



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS



ILHAM-EC

The value of land and economic valuation methods

Dr Nicola Favretto n.favretto@leeds.ac.uk

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Acknowledgements: Prof Jouni Paavola, University of Leeds



Learning goal and outline

LEARNING GOAL

- To understand the welfare-economic basis of monetary valuation of the environment and the main approaches to monetary valuation

OUTLINE

- What is the “**value of land**”?
 - **Theoretical framing:**
 - Defining **ecosystem services** and different **types of value**
 - What is the **Total Economic Value (TEV) framework**?
 - **Valuation methods:** how do we measure the TEV?



What is the “value of land”?

- Grounded in the concept of **Ecosystem Services (ES)**
 - Benefits that humans obtain from nature - through interaction of **natural, social, physical** and **human** capital

ES categories:

Provisioning: fresh water, food, fuel

Supporting: nutrient cycling, soil formation

Regulating: regulation of climate/flood, water purification

Cultural: aesthetic, educational, spiritual, recreational



- What is **value**: “**welfare utility**” (satisfy human needs) vs “**price**” of a good or service
 - Valuation encompasses two main principles of welfare economics: **preferences** and **money**



Why consider valuation?

- Give a **market value** for **non market goods (un-priced)** such as ecosystem services
- Valuation **captures tradeoffs** in a world of scarce resources and conflicting desires/interests

→ better resource management decisions




ES categories and examples of valuation

Provisioning services

- Estimation of soil erosion costs in relation to investment in erosion reduction

Regulating services

- Estimation of costs of pollution to set up payments for maintenance



Source: TRUCOST, 2013, p. 25



ES categories and examples of valuation

Cultural services

- Estimation of aesthetic and spiritual values to protect cultural/spiritual assets

Supporting services


- Difficult to value

Source: Nicola Favretto





Welfare economics & valuation



- Society needs to choose the **mix of environmental service flows** that is consistent with the **highest possible level of human well-being**
- Monetary valuation derives demand curves for environmental services
- D depicts the sum of the individuals' willingness to pay for Q_s of it
- Area A: **consumer surplus** (net benefit of a good to consumers)



Some important terms


- **WTP = willingness to pay** for a change in environmental quality
 - E.g. preservation (instead of extinction) of a species
- **WTA = willingness to accept** compensation for a change in environmental quality
 - E.g. for an increase of X in noise level in the neighbourhood due to increase in air traffic
- WTPs and WTAs for the same environmental change often differ: **WTP < WTA**


... It all relates to “well-being”: individual’s preferences and their **willingness to pay for gains** or to **accept compensation for losses**



Total Economic Value

= sum of WTP/WTAs for change in policy/project







Non demand based methods – Market price

- **Market price:** Observe prices directly in markets
 - E.g. Timber and fuel wood from forests
 - Advantage: easy to apply
 - Disadvantage: market prices can be distorted by subsidies



Revealed preference methods – Hedonic price

- Preferences and values are 'revealed' in complementary or **surrogate** markets
- **Hedonic price**: estimates economic values of ecosystem services that directly affect the price of marketed goods, E.g.:
 - Explores **WTP for environmental quality** in property sales - e.g. proximity of park to house
 - **Property prices** are explained by a **function of environmental attributes**
 - **Regression analysis** used to estimate increments in property values with different environmental and structural attributes



Source: Van Beukering et. al 2007 Valuing the Environment in Small Islands - An Environmental Economics Toolkit



Hedonic price case study (Van Beukering et al. 2007)

- **Amenity value of coastline** in Guam using actual behaviour
- **Environmental goods** – presence of a clean beach and healthy coral reef
- 2000-2004 **Statistical analysis** of database of 800 **house sales** showed that every additional km from the coast the value of a house declined by US\$ 17,000
- Extrapolation results yielded **total annual amenity value of coastal attributes** as US\$9.6 million





Revealed preference methods – Travel cost


- Method used to value sites that are used for recreation
- **Travel expenses** (number of visits), local **expenditure** and **time costs**
- *Visitors total expenditure* is used to estimate *demand* for services on site; then it's aggregated to derive *total benefit*
- Travel cost method involves tricky questions: what costs to include and how to distinguish costs that are incurred for other reasons





