89	84	78	6	-11
Algeria	1.65	1.59	1.55	-2.44	0.06	99	101	101	0	2
Angola	0.89	1.00	0.86	-16.92	0.04	140	138	146	-8	6
Argentina	2.71	2.60	2.60	0.19	0.04	66	71	69	2	3
Armenia	1.73	1.75	1.60	-9.32	0.08	94	95	100	-5	6
Australia	6.68	6.84	5.89	-16.11	0.12	8	10	14	-4	6
Austria	5.29	5.30	5.23	-1.30	0.01	19	25	24	1	5
Azerbaijan	1.97	1.87	1.87	0.11	0.05	82	87	82	5	0
Bahrain	6.65	10.04	7.58	-32.41	-0.14	9	3	5	-2	-4
Bangladesh	0.66	0.62	0.66	6.54	-0.01	153	157	155	2	2
Belarus	3.99	3.80	3.70	-2.83	0.07	44	48	47	1	3
Belgium	7.11	8.00	7.39	-8.25	-0.04	7	5	7	-2	0
Benin	1.36	1.23	1.34	8.21	0.01	116	124	113	11	-3
Bolivia	2.61	2.57	2.56	-0.40	0.02	69	72	70	2	1
Bosnia/Herzegovina	2.74	2.75	2.63	-4.70	0.04	65	64	67	-3	2
Botswana	2.84	2.68	2.44	-9.61	0.14	63	69	72	-3	9

Brazil	2.93	2.91	2.80	-3.65	0.04	60	58	57	1	-3
Bulgaria	3.56	4.07	3.02	-34.95	0.15	51	45	53	-8	2
Burkina Faso	1.53	1.32	1.31	-0.45	0.14	104	117	118	-1	14
Burundi	0.85	0.90	0.90	-0.34	-0.07	144	148	143	5	-1
Cambodia	1.19	1.03	1.09	5.51	0.08	123	135	130	5	7
Cameroon	1.09	1.04	1.10	4.90	-0.01	132	134	129	5	-3
Canada	6.43	7.01	6.33	-10.76	0.01	10	8	8	0	-2
C. African Republic	1.36	1.32	1.37	3.53	-0.01	115	116	109	7	-6
Chad	1.89	1.73	1.85	6.97	0.02	85	98	83	15	-2
Chile	3.24	3.24	3.27	1.08	-0.01	53	52	50	2	-3
China	2.13	2.21	2.03	-9.13	0.05	77	76	81	-5	4
Colombia	1.80	1.87	1.80	-3.63	0.00	90	88	88	0	-2
Congo	1.08	0.96	1.01	4.85	0.06	133	141	136	5	3
Costa Rica	2.52	2.69	2.61	-2.89	-0.04	73	67	68	-1	-5
Côte d'Ivoire	0.99	1.01	1.04	3.08	-0.05	136	137	135	2	-1
Croatia	4.19	3.75	3.80	1.36	0.09	39	49	46	3	7
Cuba	1.90	1.85	1.74	-6.57	0.08	84	89	90	-1	6
Cyprus	4.44	6.87	4.37	-57.28	0.02	35	9	39	-30	4
Czech Republic	5.27	5.73	5.38	-6.47	-0.02	20	16	19	-3	-1
Korea, DPR	1.31	1.32	1.31	-0.80	-0.01	118	115	117	-2	-1
Congo, DR	0.76	0.75	0.76	1.47	-0.01	150	152	151	1	1
Denmark	8.25	8.26	8.48	2.57	-0.03	4	4	3	1	-1
Dominican Rep.	1.42	1.47	1.42	-4.05	0.00	110	107	106	1	-4
Ecuador	2.37	1.89	2.11	10.51	0.11	75	86	79	7	4
Egypt	1.70	1.66	1.71	3.21	-0.01	98	100	93	7	-5
El Salvador	1.99	2.03	2.06	1.33	-0.03	81	80	80	0	-1
Eritrea	0.66	0.89	0.91	3.03	-0.39	154	149	142	7	-12
Estonia	4.73	7.88	5.78	-36.29	-0.22	28	7	15	-8	-13
Ethiopia	1.13	1.10	1.08	-1.80	0.04	128	130	133	-3	5
Finland	6.21	6.16	5.96	-3.30	0.04	13	14	13	1	0
France	4.91	5.01	4.86	-3.17	0.01	25	30	29	1	4
Gabon	1.81	1.41	1.68	16.05	0.07	88	110	95	15	7
Gambia	1.41	3.45	1.38	-149.06	0.02	112	51	107	-56	-5
Georgia	1.43	1.82	1.51	-20.31	-0.06	109	90	103	-13	-6
Germany	4.57	5.08	4.69	-8.32	-0.03	32	28	33	-5	1
Ghana	1.74	1.75	1.66	-5.34	0.04	93	94	97	-3	4
Greece	4.92	5.39	5.12	-5.27	-0.04	24	22	27	-5	3
Guatemala	1.78	1.77	1.84	3.35	-0.03	91	93	86	7	-5
Guinea	1.72	1.67	1.67	0.43	0.02	97	99	96	3	-1
Guinea-Bissau	1.10	0.96	1.08	11.24	0.02	131	142	132	10	1
Haiti	0.60	0.68	0.63	-7.00	-0.06	155	155	156	-1	1
Honduras	1.73	1.91	1.83	-4.26	-0.06	95	83	87	-4	-8
Hungary	3.59	2.99	2.99	-0.08	0.17	50	57	54	3	4
India	0.87	0.91	0.86	-6.07	0.01	143	145	145	0	2
Indonesia	1.13	1.21	1.11	-9.49	0.02	130	127	128	-1	-2
Iran, Islamic Rep.	2.66	2.68	2.70	0.50	-0.01	68	68	62	6	-6
Iraq	1.42	1.35	1.45	7.04	-0.02	111	114	104	10	-7
Ireland	6.22	6.29	6.10	-3.15	0.02	12	12	12	0	0
Israel	3.96	4.82	4.28	-12.55	-0.08	46	37	41	-4	-5
Italy	4.52	4.99	4.70	-6.18	-0.04	34	31	32	-1	-2
Jamaica	1.72	1.93	2.22	13.34	-0.29	96	82	77	5	-19
Japan	4.17	4.73	4.37	-8.12	-0.05	40	38	38	0	-2
Jordan	2.13	2.05	2.22	7.71	-0.04	76	79	76	3	0
Kazakhstan	4.14	4.54	4.38	-3.83	-0.06	41	40	37	3	-4
Kenya	0.95	1.11	1.06	-5.01	-0.12	138	129	134	-5	-4
Kuwait	9.72	6.32	7.54	16.07	0.22	2	11	6	5	4
Kyrgyzstan	1.29	1.25	1.22	-2.01	0.05	120	123	122	1	2
Laos	1.30	1.28	1.26	-1.48	0.03	119	119	119	0	0
Latvia	3.95	5.64	5.39	-4.65	-0.36	47	18	18	0	-29
Lebanon	2.85	2.90	2.64	-9.77	0.07	62	59	66	-7	4
Lesotho	1.07	1.07	1.12	4.02	-0.04	134	132	127	5	-7
Liberia	1.28	1.26	1.32	4.30	-0.03	121	120	114	6	-7
Libya	3.19	3.05	3.04	-0.51	0.05	55	55	52	3	-3
Lithuania	4.38	4.67	4.43	-5.47	-0.01	37	39	35	4	-2
Madagascar	1.16	1.79	1.16	-54.60	0.00	127	91	126	-35	-1
Malawi	0.78	0.73	0.78	6.28	-0.01	148	154	149	5	1
Malaysia	3.90	4.86	3.44	-41.42	0.12	49	36	48	-12	-1
Mali	1.86	1.93	1.72	-12.18	0.08	86	81	92	-11	6

Mauritania	2.86	2.61	2.74	4.67	0.04	61	70	58	12	-3
Mauritius	4.55	4.26	4.39	2.90	0.04	33	44	36	8	3
Mexico	3.30	3.00	2.92	-2.68	0.12	52	56	55	1	3
Mongolia	5.53	5.53	5.38	-2.80	0.03	17	20	20	0	3
Morocco	1.32	1.22	1.19	-2.63	0.10	117	125	125	0	8
Mozambique	0.78	0.77	0.76	-1.34	0.03	147	150	153	-3	6
Myanmar	1.94	1.79	1.78	-0.38	0.08	83	92	89	3	6
Namibia	2.03	2.15	2.41	10.64	-0.19	79	77	73	4	-6
Nepal	0.76	3.56	0.76	-367.06	0.00	149	50	152	-102	3
Netherlands	6.34	6.19	6.24	0.72	0.02	11	13	10	3	-1
New Zealand	4.31	4.89	4.20	-16.36	0.03	38	34	42	-8	4
Nicaragua	1.56	1.56	1.63	4.35	-0.04	102	102	98	4	-4
Nigeria	1.44	1.44	1.54	6.97	-0.07	108	108	102	6	-6
Norway	4.77	5.56	5.25	-5.94	-0.10	26	19	23	-4	-3
Palestinian Terr.	0.46	0.74	0.69	-7.02	-0.50	158	153	154	-1	-4
Oman	5.69	4.99	5.36	7.04	0.06	16	32	21	11	5
Pakistan	0.75	0.77	0.77	0.66	-0.02	151	151	150	1	-1
Panama	2.97	2.87	2.87	-0.26	0.03	59	63	56	7	-3
Papua New Guinea	2.68	2.14	2.65	19.35	0.01	67	78	64	14	-3
Paraguay	2.99	3.19	3.28	2.70	-0.10	58	53	49	4	-9
Peru	2.03	1.54	1.85	17.06	0.09	80	103	84	19	4
Philippines	0.98	1.30	0.98	-32.05	0.00	137	118	137	-19	0
Poland	3.94	4.35	4.00	-8.61	-0.02	48	43	44	-1	-4
Portugal	4.12	4.47	4.32	-3.35	-0.05	42	41	40	1	-2
Puerto Rico	0.03	0.04	0.03	-10.34	-0.20	159	159	159	0	0
Qatar	11.68	10.51	10.52	0.13	0.10	1	2	1	1	0
Korea, Rep.	4.62	4.87	4.65	-4.80	-0.01	31	35	34	1	3
Moldova	2.10	1.39	1.37	-1.44	0.35	78	113	108	5	30
Romania	2.84	2.71	2.49	-8.60	0.12	64	65	71	-6	7
Russia	4.40	4.41	4.19	-5.33	0.05	36	42	43	-1	7
Rwanda	0.71	1.02	0.98	-4.41	-0.38	152	136	139	-3	-13
Saudi Arabia	3.99	5.13	4.77	-7.61	-0.20	43	26	31	-5	-12
Senegal	1.53	1.09	1.22	10.02	0.21	103	131	124	7	21
Serbia	2.57	2.39	2.34	-1.89	0.09	71	73	74	-1	3
Sierra Leone	1.13	1.05	1.09	3.49	0.04	129	133	131	2	2
Singapore	6.10	5.34	5.70	6.45	0.07	14	23	16	7	2
Slovakia	4.66	4.06	3.11	-30.58	0.33	30	46	51	-5	21
Slovenia	5.21	5.30	5.15	-2.97	0.01	21	24	26	-2	5
Somalia	1.44	1.42	1.45	1.50	0.00	107	109	105	4	-2
South Africa	2.59	2.32	2.70	13.98	-0.04	70	75	63	12	-7
Spain	4.74	5.42	5.09	-6.58	-0.07	27	21	28	-7	1
Sri Lanka	1.21	1.21	1.22	0.59	-0.01	122	126	123	3	1
Sudan	1.63	1.73	1.72	-0.52	-0.06	100	97	91	6	-9
Swaziland	1.45	1.50	1.24	-20.35	0.14	106	106	120	-14	14
Sweden	5.71	5.88	6.28	6.38	-0.10	15	15	9	6	-6
Switzerland	5.01	5.02	5.28	5.06	-0.05	23	29	22	7	-1
Syria	1.45	1.52	1.35	-12.76	0.07	105	105	112	-7	7
Tajikistan	0.90	1.00	0.87	-14.63	0.03	139	139	144	-5	5
Thailand	2.41	2.37	2.29	-3.34	0.05	74	74	75	-1	1
Macedonia TFYR	5.36	5.66	5.54	-2.12	-0.03	18	17	17	0	-1
Timor-Leste	0.47	0.44	0.53	18.04	-0.13	157	158	158	0	1
Togo	1.03	0.97	0.98	0.30	0.05	135	140	138	2	3
Trinidad/Tobago	7.56	3.09	6.20	50.15	0.18	5	54	11	43	6
Tunisia	1.76	1.90	1.85	-2.47	-0.05	92	85	85	0	-7
Turkey	2.55	2.70	2.65	-1.88	-0.04	72	66	65	1	-7
Turkmenistan	3.98	3.93	3.88	-1.15	0.03	45	47	45	2	0
Uganda	1.57	1.53	1.60	4.43	-0.02	101	104	99	5	-2
Ukraine	3.19	2.90	2.70	-7.45	0.15	54	60	61	-1	7
U.A.E.	8.44	10.68	10.32	-3.49	-0.22	3	1	2	-1	-1
United Kingdom	4.71	4.89	4.81	-1.78	-0.02	29	33	30	3	1
Tanzania	1.19	1.18	1.23	4.59	-0.04	124	128	121	7	-3
United States	7.19	8.00	7.58	-5.46	-0.05	6	6	4	2	-2
Uruguay	5.08	5.13	5.20	1.33	-0.02	22	27	25	2	3
Uzbekistan	1.82	1.74	1.71	-1.88	0.06	87	96	94	2	7
Venzuela	3.02	2.89	2.72	-6.23	0.10	56	61	59	2	3
Viet Nam	1.39	1.40	1.36	-2.92	0.02	113	111	110	1	-3
Yemen	0.87	0.94	0.96	1.87	-0.10	141	143	140	3	-1
Zambia	0.84	0.91	0.83	-9.27	0.01	145	146	147	-1	2