Travel cost case study (Pieter van Beukering et al. 2010)

- **Recreational value** of Hawaiian coral reefs
- Define zonal distribution of coral reef visitors to Hawaii
- **Travel costs:** actual costs of transportation, cost of travel time and local expenditures
- Most visitors come by plane: airfares used
- **Time cost** was calculated using **wage rates** (i.e. opportunity costs)
- Travel costs and visitation rates yielded a **demand curve** for Hawaiian tourism
- Marine active tourists spent **18% of expenditures on coral reefs**
- Total reef associated **consumer surplus** was US\$97 million





Stated preference methods – Contingent valuation

- Asking people their WTP/WTA for an environmental service

CASE STUDY (Arin and Kramer 2002)

- Environmental policy – Demand for dive trips to 3 protected coral reef areas in the Philippines
- **Survey** – Tourists were surveyed in 1997 using face to face interviews
- *How much would you be willing to pay as a daily, per person entrance fee to a marine sanctuary where fishing is prohibited in addition to the costs of the trip?*

US\$0, US\$1, US\$3, US\$5, US\$10 and other (please specify)





Contingent valuation – case study

- Results showed positive WTP to enter sanctuaries
- Revenues could support:
 - Coral reef conservation
 - Employment for fishermen banned from fishing (**compensation**)

US\$95-116k on Anilao



US£0.85-1M on Mactan



Stated preference methods – Choice experiments

- CEs depicts economic values as **collections of attributes**
- CE' s addresses some difficulties of CV by **asking people to value attributes** of an environmental good
- Advantages:
 - Efficiency: respondents **evaluate multi-attributes** simultaneously
 - **Intuitive** and more meaningful elicitation of value

Choice modelling:
the monetary value of environmental services can be estimated from the trade-offs people make between environmental attributes and income



Box one contains extremely good weather and one whale will be spotted during the holiday. The package costs \$100









Box two contains mildly good weather and two whales will be spotted during the holiday. The package costs \$150

Choice experiments case study

- Local WTP for coral reef conservation focusing on **local recreational use**, abundance of **culturally significant fish** and **non-commercial fishery** values

Findings:

- Recreational benefits/supply of culturally significant fish most important
- Sharing** of fish with family and friends **more important than re-sale**
- Attitudes: more concerned with pollution than ban on harmful fishing practices

Attributes	Option 1	Option 2	Current situation
 <p>REEF RECREATION Number of recreation areas provided by coral reefs</p>	20% less	20% more	No change
 <p>FISH CATCH Reef fish & seafood caught on the average fishing trip is enough for:</p>	One meal	meal + sharing + selling	One meal
 <p>CULTURAL FISH Amount of cultural fish (e.g. baby Rabbitfish & baby Goatfish)</p>	20% less	20% more	No change
 <p>REEF MANAGEMENT PRACTICES</p>	None (outside the MPAs)	Measures taken	None (outside the MPAs)
 <p>POLLUTION FROM LAND Change in the amount of pollution entering reef (e.g. sediment, sewage)</p>	20% more	20% less	No change
 <p>INCOME TAX Change in the amount of income tax that you pay on a yearly basis</p>	\$40/year less	\$40/year more	No change
Which of the options do you prefer?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Option 1	Option 2	Current situation



Benefit transfer method

- Borrowing WTP for one site and applying to another
- Why use this method? Limited resources
- Pre-conditions:
 - Original study should be valid and rigorous
 - Populations and study sites (i.e. environmental characteristics) must be similar





Conclusion

- **Value** and **price** are **different** concepts
- There are multiple types of values – you should be familiar with them by now
- The **Total Economic Value** provides a useful framework for comprehensive valuation of ecosystem services under their multiple categories
- **There is no “one best” method:** Ecosystem services can be valued using a variety of methods – each one serves different purposes and has got its own pros and cons
- Ecosystem valuation is **not “precise”**, but it provides useful information that **can support policy and decision making** in a world of finite resources