Zimbabwe	1.17	1.25	1.31	5.03	-0.12	125	121	115	6	-10

TABLE 3: NFA 2010 and NFA 2011 Editions comparison: biocapacity data table.

	(a) Biocapacity 2008 (2011 Edition)	(b) Biocapacity 2007 (2010 Edition)	(c) Biocapacity 2007 (2011 Edition)	(c)-(b) / (c)	(a)-(c) / (a)	Rank (a)	Rank (b)	Rank (c)	ΔRank between editions - (b) to (c)	ΔRank between years - (c) to (a)
	[gha/capita]	*[gha/capita]*	*[gha/capita]*	*%*	*%*					
Afghanistan	0.40	0.54	0.47	-15.49	-0.17	140	139	142	-3	2
Albania	0.88	0.87	0.85	-3.08	0.04	107	110	108	2	1
Algeria	0.56	0.59	0.57	-4.15	-0.01	134	138	136	2	2
Angola	2.98	3.00	3.00	0.13	-0.01	39	40	40	0	1
Argentina	7.12	7.50	7.32	-2.35	-0.03	16	15	16	-1	0
Armenia	0.72	0.71	0.74	3.91	-0.03	120	117	114	3	-6
Australia	14.57	14.71	14.54	-1.22	0.00	5	5	5	0	0
Austria	3.34	3.31	3.25	-2.10	0.03	31	33	33	0	2
Azerbaijan	0.72	0.76	0.73	-5.01	-0.01	116	118	116	2	0
Bahrain	0.69	0.94	0.77	-22.04	-0.11	105	114	121	-7	16
Bangladesh	0.42	0.38	0.40	6.91	0.04	150	148	147	1	-3
Belarus	3.40	3.29	3.20	-2.83	0.06	32	35	32	3	0
Belgium	1.33	1.34	1.34	-0.14	-0.01	81	81	84	-3	3
Benin	0.98	0.78	0.98	20.69	0.00	115	103	104	-1	-11
Bolivia	18.39	18.84	18.74	-0.51	-0.02	2	2	2	0	0
Bosnia/Herzegovina	1.64	1.60	1.57	-1.82	0.04	72	74	71	3	-1
Botswana	3.76	3.83	3.79	-0.91	-0.01	28	27	26	1	-2
Brazil	9.63	8.98	9.67	7.13	0.00	12	11	11	0	-1
Bulgaria	2.65	2.13	2.05	-3.84	0.23	59	61	49	12	-10
Burkina Faso	1.37	1.30	1.19	-8.95	0.13	84	90	81	9	-3
Burundi	0.45	0.50	0.48	-4.45	-0.08	141	144	145	-1	4
Cambodia	1.01	0.94	0.97	3.19	0.04	104	104	103	1	-1
Cameroon	1.87	1.85	1.92	3.63	-0.03	66	64	67	-3	1
Canada	14.92	14.92	14.74	-1.21	0.01	4	4	4	0	0
C. African Republic	8.35	8.44	8.51	0.84	-0.02	14	14	14	0	0
Chad	3.17	3.17	3.21	1.25	-0.01	35	34	35	-1	0
Chile	3.74	3.83	3.78	-1.51	-0.01	27	28	27	1	0
China	0.87	0.98	0.86	-14.33	0.02	103	109	109	0	6
Colombia	3.89	3.98	3.95	-0.86	-0.01	24	23	23	0	-1
Congo	12.20	13.27	12.54	-5.77	-0.03	6	6	6	0	0
Costa Rica	1.60	1.90	1.68	-13.01	-0.05	64	71	72	-1	8
Côte d'Ivoire	1.85	1.67	1.79	6.53	0.03	69	67	68	-1	-1
Croatia	2.92	2.50	2.59	3.31	0.11	50	48	43	5	-7
Cuba	0.71	0.74	0.71	-3.80	-0.01	119	120	119	1	0
Cyprus	0.24	0.40	0.29	-39.00	-0.17	147	154	153	1	6
Czech Republic	2.68	2.67	2.60	-2.44	0.03	46	46	47	-1	1
Korea, DPR	0.62	0.58	0.60	3.15	0.04	135	134	130	4	-5
Congo, DR	3.10	2.76	3.19	13.53	-0.03	44	36	36	0	-8
Denmark	4.81	4.85	4.72	-2.75	0.02	21	21	21	0	0
Dominican Rep.	0.54	0.50	0.50	0.58	0.07	142	142	139	3	-3
Ecuador	2.18	2.33	2.22	-4.98	-0.02	54	57	62	-5	8
Egypt	0.65	0.62	0.66	6.71	-0.01	127	125	125	0	-2
El Salvador	0.62	0.67	0.62	-7.95	0.00	123	129	129	0	6
Eritrea	1.47	1.60	1.72	7.09	-0.17	73	70	76	-6	3
Estonia	8.73	8.96	8.95	-0.10	-0.02	13	13	13	0	0
Ethiopia	0.65	0.66	0.65	-2.06	0.00	125	128	127	1	2
Finland	12.19	12.46	12.33	-1.10	-0.01	7	7	7	0	0
France	2.99	3.00	2.92	-2.75	0.02	38	42	39	3	1
Gabon	28.72	29.29	29.24	-0.19	-0.02	1	1	1	0	0
Gambia	1.15	1.10	1.05	-5.13	0.09	98	100	95	5	-3
Georgia	1.17	1.21	1.18	-1.99	-0.01	88	91	94	-3	6
Germany	1.95	1.92	1.88	-2.43	0.04	63	66	66	0	3
Ghana	1.28	1.19	1.26	5.25	0.02	91	86	90	-4	-1
Greece	1.59	1.62	1.50	-7.83	0.05	70	76	73	3	3

Guatemala	1.07	1.12	1.16	3.37	-0.09	96	93	100	-7	4
Guinea	2.93	2.85	2.91	2.25	0.00	40	43	42	1	2
Guinea-Bissau	3.40	3.22	3.49	7.79	-0.03	33	30	31	-1	-2
Haiti	0.31	0.31	0.33	7.94	-0.08	153	150	151	-1	-2
Honduras	1.97	1.84	2.04	9.92	-0.03	67	62	65	-3	-2
Hungary	2.68	2.23	2.15	-3.94	0.20	57	60	46	14	-11
India	0.48	0.51	0.49	-4.61	-0.01	140	143	143	0	3
Indonesia	1.32	1.35	1.32	-2.77	0.00	79	84	87	-3	8
Iran, Islamic Rep.	0.84	0.81	0.92	11.96	-0.10	114	106	111	-5	-3
Iraq	0.24	0.30	0.33	9.37	-0.38	154	151	154	-3	0
Ireland	3.41	3.48	3.49	0.31	-0.02	30	31	30	1	0
Israel	0.29	0.32	0.31	-2.21	-0.07	152	153	152	1	0
Italy	1.15	1.14	1.13	-1.20	0.01	94	95	96	-1	2
Jamaica	0.33	0.38	0.33	-15.61	-0.02	149	152	150	2	1
Japan	0.59	0.60	0.59	-1.62	0.00	131	135	134	1	3
Jordan	0.24	0.24	0.24	-0.08	-0.02	155	155	155	0	0
Kazakhstan	3.48	4.01	3.93	-1.96	-0.13	23	24	29	-5	6
Kenya	0.53	0.59	0.59	-1.17	-0.11	133	136	141	-5	8
Kuwait	0.43	0.40	0.45	12.15	-0.05	148	145	146	-1	-2
Kyrgyzstan	1.33	1.34	1.38	2.43	-0.04	80	80	86	-6	6
Laos	1.65	1.58	1.60	0.94	0.03	74	72	70	2	-4
Latvia	6.63	7.07	6.58	-7.43	0.01	17	17	17	0	0
Lebanon	0.39	0.40	0.38	-5.25	0.03	146	149	149	0	3
Lesotho	0.81	0.81	0.82	0.46	-0.01	113	112	112	0	-1
Liberia	2.95	2.47	3.11	20.41	-0.05	52	37	41	-4	-11
Libya	0.66	0.44	0.68	34.48	-0.02	144	123	124	-1	-20
Lithuania	4.32	4.36	4.24	-2.92	0.02	22	22	22	0	0
Madagascar	2.92	3.07	2.98	-2.94	-0.02	37	41	44	-3	7
Malawi	0.67	0.70	0.72	2.15	-0.08	121	119	123	-4	2
Malaysia	2.50	2.61	2.52	-3.33	-0.01	48	49	51	-2	3
Mali	2.29	2.49	2.19	-13.68	0.04	51	59	57	2	6
Mauritania	5.21	5.50	5.34	-2.96	-0.02	19	20	20	0	1
Mauritius	0.56	0.56	0.55	-1.88	0.02	138	139	137	2	-1
Mexico	1.42	1.47	1.42	-3.41	0.00	76	78	78	0	2
Mongolia	15.33	15.14	15.61	3.03	-0.02	3	3	3	0	0
Morocco	0.70	0.61	0.61	0.49	0.12	130	132	120	12	-10
Mozambique	2.21	1.89	2.25	15.81	-0.02	65	56	60	-4	-5
Myanmar	2.22	2.04	2.19	6.83	0.01	61	58	59	-1	-2
Namibia	7.18	7.56	7.31	-3.42	-0.02	15	16	15	1	0
Nepal	0.53	0.55	0.53	-3.21	0.01	139	140	140	0	1
Netherlands	1.03	1.03	1.01	-1.74	0.02	99	102	101	1	2
New Zealand	10.19	10.77	10.35	-4.04	-0.02	9	9	9	0	0
Nicaragua	2.33	2.82	2.39	-18.08	-0.03	41	52	53	-1	12
Nigeria	1.12	1.12	1.08	-3.68	0.04	97	99	97	2	0
Norway	5.40	5.48	5.41	-1.33	0.00	20	19	19	0	-1
Palestinian Terr.	0.13	0.16	0.13	-21.13	0.01	156	157	157	0	1
Oman	2.20	2.14	2.26	5.21	-0.03	58	55	61	-6	3
Pakistan	0.40	0.43	0.44	1.68	-0.08	145	146	148	-2	3
Panama	2.67	3.15	2.70	-16.59	-0.01	36	44	48	-4	12
Papua New Guinea	3.67	3.75	3.73	-0.63	-0.02	29	29	28	1	-1
Paraguay	10.92	11.24	11.07	-1.54	-0.01	8	8	8	0	0
Peru	3.82	3.86	3.85	-0.33	-0.01	26	26	25	1	-1
Philippines	0.62	0.62	0.61	-2.00	0.02	126	133	131	2	5
Poland	2.00	2.09	2.03	-2.94	-0.01	60	63	64	-1	4
Portugal	1.29	1.25	1.27	1.20	0.02	85	85	89	-4	4
Puerto Rico	0.17	0.14	0.17	16.92	-0.05	157	156	156	0	-1
Qatar	2.05	2.51	2.42	-3.88	-0.18	49	51	63	-12	14
Korea, Rep.	0.72	0.33	0.70	52.47	0.02	151	122	115	7	-36
Moldova	1.33	0.66	0.65	-1.79	0.51	124	126	85	41	-39
Romania	2.33	1.95	1.88	-3.71	0.19	62	65	54	11	-8
Russia	6.62	5.75	6.52	11.78	0.02	18	18	18	0	0
Rwanda	0.52	0.56	0.52	-9.03	0.01	136	141	142	-1	6
Saudi Arabia	0.65	0.84	0.68	-23.97	-0.03	112	124	126	-2	14
Senegal	1.40	1.20	1.23	2.40	0.12	89	87	80	7	-9
Serbia	1.41	1.16	1.20	3.22	0.15	92	89	79	10	-13
Sierra Leone	1.71	1.20	1.73	30.81	-0.01	90	69	69	0	-21
Singapore	0.02	0.02	0.02	-2.19	-0.04	158	158	158	0	0
Slovakia	2.86	2.68	2.61	-2.41	0.09	45	45	45	0	0

Slovenia	2.59	2.61	2.60	-0.23	0.00	47	47	50	-3	3
Somalia	1.36	1.40	1.41	1.21	-0.04	78	79	82	-3	4
South Africa	1.21	1.14	1.14	0.17	0.05	95	94	91	3	-4
Spain	1.46	1.61	1.58	-1.94	-0.09	71	73	77	-4	6
Sri Lanka	0.46	0.45	0.43	-4.04	0.07	143	147	144	3	1
Sudan	2.34	2.42	2.45	1.03	-0.05	53	50	52	-2	-1
Swaziland	0.97	1.00	0.96	-4.25	0.00	101	105	105	0	4
Sweden	9.51	9.75	9.67	-0.79	-0.02	11	12	12	0	1
Switzerland	1.20	1.24	1.22	-1.88	-0.02	86	88	92	-4	6
Syria	0.57	0.70	0.71	0.98	-0.24	122	121	135	-14	13
Tajikistan	0.56	0.56	0.58	4.10	-0.05	137	137	138	-1	1
Thailand	1.17	1.15	1.17	1.08	0.01	93	92	93	-1	0
Macedonia TFYR	1.55	1.43	1.47	2.23	0.06	77	77	75	2	-2
Timor-Leste	0.86	1.21	0.88	-38.22	-0.02	87	108	110	-2	23
Togo	0.67	0.60	0.65	8.13	0.03	132	127	122	5	-10
Trinidad/Tobago	1.56	1.57	1.57	0.42	-0.01	75	75	74	1	-1
Tunisia	0.96	0.98	1.01	3.24	-0.06	102	101	106	-5	4
Turkey	1.31	1.32	1.33	0.76	-0.02	83	82	88	-6	5
Turkmenistan	3.19	3.21	3.30	2.63	-0.03	34	32	34	-2	0
Uganda	0.81	0.85	0.81	-4.14	0.00	111	113	113	0	2
Ukraine	2.23	1.82	1.77	-2.96	0.21	68	68	58	10	-10
U.A.E.	0.64	0.85	0.83	-1.85	-0.30	110	111	128	-17	18
United Kingdom	1.34	1.34	1.32	-1.58	0.02	82	83	83	0	1
Tanzania	1.02	1.02	1.08	5.98	-0.06	100	98	102	-4	2
United States	3.86	3.87	3.87	-0.03	0.00	25	25	24	1	-1
Uruguay	10.03	9.91	9.91	-0.01	0.01	10	10	10	0	0
Uzbekistan	0.91	0.92	0.91	-1.11	0.00	106	107	107	0	1
Venzuela	3.00	2.81	3.06	7.95	-0.02	42	38	37	1	-5
Viet Nam	1.09	0.86	1.09	21.12	0.00	108	96	98	-2	-10
Yemen	0.60	0.62	0.62	0.20	-0.04	128	130	132	-2	4
Zambia	2.31	2.26	2.38	4.98	-0.03	55	53	55	-2	0
Zimbabwe	0.72	0.75	0.76	1.03	-0.06	117	115	117	-2	0

Methodological differences between editions can be demonstrated be looking at the change in absolute Ecological Footprint and biocapacity, and by looking at changes in country rankings for these two indicators. For the year 2007 - the most recent year covered by both NFA 2011 and NFA 2010 Editions - there were seven countries whose rank in Ecological Footprint per capita changed more than 15 places (standard deviation - s.d. = 12.1); for biocapacity per capita, there were only two countries whose rank changed by more than 15 places (s.d. = 5.2). Nine countries showed absolute changes in the Ecological Footprint greater than 1.0 gha per capita (s.d. = 0.6 gha per capita); no countries showed absolute changes in biocapacity greater than 1.0 gha per capita (s.d. = 0.2 gha per capita) (Figure 6).

FIGURE 6: Histogram of changes in country ranks (top) and per capita values (bottom) moving from NFA 2010 edition to NFA 2011 edition for the data year 2007. Lines indicate normal distribution fit to each histogram.





Regardless of the changes at the national level, trends for both editions show an overall decrease in world biocapacity and an overall increase in Ecological Footprint during the 47 year time series. Figure 7 shows the trend for humanity's average per capita Ecological Footprint and biocapacity for both the 2010 and 2011 Editions of the National Footprint Accounts. The largest difference between the two editions is the increasing difference in biocapacity going back in time, obtained as a result of the shift to a constant global hectare approach (see section 5.2). Due to the increase in agricultural productivity over the last 50 years, one hectare of cropland in 1961 provided fewer resources for human consumption than one hectare of cropland in 2008, and thus corresponds to fewer constant global hectares of biocapacity.

FIGURE 7: Humanity's average per capita Ecological Footprint (EF) and biocapacity (BC) over time. Trends from the 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011 Editions of the National Footprint Accounts are provided for comparison purposes.



A similar reduction in the Ecological Footprint takes place when moving to a constant global hectare calculation. However, this change has been largely offset by the change in the ocean uptake calculation (see section 5.3), where the NFA 2011 Edition uses a much lower value of ocean sequestration than prior versions, and thus there is an increased carbon Ecological Footprint. Taken together, these two methodological changes result in a large shift in the relative composition of the 1961 Ecological Footprint between NFA 2010 and NFA 2011 (48% cropland/12% carbon and 24% cropland /36% carbon respectively).

Nevertheless, global trends in the Ecological Footprint and biocapacity show a consistent message across the last four methodological updates of the National Footprint Accounts: population growth that outstrips increases in bioproductivity; and, following a relatively rapid increase in the 1960s, little change in the average Ecological Footprint per person over the last 40 years.

7. National Footprint Accounts' limitations

NFAs aim at measuring whether or not humans are able to live within the Biosphere's ecological budget. To answer this research question, a systemic approach is used to assess, in a combined way, the impact of pressures that are usually evaluated independently. Therefore, NFAs have been developed as a resource accounting framework, where the various pressures are first analyzed independently and results are then aggregated into a single number (see section 2 and Figure 1). Aggregation, however, has the drawback of implying a greater degree of additivity and substitutability between the included land use types than is probably realistic (DG Environment, 2008; Giljum et al., 2009; Kitzes et al., 2009; Wiedmann and Barrett, 2010).

The quality, reliability and validity of the NFAs are dependent upon the level of accuracy and availability of a wide range of datasets, many of which have incomplete coverage, and most of which do not specify confidence limits. Considerable care is taken to minimize any data inaccuracies or calculation errors that might distort the NFAs, including inviting national governments to collaboratively review the assessment of their country for accuracy (e.g., Abdullatif and Alam, 2011; Hild et al., 2010; von Stokar et al., 2006). In addition, the Ecological Footprint methodology is continually being refined and efforts are made to improve the transparency of the NFAs and the related written documentation (Gracey et al., 2012; Kitzes et al., 2009), allowing for more effective internal and external review.

Finally, NFAs are specifically constructed to yield conservative estimates of global overshoot. On the supply side, biocapacity is overestimated as both the land degradation and the long-term sustainability of resource extraction is not taken into account. On the supply side, Ecological Footprint is underestimated as it does not track freshwater consumption, soil erosion, GHGs emissions other than CO_2 as well as impacts for which no regenerative capacity exists (e.g. pollution in terms of waste generation, toxicity, eutrophication, etc). A detailed list of strengths and weaknesses of the Ecological Footprint methodology and limitations of the NFAs, can be found in Galli et al (2011) and Ewing et al (2010b), respectively.

Conclusions

In an increasingly resource constrained world, accurate and effective resource accounting systems are needed if nations, cities and companies want to stay competitive. National Footprint Accounts (NFA) is one such accounting system, designed to track human demand on the regenerative and absorptive capacity of the biosphere.

NFAs are maintained and updated annually by Global Footprint Network. Every new edition relies on the use of more comprehensive data sets and independent data sources, more consistent and reliable data, a revised and updated methodology and a more robust calculation process. Each time a new edition is released, Ecological Footprint and biocapacity values are back calculated from the most recent year in order to ensure consistency across the historical time trends. Edition after edition, these improvements lead to more reliable (and yet consistent) Ecological Footprint and biocapacity values and trends for nations and the world.

Stakeholders interested in monitoring nations' Ecological Footprint and biocapacity values and/or setting Footprint reduction targets are advised not to compare results obtained via different editions of the NFAs, and encouraged to always look at the time trends from the most recent edition of the NFAs.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Robert Williams for his help in the National Footprint Accounts Program as well as Nicolò Passeri for comments and feedback on a preliminary version of the paper. Thanks are also due to the two anonymous reviewers for their precious and constructive comments.

We would also like to acknowledge Avina Stiftung, Arthur und Estella Hirzel-Callegari Stiftung, Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi, Flora Family Foundation, Foundation for Global Community, Karl Mayer Stiftung, MAVA - Fondation pour la Protection de la Nature, Mental Insight Foundation, Skoll Foundation, Stiftung ProCare, Winslow Foundation, WWF International, Zayed International Prize for the Environments and many individual donors who have made the update of the National Footprint accounts possible. Thanks also go to the National Footprint Accounts Review Committee who has been providing continuous feedback on the development of the methodology.

References

Abdullatif, L., Alam, T., 2011. *The UAE Ecological Footprint Initiative*. http://awsassets.panda.org/downloads/en_final_report_ecological_footprint.pdf

Akaike, H., 1978. A Bayesian Analysis of the Minimum AIC Procedure. *Ann.Inst. Statist. Math*. 30, Part A, 9-14.

Barnosky AD, Hadly EA, Bascompte J, Berlow EL, Brown JH, Fortelius M, Getz WM, Harte J, Hastings A, Marquet PA, Martinez ND, Mooers A, Roopnarine P, Vermeij G, Williams JW, Gillespie R, Kitzes J, Marshall C, Matzke N, Mindell DP, Revilla E, Smith AB. 2012. Approaching a state shift in Earth's biosphere. *Nature* 486, 52-58.

Bastianoni, S., Niccolucci, V., Pulselli, R.M., Marchettini, N., 2012. Indicator and *indicandum*: "Sustainable way" vs "prevailing conditions" in the Ecological Footprint. *Ecological Indicators*, 16, 47–50.

Costanza, R., d'Arge, R., de Groot, R., Farber, S., Grasso, M., Hannon, B., Limburg, K., Naeem, S., O'Neill, R.V., Paruelo, J., Raskin, R.G., Sutton, P., van den Belt, M. 1997. The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature*, 387, 253-260.

Costanza, R., Daly, H.E., 1992. Natural capital and sustainable development. *Conservation Biology* 6, 37–46.

Daly, H.E., Farley, J., 2004. Ecological Economics: Principles and Application. Island Press, Washington, USA.

Daly, H.E., 1990. Towards Some Operational Principles of Sustainable Development. Ecological Economics 2, 1–6.

DeFries, R.S., Foley, J.A., Asner, G.P., 2004. Land-use choices: balancing human needs and ecosystem function. *Front Ecol Environ* 2(5), 249–257.

DG Environment, 2008. *Potential of the Ecological Footprint for monitoring environmental impact from natural resource use*. http://ec.europa.eu/environment/natres/studies.htm.

Ewing, B., Reed, A., Galli, A., Kitzes, J., Wackernagel, M., 2010a. *Calculation Methodology for the national Footprint Accounts, 2010 Edition*. Oakland: Global Footprint Network http://www.footprintnetwork.org/images/uploads/National_Footprint_Accounts_Method_Paper_2010.pdf

Ewing, B., Moore, D., Goldfinger, S., Oursler, A., Reed, A., Wackernagel, M., 2010b. *The Ecological Footprint Atlas 2010*. Oakland: Global Footprint Network. www.footprintnetwork.org/atlas.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) Statistical Databases. http://faostat.fao.org/site/291/default.aspx (accessed February 2011).

FAO, 2000. *Technical Conversion Factors for Agricultural Commodities*. http://www.fao.org/es/ess/tcf.asp. (accessed February 2011).

FAO, 2006. *World maps of climatological net primary production of biomass, NPP*. http://www.fao.org/nr/climpag/globgrids/NPP_en.asp (accessed March 2012)

FAO and IIASA (International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis), 2000. Global Agro-Ecological Zones.. http://www.fao.org/ag/agl/agll/gaez/index.htm (accessed February 2011).

FAO, 1998. *Global Fiber Supply Model.* ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/006/X0105E/X0105E.pdf (accessed February 2011).

Ferguson, A.R.B., 1999. The logical foundations of ecological footprints. *Environment, Development and Sustainability* 1, 149–156.

Galli, A., 2007. *Assessing the role of the Ecological Footprint as Sustainability Indicator*. Ph.D. Thesis. Department of Chemical and Biosystems Sciences. University of Siena, Italy.

Galli, A., Kitzes, J., Wermer, P., Wackernagel, M., Niccolucci, V., Tiezzi, E., 2007. An Exploration of the Mathematics behind the Ecological Footprint. *International Journal of Ecodynamics*. 2(4), 250-257.

Galli, A., Wiedmann, T., Ercin, E., Knoblauch, D., Ewing, B., Giljum, S., 2012. Integrating Ecological, Carbon, and Water Footprint into a "Footprint Family" of indicators: definition and role in tracking Human Pressure on the Planet. *Ecological Indicators*, 16, 100-112.

Galli, A., Wiedmann, T., Ercin, E., Knoblauch, D., Ewing, B., Giljum, S., 2011. *Integrating Ecological, Carbon and Water Footprint: Defining the "Footprint Family" and its Application in Tracking Human Pressure on the Planet*. OPEN:EU project deliverable. http://www.oneplaneteconomynetwork.org/resources/programme-documents/WP8_Integrating_Ecological_Carbon_Water_Footprint.pdf

Giljum, S., Hinterberger, F., Lutter, S., Polzin, C., 2009. *How to Measure Europe's Resource Use. An Analysis for Friends of the Earth Europe.* Sustainable Europe Research Institute, Vienna.

Global Footprint Network, 2011. *National Footprint Accounts, 2011 Edition*. Available at www.footprintnetwork.org.

Gracey, K., Lazarus, E., Borucke, M., Moore, D., Cranston, G., Iha, K., Larson, J., Morales, J.C., Wackernagel, M., Galli, A., 2012. *Guidebook to the National Footprint Accounts: 2011 Edition*. Oakland: Global Footprint Network. www.footprintnetwork.org/methodology.

Gulland, J.A., 1971. *The Fish Resources of the Ocean*. West Byfleet, Surrey, United Kingdom: Fishing News.

Haberl, H., Erb, K., Krausmann, F., 2001. How to calculate and interpret ecological footprints for long periods of time: the case of Austria 1926-1995. *Ecological Economics*, 38, 25-45.

Haberl, H., Erb, K.H., Krausmann, F., Gaube, V., Bondeau, A., Plutzar, C., Gingrich, S., Lucht, W., Fischer-Kowalski, M., 2007. Quantifying and mapping the human appropriation of net primary production in earth's terrestrial ecosystems. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci*. 104, 12942-12947.

Hammond, G.P., Jones, C.I., 2008. Embodied energy and carbon in construction materials. *Proc. Instn Civil. Engrs: Energy,* 161(2), 87-98.

Heinberg, R., 2007. *Peak Everything: Waking Up to the Century of Declines.* New Society Publishers, Gabriola Island, British Columbia, Canada.

Hild, P., Schmitt, B., Decoville, A., Mey, M., Welfring, J., 2010. *The Ecological Footprint of Luxembourg - Technical Report*. http://www.myfootprint.lu/files/RAP-20100614-EF_Lux_Phase_2-v.4.0.pdf

IEA Statistics and Balances. http://data.iea.org/ieastore/statslisting.asp (accessed February 2011).

Imhoff, M.L., Lawrence, W.T., Elvidge, C., Paul, T., Levine, E., Privalsky, M., Brown, V., 1997. Using nighttime DMSP/OLS images of city lights to estimate the impact of urban land use on soil resources in the United Sates. *Remote Sens. Environ*. 59, 105–117.

Interfacultaire Vakgroep Energie en Milieukunde Energy Analysis Program, Research Report no. 98, Groningen, 1999.

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), 2001. *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), 2006. *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Volume 4: Agriculture Forestry and Other Land Use.* http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/vol4.html (accessed February 2010).

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), 2007. *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.* [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

Khatiwala, S., Primeau, F., Hall, T., 2009. Reconstruction of the history of anthropogenic CO_2 concentrations in the ocean. *Nature*, 462, 346-350.

Kitzes, J., Galli, A., Bagliani, M., Barrett, J., Dige, G., Ede, S., Erb, K-H., Giljum, S., Haberl, H., Hails, C., Jungwirth, S., Lenzen, M., Lewis, K., Loh, J., Marchettini, N., Messinger, H., Milne, K., Moles, R., Monfreda, C., Moran, D., Nakano, K., Pyhälä, A., Rees, W., Simmons, C., Wackernagel, M., Wada, Y., Walsh, C., Wiedmann, T., 2009. A research agenda for improving national ecological footprint accounts. *Ecological Economics*, 68(7), 1991-2007.

Kitzes, J., Peller, A., Goldfinger, S., Wackernagel, M., 2007a. Current Methods for Calculating National Ecological Footprint Accounts. *Science for Environment & Sustainable Society*, 4(1) 1-9.

Kitzes, J., Galli, A., Wackernagel, M., Goldfinger, S., Bastianoni, S., 2007b. A 'constant global hectare' method for representing ecological footprint time trends. Available on-line [URL]: http://www.brass.cf.ac.uk/uploads/fullpapers/Kitzes_M66.pdf.

Marland, G., Boden, T.A., Andres, R.J., 2007. *Global, Regional, and National Fossil Fuel CO_2 Emissions*. In Trends: A Compendium of Data on Global Change. Oak Ridge, TN: Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory and U.S. Department of Energy.

Max-Neef, M., 1995. Economic growth and quality of life: a threshold hypothesis. *Ecological Economics* 15, 115–118.

Monfreda, C., Wackernagel, M., Deumling, D., 2004. Establishing national natural capital accounts based on detailed ecological footprint and biocapacity assessments. *Land Use Policy* 21, 231–246.

Moore, D., Galli, A., Cranston, G.R., Reed, A. Projecting future human demand on the Earth's regenerative capacity. *Ecological Indicators* 16, 3-10.

Pauly, D., Christensen, V., 1995. Primary production required to sustain global fisheries. *Nature*, 374, 255-257.Rees, W.E., 1992. Ecological footprints and appropriated carrying capacity: What urban economics leaves out. *Environment and Urbanization*, 4, 121-130.

Rockström, J., W. Steffen, K. Noone, Å. Persson, F. S. Chapin, III, E. Lambin, T. M. Lenton, M. Scheffer, C. Folke, H. Schellnhuber, B. Nykvist, C. A. De Wit, T. Hughes, S. van der Leeuw, H. Rodhe, S. Sörlin, P. K. Snyder, R. Costanza, U. Svedin, M. Falkenmark, L. Karlberg, R. W. Corell, V. J. Fabry, J. Hansen, B. Walker, D. Liverman, K. Richardson, P. Crutzen, and J. Foley. 2009a. Planetary boundaries: exploring the safe operating space for humanity. *Ecology and Society* **14**(2): 32. [online] URL: http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol14/iss2/art32/

Rockström R, Steffen W, Noone K, Persson A, Chapin FS, Lambin EF, Lenton TM, Scheffer M, Folke C, Schellnhuber HJ, Nykvist B, de Wit CA, Hughes T, van der Leeuw S, Rodhe H, Sörlin S, Snyder PK, Costanza R, Svedin U, Falkenmark M, Karlberg L, Corell RW, Fabry VJ, Hansen J, Walker B, Liverman D, Richardson K, Crutzen P, Foley JA., 2009b. A safe operating space for humanity. *Science*, 46, 472-475.

Scheffer, M., Carpenter, S., Foley, J.A., Folke, C., Walker, B., 2001. Catastrophic shifts in ecosystems. *Nature* 413, 591-596.

Schlesinger, W.H. 2009. Planetary boundaries: Thresholds risk prolonged degradation. *Nature Reports Climate Change* 3, 112-113.

Stiglitz, J.E., Sen, A., Fitoussi, J-P., 2009. *Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress*. http://www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr/documents/rapport_anglais.pdf

Thomas, C.D., Cameron, A., Green, R.E., Bakkenes, M., Beaumont, L.J., Collingham, Y.C., Erasmus, B.F.N., Ferreira de Siqueira, M., Grainger, A., Hannah, L., Hughes, L., Huntley, B., van Jaarsveld, A.S., Midgley, G.F., Miles, L., Ortega-Huerta, M.A., Peterson, A.T., Phillips, O.L., Williams, S.E., 2004. Extinction risk from climate change. *Nature* 427, 145-148.

Thormark, C., 2002. A low energy building in a life cycle-its embodied energy, energy need for operation and recycling potential. *Building and Environment*, 37, 429-435.

UN Commodity Trade Statistics Database. 2011. http://comtrade.un.org (accessed February 2011).

UNECE and FAO, 2000. *Temperate and Boreal Forest Resource Assessment.* Geneva: UNECE, FAO.

UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme), 2007. *GEO_4 Global Environment Outlook: environment for development.* Progress Press Ltd, Malta.

Venetoulis, J., Talberth, J., 2008. Refining the ecological footprint. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 10(4), 441-469.

von Stokar, T., Steinemann, M., Rüegge, B., 2006. *Ecological Footprint of Switzerland - Technical Report*. Published by Federal Office for Spatial Development (ARE), Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), and Federal Statistical Office (FSO). http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/en/index/themen/21/03/01.parsys.0001.downloadList.00011.DownloadFile.tmp/ecologicalfootprinttechnicalreport.pdf

Wackernagel, M., 1991. *"Land Use: Measuring a Community's Appropriated Carrying Capacity as an Indicator for Sustainability"* and "*Using Appropriated Carrying Capacity as an Indicator, Measuring the Sustainability of a Community"*. Report I and II to the UBC Task Force on Healthy and Sustainable Communities. The University of British Columbia, Vancouver.

Wackernagel, M., 1994. *Ecological Footprint and Appropriated Carrying Capacity: A Tool for Planning Toward Sustainability*. Ph.D. Thesis. School of Community and Regional Planning. The University of British Columbia.

Wackernagel, M., Onisto, L., Linares, A.C., Falfán, I.S.L., García, J.M., Guerrero, A.I.S., Guerrero, M.G.S., 1997. *Ecological Footprints of Nations: How Much Nature Do They Use? How Much Nature Do They Have?* Commissioned by the Earth Council for the Rio+5 Forum. Distributed by the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives, Toronto.

Wackernagel, M., Onisto, L., Bello, P., Linares, A.C., Falfán, I.S.L., García, J.M., Guerrero, A.I.S. Guerrero, M.G.S., 1999a. National natural capital accounting with the ecological footprint concept, *Ecological Economics*, 29, 375-390.

Wackernagel, M., Lewan, L. Hansson, C.B., 1999b. Evaluating the use of natural capital with the ecological footprint. *Ambio*, 28, 604–612.

Wackernagel, M., Schulz, B., Deumling, D., Linares, A.C., Jenkins, M., Kapos, V., Monfreda, C., Loh, J., Myers, N., Norgaard, R., Randers, J., 2002. Tracking the ecological overshoot of the human economy, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci*, 99(14), 9266-9271.

Wackernagel, M., Monfreda, C., Schulz, N.B., Erb, K.H., Haberl, H., Krausmann, F., 2004. Calculating national and global ecological footprint time series: resolving conceptual challenges. *Land Use Policy*, 21(3), 271-278.

Wackernagel, M., Rees, W.E., 1996. *Our Ecological Footprint: Reducing Human Impact on the Earth*. New Society Publishers, Gabriola Island, BC.

Wackernagel, M., Monfreda, C., Moran, D., Wermer, P., Goldfinger, S., Deumling, D., Murray, M., 2005. *National Footprint and Biocapacity Accounts 2005: The underlying calculation method*. Oakland: Global Footprint Network. www.footprintnetwork.org.

Wiedmann, T., Barrett, J., 2010. A review of the ecological footprint indicator—perceptions and methods. *Sustainability*, 2 (6), 1645-1693